

Salisbury University
Consortium Coordinating Committee meeting
October 6, 2016, 12 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Minutes

Present: Teri Herberger and Matt Hill, Co-Chairs (Co-Chairs, Staff Senate); Stephen Ford (President, Faculty Senate); William Barron (President, Graduate Student Council); Julia Howell (President, SGA); Tim Robinson (Adjunct Faculty Caucus); Amy Hasson (Chief of Staff, President's Office); Gina Boobar (President's Office)

Naming of 2016-2017 Chair

Teri Herberger and Matt Hill were named the 2016-2017 Co-Chairs, per the bylaws which state that the Staff Senate representative will chair the Coordinating Committee in odd fiscal years.

Report from Faculty Senate – Stephen Ford

- They have had four meetings so far, including one special meeting.
- Shared Governance Survey (unfinished business from last year) – This survey is sent annually from the USM. The primary issue from SU was transparency for budgets. The Faculty Senate charged the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) with investigating. (Stephen will share the USM shared governance report with the Consortium Coordinating Committee members. Copy of report attached to minutes.)
- Great Colleges to Work for Survey – The Faculty Senate charged the FWC with investigating this as well. (Stephen will share the survey results summary document with the Consortium Coordinating Committee members. Copy of document attached to minutes.)
- New Academic Advising Center will open soon in the Blackwell Library building. The Faculty Senate felt the new academic advising proposal should have come in front of them, so they called a special meeting in order to talk about it.
- They were informed of the SU Gull Card Plus One program by the Interim Vice President of Administration and Finance. Program description and benefits should be on the SU website soon.
- This is the second year of the General Education review. A three year time period was anticipated for this process.
- College of Health and Human Services – This proposal is in the early stages of discussion. How does it fit in? How will it work? Where would it be located? Does it make sense for SU?
- The changes in federal regulations governing the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and the impact on SU were presented at the President's Advisory Team meeting. Because of lawsuits, implementation may be delayed. The current deadline is December 1, so this is a pressing issue.
- They are addressing the issue of searching the Faculty Senate archives. With the help of SU's archivist, they are investigating the possibility of using the Institutional Repository SOAR@SU, which has a very nice search mechanism. The Faculty Senate would be used as a guinea pig for this project and the other governance bodies can utilize it as well.

The plan would be to transfer all Faculty Senate documents to SU's archivist once a year, probably in May.

Report from Adjunct Faculty Caucus – Tim Robinson

- They are working with Associate Provost Rich Wilkins regarding the Affordable Care Act and its impact on adjunct faculty. They have not gotten anything definitive yet.
- They are working out an issue with parking passes. Currently in many cases, adjunct faculty cannot purchase discounted parking passes. Hopefully there will be a favorable change for next year.
- It is very difficult to find adjunct faculty to volunteer to serve on the consortium committees.

Report from Staff Senate – Teri Herberger and Matt Hill

- They have only held a couple of meetings so far, and they have received reports at those meetings (budget process changes, FLSA changes, etc.), so they have not had a chance to get to any new business.
- They have been primarily concerned with the FLSA issue, but if the deadline has been moved the issue will not be as urgent.
- They will be pushing for nominations for the Board of Regents' Staff award.

Report from Student Government Association – Julia Howell

- They are rewriting their constitution; trying to create three equal branches.
- They are drafting a bereavement policy, which they have discussed with Stephen Ford.
- They are working on bridging the gap between downtown Salisbury and the University.
 - SGA members will be going downtown to help with the Treat Street Halloween trick-or-treat event.
 - Looking into possibilities for downtown housing for students.
- They are working on developing a new event for the spring semester – “Be the Difference.”
- They are addressing the fact that there are no feminine hygiene dispensers in any of the academic buildings. They plan to speak with Eric Berkheimer about this matter.
- They are trying to get Hungry Minds and Rise Up Coffee in the Academic Commons to extend their hours. They have contacted Owen Rosten about this issue.
- They are trying to utilize the Green Fund in order to get reusable bags for the I Love Salisbury event to use for leaves and yard waste.
- They are partnering with the Political Science Department for the Spring SGA elections.
- They are trying to get weekly speakers to be assigned to the same day, time, and place every week, so students know when and where to go if they are interested in attending.

Report from Graduate Student Council – William Barron

- They are also rewriting their constitution; adding information to help the Executive Council transition from year-to-year.
- They are developing new positions for Assembly members, including one for on-line only learning (person would telecommute into meetings), and one for distance learning.
- They are trying to organize a graduate student orientation.

Consortium Committees

- A bylaw amendment proposal was submitted by the Cultural Diversity and Inclusion Committee. The Consortium Coordinating Committee members will review the proposal, as well as look at the membership of all the consortium committees.

Other

- The group agreed to have all documents which are shared among the governance bodies be posted on SU's Campus Governance website.

Meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Recorder: Gina Boobar



Report from the Council of University System Faculty
Chair's Report on Shared Governance
June, 2016

This report takes a thematic approach to examine the state of shared governance at each of the 12 USM institutions. The primary sources for this report are the Chair's survey, two meetings of CUSF with the senate chairs, and the 10-minute talk given by each Senate Chair during the CUSF meeting at that campus.

The survey was distributed to each Senate in May 2016. Some institutions have circulated the survey widely among faculty and others have distributed it to their full Senates or their Senates' executive committees. Still other surveys were completed by the Senate Chairs alone. The survey questions are reproduced below and throughout the paper for reference purposes. Each uses a scale of strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree or non-applicable.

1. Shared governance on our campus is alive and healthy.
2. There are excellent communications and consultation by the administration with the faculty and senate leadership.
3. The faculty senate plays an important role in making academic decisions at the university.
4. The faculty senate plays an important role in making administrative decisions at the university.
5. Other than on rare occasions, the President rarely overturns faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility.
6. The President seeks meaningful faculty input on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.
7. The President supports and advocates the principles of shared governance.
8. The President supports and advocates the principles of shared governance at the subunit level also (eg. college, department).
9. The administration is supportive of faculty involvement in shared governance.
10. The administration utilizes faculty involvement in the areas of planning and strategic planning.
11. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in budgeting and fiscal resource planning.
12. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in academic affairs and program development.
13. The administration recognizes faculty involvement in staff selection and hiring.
14. Structures and processes that allow for shared governance are clearly defined in the governance document (eg. faculty handbook).
15. Shared governance between administration and faculty functions in an effective manner.

16. Joint decision making and shared governance discussed in questions 9 – 14 are practiced at the sub-unit levels also (eg. college, department).

The findings from the survey are summarized below into themes. For each theme excerpts from the survey have been included to provide context for the analysis that is presented. The excerpts are not meant to be representative in nature nor can they be generalized to a larger group of faculty leaders or faculty. Instead they tap into USM faculty leadership’s perspectives on the unique and dynamic status of shared governance on USM campuses.

In this report the term “Faculty Senate” (sometimes abbreviated as "FS") is monolithically used to describe the faculty component of shared governance regardless of the variations in structure that differ from campus to campus. Similarly, this report uses the term “Senate Chair” universally with the understanding that some universities use the term “Senate President” and variations thereof.

Climate for Governance

Table I: Shared governance on our campus is alive and healthy (Item 1).
Survey Responses [n=12]

	SA-[n/%]	A-[n/%]	D-[n/%]	SD-[n/%]	NA-[n/%]
BSU			X		
CSU		X			
FSU	X				
SU		X			
TU (n-160)	X=4/2.52	X=48/30.19	X=52/32.70	X=40/25.16	X=15/9.43
UB	X				
UMB (n-15)	X=2/13	X=10/67	X=3/20	X=0/0	X=0/0
UMBC	X				
UMCES	X				
UMCP/UMD		X			
UMES (n-87)	X=8%	X=40%	X=18%	X=16%	X=5%
UMUC		X			
Total	4/33	6/50	2/16	0/0	0/0

Note: UMES' response is reported in percentages only. Real numbers were unavailable at the time of this report.

The majority of institutions (10 out of 12) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement that shared governance was “alive and healthy on their campus”. For those that described their institutions as having a strong sense of shared governance, having a structure that allowed for open and routine dialogue amongst faculty leaders and administration was frequently mentioned. This often took the form of top administrators meeting with faculty regularly at faculty meetings or having steering committees in which faculty leaders were invited to participate. The following comments reflect examples of how universities institutionalized a climate of shared governance on their campus.

UMBC: I am a regular member of the President’s Council along with all the Vice Presidents and Deans. The President’s Council meets twice a month. I am also a member of the UMBC budget Committee which meets once a month. As Chair of the Executive

Committee, I host the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Tea with the Senior Administration once a month, during which time we discuss matters of importance to faculty. As Faculty Senate President, I serve on the UMBC Strategic Planning Steering committee and the Middle States Accreditation Steering Committee. I also serve on the university Program Concept Group that makes decisions on new program proposals. Faculty Senate input is actively sought after by members of the Administration and taken seriously on our campus.

UB: Monthly Senate meetings with president and provost plus monthly pre-meetings with both.

CSU: They (President and Provost) have provided avenues for discourse... The President has and continues to put structures in place to facilitate shared governance, such as establish the President's Shared Governance Council and Student Success Council.

UMCES: Ex officio members of the Faculty Senate include the President, Vice President for Education, and Graduate Student and Faculty Research Assistant representatives. The FS Chair serves on the UMCES Administrative Council, which is comprised of staff representatives and the UMCES leadership.

Equally as important to having an infrastructure in place to support shared governance is the will and desire to ensure its implementation on campus. Admittedly less concrete than implementing a structure, administrators who consistently communicated through words and deeds an overall desire to take the perspectives of faculty and other key stakeholders into account over time earned the trust of faculty. CSU described it as being "open to faculty and staff suggestions and input" and "being receptive to new ideas" while UMBC recognized faculty input was "actively sought after" by administrators and "taken seriously". Similarly UMB discussed the inclusive nature of top administrators stating "there is a clear interest on the part of the administration in this topic" of shared governance.

Two institutions (BSU and TU) disagreed that shared governance is practiced consistently, the implication being that faculty morale and therefore, teaching and learning, are potentially harmed.

BSU: The higher-up administration appears convinced that shared governance is an act of mercy or good will towards the faculty; actually it works the other way around: the faculty share the governance with the administration. In effect, the faculty feel patronized.

TU: Responses indicated that the structures of shared governance could be stronger and that there is some skepticism among faculty regarding the commitment of the administration to shared governance. Some were quite clear that they feel shared governance has deteriorated at Towson over the past few years. This sentiment is echoed by the majority of the faculty on the Senate and by a lot of other faculty who've spoken to me [the Senate Chair] about it. Faculty would like to see shared governance strengthened at Towson; the fear is that otherwise the quality of the education we offer will fall into decline—perhaps already has begun to do so.

Ultimately, administrators who were inclusive and intentional about welcoming participation in the decision making process demonstrated their desire to operationalize shared governance on a

campus. When discussing the interactions between administration and faculty the FSU Faculty Senate Chair noted that one of his responsibilities is to attend a portion of the President's Executive Council meetings. This has given faculty the opportunity to have "voice earlier in the process." He states "Instead of being told of a decision, we are more likely to be able to share our thoughts before the decision is made." This comment highlights another factor that contributes to an effective climate of shared governance; and it is timing. Faculty act in an advisory capacity to administration and in order to carry out their responsibilities they must be included early in the decision making process. When they are routinely excluded and are not given opportunities to contribute and are informed of changes, the actions of administrators will generally be received as disingenuous and will not cultivate a climate of shared governance on the campus.

Summary: Many (10 out of 12) of the institutions described their campus as one where shared governance was practiced. Those campuses were most likely to have an internal structure that routinely promoted faculty involvement in the affairs of the institution. This took many forms from meeting regularly with the President's cabinet to top administrators serving as ex officio members on faculty senates. Schools with structures that facilitated open two-way dialogue were most likely to report strong shared governance. Another important factor that coincided with shared governance was an administrator's ability to establish a rapport with key stakeholders and to consistently implement, through words as well as deeds, their ongoing commitment to shared governance. When one or both elements were missing faculty were likely to disengage from the process and when left unaddressed over a significant period of time morale as well as productivity were most likely to suffer.

Institutional Communications:

Table II: *There are excellent communications and consultation by the administration with the faculty and Senate leadership (Item 2).*

Survey Responses [n=12]

	SA-[n/%]	A-[n/%]	D-[n/%]	SD-[n/%]	NA-[n/%]
BSU				X	
CSU	X				
FSU		X			
SU		X			
TU	X= 3/1.88	X=47/29.38	X=52/32.50	X=38/23.75	20/12.50
UB		X			
UMB (n-23)	X=2/ 13	X=9/60	X=3/20	X=1/7	0/0
UMBC	X				
UMCES	X				
UMCP/UMD		X			
UMES	X=7	X=37	X=27	X=11	X=5
UMUC		X			
Total	X=3/25	X=7/58	X=1/.08	X=1/.08	X=0

For most campuses that agreed that they have "excellent communications and consultation," they described a mixture of formal and informal channels of communication embedded in the

structure of the institution. Faculty at most of the institutions report that they and the administrators work systematically to encourage frequent communication. Several institutions indicate, however, that the administrators occasionally merely tell faculty about decisions after the fact, rather than including representative faculty in conversations before and during the decision making process. Finally, TU noted a desire to change the structure of shared governance and, in so doing, to improve communications across the university.

CSU: This new administration is demonstrating its commitment to building/rebuilding an environment where faculty are viewed as allies. Members of the administration have attended Faculty Senate Executive Council meetings and have met with the whole faculty on several occasions. The Provost meets regularly with the Faculty Senate Leadership and the President, to-date, has been nothing but responsive to faculty or the Faculty Senate Leadership's request to meet.

FSU: "The president and provost share a report followed by a question and answer session with the senate. This has worked very well to help the flow of information. There are times where decisions are simply made and told to us where we feel we should have had a more of an opportunity to share our perspectives and thoughts before the decision was made.

SU: There are many examples of consistent communication between administration, faculty senate leadership and the faculty in general. First, all Senate meetings are open. Second, the Senate officers meet regularly with the Provost. Third, the Senate President is a member of the President's Advisory Team. This group includes the President, the Vice-Presidents, the academic deans, and the leaders of campus governance groups (Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Student Government Association, and the Adjunct Faculty Caucus).

TU: Senators agreed that communication of Senate business needs to be much better, across the university. Students and staff expressed the desire to have greater representation on the Senate. These concerns may lead Towson to reorganizing their shared governance structure—perhaps considering the option of a Faculty Senate, since currently there is no university body of shared governance offering exclusively faculty representation.

UB: We are doing an assessment of shared governance at UB and communications appears to be an area that needs some strengthening.

UMB: Dr. Jarrell attends meetings regularly and updates the senators about issues of importance. [In some cases,] it seems that the Administration or the Deans of the schools inform the Faculty Senate of what has already been decided.

UMBC: The communications and consultation between the Administration and the Faculty Senate are in general very good. The Faculty Senate President is consulted frequently by the President of the university on matters of importance to the campus community (e.g., budget announcements, integrating adjunct faculty in shared governance, campus safety and climate).