

CUSF Executive Committee

Tuesday, November 7, 2016

12:00 -- 2:00 pm

USM System, Adelphi Conference Room 1

ATTENDANCE:

Chair: Robert B. Kauffman, FSU	Present
Past Chair: Virletta Bryant, CSU	Present
Vice Chair: Nagaraj Neerchal, UMBC	Present
Secretary: Patricia Westerman, BSU	Present
At-large: Chris Brittan-Powell, CSU	Present
At-large: Elizabeth Clifford, TU	Present
VCAA: Joann Boughman, USM: Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	Present
Asst to Sr VCAA: Zakiya Lee, USM	Present by phone

12:44 Call to order

Robert Kauffman called the meeting to order.

12:44 Approval of October 7, 2016 Executive Committee Minutes

The minutes of the September 9, 2016 executive committee meeting were approved.

**12:46 Report on Chancellor's Council— Robert Kauffman and Report from USM—
Joann Boughman**

Jo: We tried to get a uniform approach to Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) across campuses. The main question was how to move from nonexempt to exempt, and how to handle their losing several days of leave. On some campuses, those moving from nonexempt to exempt will use some administrative time to cover leave. The cost to the USM was \$12 million. We anticipate another target pretty soon, and this target may be much higher and affect many more people. We will make the December 1 timeline.

Nagaraj: We are already nonexempt employees more than lecturers, higher than some faculty, so it will be interesting.

Jo: It was really unfortunate, because the objective was actually about middle managers at food service and retail industries.

Jo: On budget reductions: We always submit three budgets, at the request of the state. The budget we submitted had \$25 million in cuts in it. Receipts were lower than expected, so we will have a mid-year FY 2017 cut. We believe that this can be absorbed by not filling vacant lines and by a little bit of attrition. We do not expect mid-year tuition hike or layoffs. We are at 4.9% unemployment; the structural unemployment nationally is 5%. The governor expects that we will fall short in tax revenues, so we have to be vigilant. We do not expect more cuts, but we do not expect higher funding either.

Chris: Going into spring budget negotiations, what is your sense?

Jo: We do not know. This will be the last budget for Governor Hogan before his possible reelection, so we hope he will continue to focus on funding higher education. The need for a highly educated workforce remains very important to the governor. We are clearly critical in providing this.

Robert: On fall enrollment, I will send a table to everyone.

Jo: Presidents talk with each other about how other campuses can help guide students to boost enrollment at campuses where enrollment is lower than expected.

Robert: On alcohol use mitigation, I will send the article. It says that essentially nothing has changed on campuses with regard to binge drinking, drinking, etc. on campus over time. You may want to share it with your faculty.

Robert: On identity authentication.

Jo: This was originally intended for online classes, now it encompasses cheating in general. Part of the solution is training students about what cheating is, and the consequences. Also, moving away from simple multiple choice tests to greater student engagement, so that faculty will recognize whether or not work is from a student, based upon earlier work in the semester. We discussed the need to let students know that if they give student ID and access to someone to cheat for them, they have just given him/her access to all of their information.

Robert: Two policies were reviewed, as part of overall review of all BOR policies:

- Advertising

Jo: no changes.

- Record management

Jo: There are a couple changes in federal law, so the attorney general's office is making tweaks.

Chris: Are faculty-oriented policies being reviewed?

Jo: We have started looking at Appointment, Rank, and Tenure (ART) again, and workload. We have workgroups on both. On ART policy, the goal is to reduce from 17 pages to 4 or 5 pages, removing all ranks at every institution.

Chris: When these reviews get going again, what would the process be?

Jo: We will reenergize faculty workgroups on them. CUSF names representatives to both workgroups.

Zakiya: Once rewriting begins, iterations will be shared with constituents. The faculty workload group consists of provosts, faculty appointments, institutional research people, attorneys from the office of the attorney general, and USM staff. We met three times between April and July. ART has not met in a year. We want to get workload done first.

Robert: On the joint meeting.

Jo: Zakiya and I met with Jim Brady to talk about topics for the joint meeting. We will also have a phone conference this week to prepare them for the meeting. We'll let Jim Brady open with comments and discuss a couple main areas, then have other regents also discuss the major issues, rather than read and answer specific questions. I would not be surprised if regents ask attendees to give them information as well. The three council chairs will facilitate the discussion.

Nagaraj suggested that one person moderate, rather than have all three council chairs participate.

Beth suggested that one could moderate, while the other two walk around with microphones.

Robert reported that CUSF will have a breakout session from 1:30 to 2:30p.m. We will discuss the logo and the collective bargaining motion, as well as informational items.

1:27 Collective bargaining motion

["Resolution Reaffirming the CUSF Affirmative Position for Collective Bargaining Rights for University System of Maryland Faculty](#)

[Whereas, the Council of University System Faculty \(CUSF\) serves as the faculty advisory body for the University System of Maryland \(USM\); and](#)

Whereas, CUSF Council passed 23-3 the following resolution on November 16, 2010 which was and still is the current position of CUSF regarding collective bargaining.

CUSF urges the Chancellor and the Board of Regents to support legislation extending the right to consider the alternative of collective bargaining to USM faculty. This is not an endorsement of collective bargaining. Rather CUSF would like each campus to have the right to consider collective bargaining if it chooses based on its circumstances, as other public sector employees, even on some of our campuses, already have done. (CUSF CB Resolution passed by 23-3 on 11/16/10).

Be It Resolved, that CUSF again reaffirms its existing policy position stated in November 16, 2010 motion.

Submitted by: CUSF Legislative Affairs Committee"

Robert: Does this one paragraph submitted as part of new resolution from the CUSF legislative affairs committee alter the 2010 resolution? And is it appropriate for us to discuss this issue at CUSF excomm?

Nagaraj: The committee is empowered to put forward a motion in a CUSF mtg. We can also discuss this resolution at excomm because three members of legislative committee are on CUSF excomm. Excomm has the right to go back to the committee and say that the committee may or should forward the resolution.

Chris: Robert subsequently, via email, told the legislative committee of his displeasure with the resolution. The legislative affairs committee changed it to remove the "whereas" statements.

Robert: If it is not significantly different from original 2010 statement, then perhaps we could retract the earlier motion and make a new motion for this resolution.

Nagaraj: Committee can decide which approach to take. Looking at version 6 (above), it is not identical to the 2010 resolution, but it is reaffirming it. One can read this to say that there may be a question as to whether CUSF needs to reaffirm. Whether such a need exists, I do not know. If there is no such need, we might as well not do that.

Virletta: In discussing the matter with legislators, we learned that these types of things need to be updated regularly, as legislators work annually. Yes, something does need to be done. We need, at the very least, to reaffirm.

Nagaraj: Who are "they"? Are there specific legislators?

Virletta: This was part of the conversation as we visited specific legislators during the last session. It was a recurring theme regarding this issue. But also, in general, with anything involving general assembly, we need updated resolutions.

Robert: There is a need to reaffirm. Do we need a vote to reaffirm?

Nagaraj: Yes.

Robert: We will have a vote on this. How do we best advance it? I suggest that committee withdraw the motion from the Frostburg meeting and put forward this resolution.

Chris / Nagaraj: We agree.

Robert: I will include the current version in the packet.

Chris: We should have a history of motions as context for newly proposed resolutions.

Robert: Do we want to include the tabled version?

Virletta/ Nagaraj / Chris: No.

1:56 Logo

Robert: Julie Simon had a meeting with Anne Moultrie, who said that we would have to use the full USM logo as part of CUSF logo. I proffered that USM should consider a policy on logos so that the logos of the councils do not have to include the USM logo, which could be confusing to the viewer. Question is how to combine components.

Jo: The logo does not identify CUSF as part of USM, because "USM" does not appear on the CUSF logo. There is a version of the new USM logo that says "University System of Maryland" around it and then includes "CUSF."

Robert: On page 23 of packet, you find the logos. Julie made two of them. She likes the intertwined/interwoven one, but it doesn't tie us into USM.

Virletta: What about smaller font of USM on our logo?

Robert: Choices are A, B, or C.

Virletta: Combine the shield and "Council of University System Faculty," but include smaller font saying "University System of Maryland."

Robert: I will take this to Julie.

2:08 Newsletter

Beth would like a picture and paragraph of Robert for the next edition.

2:09 BOR faculty award

Robert: There is a white paper on enhancement of funding for the BOR faculty award. It would be a one-time award. The proposal is to add it to the faculty member's base salary.

Nagaraj: Administration will not like it. I'm afraid that this money will come from the merit pot.

Virletta: Let's look back to see if we can ensure that the increase from \$1000 to \$2000 can happen. And then second, I recommend sending it to CUSF.

Jo: Half of the money comes from foundation, and the other half from campus. I had four meetings about this with various groups. To go from \$1000 to \$2000, perhaps we'll cut back from 16 to 12 awards and give \$2000 per award. The question was, if we do this for CUSF, should we do same for staff? Staff never came to the table. On the other hand, this morning, the BOR said it wants to give more awards so that it will be more inclusive of all campuses.

Robert: Let's take our time with this.

Zakiya: Any changes need to happen by a certain date, but it doesn't need to happen by tomorrow. It needs to be decided by the end of this academic year in order to ask for a change in the budget for next year.

2:18 Old or new business

Chris: There are issues about faculty and about curriculum. Both fall under the larger issue of corporatization of higher education.

1. Definition of faculty.
2. Who determines curricular changes?

Jo: George Mahaffey, executive director of AAC&U, will attend the December CUSF meeting. His topic from the national level is an environmental scan on the changing of the professoriate. So, Robert, you should articulate the topic so that it will include what people are talking about: Changes from tenured/tenure-track to FT/not tenure-track, etc. George would be in a great position to have that conversation with CUSF.

Nagaraj: Jo, could we share the USM workload report with George?

Jo: Yes, and he may ask for additional data, and we will provide it.

Nagaraj: At our next excomm meeting, we should talk about questions to ask George.

Chris: On curriculum, faculty are fairly conservative and don't want to make radical changes, such as not allowing textbooks, changing to competency-based education (as we see at UMUC, but also elsewhere), etc. Would George talk about these issues as well?

Jo: We at USM are institution-centric, so we do not adopt something on behalf of all institutions within it.

Chris: The concern is if a provost decides something like this, without input from faculty/without shared governance.

Beth: Another concern is when you have institutions pressuring professors to write books and then the institution says "we're not going to assign books." We're going to have a situation that permits students to graduate without having read books.

2:26 Adjourn