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DRAFT Minutes

1. Meeting called to order.

2. Welcome from Cynthia Coleman, BSU, introducing Dr. Karen Shaheed, Provost and Dr. Karl Brockenbaugh, VP for Administration/Finance and Liaison for BSU Staff Council.

Dr. Shaheed: BSU has 5,600 students, its first doctoral student will graduate in December 2011. New building for fine and performing arts, scheduled to open Spring 2012. Closing the achievement gaps, staff helps with retention and the graduation of students.

Dr. Brockenbaugh: Role is to support and communicate staff concerns with the president. BSU staff has helped to change policies, work together on budget and furlough plans.
Vincent Novara, Chairperson, University of Maryland, College Park Senate Committee on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) met with the Council to ask for a statement of support regarding expansion of system-wide benefits and policy coverage to same-sex domestic partners.

Specifically:

- USM Institutions should be authorized to offer the same tuition remission benefits for same-sex domestic partners enrolled at USM institutions that are available to spouses.

- Same-sex domestic partners should be included in the policies, as appropriate, which allow USM employees to use sick leave for illness or injury in the employee’s immediate family.

- Same-sex domestic partners should be included in the policies, as appropriate, which allow USM employees to use paid bereavement leave on account of the death of any member of the employee’s immediate family.

- The inclusion of same-sex domestic partners in policies regarding family and medical leave should be executed, paralleling policies mandated by Federal law.

- University policies related to nepotism should be extended to include same-sex domestic partners.

- The expansion of system benefits to same-sex domestic partners may be considered a priority in the next go around of negotiations that will replace the Collective Bargaining Agreements set to expire on June 30, 2013 for the University of Maryland College Park. No changes to policies or benefits, such as those listed herein, for employees covered by collective bargaining, may occur until after such negotiations take place, as appropriate.

3. Financial implications have not been discussed.
   - Rosario van Daalen said that DBM-ERB’s position on this issue is that benefits are not extended to non-married opposite-sex couples, as they can get married.
   - Ron Butler: why not domestic partnerships? Focusing on the same-sex couples at this point are denied right to marry in Maryland.
   - Rosario van Daalen: At USM, married spouses of same sex are eligible for tuition remission; same-sex partners are not

A vote was held, ayes have it.

4. Minutes were approved with no changes

5. Chair’s Discussion
a. Meeting Rotation Schedule: Look to putting together a three-year schedule that takes into account the fact that we have 13 USM Institutions to visit and only 12 months in the year to schedule meetings.
   o Roy Ross. Want to make sure that the far-off Institutions be kept in the rotation.
   o Rosario van Daalen. It is helpful and perhaps the only opportunity to visit USM Institutions at the farthest points of the State.
   o Jesse Ketteman, FSU: Does want us to recognize that the challenges to attract people to come out there, it truly is a full-day trip for them, as opposed to the Baltimore-Washington corridor universities.
   o Roy Ross. Traditionally we have done outreach to all of the Institutions, but it is very important to keep the farthest ones on the roster.
   o Gynene Sullivan. Since we have three universities in the Baltimore area, we may want to drop one of them off each year.
   o Willie Brown. Why should we not combine a Salisbury-UMES meeting out of fairness?
   o Gabriel Purviance: It is an issue of regionalism; there is a recognized benefit to promote the benefits of the region. Frostburg is the only university in the area where there is no other university in the region.
   o Nancy Bowers. Why not just keep everyone in, but rotate through all thirteen institutions.
   o Willie Brown. Change the mindset from a 12-month to a 14-month rotation. Make an exception for FSU, where there is no immediate university in the region.
   o Debby Mathis. Time of year is important at FSU, need to take that into account. Mary Hickey. Leaving FSU still needs to travel 12 of 14 months. Should not be dropped out or compensated in any negative way, they are traveling the farthest. Create a rotation with two exceptions – always to FSU, always to System Office, always the Joint Meeting (November at UMCP).
   o Gynene Sullivan. Why don’t we organize the meeting schedule around regionality? Instead of individual institutions, do regions (Eastern Shore, FSU, Baltimore, College Park). Four exceptions. System Office, Annapolis, UMCP, FSU. Rotate through the rest.

Willie will draft up a three-year calendar. Dolores Jackson made a motion to have Executive Council make draft for further discussion. Discussion would be by e-mail. Unanimously in favor of this motion.

b. Joint Council’s Meeting Agenda. Questions to be discussed were distributed yesterday at 4:51 pm.
   o Rosario van Daalen. Schedule seems tight, had a question if we could not extend to 2:30.
   o Willie Brown. If it goes over, it goes over.
   o Debby Mathis. Agreed with Rosario van Daalen that it may be tight. If we have 10 tables, how will we have a report-back discussion with one minute per table, probably extend the discussion to 20 minutes instead of ten.
   o Willie Brown. Agreed that we should extend to 2:30 pm.
   o Melissa Stein. Suggested extending introductions by 10 minutes.
Willie Brown. Agenda approved with aforementioned changes.

c. Back to Meeting Rotation Schedule. Cynthia Coleman. Meetings already scheduled through July 2012. Executive committee can send out alternate scenarios, come back to finalize discussion in December. There is no rush, even if there is more tweaking to do. Roy Boss. It’s fine with UMB.

d. UMCP-UMB merger talks. Purple Committee meeting to discuss merger on October 28. Chancellor asked for representatives. Willie volunteered himself and Gynene to represent. A question of a conflict of interest has been raised, as they are employed at UMCP and UMB respectively. Concern is that there may be the appearance of a conflict of interest.
   o Sister Maureen Schrimpe. You represent CUSS, not your Institutions. Willie and Gynene will represent CUSS. Willie Brown has done research on impact of organizational culture and representation of staff. Biggest concern is communication. Lack of communication or poor communication is an issue. Communication is very limited to students. Fears also exist of how it directly affects the staff at UMCP/UMB, such as possible lay-offs.
   o Dolores Jackson. The key concern is that in these discussions that are not directly affected by the merger will be to the other Institutions.
   o Mi’Shaun Stevenson. Where is the push coming from to disseminate the information?
   o Willie Brown. Chancellor’s Council – it is discussed on a monthly basis.
   o Debby Mathis. The scope of the merger and its impact on staff is so large. How can one get the information to make any decision?
   o Willie Brown. Response to the question about staffing levels is that these questions have not been asked yet.
   o Gynene Sullivan. Information may be trickling down only slowly through the non-merger presidents.
   o Rosario van Daalen. There are issues that could impact non-UMCP/UMB schools. Must go beyond what is being said.
   o Mary Hickey. Lack of information makes it hard to make any decisions. Is there a timeline?
   o Willie Brown. December 15 is deadline for BOR to report to legislature.
   o Willie Brown. We cannot postpone or delay it. Presidents have no choice in this.
   o Cynthia Coleman. What if BOR says it is not feasible? What if they say no to Mike Miller? What possible retribution would there be if we do not support the merger? How can we streamline the processes if there is no merger?
   o Ron Butler. Is Mike Miller looking for a research park? Does he want us to be a premiere research establishment? Is merging the two institutions necessary? All at non-flagship institutions will end up fighting for limited pool of funding. A major argument is that there will be diminished resources for the rest of the USM Institutions. Who gets the final say?
   o Roy Ross. If Mike Miller wants is badly enough, he can find support on Senate side, but less support on the house side.
   o Mi’Shaun Stevenson. What about using Capwiz?
   o Willie Brown. The assembly may be concerned if we use state funds to oppose a state-mandated action.
Debby Mathis. Academically heard that research of hard science would benefit with the merging with social sciences. Found it to be very interesting.

Willie Brown. Interdisciplinary research is becoming more important. Mike Miller’s way of going about this change is not necessarily the wisest. Suggested we all go to the web site to read information about the merger, please read and send comments to him and Gynene.

Rosario van Daalen. We hope that members who are not able to attend these meetings give information to their Institution staff senates.

e. Annual Newsletter Dissemination. Has anyone not seen it? Willie says it is on the web site.

f. Letters for CUSS members. The CUSS Executive Committee member Institutions’ Presidents receive a letter from the Chancellor recognizing the elected individuals for the CUSS year. In turn, Willie will send out a note to all of our presidents and supervisors to recognize the CUSS membership. Gynene needs the name, institution, supervisor’s name and address, president’s name and address. She will collect the information via e-mail.

g. BOR Awards. There was a bit of confusion with the changes. Willie created a single document to summarize changes detailing deadlines and processing time for notification of awards. Comments: Willie Brown notes that Chris from Coppin is in agreement.

Gynene Sullivan. Wants to set up a meeting among Gynene, Willie and Chris with Leonard Raley, President and CEO of University of Maryland Foundation to promote the awards more, as it is a big deal. Will need BOR approval for any of these changes. Agreed with processing dates, hoping to have awards by June meeting. Evaluation process is too much for one committee. Willie’s suggestion is that each sub-committee take a subset of applications for review. Work will be split among all of the committees.

Rosario van Daalen. Given individual CUSS members’ interests, possibly evaluating individuals from own campus, may need to think if that plan is the most viable.

Mi’Shaun Stevenson. Each committee select 2 within each committee to do the evaluation.

Jesse Ketterman. Concern is that it may be biased when your own university’s candidates are being evaluated. Can one do that from a neutral perspective. Evaluation sheet used to exist, how does one create a neutral evaluation sheet with neutral criteria?

Dolores Jackson. BOR Awards committee recruited others to assist in the process. Depends on the award category how many nominees we will have per award.

Willie Brown. We have made a concerted effort to get the timing right. We are giving BOR eight weeks to put packet together – more time than in the past. We also say we are getting to BOR by early November. All of this is with the agreement of the BOR, no more of the bouncing around of dates. Refining of categories has been done so as to remove subjectivity (or as much as possible). We should also be able to say that we individual members, as elected CUSS members, can neutrally evaluate the materials. There was general agreement on this principle. We have
also worked to address the criterion of just doing job vs. going above and beyond the call.

- Melissa Stein. BOR Awards to be marketed through Staff Senate, does anyone have a template?
- Brian Souders. UMBC may have a model. Joel will look.
- Dolores Jackson. Why September? Why not August, as we have so much going on in September just doing our jobs.
- Willie Brown. Is August any different than September?
- Mary Hickey. Why is there a specific date for distribution of applications? Why is it not available year-round for the following year?
- Dolores Jackson. Nominations come from Presidents of individual Institutions at a specific time. Sharing of the reviewing of the applications.
- Gynene Sullivan. We need someone from each Institution to review all. Needs to be representation from all Institutions, but not each committee will have members from all Institutions.
- Rosario van Daalen. Are all committees fully staffed?
- Willie Brown. Shelving the divvying up of the work until December. Will proceed with getting final approval of BOR for our proposed changes.
- Joel DeWyer. Argues that it’s six of one, half a dozen of another. Willie Brown. Volunteers did not necessarily show.
- Gabriel Puviance. Can the Chair appoint representation if it does not come willingly?
- Willie Brown. Would prefer it be a volunteer role.
- Gynene Sullivan. These are recognizing our work, even if it is work for us. She’s willing to do that work, and we should as well.

Motion #1. Look at the nominations as they come in, divide up the work. Motion 1 passes.

h. New BOR Exceptional Service Towards the Advancement of Shared Governance (Institutional or USM) Award. Joel DeWyer. Looked at it in Salisbury, agreement that it looked good. Gynene Sullivan. Start it for next year, not this year. Willie Brown. Will include as a separate proposal to the BOR.

6. Vice Chair’s Notes. No comments from Gynene’s notes from BOR Retreat.

7. Joint Meeting in November. Three topics for Governor and Chancellor to talk about. Governor may speak about possible tuition hikes. Future of system employees as per staffing levels and so on.

- Willie Brown. Possible future funding cuts at federal level could really hurt Maryland. Protecting retirees’ benefits as much as possible.
- Dolores Jackson. Something about keeping the vision of keeping schools competitive in STEM initiatives with funding limitations.
- Rosario van Daalen. Jackie’s questions have valid points, but we may need to phrase questions/thoughts to keep in mind as they consider the budget for the system. We would like to make it a more positive type of a question.
8. Chancellor’s Liaison Report. ORP and changes to The Pension Committee cancelled its October 20 meeting so the USM’s presentation on the ORP-Retiree’s dependent health care eligibility did not take place; no future date has been scheduled at this time. Importance of testimony is to address employee’s difficult situations due to the lack of having 25 years of service so that spouse/child could be covered under the health insurance. Bring any of these to Willie and Rosario’s attention. Encouraged all CUSS members to remind their constituents at their Institutions of the “use-it-or-lose-it” annual leave policy and the maximum of 400 hours of carry over to the next calendar year.

Remind constituents as well to update beneficiaries for all benefit programs (i.e., life insurance, retirements plans). Unum Life Insurance for dependent children is now extended to age 26. Additionally, Unum is now in the process of collecting ages and names of beneficiaries.

Under Supplemental Retirement Plans 403(b) and 457(b) – For calendar year 2012, Congress has increased the limited amount that can be contributed to $17,000 in each plan. Over age 50, the limit remains at an additional $5,500 in each plan. Rosario encouraged employees to schedule information meetings with the Fidelity, MSRP-Nationwide and TIAA-CREF representatives to review status of their accounts. All Regular and Contingent Status Staff and Faculty Employees are eligible to enroll in these plans.

9. November Joint Meeting. Willie asked for approximate attendance from individual institutions.

10. Meeting adjourned.