

CUSF General Body Meeting  
Frostburg State University, Frostburg, Maryland

**Minutes**

Thursday, October 11, 2012

| <b>Attendance:</b>   |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>Bowie (2)</b>     | Joan S. Langdon, Monika Gross  |
| <b>Coppin (2)</b>    | Virletta Bryant, Chris Brittan-Powell  |
| <b>Frostburg (3)</b> | Robert Kauffman, Elesha Ruminski, Peter Herzfeld                                   |
| <b>Salisbury (3)</b> | David Parker   |
| <b>Towson (4)</b>    | Jay Zimmerman, Leonie Brooks   |
| <b>UB (2)</b>        | Stephanie Gibson (phone)   |
| <b>UMB (5)</b>       | Richard Manski (phone)   |
| <b>UMBC (3)</b>      | Roy Rada, Nagaraj Neerchal   |
| <b>UMCES (2)</b>     |  |
| <b>UMCP (6)</b>      | William Stuart, William Montgomery   |
| <b>UMES (2)</b>      |  |
| <b>UMUC (3)</b>      | Betty Jo Mayeske, Margaret Cohen, Joyce Henderson, David Hershfield, Joyce Shirazi |
| <b>Guests:</b>       | Joann Boughman (USM), Mary Mumper (FSU), Keith Eshleman (UMCES)                    |

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

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| November 13, 2012 (Tuesday)  | BSU, Bowie State University (with CUSS, USMSC) |
| December 10, 2012 (Monday)   | UB, University of Baltimore                    |
| January 23, 2013 (Wednesday) | USM, University System of Maryland             |
| 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 - 10:00 AM**

Jay Zimmerman called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM.

**WELCOME FROM FSU - 10:02 AM**

Robert Kauffman introduced the President, Jonathan Gibraltar, and the Provost, Stephen Simpson. Dr. Gibraltar joined Frostburg State University in March 2006. Among his accomplishments, he has improved enrollment, renewed its focus on marketing, branding and raising the institution's profile, and successfully completed a comprehensive 15 million dollar campaign. In addition, he has initiated a sustainability initiative on campus and assisted in revitalizing Frostburg's historic Main Street. Last, he

has addressed high-risk drinking by developing a community-based, multi-faceted approach within his administration and off-campus establishments.

Dr. Gibraltar noted that Frostburg is now ranked 8<sup>th</sup> in AACSB online rankings. Frostburg has initiated its first EdD program. Our nursing program is doing well. Also, we have a new information and technology building. Recently, the Lane Center was renovated and reflects a sustainability design. He introduced Dr. Steve Simpson, Provost, who made a few comments. First, Steve noted that he had a long history as a faculty member with shared governance. Second, he noted that the CUSF faculty work for other faculty and do an incredible service to their campuses and the System. Third, he noted that he had worked closely with many of the people in attendance over the years and it is a pleasure to see everyone again.

The President answered some questions from the members. Questions included the nursing program, the online nursing program, the Hagerstown Center (USMH), and the new EdD program. He noted that USMH enrollment has increased.

#### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - 10:34 AM

A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the September 21<sup>st</sup> minutes.

#### REPORT FROM USM - 10:23 AM

Jay introduced Joann Boughman, Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, who presented the report from USM. First, she updated the group on *faculty workload*. First, she noted that the normal procedure is for the faculty senates to work with their presidents to address workload issues on the individual campuses. Second, she noted that one of the problems that we have is that individual campuses do not count workload and overload the same on individual campuses. Third, she acknowledged the importance of faculty being able to teach overload. However, at the same time, she noted that too much overload and too high a workload can result in students suffering.

Second, she addressed the *financial aid report* which will be distributed shortly. She noted that as expected, students are incurring more debt. Also, she noted that it is a complicated process compiling this information since students receive financing from private, federal, and numerous sources.

Third, she reviewed the recent retreat of the Council of University Presidents. She noted that Dr. Zimmerman was in attendance also. It was hosted at Fort Meade. She noted that they made it abundantly clear that they have a need in *cyber-computer security*. She noted that there is a definite need to provide programs in this area at the individual campuses. She reviewed some of the individual initiatives where institutions were experimenting in an effort to address this issue. She indicated that cyber-security is a major in and of itself as well as potentially part of a core curriculum that can serve technical specializations.

Fourth, she will be meeting with the vice-presidents of student affairs in the System schools regarding the *alcohol problem* on campuses. Joann acknowledged that President Gibraltar addressed this in his opening comments. They will be attempting to develop guidelines and best practices regarding how to deal with this issue. Faculty need to be aware of this issue and they need to be aware that System is planning to address this issue in the near future.

Fifth, in response to a question from a member, Joann addressed the *workload issue* again. Much of the conversation involved UMUC and the workload of adjuncts. She noted that the limits have been relaxed somewhat and there is a need to be cautious for the student's benefit. Amidst several questions, Joann indicated that there may be a need to reexamine the system wide policy to make it clearer. In addition, it may be necessary to reexamine institution level policies, in part, because System wide policies tend to be fairly general. There was a brief summary provided by the recent presentation of Ben Passmore to ExecCom. First, the workload report is required by the Regents. This is its primary purpose. Second, Ben suggested that CUSF should be cautious about reexamining too much. The problem is that although it provides some benefit on defining the upper and lower bounds of productivity, there is sufficient individuality among the campuses to suggest that workload issues should be dealt with at the campus level. Third, the workload instrument may be most effective as a broad-based instrument that can be used to identify potential problems at the individual campus level. Joann indicated that it is her style that individual campuses need to be aware that these issues are out there, and if there are specific issues that need to be brought back to CUSF, then they should. From a system level, this should be a mechanism by which these things can be addressed. Regarding the first point, Joann added that one of the main purposes of the workload report for the Regents is to get a feel of what faculty are doing versus the expectations they have of them.

One member addressed the *academic transformation* issue with a statement about the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT) and the redesign of Psych 100. Joann added that academic transformation is an important issue within the System and on campuses. It is more than simply putting courses online. Academic transformation involves a lot of innovative curriculum programs that increase student outcomes and increase active learning. In addition, she noted that this is important to CUSF because the transformation will be faculty driven. She added that your faculty should be hearing about this on your campuses.

At the last meeting Nancy Shapiro discussed *advanced professional certification*. Joann provided an update. She noted that the draft will not be published until around October 31<sup>st</sup>. (Secretary's Note: *see Dr. Nancy Shapiro's, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, report on the MSDE draft regulations for the Advanced Professional Certification in the September 21, 2012 CUSF meeting.*)

In response to a previous *motion regarding MHEC potentially blocking programs* (see: MOTION 1216, September 21, 2012 CUSF meeting), Joann provided the following comments. First, there is the kickoff of the State's Plan. MHEC is required to produce a plan every four years. In the 2009 Plan, there were five goals and the new plan proposes six goals. The plan was written by fairly large writing groups which included people from every campus involved in this process although most of them were probably not faculty. She noted that most of these goals are fairly generic. The purpose of MHEC is to coordinate the implementation of programs in Maryland and not to be a barrier to the implementation of these new programs. She added that if she sensed that MHEC was being a barrier, her role would be to intervene on behalf of System. She concluded with the statement that if MHEC is acting as a barrier, she needs to be made aware of the situation.

As part of this issue Joann delineated the *program approval process* of a program as it passes through System and MHEC. As part of this process, there is a review process where other campuses can respond regarding duplication and other potential conflicts. The role of MHEC is to coordinate this review process. This process reaches down through the campuses through the Provost's office and the review of a new program can be fairly extensive and far reaching within the System. All new programs go through this process.

---

## STATE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE REPORT - UMUC - 11:30 AM

**Background:** Jay Zimmerman introduced Dr. Mary Mumper, Chair of Faculty Senate at Frostburg State University, who provided the following report on the state of shared governance at FSU. Mary began her report with the comment that shared governance is “**alive and well**” at Frostburg. She noted that at Frostburg, shared governance is represented in three standing committees: Academic Affairs Committee (ACC), Faculty Concerns Committee (FCC), and Institutional Resources and Priorities (IPR) Committee. All three committees are active and work with the administration.

**Current State of Shared Governance:** Regarding the current state of shared governance at FSU, Mary noted that there is a good relationship with the President and the Provost. They are very receptive to comments and recommendations from the faculty. She cited several examples including the recent development of the strategic plan. She noted how faculty had representation and input into the process.

**Concerns and Issues:** She indicated several concerns and issues at FSU. First, there was the issue of the budget and salaries. Currently, the salaries at Frostburg are the lowest in the System. Although housing costs are lower in western Maryland, the other cost-of-living items are still similar to everywhere else.

Second, Mary expressed a personal concern with the unionization issue. She noted that she had worked in a union system and she noted some of the following problems including stringent work load rules and lack of flexibility. There was a brief discussion on this topic area.

Third, she summarized the issues facing FSU. These included enrollment decline, a need to increase enrollment and the quality of students recruited, and a need to increase the reputation of the school. These are issues that affect the institution in general more than the state of shared governance. Regardless, they require the working of the faculty and administration through the shared governance process.

**Q&A:** Several questions focused on declining enrollment and the measures taken and on salaries as they related to adjuncts and UMUC. The question and answer period was limited since Mary needed to go to class. Her report ended at 11:50 AM.

There was a general discussion regarding shared governance and defending the shared governance policy. The issue was raised that if a president of one of the institutions was not in favor of shared governance, it won't happen. The discussion emphasized several points. First, CUSF is the defender of shared governance and it derives its authority to defend shared governance from the Regent's Policy on shared governance. If CUSF doesn't defend shared governance, no one else will. Second, the Chancellor has been a defender of shared governance. This will become an important issue for CUSF with the eventual transition to a new Chancellor.

As part of the general discussion on shared governance issues, it was noted that at College Park they have a score card that lists all the motions and a score on them. They found that this score card is fairly handy as a summary of what the faculty senate has done as well as what the President has done with regards to the motions passed. It was noted that other campuses might want to consider using this tool.

Last, there was a discussion regarding integrating adjuncts into the shared governance process. Although the discussion focused on UMUC which has a large proportion of adjunct faculty, it included more traditional campuses also. It was noted that on one campus two seats on faculty senate were designated for non-tenure track faculty and adjuncts. Although there were several interested adjuncts, most adjuncts were for whatever reason not interested in participating in shared governance, and the seats had to be

filled by tenure-track faculty. In addition, it was suggested that at UMUC, they may need to compensate adjunct faculty for their participation in shared governance and that it might be desirable to have a motion to that effect at the next meeting.

#### LUNCH - 12:05 PM

The five committees met during lunch to determine membership, the chair and issues that need to be addressed.

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS - 1:02 PM

Since most of the committee chairs were absent, the committee reports were abbreviated. However, there was a report from the Academic Affairs Committee and a floor discussion by the general membership regarding obtaining email access and lists. The issue is important in the meet and confer process which requires communications with a hard to reach group of faculty. In addition, this problem is amplified at UMUC where they have a large number of adjuncts dispersed around the world. (Secretary's Note: *See State of Shared Governance Report from UMUC in the September 21, 2012 minutes regarding impact of email access at UMUC.*). In addition, the discussion involves the issue of privacy, and the freedom of information act. The issue involves obtaining the official email list. It was suggested that the CUSF general body may want to pass a motion requesting that the email list of adjuncts be made available. Additional discussion noted that at some institutions rather than giving the email list to the faculty, the administration will email the information for the faculty. There was general agreement that this was not a satisfactory approach.

Jay noted that the issue of email access was discussed at the recent Senate Chairs meeting (Secretary's Note: *See the December 9, 2011 Senate Chairs meeting minutes.*). It was noted from the floor that the email information is public information under the freedom of information act. Faculty can go online and review the Maryland Public Information Manual from the Attorney General's Office which will tell faculty how to obtain this public information.

#### NEW BUSINESS - 1:20 PM

**Bowie State Vote of No-confidence:** Jay suggested that due to time constraints, the membership move new business before old business. He indicated that CUSF had a request from Bowie State University regarding their recent vote of no-confidence of their President. The chair of their faculty senate requested Joan Langdon and Monika Gross to speak to CUSF on behalf of their situation. They provided an overview of the situation and indicated that there were two main concerns.

First, a review was conducted this past year by a team of three presidents who came to campus (BSU) and met with various groups including members of Senate. They reported their findings to the Chancellor. Based on these findings, the Chancellor sent a letter to the campus on July 2<sup>nd</sup> that with the exception of a few senators, the campus was happy with their President. There was an issue that inappropriate information had been disseminated in the letter.

The second issue focuses on the Faculty Advisory Council. The Faculty Advisory Council was created by the President, and in essence, it may replace the role of the Faculty Senate. A primary difference with shared governance is that faculty nominated to this Council are approved to the Council by the

administration.

There was a discussion on both issues. First a question was raised whether the President had received approval for the FAC to represent shared governance from System and the Regents. This is not known. Second, it was suggested that this may be a classic example of attempting to subvert shared governance by requiring administrative approval to be a member of the Council. Third, it was noted that the President is entitled to have advisory councils to assist in making administrative decisions. Also, the discussion revealed that usually there are faculty senate representatives on these councils. In addition, these councils don't duplicate the work of faculty senate committees. Both of these criteria are ways to determine if the FAC is a device to supplant faculty governance and the senate at BSU.

A motion was made from the floor and seconded.

**MOTION 1217:** CUSF expresses its concern toward the new Faculty Advisory Council at Bowie State University which appears to undermine shared governance at that institution. [Disposition: motion passed unanimously]

There was a discussion of the motion. The discussion emphasized that the motion expresses a concern on the part of CUSF regarding the creation of the new FAC at Bowie State University. The implications and message of the motion were discussed. One implication is that the motion will go into the Chair's report which is distributed to the Regents. Regarding the message, there were several attempts to wordsmith the motion. The final version of the motion is presented above. In general, the motion doesn't express any action to be taken by CUSF at this time, nor does it necessarily agree with the proposition that the issues as presented have actually occurred. What the motion states is that sufficient evidence has been presented to the General Body of CUSF for CUSF to express concern on this matter. Amidst the discussion, there was a call to question which failed to pass, and discussion continued. The motion passed unanimously.

## OLD BUSINESS - 1:50 PM

**Tabled Motion 1212:** At the May 18<sup>th</sup> meeting Motion 1212 was tabled and returned to the Faculty Rights committee. Since the motion had not been acted upon, Jay indicated what the membership wanted to do with the motion. The motion is provided below for faculty convenience. 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 has been implemented. First, the State of Shared Governance on campus report has been initiated. Next, it will be a major topic at the Senate Chair's meeting. 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. In summary and as previously noted, CUSF has a procedure in place that is consistent with policy and a motion at this time is not really necessary. The tabled motion remained tabled.

**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]

ADJOURNMENT - 2:04 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

*Robert B. Kauffman*

Robert B. Kauffman  
Secretary

Attachments: none

Interim ExecCom  
Approval

Interim ExecCom  
Approval