

Senate Chairs Meeting  
University System of Maryland (USM)  
at Adelphi, Maryland

**Minutes**

Thursday, December 14, 2012

<b>Attendance:</b>	
<b>Bowie</b>	John Organ, Jr. (SC)
<b>Coppin</b>	Nicholas Eugene (SC), Virletta Bryant (ExecCom)
<b>Frostburg</b>	Robert B. Kauffman (ExecCom)
<b>Salisbury</b>	
<b>Towson</b>	Timothy Sullivan (SC), Jay Zimmerman (ExecCom)
<b>UB</b>	Dan Gerlowski (SC)
<b>UMB</b>	Richard Zhao (SC)
<b>UMBC</b>	Tim Nohe (SC), Nagaraj Neerchal (ExecCom)
<b>UMCP</b>	Martha Nell Smith (SC)
<b>UMES</b>	Rose Jagnus
<b>UMUC</b>	Theo Stone (SC)
<b>Guests:</b>	Jo Boughman (System)

**Future Meeting Dates for 2012-2013:**

April 26, 2013 (Friday) System, Adelphi

**CONVENING THE MEETING - 10:00 a.m.**

Virletta Bryant called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. in the small conference room at System in Adelphi.

**STATE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE REPORTS - 10:00 a.m.**

Virletta provided a brief overview of the purpose of the State of Shared Governance Reports. She noted that several universities were having trouble with shared governance and that its purpose was to provide both formal and informal channels of communications between faculty and the Chancellor.

**Bowie State University (BSU)** – John Organ, Senate Chair of Bowie, gave the first report. John indicated that their President doesn't have the respect of their faculty. He indicted that their President has incompetent people, and he has been dishonest in his dealings with the faculty. In summary, John feels that their President doesn't consult with them and expects them to do what he wants without question. He noted that Bowie, a Historically Black Institution (HBI), they were treated as if it were a "stepchild" within the system and compared their situation with that of a slave mentality. Overall and germane to this process, it was the assertion of John that their President didn't involve the faculty in the shared governance process. He noted several situations.

First, John indicated that they had a five year review of the President where the faculty was not involved with the establishment of the committee. He indicated that the committee was selected by the Chancellor and when the faculty requested representation on this committee, John noted that the Chancellor indicated that they could have only the members that the Chancellor appointed. Followup with the Chancellor on this matter was to no avail. John cited several procedural errors including a correspondence problem with the Chancellor. He indicated that in July, they received an open letter to the Council from the Chancellor indicating the reappointment of the President and that the only group on campus with which they had problems was the faculty. John indicated that they wrote the Chancellor and requested that he respond to seven questions. Also, John objected to lack of confidentiality regarding the process.

Second, John indicated that their President has established an advisory committee which has met twice this semester in an effort to avoid the faculty and the shared governance process.

Third, John indicated that yesterday (December 13, 2012) they had a town hall meeting and they found out that they were going to have their graduation ceremonies at College Park rather than at Bowie. He indicated that this was inappropriate and that both the students and faculty were not in favor of this and that they had advised the President of their objection.

**Coppin State University (CSU)** – Nicholas Eugene, Chair of the Faculty Senate, described the state of shared governance at Coppin. He identified that there was a leadership issue where their President didn't follow through. He noted that they had a vote of no confidence on the President and Dr. Avery is stepping down in January 2013. An interim president has been appointed. In addition, there has been an *oversight or advisory committee* appointed by System with Freeman Hrabowski III, President of UMBC as chair of the committee. The purpose of the committee is to focus on Coppin's mission and how they can assist in developing a structure and infrastructure to implement their mission, to meet the needs of students on campus, and to facilitate and strengthen their long term relationship with the community. Also, shared governance is one of the advisory committee's foci. This group is currently working on its task. In response to a question, it was indicated that at least one member of the advisory committee was elected by the faculty.

**University of Baltimore (UB)** – Dan Gerlowski, Chair of the Faculty Senate, indicated that it has been an exciting time at UB. [Secretary's Note: *See the December 10, 2012 for a full report of his report on shared governance at UB.*] Approximately two years ago, the faculty "rose up" and indicated that they needed to spend more money on faculty. They received a qualified commitment from the President to hire 40 new faculty members over the next five to seven years. One of the results of that debate was for a committee to work over one year to build a shared governance document that complies with the System policy. He noted that UMBC is the shining model of shared governance within the System. They looked at what UMBC did and used it as a model for their plan. Their plan is on the UB website. Their shared

governance focuses on three groups on campus: the faculty, staff, and students. Each of these groups has its own senate. There is a *Governance Steering Council* which is comprised of two members from each of the senates and the past president of the Council. They are responsible for staffing campus wide committees. They have a budget committee, work life committee, campus environment, and at least one more committee. They were formed in August. The Governance Steering Council meets with the President.

He noted that they came close to voting a vote of no confidence for their President. He indicated that it was probably a good thing that they didn't have the vote. He stressed the importance of working with the President to affect change. He noted that shared governance rests with the faculty on their respective campuses and with working with their presidents to achieve it.

**University of Maryland University College (UMUC)** – Theo Stone, Faculty Advisory Council Chair, provided the following report on the state of shared governance at UMUC. [Secretary's Note: *See the September 2012 for a full report on shared governance at UMUC.*] He indicated that UMUC has several hundred full-time teaching faculty and over 4,000 adjunct faculty. They have a new president and they are still working out the details of shared governance with their new president.

Theo indicated that they just went through an external survey where they contracted with an outside group to conduct the "climate" survey of working conditions at UMUC including shared governance. It was a long and lengthy process that would be difficult to do on an annual basis. One of the ideas that began to emerge regarding shared governance was the "360 evaluation" of the senior academic administrators. They are now analyzing the data so they will see how everything works out.

Theo noted that in the Middle States accreditation process there is a section on shared governance. Middle States occurs every ten years. He noted that it is important for faculty to recognize this and utilize it as a vehicle for evaluation.

**University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB)** – Richard Zhao, Chair of the Faculty Senate, discussed the state of shared governance at University of Maryland, Baltimore. He noted that they just went through the merger study with UMCP and that shared governance was included as part of the study. He emphasized that shared governance acts like a check and balance with the administration. He suggested that they could have an *annual score card* or annual survey to evaluate and give the President a grade. This would provide a check and balance process.

*Faculty Evaluation of Presidents* – There was a discussion regarding the Chancellor's evaluation of the Presidents. Jay Zimmerman noted that there are at least two evaluations available to evaluate the state of shared governance on campus. The first is the Chancellor's annual evaluation of presidents. Jay noted that there should be faculty input into this process. In addition, as envisioned, the generation of the CUSF Report on Shared Governance could be used in this respect. The second evaluation is the five year evaluation of presidents. This evaluation involves faculty input but often it is too little too late when the average tenure of presidents isn't much longer than the five year period.

**University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC)** – Tim Nohe noted that the state of shared governance at UMBC was operating fairly smoothly. He attributed this, in part, due to the fact that many of their deans and people in leadership positions were former shared governance people. Also, he noted that Freeman Hrabowski III, President of UMBC, was chairing a committee to assist Coppin in developing their shared governance process as well as their contribution to UB.

**University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (UMCES)** – Rose Jagnus indicated that UMCES has a unique structure. They have four labs that are geographically dispersed. They have a small faculty and their President has been there for a long time. She indicated that there have not been a lot of problems and that they are in the process of reviewing their president. As part of the review process, they sat down with the Chancellor and developed a plan. They had the President outline what he was proposing to do. Then the President had four town hall type meetings with each of the four centers. They have their final questionnaire that will be posted online and students and faculty can respond to their president's performance. That feedback will be provided to the President as part of their report.

She indicated that the University of Maryland, Biotechnology Institute (UMBI) that was located in Baltimore has been reorganized. They have the same faculty and they now have a home in one of three institutions. One third belong to UMCES, one third to UMB, and one third to UMBC. Essentially, UMBC has controlling interest. Unlike most other institutions, their funding comes primarily from grants and contracts. They have a governing council, but the authority lies with the presidents of the three institutions. In this context, shared governance doesn't really play much of a role at UMCES.

**Towson University (TU)** – Tim Sullivan summarized the state of shared governance at Towson with the following quote: "Our culture has sustained us." He noted that Towson has experienced considerable and rapid growth. With these changes, there have been a lot of changes in the role and expectations of the faculty. He suggested that it is an "identity issue" and a problem of trying to find out who they are. He indicated that their President, Maravene Loeschke, came from the faculty ranks and is familiar with and supportive of the shared governance process.

**University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP)** – Martha Smith, Chair of the Faculty Senate, provided an abbreviated summation of shared governance at College Park. Other than athletics and the decision to go to the Big Ten, she indicated that shared governance was doing well at College Park. She noted that she was not notified before the announcement of the Big Ten decision before went public but she wasn't included in the decision making process either.

*Faculty Evaluation of Presidents* – There was a discussion regarding the evaluation and the merits of evaluating the senior administration. Robert Kauffman, former Senate Chair at Frostburg, indicated that faculty evaluate the President, Provost, Deans and Library Director using survey instrument. All the results are provided to the President. The results of the Deans are provided to the Provost, but the President's results are not provided to the Provost. The President shares the results with Provost and Library Director. The Provost shares the results of the deans with the individual Deans. The faculty receive a verbal presentation of the full results at a Faculty Assembly including a summary of free responses. They do not receive a copy of the written documentation, nor is it put on the website. Overall, the results are mixed. One Dean who most of the faculty have traditionally complained about tends to hover around the 50% approval rating. If you are looking for a knockout blow of one of the senior administrators with the evaluation, it is most likely not going to happen. Otherwise, the evaluation works well.

**Frostburg State University (FSU)** – Mary Mumper (not in attendance) provided a state of share governance report at Frostburg during the October General Body meeting [Secretary's Note: *See the October 11, 2012 for her full report on shared governance at Frostburg.*] Robert Kauffman provided a brief summary of that report to the group with an emphasis on the standing committee structure (Academic Affairs Committee (ACC), Faculty Concerns Committee (FCC), and Institutional Resource and Priorities Committee (IPR). In addition, policies and procedures are delineated in the Faculty Handbook.

LUNCH - 12:00 p.m.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM DISCUSSION - 12:14 p.m.

Virletta provided an overview of the academic freedom document that has been passed by CUSF and distributed to the individual campuses. The document is available for review and passage at the institution level. Regarding current policy, there were two issues raised. First, which sections of the academic freedom policy were covered under existing policy, and second, were there any omission where the academic freedom document was not covered under existing policy. It was recommended that Joann's office do a side by side comparison to see which points were already covered and which points were not.

TUITION REMISSION MOTION - 1:00 p.m.

BOR Policy VII-4.20, Paragraph IV.B, Section 2 b states that a spouse or dependent child may attend another USM institution with 50% tuition remission, with the approval of the President or designee, if the academic program is not available at the home institution or if the spouse or dependent child is not accepted for admission at the home institution. The ExecCom has developed the following motion for discussion and approval by the General Body. This item was primarily informational to the Senate Chairs attending.

**MOTION #1213: Tuition Remission Proposal** – CUSF requests that the following change to the above BOR policy provision be made. The spouse or dependent child may attend any USM institution to which they have been admitted with 50% tuition remission. This is intended to extend the tuition remission benefit of those employees whose date of employment is on or after January 1, 1990. It will not affect the tuition remission for employees hired before January 1, 1990 and it will not affect the tuition remission for spouses or dependent children admitted to the home institution.

REPORT FROM USM - 1:00 p.m.

Joann Boughman, Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, presented her report. First, regarding the *budget*, there is not much new since the legislative session has not yet begun. She noted that the 2% COLA will occur in January. Since it is for half a year, the COLA will in effect be 1% for this academic year.

Next, Joann discussed *academic transformation* and *competency based education*. She noted that there are a lot of proposals and new trends in education. One of these new initiatives focused on competency based education where students would receive credit based on life experiences. She noted that competency would most likely occur by evaluation of a portfolio or by a test. She noted that several campuses were attempting to adjust to this new trend.

Joann discussed *performance based budgeting*. This is an issue where a few legislature staffers have latched onto the concept and recommend its implementation within Maryland. Although on the surface it may seem plausible, Joann noted that in every state in which it has been tried, it has failed. She noted that because of the differences in the goals and missions of the individual campuses, it would be difficult to

develop a performance based budgeting system across the system. In addition, there is a pier based system already in place and the base is currently underfunded. She noted that they have had a very busy work group and she reported on its findings. A recommendation was that if performance based funding is considered, it should be considered on top of the base of all the funding that goes to higher education with a 1% additional funding being distributed on the basis of performance based funding. In conclusion, Joann noted that they have been having some success explaining the problems associated with performance based budgeting and this has decreased the interest in the approach by the legislative staffers.

ADJOURNMENT - 1:30 p.m.

Virletta indicated that the next meeting of Senate Chairs is April 26, 2012. With no further business, a motion was made and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Robert B. Kauffman*

Robert B. Kauffman  
Secretary

Attachments: none

Approved