

Annual Joint Meeting
 Council of University System Faculty (CUSF)
 Council of University System Staff (CUSS)
 University System of Maryland Student Council (USMSC)
 Bowie State University, Bowie, Maryland

CUSF Minutes

Thursday, November 13, 2012

Attendance:	
Bowie (2)	Joan S. Langdon, Monika Gross
Coppin (2)	Virletta Bryant, Chris Brittan-Powell
Frostburg (3)	Robert Kauffman, Peter Herzfeld
Salisbury (3)	David Parker, Bobbi Adams
Towson (4)	Jay Zimmerman, Martha Siegel, Leonie Brooks, Thomas Krause
UB (2)	Stephanie Gibson
UMB (5)	Richard Manski
UMBC (3)	Drew Alfgren, Roy Rada, Nagaraj Neerchal
UMCES (2)	
UMCP (6)	William Stewart, Linda Aldory, Radu, Balan, Kenneth Holum, William Montgomery
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin
UMUC (3)	Betty Jo Mayeske, Margaret Cohen, Joyce Henderson, David Hershfield
Guests:	Joann Boughman (USM)

Future Meeting Dates for 2012-2013:

December 10, 2012 (Monday)	UB, University of Baltimore
January 23, 2013 (Wednesday)	USM, University System of Maryland
February 18, 2013 (Monday)	UMB, University of Maryland, Baltimore
March 11, 2013 (Monday)	SU, Salisbury University
April 9, 2013 (Tuesday)	TU, Towson University
May 10, 2013 (Friday)	UMCP, University of Maryland College Park
June 14, 2013 (Friday)	UMBC, University of Maryland Baltimore County

CONVENING THE MEETING - 10:00 a.m.

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. and there was a welcome by Bowie State University.
 [Secretary's Note: *Due to traffic delays of two hours, the Secretary did not arrive to the meeting until 10:45 a.m. Hence, the minutes reflect the Secretary's absence.*]

WELCOME FROM BSU - 10:02 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS - 10:10 a.m.

REPORT FROM USM - 10:23 a.m.

Joann Boughman, Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, presented her report.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE - 10:45 a.m.

P. J. Hogan, Vice Chancellor for Government Relations, and Andy Clark, Director of Legislative Affairs, provided the legislative update. P. J. Hogan began the presentation. In terms of the legislative update, he noted that “*the only thing that is certain is uncertainty.*” Although there are things that will most likely occur, there is no certainty that they will occur.

Annual Budget Process: First, P. J. covered the annual budgeting process. He indicated that there are three scenarios. The scenario that is followed will be determined by the revenue projections in December. He underlined the importance of retail sales over the holiday season noting that the holiday period can easily account for 30-50% of total retail sales for the year. This, in turn, will affect the revenue projections for the State.

1. *Worst Case Scenario:* In this scenario, there is no solution on the Federal “fiscal cliff” issue, and the Maryland economy slows down significantly. In this scenario, there is no growth nor is there corresponding tax revenue. Furlough days and similar measures are typically associated with this scenario.
2. *Current Services Budget:* Under this scenario, there is sufficient funding to maintain current services. It is a status quo budget with “no new items” funded. However, there is some funding for utilities, mandates, and normal inflation.
3. *Enhancement Budget:* This budget includes things that the System wants to do. It includes new directions and initiatives. It includes such items as increasing enrollment or graduation rates, meeting the strategic plan goal of 55% retention, meeting the achievement gap across campuses, and technology transfer. These enhancements are, in large part, related to what the Governor is interested in also.

Act 2 occurs with the submission of the Governor’s budget on January 15th. P.J. noted the Legislature cannot add to the budget. They can only cut the budget. Act 3 is when the budget committee has their hearings and Act 4 is when they decide. The House of Delegates makes its decision on the budget and the Senate makes its decision independently of the House. Categorically, they rarely agree. Traditionally, the Senate cuts higher education more than the House. The last time the House cut more than the Senate was in 1994. Act 5 is the conference committee where they work out the differences. What begins as the high water mark with the Governor’s budget usually becomes a lower new high water mark determined by the Senate. Usually, they will split the difference between the House and Senate.

P. J. noted that the goals of higher education as well as the System’s strategic plan and those of the individual institutions are consistent with the O’Malley administration. These are to provide a *high quality affordable education*, to address workforce needs, and to create technology transfer that will spin off new businesses.

He noted that there is a plan for COLAs and merit. In addition, he noted that the economy is improving and that there will most likely be funding available for both. However, they are predicated on an improving economy.

On December 13th there is the Assembly Affordability Meeting. It is based on three general considerations. First, how much should the general fund operating budget be increased based on projections. Second, at what price do they want to sell their general obligation bonds and where do they want to set their debt service at. Third, they focus on the state's workforce needs. Although the committee's recommendations aren't binding on the Governor, the recommendations do influence the Governor's budget recommendations since the Legislature will eventually approve the budget. These recommendations can also be influenced by the March revenue projection and other projections. In addition, he noted several pending bills or proposals that could impact the System.

Joint degree capability of UMCES – There is a proposal for a bill that would allow the University of Maryland Center for Environment Sciences the ability to offer joint degrees with any other USM institution.

Performance based funding – This has been tried in numerous states and P. J. noted that no state has really been successful with it. They are looking for a model that works rather than replicate other systems that have been less than satisfactory.

Textbook hearings – The current approach has worked well due in large part to faculty and administration efforts. P. J. noted that the rental of e-books has not really caught on. He speculated on several reasons for this. One possible reason is that when students sell back their books at the end of the semester, they are able to increase their pocket money.

P. J. indicated that USM is doing better than most other state agencies although it isn't really a state agency. He thanked faculty for their 20,000 plus emails with personalized stories. It had an effect on potential budget cuts last year.

Andy Clark echoed P. J. Hogan's comments. When the new legislative session begins, he extended an invitation for people to dial in on their conference call every Monday at 9:00 a.m. In addition, he will also send out a weekly newsletter.

Dream Act – One question asked how much the Dream Act would cost the state. One projection suggested that it would cost 3.5 million dollars a year. Another projection suggested that it would affect roughly 212 students a year. P. J. noted the criteria that must be met in order to qualify under the Dream Act. First, the student must complete high school within the last three years. Second, they must graduate from high school. Third, they must have filed income tax for the previous three years. Fourth, they must go to a community college after high school. Fifth, they must graduate from the community college before going to a four-year institution. Sixth, they can transfer to a four-year school where they are charged instate tuition. They are not eligible for Federal aid. Seventh, they are counted as an out-of-state student. This affects the 70%/30% ratio of instate to out-of-state students at an institution. Generally, this is not an issue because most of the institutions are not close to the 30% limit. Based on all the criteria, P. J. estimated that only 212 students would most likely participate under the Dream Act. This of course assumes that all the criteria are enforced and adhered to.

A ten minute break was taken before the next topic area.

CUSF/CUSS/USMSC DISCUSSIONS - 11:45 a.m.

Richard Lucas III made some brief remarks on behalf of the Student Council. His message was that we all need to work together. For shared governance to work, it will take the faculty, staff and students working together.

Next, the discussion was opened up to the floor for questions. There was a discussion involving *shared governance on campuses*. One topic discussed focused on representation by students and staff on Senate. Representatives from Towson indicated that the Chair of the Student Government has a designated position on Senate. Currently, staff has a seat on Senate where they have voice but don't have a vote. They are looking at their constitution and this will probably change in the future. Also, they have an AAUP Committee which is comprised of only faculty and that committee also has a designated seat on Senate. It was noted that the designated representation helps to facilitate collaborative shared governance.

In contrast, at UMES there is a student body, faculty self-governance body, and a common senate body where everyone votes. Again, it is only by working together that we can resolve some of the problems on campus. In addition, the one representative outlined shared governance at UMCP and noted that non-tenure track faculty had a seat on Senate. In addition, there was a brief discussion regarding designated positions on senate and the need for these positions to follow through and keep their constituents informed.

In conclusion, Richard Lucas provided a brief summary of the discussion and noted that there needs to be collaboration between the faculty, staff, and students in the shared governance process.

LUNCH - 12:20 a.m.

REPORT FROM THE CHANCELLOR - 12:45 p.m.

Brit Kirwan, Chancellor of USM, provided some remarks on the issues that the System is facing today. He noted that he appreciated the opportunity to meet with the different councils during the year but he especially values the occasions when he can meet with all the councils in one room. He noted that the sessions with the council were an excellent opportunity for both top down and bottom up communication. In addition, he noted that the BOR (Board of Regent) is highly committed to shared governance. For example, the BOR and the system are committed to consulting with all constituent groups before introducing or changing BOR policy. He noted that if shared governance is not operating efficiently on campuses, then he wants the councils to bring it to his attention because one of his duties is to ensure that Board policy is carried out effectively. He will engage the presidents regarding the issue.

His remarks built upon the comments of P. J. Hogan and Andy Clark. They have been very aggressive in going to the Governor and representing the needs of the System. The Governor has been very supportive of higher education. With the economic challenges, the Governor's support has enabled us to avoid major cuts but, in general, we've been in a mode of trying to hold together each year hoping for an upturn in the economy. Our priorities are well aligned with the state's goals including college completion, achievement gap, workforce development research, and applied research and economic development. If the economic uptick continues, the Governor has expressed an interest in making an investment in USM, not just in helping us avoid cuts.

Next, he focused on the fiscal situation. Currently, things are looking encouraging. State revenues are up. COLAs and merit are on the table. However, the situation is precarious with the pending fiscal cliff. There is a lot of uncertainty and it is important to couch his optimism in that uncertainty. If things break well at the Federal level, System could have a good year.

Next he addressed the capital budget. He didn't spend much time on it but noted that the capital budget is very favorable.

The next issue that the Chancellor addressed was *compensation*. He noted that the Board has lots of issues facing them, but at the top of their list was compensation. They understand that compensation is a huge issue across the System and that it needs to be addressed. He outlined the forecasted increases in compensation below. In addition, he noted the usual caveats that could impact future COLA and Merit. Regardless, unless circumstances intervene, they are on the table.

January 2013 2% COLA

January 2014 3% COLA

April 2014 2 ½ % Merit

July 2014 2 ½ % Merit [Note: Yes this is two months later]

Brit concluded his remarks and opened up the discussion with question and answers.

The first question addressed *tuition remission*. It was noted that tuition remission is a big selling point for faculty coming into the System. Brit said that it is an expensive item. He noted that as part of the shared governance process, tuition remission is an item that could be put on the table and discussed. He suggested that CUSF consider this issue or any other fringe benefit that could be of benefit faculty. Although tuition remission is primarily a faculty issue, he extended his comments to include staff and student issues also.

The next question focused on *academic transformation*. Brit believes that we are at the point where we can combine information technology and intelligent software with what we know about how people learn to complement what faculty actually do in the classroom to improve learning. He noted that USM has been involved in several experiments and he is aware of several other experiments at other institutions. He believes that we are at the beginning of a huge transformation in education that will bring these technologies to bear on learning. He noted that some of the leaders like Harvard, Stanford, and MIT are experimenting in these technologies including hybrid classrooms. He believes that their involvement signals momentum in the eventual transformation. Brit addressed the creation of the new center at the System level. They are wrestling with a name for the center although they are gravitating to *The Center for Innovation and Excellence in Learning and Teaching*. Its purpose is to be a resource to institutions interested in developing these technologies and to help obtain resources for these institutions to develop their own innovations.

He noted that there is a lot of hype around these new teaching and learning strategies and people don't know what really works and what doesn't. He said that one of the purposes of the Center is to help campuses do research on the effectiveness of these new teaching and learning strategies to document whether or there actually are learning gains. He said the center will also raise money to help campuses interested expanding their course redesign efforts.

Next, Brit addressed a question on the *Open Learning Initiative*. He used the occasion to discuss a recent experiment they did involving UMBC and Towson regarding the Carnegie Mellon approach. The approach uses the computer to store the mistakes made by the students and provide the feedback to the

instructor. There is immediate feedback to the student. In addition, the instructor goes into the classroom knowing the data on student learning and can address these areas of learning in the classroom. Essentially, they found no differences between this approach and the traditional approach (lecture followed by traditional examination). Their study did suggest that the approach could be useful in lower level courses particularly if it can be shown that there are cost savings. He noted that course redesign is not for everyone.

The next question addressed *differential tuition*. Currently, each institution charges students a uniform price per credit for their education. In a sense, the humanities (lower cost) are subsidizing the higher cost science programs. Differential tuition would address this issue. Essentially, there is already some differential tuition since students are paying lab fees and other fees for courses. In addition, Brit noted that although a case can be made for tuition differential, there is no simple answer regarding implementing it.

RESPONSE TO DISCUSSION TOPICS/Q&A SESSION - 1:30 p.m.

First, the Councils were tasked to look at shared governance on individual campuses and within the councils and to develop a report. In this respect, Councils should determine common ground with each other and remain in communications with each other on campuses.

In summary regarding *tuition remission*, if we present it, they will look at it. A proposal needs to be developed over the next several months.

PHOTOS - 1:40 p.m.

Several photos were taken of the different Councils. They are not included here.

ADJOURNMENT - 2:00 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Secretary

Attachments: none

Interim ExecCom
Approved