

**CUSF/CUSS/USMSC JOINT MEETING**  
*University of Maryland College Park*  
*The Adele H. Stamp Student Union Grand Ballroom*  
*Friday, November 18, 2016 10:00 a.m.*

**Minutes**

10:00—Sherrye Larkins, Council of University System Staff (CUSS) chair convened the meeting.

10:02 Wallace Loh, President of University of Maryland addressed the attendees. He stated that higher education in the US is the only higher education entity in the world that embraces shared governance. He talked about the importance of shared governance, which includes collaboration and communication of groups, each contributing expertise in certain areas. Dr. Loh thanked attendees for participating in this joint council, and he applauded the agenda for touching upon important issues, including student success, efficiency and effectiveness, and faculty workload.

10:10—Chancellor offered a greeting via video

Chancellor Caret described the importance of communication for a number of reasons, including ensuring buy-in at all levels. He stated that the top priority of the System is to graduate enlightened, educated citizens ready to go forward and serve. And he underscored our work as a system, which illustrates that we work together for mutual success.

10:14 Sydney Comitz, president of USMSC, introduced the Regents serving on the panel:

- Regent James T. Brady, Chair
- Regent Barry P. Gossett, Vice Chair
- Regent Robert L. Pevenstein
- Regent Sharon Gooden

Regent Brady explained that we all share a common mission to make the System the best it can be and to provide educational opportunities to students across the state and beyond. He described the regents as persons who share a deep commitment to higher education and to USM. He described the BOR role as a governing board who are interested in policy, and in seeing that the leadership at the System and at the campuses is the best we could possibly have.

He stated that priorities of the BOR include student success; shared governance; diversity and inclusion, to include not just diverse ethnicities, genders, etc., but also ideas; and entrepreneurship.

The panel then addressed questions posed by the CUSS and CUSF chairs.

With regard to the diversity and inclusion initiative, the regents explained that they are interested in deep, respectful, open/frank discussion about difficult issues, and they pledged to give their serious attention to the outcome of this committee's work.

With regard to shared governance, the regents reported that they review every policy every four years, so the USM shared governance policy will be reviewed over the next two years. Additionally, they noted that the shared governance policy is implemented better on some campuses than others.

With regard to the role of HBCUs, the regents talked about reaching out to all students and including all students at HBCUs. They also discussed the important role that HBCUs have played historically, but reiterated that they must be seen as attractive and welcoming to all citizens.

With regard to efficiency and effectiveness (E&E), the regents explained briefly the focus of this initiative, which is to save money but, more importantly, to improve the quality of the education. Some areas where E&E might be constructive include (1) technologies that provide information about how a student is performing early on in a course and predict whether the student will be successful or not, (b) procurement, that is, using leverage of all the universities to get the best deals on many of the things that are used commonly, including hardware, software, etc. When asked how the initiative might assist students in gaining access to healthcare at affordable prices, one regent responded that he did not recall this as a focus of the E&E discussions. It was suggested that the USM staff perhaps look at this important issue first.

With regard to the appropriate process for bringing issues to the regents, they urged attendees to share with them "things that really matter."

With regard to the BOR's interest in highlighting to legislators and others the important work that USM faculty and staff do, the regents reported that they see the necessity to communicate to legislators that professors are doing their jobs, to explain workload, which includes not just teaching but preparation, research, mentoring, service, etc. There was clear recognition by the regents of the increasing academic underpreparedness of entering college students, when compared to college students historically. One regent, therefore, stated his belief that the role of faculty has to be reassessed so that mentoring and advising isn't something that happens only if one has the time to do it. Rather, he said, we need to make time for it so that we have the best prepared students going forth into the world.

With regard to national rankings of institutions of higher education, the regents urged a focus on making the institutions better, rather than spend time looking at "superficial" things such as rankings. Institutions can improve by focusing on working to make students more successful, using technology to help some of the remedial needs of some students, building pathways for students from high school through college and into the workforce.

With regard to online education, Regent Brady said that he believes that "it IS the future." Regents urged institutions to discover how to implement online teaching in a way that is both

productive and respectful of academic freedom. There was also a recommendation to increase collaboration across campuses.

The regents thanked Sydney and the joint Councils for inviting them, and asked for ongoing honest and challenging dialog.

11:25 Patrick Hogan—strategy for legislative session

On January 12, the legislative session begins. The System's government relations staff have some idea of what bills might come up, but there are always some surprises. Of the 3000 bills that arise yearly, USM focuses on about 100 of them, and more closely on 20 to 30. The most important is the budget, and the staff have already started working on this. The staff is also pursuing a few bills, as seen on the handout provided at the meeting. These bills relate primarily to facilities renewal, a study of the optional retirement plan, and open educational resources. From a "defensive" standpoint, the staff is also focused on possible legislation relating to financial aid reduction prohibition, permitting awarding of bachelor's degrees at community colleges, and deciding on the direction of Baltimore City Community College.

As was done last year, the Councils will be invited to participate at USM day in Annapolis—the Councils will work jointly on this day to sit in on Senate and House legislative sessions for the day, after which legislators are invited to a lunch reception with us. In between these activities, Council members visit with legislators in their offices to discuss matters with them.

In response to a question, Patrick stated that "clawbacks" would be unlikely, but possible.

11:40 Break

11:50 LUNCH

12:49 Anthony Foster, Associate Vice Chancellor for Accountability and Planning, updated the group on the USM strategic planning process.

Mr. Foster reported that the System plan (see attached powerpoint for specific information) is required by state law, which provides 3 overarching goals. Under these three goals, the strategic planning team has developed five broad themes as well as further goals and objectives.

One highlight of the review process is the indication that degree production is on track, and that STEM degree production, in particular, exceeded the 2020 goal. In addition, business start-ups exceeded the 2020 goal.

With regard to faculty salaries, the average faculty salary has increased by 14 percentage points, from 67% to 81% of peers nationally. The goal is 85%.

Q&A

Question: What is the impact, if any, of the uncertainty after the results of the elections last week, especially on research funding, international students, possible decreases in tenured and tenure-track faculty? Are these concerns built into the strategic plan?

Answer: We're a bit unsettled at this point, and we will have to see what the possible impact will be.

Question: It would be interesting to see broader tracking of graduate degrees, as the national trend is down. It is important to see where system is, vis a vis national trends.

Answer: We do track them. Perhaps we should emphasize them more.

Question: The HR model with regard to the staff in the system seems inadequate. For staff who wish to seek opportunities for promotion, they do not see ladders of opportunity for this. In terms of faculty, there's always the expectation that they'll earn advanced degrees and this leads to promotion. The same expectation is not evident for staff. I would like to see the system look at promotion potential for staff persons.

Answer: Thank you..

Question: I'd like to take this prior comment and suggest that, if you weave diversity into the plan, the question of career ladders should be addressed. When we offer ladders, and then we promote persons from within, what is the impact on diversity?

Answer: I agree that we tend to focus on students. The staff viewpoint does tend to get overlooked, so thank you.

Question: For reporting on faculty compensation, do the categories of faculty for which you compile data include adjuncts?

Answer: We do look at adjuncts.

Question: Do you have goals related to this?

Answer: No, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile goal does not seem to relate to adjuncts.

1:31 Sydney closed the meeting.

CUSF meeting  
Ramon Jimenez Room 2208

**ATTENDANCE:**

Bowie (2)	Benjamin Arah, Patricia Westerman
Coppin (2)	Virletta Bryant, Chris Brittan-Powell
Frostburg (3)	Robert Kauffman
Salisbury (3)	
Towson (4)	Beth Clifford, Ryan King-White, Raj Kolagani, Jay Zimmerman
UB (2)	Julie Simon
UMB (5)	Karen Clark, Isabel Rambob
UMBC (3)	Nagaraj Neerchal, James Stephens
UMCES (2)	
UMCP (6)	Drew Baden, Qingbin Cui, Philip Evers, Jordan Goodman (Senate Chair), Ethan Kaplan, Simon
UMES (2)	Bill Chapin
UMUC (3)	Elizabeth Brunn, Sabrina Fu, David Hershfield
USM	Joann Boughman, Zakiya Lee

1:40 Approval of October CUSF (Frostburg) minutes

--Add Jessica Sowa by phone

Approved; 4 abstentions

1:42 Senate Chair's report—Jordan Goodman

Jordan: University Senate at Maryland consists of faculty, staff, and students. It includes "professional-track" faculty and Deans and ex-officio department chairs, so there is input from all constituencies. The idea is that the "best idea wins." The chair-elect, chair, and past chair

interact on the executive committee. The Senate holds open meetings. The student newspaper comes. There are also standing committees

The senate executive committee meets monthly with the president and monthly with the provost. President gives a brief address at the beginning of each senate meeting.

In senate meetings, nobody was prepared and nobody remembered what happened after it was over. I have tried to change this. We now use a social media tool called "Slack." We post material that we want to discuss before the meetings, share questions and comments, and get minutiae out of the way before the meetings.

The state of shared governance on campus and on the senate has failed because the senate has been waiting for important issues to come to it, and the administration does not bring important issues to senate. That is, the administration has not asked for senate input on important things. For example, the senate is not participating in discussions on the budget because the president says that the budget is "too complicated for you to understand."

CUSF members suggested having a standing committee on budget, as some USM institutions do.

Jordan: Another example was the renaming of Byrd stadium. The senate was not asked about this. Nor was it consulted on issues such as resources used on the Cole Field House renovation, the partnership with Baltimore.

Nagaraj suggested that he could send the question about Senate input into budget to the senate chairs and compile the information and share it with you. We just need to formulate the question(s).

CUSF members asked about "Slack," and Jordan explained that it is free and open, but can be password-protected. Some CUSF members are interested in using Slack for CUSF. Robert said that we could talk about it.

2:08 Tabled motion on collective bargaining (page 14)

Jay explained that, at the time of the 2010 resolution, 50% of CUSF was for collective bargaining, 50% was against. So CUSF at that time wrote its resolution as a compromise, urging that each institution would be permitted to consider collective bargaining.

Other CUF members explained that this resolution simply permits faculty to have this right. Now, faculty do not have the right.

Beth: In terms of the wording of the original resolution, it is not contradictory because faculty have been excluded from even considering collective bargaining. We just wish to reiterate it so that it gives us more muscle in working with Annapolis.

Jay: This is simply urging the chancellor, the regents, and the presidents to support us when this type of thing comes before the legislature. I think we should re-support this statement.

Julie: What are we voting on?

RBK: We are voting to support the statement. It makes it current.

Beth: And if we don't pass this, that old resolution stays anyway.

RBK: Motion—Approved. 3 abstentions.

One word of caution is that original motion was a recommendation to the chancellor which is within the purview of CUSF. I would caution about using it in Annapolis so that it is not construed as lobbying against an existing policy of USM.

2:19 Robert asked for feedback on the meeting this morning.

Some CUSF members were impressed with the regents' openness and saw the interaction as worthwhile. Other CUSF members found the regents' responses to be embarrassing and insulting.

Some members suggested greater interaction of Council members with the regents, perhaps by permitting follow-up questions, by allowing for some chatting during breakfast, or by offering breakout groups per regent. The concern here was that the attendees heard the opinions of the regents but the regents learned little about the attendees' perspectives and ideas.

2:39 Adjourned

<b>Schedule of Future CUSF Meetings</b>		
<b>Month</b>	<b>Schedule of CUSF Council Meetings for 2016-2017 Academic Year</b>	<b>Location</b>
December	Thursday, Dec 8, 2016	CSU
January	Wednesday, Jan 18, 2017	USM, Adelphi
February	Thursday, Feb 16, 2017	UB
March	Wednesday, March 15, 2017	UMUC
April	Thursday, April 20, 2017	TU
May	Monday, May 15, 2017	UMBC
June	Tuesday, June 13, 2017 (optional)	USM, Adelphi