This report reports the activities of CUSF since the submission of the last report in November. Two Council meetings are reported upon in this report. The next Council meeting is scheduled for January at Adelphi.

MEETINGS AND ACTIVITIES: The following are the meetings and other activities conducted by CUSF since the last report.

• **Council Meeting at the UMCP:** The Council had its November meeting at the University of Maryland College Park (UMCP). We thank President Loh and his staff for their hospitality. The meeting was a joint meeting of the three Councils and we thank Laila Shishineh, CUSS Chair, for doing the primary organizational work for the meeting. Several Regents were in attendance and there were good discussions at the tables. Regents included Vice-Chair Regent Barry P. Gossett and Regents Johnson, Leggett, Pope, & Schulz.

• **December Council Meeting at the UB:** The Council had its December 9th meeting at the University of Baltimore. We thank President Schmoke and his staff for their hospitality. One resolution was passed which authorized the Chair to write a letter of appreciation to the Chancellor for his service and support of the faculty. (Note: A copy of the letter is attached to the report.) MJ Bishop spoke to the group on incorporating OERs, credentialing, and badging throughout the System. The consensus of the CUSF Council was to pursue the emeritus faculty BOR member and to circulate the draft as presented. (Note: See attached proposal and commentary.) The faculty had a discussion of student aggression toward faculty members. (Note: See the separate item below.)

• **Academic Integrity Initiative:** The Educational Policy Committee of CUSF has been working on BOR policy recommendations to the BOR regarding BOR Policy III-1.00 and 1.02. More on this in January. Second, the EdPolicy members of CUSF invited key members of the administration (e.g. associate provost, Student Council Chair, Student Services) to discuss what steps are being taken at UB and what additional steps CUSF can take to assist the implementation of academic integrity on the campus. The two-way dialogue was most informative for all parties.

• **Code of Civility:** An outgrowth of the State of Shared Governance Report by the Senate Chair Stephanie Gibson was a robust discussion regarding an alliance between Student Affairs and students which enables students to take aggressive behavior and aggression toward faculty. The discussion quickly revealed that there is an issue, that it is a system-wide issue, and that it is not an isolated matter on campuses. Possible solutions were discussed including developing a Code of Civility. The issue was delegated to the Faculty Concerns Committee for further action.
• **Emeritus Faculty BOR Member Resolution:** A draft of the Emeritus Faculty BOR Member resolution is attached. It has been informally shared with the Student and Staff Councils. It is expected that the resolution will continue to evolve. In addition, the Legislative Committee of CUSF has done some research regarding what other states have done regarding student, faculty, and staff representation on the BOR. That research is presented in the attached commentary.

**COMMENTARIES:** Attached with this report there is the emeritus proposal, one commentary, and a letter of appreciation.

Respectfully Submitted: December 11, 2019  
Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.  
Chair, Council of University System Faculty
BACKGROUND: Last year the Legislature passed changes to the USM BOR. In an effort to increase transparency and responsiveness, one of those changes was to increase the student representatives on the BOR from one to two representatives. Along with the students, faculty are the backbone of higher education and they can provide valuable input in the decision making process. Because of transparency and their valuable contribution in higher education, CUSF recommends that one of the positions on the BOR be reserved for an emeritus faculty member. Two avenues of approach have been identified. The first would recommend that the Governor strongly consider dedicating one of the Regent appointments to an emeritus faculty member. The second approach would seek legislative action. Either or both approaches can be pursued at the same time.

Suggested criteria for the emeritus faculty would include but not be limited to the following:

1) Emeritus faculty are retired faculty. This reduces or eliminates the potential conflict of interest that arises from when a state employee is appointed to the BOR.

2) Emeritus faculty represent the quality and longevity of the faculty. Normally, emeritus faculty have a minimum of ten years of experience as a full-time tenure-track faculty member. They have achieved the rank of associate or full-professor status, and they have demonstrated excellence in their field.

3) Although it is suggested that preference be given to USM emeritus faculty, out-of-state emeritus faculty and emeritus faculty from non-USM institutions may be considered also.

A process similar to the selection of the student regents can be used. A call-out to the campuses and CUSF for nominations would initiate the process. Nominees would be reviewed by a committee composed of CUSF members and USM staff. The nominee would be interviewed by representatives of the Governor’s office regarding suitability. The nominee would be advanced to the Governor’s Office by the Chancellor on behalf of USM.

RESOLUTION: Be it resolved that the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF) recommends that one of the BOR members be dedicated to an emeritus faculty members. This may be achieved administratively by the Governor dedicating one of the USM Board of Regents appointment as an emeritus faculty member or legislatively with an act or amendment to an existing law by the Legislature.
Commentary 1912.1: Faculty Representation on the BOR – A Brief Summary

The following summary was provided to me by Jason Geary (UMCP) and the Legislative Committee of CUSF. Its purpose is to provide a summary and background of what other state have done regarding this issue. Faculty representation on the BOR provides valuable input to the board. The following summary is not meant to be comprehensive at this time, but to show that other states have addressed the issue.

Exploring faculty representation on university system boards of regents (or their equivalent) nationwide revealed that 11 states have at least one faculty representative to the board. Those states include Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Kentucky, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Models vary considerably from one state to the other. In the case of Arizona, for instance, whose Board of Regents governs the state’s three public universities (Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, and the University of Arizona), it is the chair of the Arizona Faculty Councils—the coordinating body for the faculty governments of the three universities—who provides representation to the board in a non-voting capacity and who is not a fully fledged member of the board. By contrast, at the University of Kentucky, which has a separate Board of Trustees for each of the universities comprising its system, the faculty representative to the board is a fully fledged voting member. At the State University of New York (SUNY) system, the largest system of colleges, universities, and community colleges in the country, the Board of Trustees includes as ex officio members the President of the Faculty Senate as well as the President of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges. In most cases where faculty representation to the system board is present, such members are non-voting, and in at least seven of the eleven states mentioned above, the representative is the president of the system-wide faculty senate or some equivalent body.

My take-away is that there justification for faculty representation and input on the BOR. At least 11 states have embraced this approach. The issue is how to do so while maintaining the autonomy of the board. Although we didn’t research the issue further at this time, I would suspect that the different approaches (e.g. ex officio members, non-voting member, etc.) are attempts to provide valuable input while maintaining the autonomy of the board. It should be noted that the current emeritus faculty BOR member proposal being suggested by CUSF addresses this issue. As has often been noted, the composition of USM’s institutions is unique and diverse. As the emeritus faculty proposal evolves and moves forward, it may be necessary to modify the proposal to the specific needs of USM and the State. Regardless, there is a need for faculty representation on the BOR while maintaining the autonomy of the board.
Council of University System Faculty (CUSF)  
3300 Metzerott Road  
Adelphi, MD 20783  
December 10, 2019

Dr. Robert Caret  
Chancellor  
University System of Maryland  
701 E. Pratt Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Dear Chancellor Caret:

I am writing this letter on behalf of the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF). At its December 9th meeting at the University of Baltimore, the Council passed a resolution instructing me to write a letter of appreciation to you on behalf of the Council. You have been a friend of the faculty and have been supportive of their interests in strengthening higher education through shared governance.

There are many examples that could be noted. However, I will focus on the State of Shared Governance Report. Although the report was in place prior to your term as Chancellor, you championed it and took it to a new level in your yearly evaluation of the presidents regarding shared governance. Your efforts have essentially “closed the loop” by providing valuable feedback from the campuses to you in the evaluation process. Closing the loop strengthens shared governance and the educational process on the campuses.

However, your efforts didn’t end there. You requested the student and staff Councils to implement similar reports, and they have done so. In addition, early in your administration, you sent a copy of the survey instrument and report to the AGB (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges). It demonstrates your leadership both within the System and nationally. You have strengthened higher education both within the System and nationally. You were out front in what you were doing and what others should be doing.

Our purpose is to serve our students. As Chancellor, you work with the Presidents, the BOR, and advisory councils to strengthen higher education. CUSF recognizes that you have worked on behalf of higher education to better serve our students. We thank you for being a friend of the faculty and for strengthening higher education in Maryland.

Sincerely,

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

cc: CUSF ExCom and Council  
      Board of Regents  
      Dr. Joann Boughman  
      Dr. Zakiya Lee