

CUSF General Body Meeting
Salisbury University, Salisbury, Maryland

Minutes

Monday, March 11, 2013

Attendance:	
Bowie (2)	Joan S. Langdon, Monika Gross
Coppin (2)	
Frostburg (3)	Robert Kauffman, Elesha Ruminski
Salisbury (3)	David Parker, Bobbi Adams
Towson (4)	Jay Zimmerman, Martha Siegel, Leonie Brooks (phone)
UB (2)	Stephanie Gibson
UMB (5)	Richard Manski
UMBC (3)	Roy Rada, Nagaraj Neerchal (phone), Joyce Tenney (phone)
UMCES (2)	Rose Jagnus
UMCP (6)	William Stuart, William Montgomery
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin, Emmanuel Onyeozili
UMUC (3)	Betty Jo Mayeske, Margaret Cohen, David Hershfield
Guests:	Nancy Shapiro (USM), J. Craig Clarke (SU)

Future Meeting Dates for 2012-2013:

April 9, 2013 (Tuesday)

May 10, 2013 (Friday)

June 14, 2013 (Friday)

TU, Towson University

UMCP, University of Maryland College Park

UMBC, University of Maryland Baltimore County

PRE-MEETING – 9:30 a.m.

Pre-meeting activities were convened at 9:30 a.m. by Jay Zimmerman at Salisbury University with committee meetings and the legislative phone conference call with Andy Clark.

CONVENING THE MEETING – 10:00 a.m.

At 10:00 a.m. Jay Zimmerman formally convened the meeting.

WELCOME FROM HOST CAMPUS – 10:00 a.m.

Dave Parker introduced the President of Salisbury University, Dr. Janet Dudley-Eshbach. First, she discussed the current situation with the Legislature in Annapolis. She noted that the Governor's budget

was particularly helpful for higher education. USM should see a significant increase in their budgets for next year. She outlined the needs for Salisbury University. First, they need more money for scholarships. Second, they need to hire additional faculty and staff. She noted that the per capita income in Maryland is the highest or second highest in the Country. Maryland is a wealth state and this wealth should be reflected in the salaries of faculty and staff. Third, she touched on the compression issue in terms of faculty salaries. Fourth, she noted the changes that have occurred at Salisbury University in terms of its growth and development. Again, she welcomed the group to campus and took questions.

She received a question regarding the support of faculty members receiving reassign time for CUSF. She noted that this should not be a problem and although she was not aware of the problem since she tends to focus on big issue items, she is supportive of assisting faculty serving in CUSF.

The next question focused on the use of the term “Honor’s University of national distinction...” The question was on the term “national distinction.” She indicated that it was her term and that it aided in their marketing efforts.

She received a question on the Perdue School of Business. She responded with a brief history of Salisbury University vis-a-vis its relationship with Perdue. Salisbury University, like Towson and Frostburg started out as a normal school. However, they have pursued more a public/private model than these schools. The net result is that they receive less funding from the legislature than their counterparts. Currently, they have four endowed schools which is unusual for a public school. Regarding the Perdue School of Business and its new building she noted that when she arrived on campus Salisbury the last time they had a new building was 12 years ago. She was able to obtain an eight million dollar donation from Frank Perdue to leverage the Perdue School of Business with the State and they were able to build the building earlier than otherwise because of the donation.

She closed her remarks by indicating her support for shared governance by indicating that it was important to her and that her role is to listen better. Second, she noted the diversity issue and changing demographics and how they are aggressively looking at these issues to better prepare students for the workplace in Maryland and the nation.

MOMENT OF SILENCE – 10:30 a.m.

There was a moment of silence for the recent passing of Irv Goldstein, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Jay noted that he had sent flowers on behalf of CUSF to the family.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – 10:32 a.m.

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the February CUSF meeting. The motion passed.

REPORT FROM SYSTEM – 10:33 a.m.

Nancy Shapiro, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs & Special Assistant to the Chancellor for P-20, provided the report from System. She noted that Joann Boughman had a personal matter and was not able to attend.

First, she addressed the current situation with the budget. The Governor had proposed in his budget approximately a 30 million dollar increase to higher education. The House budget subcommittee has proposed a 10 million dollar cut to System's budget a substantial amount which is really a transfer of funds to MHEC, scholarships, and other functions. Of the 10 million dollars, five million dollars would be used to increase MHEC scholarships and \$500,000 would be used to hire new staff to increase the approval process. Nancy noted that Andy Clark and the USM government relations staff are actively fighting this cut to the System budget. It was suggested from a Council member that the 10 million dollar cut or transfer of funds is really equivalent to borrowing the funds directly from the USM fund balance. (See attachment – Operating Budget Decisions)

The question was asked whether it is time for CUSF and faculty to respond. Nancy indicated that it was and that she would let Andy know of CUSF's interest. [Secretary's Note: *Since the meeting, the Senate passed its version of the budget and the budget is now in conference committee.*]

Center for Academic Transformation – Nancy provided a brief update on the Center. Currently, they are assembling a group of experts to work on the issues. She noted that they are actually performing experiments to test the effectiveness of some of the new methodologies and approaches. There is a lot of activity going on within the System and the Center is designed to pull together a lot of this knowledge. She indicated that Maryland is a leader in this area. She indicated that the purpose of the center was to coordinate and collaborate with the work going on at the individual campuses.

Term Limits on Senate Chairs – System was interested in knowing if there were term limits on the Faculty Senate chairs and where this information might be obtained. There was a brief discussion on the topic. It was noted that this information could be found in the individual constitutions of the Faculty Senates, that the requirement of term limits varies with campuses, and that the question was raised whether this was really an issue they should be seeking.

Budget Rollovers – The question was asked regarding the possibility of rolling over departmental budgets from one year to the next in terms of these initiatives. Nancy indicated that this was an important issue in providing continuity and the Center may be able to address the issue with best practices.

Merit – There was a question regarding faculty participation in determining how merit is distributed on the campuses. The preliminary motion stated "That CUSF believes that all decisions regarding the distribution of merit monies should be guided by faculty policies developed with faculty participation." Jay indicated that this should be a new business item in the afternoon and they should finalize the motion for then. [Secretary's Note: *See the finalized motion under new business.*]

MOTION ON HUMAN SUBJECTS – 11:20 a.m.

Jay indicated that the Executive Committee puts forth the following motion for action by the Council. The motion was seconded.

MOTION #1302 – CUSF supports the proposed changes to the USM policy on human subjects of research. [disposition: motion withdrawn]

Jay indicated that many institutions have internal IRP boards. There are instances where an approved 3rd party IRB are more appropriate. This is particularly true when there are collaborative efforts.

- The question was asked whether these outside agencies charge for the service. It was not known

if there is a charge.

- There were questions raised regarding IRB in general including the communications between the IRB and the rest of the campus.

In summary, there insufficient information presented regarding the background of the motion and its actual impact. Rather than voting the motion down, the group decided that the most appropriate approach was to withdraw the motion. The second was withdrawn and ExecCom withdrew the original motion. Nancy and Jay will communicate that CUSF had some questions on the proposed policy changes.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE – 11:46 a.m.

Rose Jagnus, chair of the nominations committee, gave her report on the nominations process to date. She indicated that currently she has the following nominations for the following positions:

Chair: Jay Zimmerman
Vice Chair: Virletta Bryant
Secretary: Bobbi Adams
At-Large: Robert Kauffman and Nagaraj Neerchal

Rose indicated that the nominations for ExecCom will officially close at 1:00 p.m. the day of this meeting. She noted that unless additional nominations were received, this will be the executive committee for next year. Jay noted that people could still self-nominate and/or email in nominations until 1:00 p.m.

AD HOC SHARED GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE – 11:50 a.m.

Richard Manski reported on the ad hoc committee meeting. He noted that they have their committee members. They had a very informative meeting with Joann Boughman, They have developed some suitable language regarding Section G in the shared governance policy. They should have something back to the Council by May. Also, it was noted that this item should be placed on the agenda of the Senate Chairs meeting in April. [Secretary's Note: *For a background discussion of this issue and a listing of the committee members, see the first item under New Business of the February 2013 minutes.*]

BYLAWS CHANGE MOTION – 11:55 a.m.

At the request of the Council, ExecCom formulated the following motion regarding approval of formal written communications. According to the Bylaws, the motion can be voted upon at the next (April) meeting. There was no further discussion on the motion at this time.

MOTION #1303 – To change Section 5.2 as described below:

5.2 Duties: The Executive Committee shall:

g. Be responsible for the publication of formal communications representing the Council.

h. [Renumber Item g to h.]

[Rationale: The ExecCom is responsible for representing the Council. Formal publications are one of those responsibilities. Then there is the question of who writes the publication. By not specifying specifically to whom this is delegated, ExecCom can delegate it to the person best able to write the communication. This could include an ExecCom member, a general member, or even someone who isn't on CUSF (e.g. System staff). Even so, ExecCom is responsible for oversight of the publication and that is the way it should be.]

LUNCH – 12:02 p.m.

REPORT ON SHARED GOVERNANCE AT SU – 1:20 p.m.

Introduced by Dave Parker, Craig Clarke, Chair of the Faculty Senate, presented the shared governance report at Salisbury University.

First, he indicated their basic structure. He noted that they have the traditional committees with their Faculty Senate. In addition, they have a “Consortium” which includes the faculty, staff and students. The coordinating committee of the Consortium includes the Presidents of the Faculty Senate, staff organization, and SGA. Typically, in the Consortium, an administrator coordinates its committees and typically the committees include traffic and other traditionally non-priority tasks.

Craig indicated that he was meeting with the faculty on the day after this meeting and would appreciate feedback from the Council on what other campuses are doing regarding shared governance. First, the Council members asked several questions regarding the Consortium structure. The primary focus was on having an administrator call the meeting of two important committees such as the finance committee and the physical affairs committee. Craig suggested that this may have been done to provide access to the committees by students and staff. Second, in response to another question, Craig indicated that he had the opportunity to meet one on one with the President. Fourth, the Provost normally attends the Senate meetings but the President does not. Fifth, there was a discussion regarding the ability of faculty to be able to ask the right questions on the part of the faculty. This is particularly true when dealing with the finances and budget.

CHAIR’S REPORT – 1:56 p.m.

Due to the time constraints and the fact that most of the topics have already been covered, Jay provided a brief report. He indicated that the activity with the Legislature was already covered. Next, Jay informed the group that the Chancellor’s Council had a presentation on “Enterprise Risk Management”, which is currently being tried at UMB. The presentation was made because it was something that the other Presidents might want to try on their campuses. The idea is to perform a campus wide assessment of the possible risks that a university runs in its operations. Some examples of risks and their mitigation were given.

OLD BUSINESS – 2:02 p.m.

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS – 2:02 p.m.

Under new business, Martha indicated that their motion would be put on the agenda for the next meeting. The finalized motion is provided below. [Secretary's Note: *For a brief discussion of the topic that lead to this motion see USM Report – Merit in these minutes.*]

MOTION #1304 – CUSF believes that policies developed with faculty participation should guide the distribution of merit money.

Since it was after 1:00 p.m. or the closing time for nominations, the nominations to ExecCom were formally closed. The nominations are as previously listed in these minutes, and the elections at the April meeting will be a mere formality.

ADJOURNMENT – 2:05 p.m.

With no further business, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Secretary

Attachments: Operating Budget Decisions

Approved

Operating Budget Decisions

House	Senate
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• \$4M general fund reduction.• \$5M transfer to MHEC for financial aid from the general fund.• \$500K transfer to MHEC for new positions from the general fund.• \$500k reduction for the College Park Academy.• \$7M restricted until report on how enhancements will be used is submitted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No reduction – House action rejected.• No transfer – House action rejected.• \$600k transfer to MHEC for new positions– House action modified.• No reduction – House action rejected.• \$16.1M restricted until report on how enhancements will be used is submitted and shall not be included in base funding for FY 2015.• \$6.7M of general fund appropriation for MPowering initiatives may only be used for MPowering initiatives.