

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

Minutes

Friday, January 20, 2012

Attendance:	
Bowie (2)	Joan S. Langdon, Monika Gross
Coppin (2)	Virletta Bryant
Frostburg (3)	Robert B. Kauffman; Peter Herzfield, Elesha Ruminski
Salisbury (3)	David Parker, Bobbi Adams, E. Patrick McDermott
Towson (4)	Martha Siegel, Jay Zimmerman, Leonie Brooks, Thomas Krause
UB (2)	Stephanie Gibson, John Callahan
UMB (5)	Richard Zhao (phone), John Collins
UMBC (3)	Nigaraj Neerchal, Zane Berge
UMCES (2)	Raleigh Hood (phone)
UMCP (6)	William Stuart, Stephen Mount, Alan Mattlage, Radu Balan, Kenneth Holum, William Montgomery,
UMES (2)	Emmanuel Onyeozili
UMUC (3)	Joyce Shirazi, Betty Jo Mayeske, Margaret Cohen, Richard Schumaker, David Hershfield (alt)
Guests:	Irwin Goldstein (guest), Brit Kirwan (guest)

Future Meeting Dates:

February 15, 2112 (Wednesday)	BSU, Bowie
March 16, 2112 (Friday)	CSU, Baltimore
April 16, 2112 (Monday)	UMB, Baltimore
May 18, 2112 (Friday)	TU, Towson
June 14, 2112 (Thursday)	SU, Salisbury

CONVENING THE MEETING - 10:00 AM

Joyce Shirazi, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM in the University of Maryland System, in Adelphi, Maryland. Joyce had the attending CUSF members introduce themselves and their affiliations.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - 10:13 AM

The December 8, 2011 minutes were approved.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MISC - 10:15 AM

Since the group was waiting for the arrival of Irv, the group began with a discussion of the committee reports.

SENIOR VICE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT - 10:20 AM

The main purpose of Irv Goldstein's report was to bring back to CUSF for review the revised ART (Appointment, Rank, and Tenure) policy revisions. [Secretary's Note: *See also the September 16, 2011 minutes for the last substantive discussion of this topic.*] Irv gave a brief background on this impetus for these revisions. He noted that the need for the technology transfer resulted from the strategic plan. The System is normally ranked in the top three in most categories assessed. However, in technology transfer, it ranks roughly 37th. This hurts the state in terms of tax dollars. There should be monies available in the budget for seed grants and similar types of initiatives. Irv provided the current proposed wording. The new wording is included below.

II-1.00 UNIVERSITY SYSTEM POLICY ON APPOINTMENT, RANK, AND TENURE OF FACULTY (Approved by Board of Regents, April 5, 1989; last amended June 20, 2008)

Section II.B.1:

Current Policy: "The criteria for tenure and promotion in the University of Maryland System are: (1) teaching effectiveness, including student advising; (2) research, scholarship, and, in appropriate areas, creative activities; and (3) relevant service to the community, profession, and institution. The relative weight of these criteria will be determined by the mission of the institution."

Proposed Policy: "The criteria for tenure and promotion in the University of Maryland System are: (1) teaching effectiveness, including student advising; (2) research, scholarship, and, in appropriate areas, creative activities *or other activities that result in the generation and application of intellectual technology transfer*; and (3) relevant service to the community, profession, and institution. The relative weight of these criteria will be determined by the mission of the institution." [Notes: the italics and **color** indicate the proposed revisions.]

II-2.00 POLICY ON SABBATICAL LEAVE FOR FACULTY (Approved by the Board of Regents, November 30, 1989)

Current Policy: "The President of an institution may grant sabbatical leaves to faculty members. The primary purpose of such leaves is to provide an opportunity for a faculty member to conduct scholarly or creative work in order to increase his or her contribution to the mission of the institution, and to enhance his or her standing in the discipline or profession."

Proposed Policy: "The President of an institution may grant sabbatical leaves to faculty members. The primary purpose of such leaves is to provide an opportunity for a faculty member to conduct scholarly or creative work, *or to engage in activities that may result in the generation and application of intellectual property through technology transfer*, in order to increase his or her contribution to the mission of the institution, and to enhance his or her standing

in the discipline or profession. The relative weight of these criteria will be determined by the mission of the institution.” [Notes: the italics and **color** indicate the proposed revisions.]

There was a question and answer session with Irv as well as a discussion among CUSF members. The following is a potpourri of comments and questions.

- As with the other ART criteria (e.g. teaching, research, and service), there is considerable flexibility among the different institutions regarding the interpretation of the criteria. The same will be true regarding the technology transfer criteria.
- It was reported that the Provost committee recommended approval of the proposal.
- It was suggested that the universities might want to look at the technology policies at the individual institutions.
- The proposed revisions will potentially affect hiring policies since hiring criteria will start here.
- One members noted that the proposed changes could potentially be used punitively. Another member suggested that they could change the fundamental principles that make us academicians.
- Another member suggested that the proposed changes could significantly modify the university culture.
- One faculty member noted that the proposed changes were reasonable accommodations.

MOTION #1201: The following motion was made from the floor... **“that CUSF support the proposed wording changes provided by Irv in the ART document.”** The motion was moved and seconded. [Disposition: 12/11/3, (for/against/abstentions); MOTION PASSED] Note: There was a procedural point of order raised regarding whether the abstentions should count in the vote or not as well as whether the votes of the two phone attendees should count. The two phone attendees voted in the affirmative.

MOTION #1202: It was moved from the floor and seconded **“that the rules committee review and make recommended changes regarding telephone voting, if needed.”** [Disposition: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY]. Steve Mount will review the proposal and report back with recommendations.

MOTION #1203: Motion from committee **“to change the CUSF Constitution to eliminate the reference to UMBI which no longer exists.”** The motion was seconded. The changes are indicated by strikethrough and red italic highlight. [Disposition: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY]

Section 2. Constituent Institutions.

For purposes of representation on the Council, constituent institutions of the University System of Maryland are: Bowie State University (BSU), Coppin State College (CSC), Frostburg State University (FSU), Salisbury University (SU), Towson University (TU), University of Baltimore (UB), University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB), University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC), University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP), University of Maryland, Eastern Shore (UMES), University of Maryland University College (UMUC), *and* University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (UMCES), ~~and University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute (UMBI).~~

Note: Irv Goldstein left the meeting after the completion of this item.

COMMITTEE REPORTS - 11:12 AM

MOTION #1204: A motion was made from the floor “**that we accept the citation motion wording with possible revisions to be submitted later during the day.**” [Disposition: passed unanimously].

Legislative Affairs: John Callahan, Chair, gave a brief report. In addition, Joyce noted that the input provided by CUSF members was helpful in framing the issue.

Panel Discussion - Lasting Legacy of Shared Governance: Steve Mount is working on a panel discussion regarding this topic for the upcoming February meeting. [Secretary’s Note: *For a fuller discussion of this item, review Item 4 in the November 8, 2011 ExecCom minutes.*]

Senate Chairs: Jay Zimmerman reported on the Senate Chair’s meeting that occurred on December 9th. Jay indicated that they had polled the chairs on the policy of faculty communications. He indicated that they were working on a proposal of best practices regarding communications. Second, Jay reported on the Family and Maternity Leave policy. He noted that the Chancellor may have some grants to supplement salaries. It was noted that adjuncts wouldn’t be included in these benefits. [Secretary’s Note: *At the time of the printing of these minutes, the draft copy of the December 9, 2011 Senate Chair’s minutes which contain an in depth review of this topic are not yet available.*]

Faculty Rights and Benefits - The chair of the committee, Pat McDermott, touched on three issues. First, the group briefly reflected on the recently BOR passed policy regarding child abuse. It was noted that CUSF provided valuable information and insight into to policy. Second, there was a brief discussion on tuition reimbursement. Third, the committee has proposed a policy on academic freedom which is proposed for discussion at the February general body CUSF meeting. [Secretary’s Note: *The proposed policy is an attachment to the December minutes.*] In addition, the committee will be surveying issues and reporting back on them as identified.

CHANCELLOR AND VICE CHANCELLOR - 11:45 AM

Both the Chancellor, Brit Kirwan, and the Vice Chancellor, Irv Goldstein, joined the meeting. They addressed the agenda items.

Budget - The Governor just released his budget. Education is a priority in the budget. In general, it avoids cuts and furloughs, even though there is a one billion dollar structural budget. There is a proposed tuition increase of 5% which with the “buy down” is 3%. The buy down means that the 2% difference is covered in the budget. The Chancellor noted that mandatory costs should be covered in the budget. However, not all items were funded (e.g. enrollment growth, merit increases, college completion agenda). There is proposed 2% COLA in the budget that would not begin until January 2013. Also, there should be merit beginning the following year. The Chancellor noted that for 2013, his intention is to make salary increases a major thrust of his initiatives.

Capital Budget - All 2013 projects are in the budget plus some one time requests.

Question and Answers - There was a brief question and answer period before lunch. First, there was a question raised regarding *retention funds*, and whether there were discrepancies in who was retained. There will be additional investigation into this. Second, there was a question regarding how well higher

education in Maryland compared with other states. The Chancellor noted that North Carolina had a 20% cut across the board in higher and education and California had roughly a 40% overall cut. In contrast, Oklahoma was reported to have a 4% raise. Third, in response to the use of retention funds, the Chancellor indicated that roughly 2% of all faculty received retention increases.

LUNCH - 12:00 PM

CHANCELLOR AND VICE CHANCELLOR (Continued) - 12:19 PM

Strategic Alliance - The Chancellor provided a brief update on the “Strategic Alliance” initiative. First, the two Presidents (UMCP and UMB) are responsible for developing recommendations and reporting them back for possible implementation. Irv’s office will keep track of these recommendations. Second, the Chancellor reiterated that an outgrowth of this report was that it confirmed the large amount of collaboration which already was going on within the System.

IRB Review - The issue was raised from the floor regarding problems with the IRB at local institutions. They may be impeding research interests rather than facilitating them. It may be time to revisit the IRBs across institutions. Perhaps a conference on them would be appropriate.

Public Corporation - The Chancellor provided a background on the legislation that created the System. He noted that the System is not a State agency. Every two to three years they bring together knowledgeable people to review where State agencies may be impeding the functioning of System. Their recommendations form the basis of legislative recommendations. The Chancellor went on to list several examples where their review has lead to legislative recommendations. The examples cited tended to address specific problems rather than broad policy issues. Currently, they are in the process of drafting their recommendations. [Secretary’s Note: *If readers want to review the policy on the public corporation they may go to the following website and review the BOR policy (I-8.00):* <http://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionI/>].

Family Leave Policy - The Chancellor indicated that JoAnn Goedert, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, is working on developing this policy. Although this is a priority item, the merger report temporarily superseded working on this initiative. [Secretary’s Note: *See the December 8, 2011 minutes for the CUSF discussion of this item.*]

Child Abuse Policy - The Chancellor provided an update on this recently passed policy by the BOR. JoAnn Goedert, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, is working on the implementation of this policy. The Chancellor noted that the question raised at the December CUSF meeting were most helpful in identifying issues that need to be addressed. The Chancellor indicated that in the implementation phase there will be half day training sessions, people on the campuses identified who can assist in the implementation of the program, and they will use the train-the-trainer model. Also, he indicated that there will be a training session at UMB on February 2nd. The question was raised regarding what was being done to protect faculty and staff reporting these incidents. [Secretary’s Note: *See the December 8, 2011 minutes for the CUSF discussion of this item.*]

Coalition Lawsuit: The Chancellor provided a brief procedural update on the lawsuit. The Chancellor noted that the plaintiffs have completed their case. Next, the defense will begin their defense shortly. He indicated that there were no surprises in the case yet. [Secretary’s Note: The following passage is from the December 8th minutes, and are included to provide background: *Currently, MHEC is being sued by a coalition that is associated with but not formally part of Morgan. The suit is not just a Maryland issue but*

is a national issue that emanates out of desegregation obligations. The lawsuit focuses on the use of program duplication as a method to segregate or limit programs in historical black institutions (HBI).]

Elections - There was a discussion regarding CUSF officer elections. It was noted that it is important to identify potential officers and to nominate them and to have elections consistent with the by-laws.

UMUC Discussion: There was a brief discussion regarding shared governance at UMUC with an emphasis on communications between faculty. Several points were made. Among them was that in Section L of the BOR policy on Shared Governance, it states that it is the President's responsibility to provide the "proper level of resources ... to allow them to carry out their shared governance responsibilities effectively." Adequate communications could be considered part of the "proper level of resources." It was suggested that faculty need to first work with their President to insure proper resources are allocated to shared governance.

ADJOURNMENT - 1:29 PM

With no further business, and with an effort to allow time for committees to work on committee work after the formal adjournment, the meeting was adjourned at 1:29 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Kauffman

Robert B. Kauffman
Secretary

Attachments: None