



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY

Chair's Report (CUSF) September 2017

Since May, CUSF has been inactive. During this period, preparations were made for the upcoming year. The first section of this report lists some of the meetings attended during the summer. The second section focuses on preparations made for the upcoming year. I borrowed this list from my report to the BOR. Most of these items are mentioned in the Action Plan. They provide a convenient listing. Last are two commentaries. The first is an update on the joint ombudsperson resolution. The second focuses on the Universities at Shady Grove.

MEETINGS: During the summer, there was a AAAC meeting at Frostburg in June and a AAAC retreat in Solomon, Maryland. The second commentary reflects discussions at the retreat. There was one BOR meeting in June at Frostburg.

ACTIVITIES FOR THIS YEAR: As noted, the following is a list of items that CUSF is planning to act upon this year. I borrowed this list from my report to the BOR. Most of these items are mentioned in the Action Plan.

- **Action Plan** – CUSF developed an action plan with action items for this year. Most of the items contained herein are contained in the plan. Other things being equal, the plan should be approved no later than October.
- **Joint Ombudsperson Resolution** (see the attached commentary also) – A continuation from last year, the Joint Ombudsperson Resolution should be reaffirmed by CUSF at its September meeting.
- **Regent's Awards** – An important function of CUSF, Jay Zimmerman chaired the committee last year and will do so again this year.
- **State of Shared Governance Report** – The State of Share Governance Report within USM is a survey of Senate Chairs regarding the state of shared governance on their campuses. The report is completed prior to April 1st in order for the Chancellor to use the data in his yearly evaluation of the Presidents. As a function of CUSF, the report is quickly becoming a very important function of CUSF. In an effort to increase its effectiveness, a task this year is to improve the data collection so that the survey is more representative of the faculty as a whole.
- **Orientation Session** – An orientation session for new members is planned prior to the September meeting. This should help bring members up to speed more quickly.
- **Newsletters** – This year CUSF is planning to publish a fall and spring newsletter.
- **Advocacy Day** – Working with Patrick Hogan and Andy Clark, the Councils once again are planning to participate in Advocacy Day.
- **Joint Meeting** – As in most previous years, CUSF participated in a joint meeting with the student and staff Councils at the November meeting at UMCP. Traditionally, the Chancellor has addressed the group and will do so again this year.
- **Chancellor's Visit** – This year we have been able to schedule visits by the Chancellor to the Senate Chair's meeting, the Joint Council meeting in November, and the Council meeting as System in January.
- **Chairman Brady's Visit** – Emphasizing the theme of communications, Chairman Brady was invited and plans to attend the April 18th meeting of the CUSF Council at UMBC.

- **MHEC Faculty Advisory Committee** – CUSF makes membership recommendations for this committee.
- **Inter-Council Attendance** – This may seem like a small thing, but it is indicative of the communications and collaborative efforts between Councils. When CUSF met at Coppin, Sherrye Larkins, Chair of CUSS, briefly spoke to our Council. When CUSS had its meeting at Frostburg, I spoke to their group.
- **The Changing Professoriate Series** – Part of good communications is being current and up-to-date on the changes occurring in higher education. The September meeting at USG. The USM Centers present unique challenges to both the System and the faculty (see attached commentary).

COMMENTARIES: For September, two commentaries are provided with this report. The first is an update on the Joint Ombudsperson Resolution. The second is the Universities at Shady Grove. There are several issues raised with the USM Centers. They are beginning to be addressed. The purpose of this commentary is to alert faculty to these issues and to encourage faculty to work with their presidents on behalf of faculty to improve the already good programs being provided.

1709.1: Joint Ombudsperson Resolution

The commentary last month (1704.2) provided the background and history of CUSF's and its original Ombudsperson Motion. Sherrye Larkins, my counterpart with CUSS, has rejuvenated interest in the Ombudsperson resolution. Things have been moving steadily forward in a good way. It can best be summarized that many people think an ombudsperson is a good idea, but they need more information about what an ombudsperson does and how do they fit into the campus community. It takes a little time for people to familiarize themselves with the concept. It is part of the process.

The three Councils have formulated a joint resolution. It is attached elsewhere as part of the May agenda. It correctly positions the ombudsperson service with the individual campuses and the Presidents. It provides a recommended standard of practice, and a review process as part of the Chancellor's yearly evaluation of the Presidents. It offers the Presidents considerable latitude in providing the service.

Currently, CUSS has approved the joint resolution at their April 25th meeting. USMSC approved the resolution at their May meeting. CUSP (Council of Presidents) has been approached regarding the motion at the May 1st Chancellor's Council. They were very supportive of the joint resolution. The Provosts (AAAC) met and reviewed the resolution this summer. They were generally supportive of the concept but wanted to know more about what an ombudsperson actually does and how they mesh with other services on campus. Ombudsperson from UMCP met with the Provosts this summer. CUSF needs to approve the resolution. We have invited ombudspersons from UMCP and UMB to the September meeting of CUSF. With the support of the Provosts and the other three Councils, the resolution will be revisited by the President's Council.

The preamble of the resolution has been refined. CUSF recognized and passed a resolution addressing the need for an ombudsperson in 2013. The joint resolution brings the original resolution full-circle. It creates a process that emphasizes its implementation on the campuses. I ask for your support on the joint resolution.

1709.1: Universities at Shady Grove (USG)

One of our foci has been the “*changing professoriate*” series. Actually, the Universities at Shady Grove (USG) fits nicely into this discussion. USG does not have a faculty senate. All the faculty belong to the host institutions. They are faculty on a campus away from the main campus with all the problems and issues associated with remote faculty. In this country, the Center concept developed by USM is relatively unique. Other states are looking at how successful USM is in implementing this concept. For the faculty, we need to get onboard with the unique challenges offered at USG.

The webpage indicates 80 degree programs from nine universities and one convenient campus. The website indicates over 4,200 students attend each year. There are some estimates that the number of students will double in ten to fifteen years. In addition, there is a similar center at Hagerstown and another one is proposed in southern Maryland. Centers like USG are becoming more prevalent in Maryland, not less.

Let me present the issues at USG with a short story. Recently, I attended a AAAC meeting where the Provosts discussed the future of Shady Grove and how to make it better in the future. Tim Chandler, the Provost at Towson, visited USC with his president. He noted that with her business sense, she framed the question as “*How would we (Towson) offer a program in Shanghai.*” Her point is that at some point, travel distance becomes prohibitive and other alternatives such as licencing models need to be considered. In the licencing model, the primary faculty might be hired locally and the university would establish the licencing controls and protocols for faculty credentials and program standards. Tim’s comments are illustrative of some of the issues that can be associated with the Centers. Regarding these issues, discussions are in their infancy and will continue.

There are a myriad of issues that are beginning to be addressed with the Centers. Many of the issues are strictly administrative. For the faculty, the current issues are at least two-fold. First is one of awareness. The faculty of the host institutions providing the programs at the Centers need to be aware that the faculty at the Centers are their faculty. They are not the Center’s faculty. They are represented by the faculty senates of the host institutions providing the programs at the Center. Second, the faculty need to begin working with their Presidents on how to best represent their faculty at these centers and how share governance can assist in strengthening the programs at the Centers.

The Universities at Shady Grove are very successful. They will grow and they will continue to be even more successful in the future. In part, one purpose of having the September meeting at Shady Grove is to increase awareness among CUSF members. The campuses need to begin the discussion on their campuses with their Presidents. The meeting at USG this September and any discussions that result from the meeting will help faculty to become more active in the discussions on their individual campuses and to recognize yet another twist in the “*changing professoriate.*”

Respectfully Submitted,
Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Chair, Council of University System Faculty