

CUSF General Body Meeting
University of System Maryland, Adelphi, Maryland

Minutes

Wednesday, January 23, 2013

Attendance:	
Bowie (2)	Joan S. Langdon, Monika Gross
Coppin (2)	Virletta Bryant, Chris Brittan-Powell
Frostburg (3)	Robert Kauffman, Peter Herzfeld
Salisbury (3)	Bobbi Adams, Michael Scott
Towson (4)	Jay Zimmerman, Martha Siegel, Leonie Brooks, Gerald Jerome
UB (2)	Stephanie Gibson, John Callahan
UMB (5)	Richard Manski, Richard Zhao
UMBC (3)	Drew Alfgren, Roy Rada, Nagaraj Neerchal, Joyce Tenney
UMCES (2)	Rose Jagnus
UMCP (6)	William Stuart, Linda Aldoory, William Montgomery
UMES (2)	Emmanuel Onyeozili
UMUC (3)	Betty Jo Mayeske, Margaret Cohen, Joyce Henderson, David Hershfield
Guests:	Joann Boughman (USM), JoAnn Goedert (USM)

Future Meeting Dates for 2012-2013:

February 18, 2013 (Monday)	UMB, University of Maryland, Baltimore
March 11, 2013 (Monday)	SU, Salisbury University
April 9, 2013 (Tuesday)	TU, Towson University
May 10, 2013 (Friday)	UMCP, University of Maryland College Park
June 14, 2013 (Friday)	UMBC, University of Maryland Baltimore County

CONVENING THE MEETING – 9:30 a.m.

The meeting was convened at 9:30 a.m. by Jay Zimmerman in the Chancellor's conference room at USM, Adelphi, Maryland. The first thirty minutes of the meeting were dedicated to committee meetings.

WELCOME FROM USM – 10:02 a.m.

There was a brief welcome to System by Joann Boughman on behalf of the Chancellor who was attending another meeting.

INTRODUCTIONS AND MINUTES - 10:27 a.m.

At the request of Jay Zimmerman, faculty introduced themselves and their institutions. A motion was made to approve the December minutes, seconded, and voted unanimously to approve them.

REPORT FROM USM - 10:32 a.m.

Joann Boughman, Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, presented her report. She began her report with a review of the recent MHEC Statewide Completion Forum. The focus of the meeting was on pathways to completion. The theme of the meeting was on completing college. It was a working meeting with several outside speakers. One of the objectives is on how to obtain the strategic plan goal of a 55% completion rate by 2025 in Maryland. She noted that some of the best work was done in small groups.

In the smaller working groups, several schools were highlighted. One of these was Bowie State. First, they have created a retention coordinator position that they have created. She noted that Bowie State has placed their retention personnel directly within the colleges and not within centralized offices to work directly with the students. They seek to directly engage students and work with them toward completion. Second, College Park presented their more formalized process that utilizes online services to engage students. They have a system where if students are going over 120 credits, they utilize the concept of *intrusive advising* where they actively seek out the student and advise them regarding completion of their degree. The third program highlighted was at Coppin. They have a special orientation and transition program for transfer students. They have found that the transition from a community college to a four-year school can be problematic for students. Last, the point was made by all the speakers that retention was not a distributed task (e.g. admissions), but “it is the job of everyone.”

Joann noted that the *legislative session* is beginning. In general, the Governor’s proposed budget has been very good to higher education. It has some programmatic monies in the budget. Tuition increases are proposed to be kept at 3%. The state will need to “backfill” the budget to make up for the differences in operating budgets.

She indicated that Anne Moultrie, Vice Chancellor for Communications, has developed a set of *bullet points* that will be shared with all the presidents and all the councils (CUSF included) when they talk with legislators (See attachment: Powering Maryland Forward – USM Messages for 2013 Legislative Session). The points will help in providing a unified voice regarding the strategic plan, STEM, student completion rates, and other initiatives.

In response to a question, Joann provided an update on the *tuition remission* issue. The Board of Regents meets in February and Jay will be presenting the resolution at the meeting.

A second question focused on the *degree completion programs* and the \$18,000 per institution that will be provided for support toward completion. This was the first year that the monies were available so there is no update on this item at this point.

JoAnn Goedert provided an update on the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) program. Currently, the System is working on an RFP where the individual institutions can participate in a system wide program to assist faculty with support if they get into trouble. She noted that currently there were ten and possibly eleven institutions that were interested in participating in the RFP. Since it is modular, institutions may have different levels of involvement. Also, there is a work group composed of seven institutions who were involved in the drafting of the RFP. JoAnn has spoken to CUSS on the RFP and they have been

supportive. She noted that the cost would be roughly \$300,000-\$400,000 overall, with the costs per campus depending on the size of the institution and the modules used. They will not know the actual costs until they put it out to bid. She noted that College Park was the one notable institution which was not participating in the RFP because they already have in place an extensive support process. There were several questions and discussion on College Park and their system.

BUSINESS – 11:00 a.m.

Regent's Faculty Awards – Virletta provided an update on the Regent's Faculty Awards. The committee has met and made their recommendations. These recommendations will be passed along to the Regents for their approval. There was a brief discussion on the award including the process of selection, on how to increase applicants, and on how to choose qualified faculty who have not applied for the award. Although the name of the award may suggest otherwise, it was noted that this award is by faculty for faculty.

Senate Chair's Meeting – Virletta, vice chair, chaired the Senate Chair's meeting at System headquarters in Adelphi on December 14, 2012. She provided a brief summary of shared governance on the campuses of those in attendance.

- One school, Bowie, indicated that shared governance was very problematic.
- Two schools, Coppin and UB, indicated that shared governance was problematic but improving.
- One institution, UMCES, has a unique structure that is different than most system institution and that it is working reasonably well.
- One institution, UMUC, indicated that it was too early to tell if shared governance was working. This was because of their history and the recent change in administration.
- Two institutions, UMB and Frostburg, indicated that shared governance was working relatively well.
- Three institutions, Towson, UMCP, and UMBC, indicated shared governance was working and working well.

Second, there was a discussion of shared governance within the institutions. The summary focused on the state of shared governance at the institutional level and not within the institution. [Secretary's Note: *See New Business under the December 10, 2012 for the BOR motion that would change the shared governance policy under item III.B and G.*] This change would affect shared governance within the organization. A summary of the consensus was that CUSF may need to address this issue in the future.

Revisiting MOTION 1212 – The motion on the Senate Chairs Annual Shared Governance Review was brought forth from ExecCom to be revisited. The original motion was made at the May 18, 2012 General Body meeting. Since the report was being compiled using other sources, it was believed that the annual report may not be necessary. The motion was tabled at the October 11, 2012 General Body meeting. Based on the data collection process to date, it was suggested that the General Body revisit the motion.

Attached to the motion is a proposal for implementation (see attachment). In the discussion, it was noted that the proposal is suggestive and that it is a starting point rather than a finalized document. It provides a structure and basic implementation of the proposal. After a brief discussion, a motion was made and seconded to pass the motion. One of the suggestions made was to include not only shared governance at the institutions but within the institution. It passed unanimously.

MOTION #1212: Senate Chairs Annual Shared Governance Review [from May 18, 2012 minutes; Tabled October 11, 2012]: Be it resolved: In order to further shared governance at individual institutions within the USM, the Council of University System Faculty recommends that the chairperson of the faculty governance body at each institution prepare a yearly report on the status of shared governance at their institution which will be sent to the Chair of CUSF. A compiled report approved by the CUSF Executive Committee will be shared with the Chancellor, CUSF General Body, and the Senate Chairs. [Disposition: motion passed; 25 yea; 0 no; 0 abstentions]

Faculty Voice – There was a discussion from the floor regarding writing an article for the Faculty Voice newsletter. The consensus of the group was that dissemination of information and communications were very important to CUSF. The point was made that the newsletter would provide a summative document of CUSF and its business. After a brief discussion, a motion was made from the floor and seconded. It passed unanimously.

MOTION #1301: Faculty Voice – Moved to direct the Executive Committee with the responsibility to write articles for the Faculty Voice. This responsibility may be delegated to a member of ExecCom or to an interested member of CUSF. The author of the article needs to consult with the editor of the Faculty Voice regarding the content of the article. [Disposition: motion passed; 24 yea; 0 no; 0 abstentions]

LUNCH AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS - 12:00 p.m.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT - 12:25 p.m.

The Chancellor, Brit Kirwan, provided his report to the CUSF members in attendance. His primary focus was on the upcoming legislative session and the budget. He began with the 2014 Governor's budget with an emphasis on the operating budget. He noted that we have come through a difficult period with furloughs and no pay raises. The base budget is still intact and that the structural deficit has been lowered. Unemployment has dropped. He noted that comparatively higher education in Maryland has fared better than most other states. *He indicated that today the state's economy is being driven by research and knowledge.*

The budget is a two step process. First, they work with the Department of Budget and Management to identify their ongoing costs. They need to account for inflation and other costs as best they can. This is reflected in the "current services budget." [Secretary's Note: *See the Legislative Update by P.J. Hogan in November 13, 2012 for a definition of the three types of budgets (worst case, current services, and enhancement budgets).*] Second, the budget has 34 million dollars in "enhancements." Working with the Governor, these are areas that advance his goals for the State. They put forth an ambitious agenda to advance these goals and the Governor has proposed to fund most of them. The 34 million dollar enhancements are funding beyond the basic costs of operating the System. Including both the current services and enhancement budgets, the Governor is proposing almost an 8% increase in funding. The Chancellor clarified this 8% increase noting that it is only roughly half of the budget. It focuses on only the State's portion of the budget. The other half of the budget is funded by tuition and fees. He noted that they should be able to hold tuition increases for full-time instate tuition to 3% this year.

The enhancements are targeted toward three different three areas. First the enhancements address the goal of reaching *55% college attainment* by 2025 as identified in the strategic plan. The chancellor noted

that there is an income disparity in earning ability based on family income. Families from the lowest quartile of income have a one in ten chance of obtaining a college degree. In contrast, if students are in the upper quartile, they have an 80% chance of obtaining a college degree. This difference leads to a need for social equity in terms of degrees. The Chancellor noted that this too is a concern of the Governor and the proposed budget reflects the need to address this issue. This is reflected in investments or funding to help close the *achievement gap*, expand enrollments and increase classroom innovation. There are a lot of interesting innovations on the horizon that will result in innovative new thinking in higher education. Also, there are monies in this budget for instructional innovation.

Second, the enhancements target *workforce needs* in high demand areas including STEM, healthcare, teacher education and in expanding capacity in these areas. The third area of enhancements addresses *translating "technology transfer" into economic development*. A large amount of research is generated by System institutions. However, the Governor has identified the need to translate the research generated into economic development for the State. There are monies in the budget to support this identified need. [Secretary's Note: *See the Senior Vice Chancellor's Report in the January 20, 2012 minutes for a discussion of the proposed policy amendment by the BOR on technology transfer. MOTION 1201 was marginally passed by CUSF supporting the proposed change.*] In conclusion, the Chancellor reminded everyone of the budgetary process. The Governor proposes his budget. The Legislature can cut the budget but cannot add funding that hasn't been proposed. With this in mind, higher education is in good position for next year.

Next, the Chancellor addressed proposed salary increases. Over the next 16 months there is potentially a 7 ½% increase in salaries.

- On January 1, 2012, there was a 2% COLA in January 2013.
- This budget includes a proposed 3% COLA that would begin on January 1, 2014.
- In April 2014, there are newly proposed 2 ½% merit funds starting in the fourth quarter of 2014.

Next, the Chancellor addressed the capital budget. He noted that they have proposed the largest five year plan. Normally, they receive 200 million dollars in good years. This year they have received 280 million dollars.

Q&A: The Chancellor answered questions from the members in attendance. Questions included health care vis-a-vis adjuncts and UMUC, the growth of programs at the Shady Grove Center, tuition remission, his responsibility to carry out the shared governance policy, and advocacy by the faculty for the budget.

CHAIR'S REPORT - 1:22 p.m.

Due to time constraints, Jay Zimmerman suggested forgoing the Chair's Report.

COMMITTEE WORK SESSIONS - 12:22 p.m.

Jay Zimmerman indicated that there would be a 15 minute work session for committees. The committees reported back at 1:50 p.m.

Faculty Affairs Committee met. Legislative Affairs is working on STEM, scholarship component of the FY2014 budget, MHEC and programs coming in from out-of-state, and listening to the Monday morning Legislative phone reports. Academic Affairs Committee is working on the problem of granting non AP

credit within the high schools.

NEW BUSINESS - 1:54 p.m.

Returning to the Regent's Awards and the issue of low participation, Virletta presented a summary of the submissions for the awards from the different campuses. Her analysis indicated that there were a dearth of submissions and increasing submissions may be an issue to address in the future.

ADJOURNMENT - 1:57 p.m.

With no additional new business, a motion was made and passed for adjournment.
Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Secretary

Attachments: Powering Maryland Forward – USM Messages for 2013 Legislative Session
MOTION #1212: Senate Chairs Annual Shared Governance Review

Approved

POWERING MARYLAND FORWARD

USM Messages for 2013 Legislative Session

OVERALL MESSAGE: USM plays a leading role in moving the state forward. Therefore, an investment in USM is an investment in the State of Maryland.

MAJOR THEMES TO REINFORCE IN SUPPORT OF THE FY 2014 BUDGET: Affordability, Academic Transformation, Access/Completion, Economic Development, *MPowering the State*

Supporting Message: USM plays a leading role in helping the state achieve its goal of having 55 percent of adult Marylanders attain college degrees. Increasing college-degree holders in the state is critical to ensuring that Maryland has employees who are adequately trained to meet workforce needs.

- Preparation: Partnering with public school systems to increase the number of high school students prepared to succeed in college.
- Affordability: Keeping tuition costs down to keep higher education affordable.
- Affordability/Completion: Increasing availability of student financial aid based on need.
- Access/Completion: Partnering with community colleges to ensure students' smooth transfer from two-year institutions to USM universities.
- Access/Completion: Expanding academic program opportunities at USM's regional higher education centers and the state's regional centers.
- Completion: Through academic transformation, exploring opportunities and leveraging technology to transform/redesign courses to achieve higher levels of student success (retention and graduation), maintain quality, and decrease cost of course delivery.

Supporting Message: USM drives the state's economic and workforce development and helps to position the state as a competitive innovation leader.

- STEM: Increasing the number of STEM graduates to meet the state's workforce and innovation needs.
- STEM: Working with public school systems to increase the number of STEM teachers and to enhance STEM teaching skills.
- Workforce: Aligning academic programs across the system to meet the state's workforce needs.
- The University of Maryland: *MPowering the State*: Launching this structured collaboration between UMB and UMCP to leverage joint resources and expertise to serve students better and help drive the state's economic development through tech transfer and commercialization activities.

- Enhancing tech transfer and commercialization efforts system-wide to help the state realize its tremendous potential in these areas.
- Attracting more than \$1 billion in contracts and grants to the state annually in support of research and development.
- Creating jobs and companies: Increasing our capacity to meet our goal to help create 325 new companies in Maryland during the next 10 years.
- Transforming the USM culture to one that highly values and practices innovation and entrepreneurship.

Supporting Message: USM is a responsible steward of state and other resources.

- Through its nearly 10-year-old **Effectiveness and Efficiency Initiative (E&E)**, achieving savings totaling more than \$356 million and integrating E&E into everything the system does.
- Maintaining favorable debt ratings, saving millions of dollars in interest expenses.
- As part of the USM federated campaign, raised more than \$2 billion in private funds to support students and academic excellence.
- Advancing environmental sustainability through policies and practices.
- Visioning the future needs of our students and the state, and, to meet those needs, strategically and prudently practicing continuous improvement in all that we do.

Supporting Message: USM excellence is a major factor in the state's growing reputation as a national education leader.

- Continuously earning high national and international rankings for quality and value.
- Recruiting and retaining system and institutional leaders, faculty, and staff recognized for excellence in a wide range of areas.
- Recognized as a national model in Effectiveness & Efficiency.
- Positioning the state as a national leader in academic transformation.
- Positioning the USM-State of Maryland collaboration as a model for state-higher education partnerships.

CUSF Proposal Chair's Annual Report on the State of Shared Governance on Campuses

Revisiting MOTION #1212

The idea for a proposal has been discussed in the General Body meetings of CUSF, the Senate Chair's meetings, and ExecCom. The current process is not collecting the necessary information to create a suitable report. The following proposal is a proposed process with which to implement MOTION #1212 if passed. A vote for the motion does not lock CUSF into this proposed process. The discussion below is a brief history of the proposal to date.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROPOSAL

At the May 18th meeting, MOTION #1212 was tabled and returned to the Faculty Rights committee (see Motion #1212 below). Since the motion had not been acted upon, Jay Zimmerman, Chair of CUSF, asked the membership what they wanted to do with the motion. The motion is provided below for reference. There was a brief discussion regarding the motion. The discussion noted that the motion may not be necessary at this time since a version of the motion was being implemented upon the recommendation of ExecCom (see August 3rd ExecCom minutes below). First, a process for the State of Shared Governance on campus report has been initiated. Next, it will be a major topic at the Senate Chair's meeting. It was believed by the ExecCom that both should provide sufficient information for the Chair of CUSF to complete a report to the Chancellor on the state of shared governance in the system. Third, it was noted that it is inappropriate for CUSF to be evaluating presidents within the System and that this was not part of the CUSF policy. For these reasons, the motion was discussed in terms of whether it should be taken off the table at the September meeting of the CUSF General Body. At that time it was recommended to leave the motion table since there was a report being compiled and it was believed to be suitable. Review at this time indicates that the information is not suitable for a report.

Motion #1212: Senate Chairs Annual Shared Governance Review [from May 18, 2012 minutes]: Be it resolved: In order to further shared governance at individual institutions within the USM, the Council of University System Faculty recommends that the chairperson of the faculty governance body at each institution prepare a yearly report on the status of shared governance at their institution which will be sent to the Chair of CUSF. A compiled report approved by the CUSF Executive Committee will be shared with the Chancellor, CUSF General Body, and the Senate Chairs. [Disposition: Tabled]

The following discussion is from the August 3, 2012 ExecCom Meeting minutes and summarizes for CUSF members the intent of this initiative.

Shared Governance Annual Report. During the last academic year there was considerable discussion regarding the evaluation of shared governance on campuses. In part, it arose out of the vote of no confidence of the President at Coppin by the Senate. Although there was much previous discussion regarding evaluation of the presidents, it was concluded that evaluation of the campus presidents by Senate Chairs for CUSF lies outside the scope of the shared governance policy. Regardless, it was concluded that there may be a need for summarizing the state of shared governance on campuses. Different methods were discussed. Although nothing was formally decided in these previous

discussions, the discussion included an informal reporting process and linking it with the Senate Chairs meeting in fall or spring.

After a brief discussion on the topic it was suggested that in addition to the Welcome to the Campus presentation by the President, that there be a Welcome to the Campus by the Chair of the Faculty Senate with a report on the state of shared governance on that campus. In addition, the topic could become incorporated into the fall and/or spring Senate Chairs meeting. (August 3, 2012 ExecCom Minutes)

Based on the process to date and the data collected, it may be desirable to institute MOTION #1212 and require the Senate Chairs to submit a report on shared governance on their individual campuses. A summary is provided below.

- During fall semester there have been three presentations by the Senate Chairs on the state of shared governance on their campuses. There was no presentation at Bowie since the November meeting was a joint meeting with CUSS and USMSC. In general, the reports presented were suitable for the report. The problem is two fold. First, during the year there will be seven presentations at best. Second, since many of the meetings are held at the same institution each year, there will be a certain redundancy in universities covered and there will be some institutions that won't be included because CUSF doesn't have meeting at all of the Universities. In addition, these presentations require prior setup and discipline in their presentations.
- Although the Senate Chair's meeting provides valuable supplemental information, there is a question regarding its effectiveness in providing the primary information for the report on shared governance in an orderly manner. Since not all Chairs are in attendance, not all universities are represented at these meetings.
- It is difficult to expect the Secretary to organize a systematic report based on the Chair's meeting. This venue provides good supplemental information rather than being the primary format for these reports.
- At the time of this proposal, we are not collecting the necessary information to create the desired report.

Based on the history and the evolution of this proposal, it is recommended that MOTION #1212 be revisited. Second, it is suggested that the following proposal serve as a template to collect and present the data for the CUSF's Report on Shared Governance.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROPOSAL

The proposed Chair's Report is consistent with the Constitution of CUSF which is to "*advise the Chancellor and to make recommendations on matters of System-wide professional and educational concern to the faculty and matters to which faculty bring special expertise.*" This proposal accomplishes this Constitutional purpose.

I-2.00-CONSTITUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FACULTY ARTICLE I

Section 1. Purpose. The Council of University System Faculty advises the Chancellor and reports regularly to the Board of Regents. Its responsibility will be to consider and make recommendations on matters of System-wide professional and educational concern to the faculty and matters to which faculty bring special expertise.

As a matter of practice, the policy on shared governance in Section III:F indicates that the Chancellor and other System administrators shall consult regularly with the legislative-mandated System-wide representative bodies, CUSF being one of these bodies. The proposed Chair's Report on Share Governance helps to formalize this process and the information provided to the Chancellor for his annual report to the BOR on shared governance. Also, it assists in the evaluations of the Chancellor, the Presidents, and other administrators regarding shared governance (Section III: F).

I - 6.00 POLICY ON SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
III Practice

- F. The Chancellor and other System administrators shall consult regularly with the legislatively-mandated, System-wide representative bodies. The Chancellor shall report annually to the Board on the status of these consultations.

- H. Effective implementation of shared governance shall be a component of evaluations of the Chancellor, the Presidents, and other administrators as designated by the Chancellor for the USM Office, and by the President for the institutions.

The Chair's Report on Shared Governance is within the nature and scope of the USM policies, and the proposal is consistent with the Constitution of CUSF. Furthermore, in terms of USM policy, it is a document that significantly aids in the consultation process to the Chancellor and BOR on shared governance within the System.

COMPLETION OF THE REPORT BY SENATE CHAIRS:

The Annual Report on Shared Governance is a report by the Chair of the Faculty Senate (or equivalent) on the shared governance. It is the Chair's report. If the Chair wants to seek the approval of a committee or of the Senate, the Chair may do so. However, for the purposes of this report, these approvals are not necessary and are solely at the discretion of the Chair. The report should be completed before April 1st and submitted to the Secretary of CUSF. Electronic submission of the report is satisfactory.

Since the final report is the CUSF Chair's report, please note that the Secretary or the President of CUSF in completing the report reserve the right to edit the submitted reports.

REPORT STRUCTURE OF SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT:

Normally, the length of the report should be one to two pages single spaced. It can be shorter or longer dependent on the need. It should be divided into four sections: Background, Current State of Shared Governance on Campus, Issues and Concerns, and Recommendations. Please include the centered title of the report below.

It is envisioned that in the future, the Faculty Rights Committee will be responsible for developing and fine tuning the survey instrument to collect the data for the report. Currently, the data in the first report is more qualitatively. In the future, it maybe desirable to collect quantitative data also.

State of Shared Governance Report
at [Insert University]
by
[Insert your name]
Chair of the Faculty Senate

Procedures:

Briefly, indicate the approval process of this report.

Examples of Procedures Section:

- 1) This report was compiled by the Chair of the Faculty Senate.
- 2) This report was compiled by the Chair of the Faculty Senate and reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.
- 3) This report was compiled by the Chair of the Faculty Senate and reviewed by the Faculty Senate.

Background:

Briefly, explain the organizational structure of shared governance on your campus. Delineate the key structures in the shared governance process that are key to its operation. Since the shared governance process varies greatly from campus to campus, the purpose of this question is to begin to identify the different shared governance structures in use within the System and their effectiveness. The relevant policy items are noted in parentheses.

Some specifics that you might consider include in your review:

- 1) Is there a shared governance plan that is being followed by the institution? (I-6:III;A)
- 2) Do you have a faculty senate or similar structure for shared governance? Are 75% of the members elected by their constituency? (I-6:III;B)
- 3) Does the faculty play a central role in the institution's teaching, research, and outreach programs? Explain how it does or does not? (I-6:III;C-2)
- 4) Do institutional structures and procedures for shared governance address the role of non-tenured and non-tenured track, part-time, adjunct, and other faculty? (I-6:III;D)
- 5) Briefly describe the resources that you receive to carry out shared governance? For example, do you receive a budget and/or reassign time as Chair? Do other faculty members involved in shared governance receive reassign time? (I-6:III;K)

Current State of Shared Governance on Campus:

The purpose of this section is to describe the current state of share governance on campus. Is it working? Are you working toward a common goal or according to a plan? Does the President and the administration consult with the faculty? Describe the effectiveness of this consultation? In part, this section builds upon the structures presented in the first section (background).

Some specifics that you might consider include in your review of this section:

- 1) Additional comments on items 1-5 in the previous section.

Issues and Concerns:

In this section, address the effectiveness of the shared governance process on campus? Do the President and Provost consult with the faculty prior to making decisions and do the faculty have input per the campus institutions? This can be your realistic wish list. Please remember that this is not an evaluation of the President. That is an internal matter and the evaluation of the President by policy is under the purview of the Chancellor and the BOR. Your focus is on evaluating the effectiveness of the President in carrying out the shared governance process. This is under our purview. If there are no real issues and if shared governance is operating relatively smoothly, please indicate that this is the case.

Some specifics that you might consider include in your review of this section:

- 1) Additional comments on items 1-5 in the previous section.
- 2) Are there recent examples where the President or the Provost have made major decisions without consulting the faculty? (I-6:III;J-1) Are there recent examples where the President or Provost has disregarded the express wishes of the faculty? Please explain. (I-6:III;J-2)

Recommendations:

In terms of shared governance and the shared governance process, what changes would you recommend on campus to make the shared governance process work more efficiently? Invariably, most of these recommendations will be carried out at the campus level in dealing with the President and the administration. However, these recommendations will be reviewed by the Chancellor (unless edited) and can be utilized by the Chancellor. If there are no recommendations, please indicate that this is the case.

CUSF CHAIR'S REPORT

As envisioned, the CUSF Chair's Report will consist of the following sections. This format may change as the process and document evolve. The Chair's Report will be completed and submitted to the Chancellor by May 1st of the year. A copy of the report will be distributed to the General Body of the membership, the Senate Chairs, and posted on the website.

- 1) Procedures of data collection – [Source: CUSF Chair]
- 2) Compilation of Senate Chair's Reports – [Source: Secretary minutes]
- 3) Summary of the welcome to the campus by the Chair of the Faculty Senate with a report on the state of shared governance on campus – [Source: Secretary's minutes]
- 4) Summary of discussion of the state of shared governance at the Senate Chair's meeting – [Source: Secretary's minutes]
- 5) CUSF Chair's summary of shared governance within the system – [Source: CUSF Chair]