MSB FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES (DRAFT)
23 MAY 2003

ATTENDEES: Adlakha, Aggarwal, Andrea, A. Bento, Brownstein, Dutt, Ford, Gerlowski, Herron, , Kemery, Korb, Laric, Luchsinger, Lynagh, Lynn, Mersha, Milbourn, Moily, Morse, Nielsen, Oblak, Otto, Popjoy, Richardson, Robinson-Backman, Rollier, Sawhney, Sriram, Stanton, Trotter, Vemuganti, Weiss, & Zacur.

CALL TO ORDER: President Nielsen called the meeting to order at 1012AM.

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: MSBFS Meeting, 9 April 03.

Professor Moily made the motion **that the minutes be accepted!**
Professor Rollier seconded the motion.
MOTION PASSED UNAMIOUSLY

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

THE AGENDA WAS ACCEPTED BY UNAMIOUS VOTE

III. DEAN'S REPORT:

JOINT PROGRAM IN ACCOUNTING WITH_TOWSON UNIVERSITY—
Dr. Zacur asked if the program would begin in January of 2004. The Dean replied that this was the target date, but that it would probably begin in the fall of 04.

Professor Weiss made the following motion (**Second:** by Professor Trotter)
The MSBFS should accept the Joint Master of Accounting program with Towson University.
THE MOTION PASSED BY UNAMIOUS VOTE

FALL RETREAT- The Dean informed the group that she was planning a day and a half retreat for the week of 25 August 2003 (Tuesday/Wednesday or Wednesday/Thursday). The subject will be strategic planning. Dean Stenberg will join us at an off-campus location.

BUDGET-She reported that the amount of the cut will be $60 million in total with $3 million being UB's share---a million dollars for each school. She thanked Professors Andrea, Morse, Popjoy, Rollier and Zacur for their help in reducing costs.

ADVISORY BOARD- The Dean said that smaller boards would be created to help with funding, enrollment, etc. In the future, board members will be asked to teach for free.

IV. RESTRUCTURE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

President Nielsen gave a report on the meeting held on May 19th with the external facilitator. Participants were the Dean, Associate Deans, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, and Deborah Ford, substituting for the

Chair of the Personnel Committee. Nielsen said that a frank discussion took place and there was a general feeling that all present were working towards the same goal: a more effective, efficient faculty governance process, but there was not consensus on the best way to achieve this. However, there was unanimous agreement that the Dean's proposal for a new faculty governance structure should be put forward to the entire faculty for their consideration.

The document ***Proposal to Restructure Faculty Senate and to Create Shared Governance (*Attachment A)** was distributed. The ***MSB Faculty Comments on Dean McCarthy's Proposal for Revision of the Faculty Governance System (*Attachment B)** was also passed out. President Nielsen distributed the ***Summary of AACSB Issues Based on Dean Gregory Bruce's Meeting with Faculty, May 9, 2003*** **(Attachment C)**. Other documents distributed were *The By-Laws from the School of Nursing* and *Memorandum on the Retreat of 19 May 03*.

The floor was opened for discussion and Professor A. Bento asked if there would be a vote today on the Faculty Governance Structure. It was pointed out that a 2/3 majority would be required to pass any motion presented this day.

Anne McCarthy's proposal was compared with the current structure, and the following major differences were identified. These served as the major discussion topics:

1. **The MSBFS will be chaired by the Dean in an ex officio capacity vs. the President being elected by the faculty.**
2. **Maintain the Executive Committee to prepare the agenda vs. a system where the Management Committee and the chairs of the new committees make the agenda**
3. **The structure and number of the committees and how members are determined**
4. **Setting up a Dean's Council (Stipulated in the By Laws)**
5. **Strategic planning process and structure.**

Dr. A. Bento made the following **motion:**

The MSBFS agrees to discuss items 1 & 2 above.

Dr. Rollier seconded the motion.

Dr. Zacur offered a friendly amendment that says "***The Dean May Chair***" The friendly amendment was accepted.

A discussion took place between the Dean and the faculty.

Professor Herron made the motion to ***Table the discussion of items 1 & 2*** ***(*** **Second: Dr. Aggarwal)**

<u>THE MOTION PASSED:</u>

FOR: 25

ABSTENTIONS: 5

Professor Herron made the motion that the **MSBFS accept the items 2 & 3 about committees: (Second: Professor Laric)**

1.There should be three MSB standing committees-undergraduate and graduate program review committees, and personnel committee.

2. Additional ad hoc committees, including interdisciplinary committees, would be constituted as needed. The proposed ones are the recruiting committee, research continuous improvement team, service continuous improvement team, and the strategic planning task force. The current interdisciplinary committees are the The International Groups for Education, Research, and Service (TIGERS) and the enterprise interest group. Potential committees might include entrepreneurship and leadership.

<u>DISCUSSION:</u>

The Faculty Senate has become a committee of the whole. The work should take place at the division level

Where will the final authority rest? This will depend on the committee.

Selection of committee members should come from divisions but members of the Standing Committees should be elected, not appointed by the Division Director or the Dean.

Breaking committees down into graduate and undergraduate spreads the work around.

Dean and Faculty Senate President can appoint ad hoc committees.

Committee decisions should be part of the strategic plan.

Does AACSB have rules about committees? No!

Dr. Laric called for the Question!

<u>The issue failed to get the 2/3 vote needed.</u>

15= FOR
9= Opposed

Discussion continued about the role of committees, how members are chosen, how members are evaluated, etc.

PROFESSOR A. BENTO CALLED THE QUESTION! (Second--Dr. Laric)

FOR +29
OPPOSED=0

PROFESSOR HERRON'S MOTION PASSED

FOR-29
AGAINST-0

A discussion then took place regarding the make up of the committees.

Professor Dutt made a motion that a committee be created to put together the specifics of the proposed Shared Faculty Governance Structure and come forth with a proposal at the August Faculty Retreat. The committee should be made up of

Dean McCarthy, Lee Richardson, Chris Nielsen, Steve Isberg, and Anil Aggarwal. (Second: Professor Richardson).

THE MOTION PASSED:
FOR=27
AGAINST= 0
ABSTAINING=2

V. NOMINATION COMMITTEE REPORT AND ELECTIONS

Professor Trotter passed out the **MSBFS OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES FOR 2003 & 2004 (Attachment D).**

No action was required since Professor R. Bento dropped out as a candidate for University Council alternate.

VI. ADMINISTRATORS EVALUATION RESULTS

Dr. Nielsen handed out a copy of the cover letter that went out with the results of the evaluations **(Attachment E).**

She then pointed out that the minutes of the MSBFS meeting of 11 April said that the Executive Committee would give an oral report, but that the minutes did not specify what type of oral report was to be given. Dr. Nielsen said there appeared to be three choices:

1. Provide a report including both average scores and comments.
2. Provide some other version of an oral report.
3. Rescind the motion to report the results of the administrators' evaluations.

Professor Luchsinger made the motion to ***Rescind our decision to present an oral report. (Second*****: Professor Mersha).**

Richard Trotter made a motion for a secret ballot. This motion was seconded. **The MSBFS voted for a secret ballot:**
FOR=22
AGAINST=2
ABSTAINING= 5

A discussion took place regarding the process that was used to evaluate the administrators.

Dr. Luchsinger's motion failed to achieve the 2/3-vote necessary:
FOR=19
AGAINST=12

Professor Nielsen then proceeded to give an oral report of the Administrators' Evaluations. She reviewed the purpose of the evaluation process: to support a shared goal of institutional excellence. The evaluation reports provide constructive feedback to our administrators, and a basis for dialog in areas where improvements could be made in the functioning of the university. Nielsen commented that the majority of the comments received had, indeed, been offered in a positive spirit.

Several Division Directors said that they had found the results provided helpful feedback. Nielsen mentioned the care that the Executive Committee had taken to insure that faculty responses maintained anonymity. Over 40 faculty members participated in the process, representing a response rate of over 80% from full-time faculty.

President Nielsen announced that it had been an honor to serve the MSB faculty during the past year, and she was happy that the year was almost over! Several faculty members indicated that they would like the minutes to reflect the Faculty Senate's appreciation for Nielsen's hard work and service during the past year. There was a round of applause.

VII. TIGER TEAM AWARDS-

Professor Nielsen announced that the TIGER team summer research awards was to Professors Aggarwal and Fowler.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 12:35PM

Respectfully submitted,

Peter M. Lynagh, Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

Proposal to Restructure Faculty Senate and to Create Shared Governance

Background

The retreat was a follow-up to two meetings between the executive committee and the dean. At both of these meetings, the dean asked the executive committee to work with her over the next several weeks to improve the structure of governance in order to respond to the external challenges facing the school. At the second meeting, everyone agreed that a retreat would help improve communication and move us forward.

We approached the retreat as an opportunity for a discussion about communication and governance structure within the Merrick School with the purpose of making it more responsive to external threats. We started with the assumption that everyone in the room cared about and is committed to seeing the school succeed.

The facilitator asked each of us to write our goals for the day. Several themes emerged and we grouped them by orientation: content or process. The main themes for content goals included:

- participate meaningfully in shared governance
- build a flexible, rigorous committee structure
- establish a vision shared throughout the school
- strive for excellence in all we do,
- and allow for a degree of personal and professional autonomy without detracting from the good of the school.

The main themes for the process goals included:

- achieve excellence by ensuring that our efforts as a school represent more than the sum of our individual talents, by bringing out the best in ourselves and together meeting challenges we face
- enhance communication between faculty and the administrative team, establishing an environment of openness and trust,
- ensure accountability
- become better at working together as a team,
- establish the MSB's ability to build a consensus,
- be reflective of both unity and unanimity,

A recommendation of the proposed structure involves:

Components

- The Faculty Senate will be chaired by the dean in an ex officio capacity. The agenda will be determined by the dean, the management committee and the committee chairs. A date will be set prior to each meeting for all faculty members to raise issues for inclusion on the agenda

- Three MSB standing committees – undergraduate and graduate program review committees, and personnel committee.
- Additional ad hoc committees, including interdisciplinary committees, would be constituted as needed. The proposed ones are the recruiting committee, research continuous improvement team, service continuous improvement team, and the strategic planning task force. The current interdisciplinary committees are the international education (TIGERS) and the enterprise interest group. Potential committees might include entrepreneurship and leadership.
- A Dean's Council comprised of three members invited by the dean and three members elected by the faculty. The purpose would be to provide another avenue for faculty voice in addition to the division directors and committee chairs.
- A Strategic Planning task force would be comprised of the dean, associate dean, division directors, and committee chairs and needs to start its work in summer 2003.

Composition

- Some committees will be comprised of one member per division; other committees may have multiple members from one division depending on purpose and needs of the committee and faculty expertise.
- Selection of faculty representation to the committee occurs within each division and may vary across divisions. Some divisions may utilize a discussion between the faculty member, the division director and review by the division members. Other divisions may select committee members through election, while others may choose discussion that culminates with consensus, but no formal vote. Committee members will elect the committee chair.
- Committee members would have multi-year terms (2 to 3) that are staggered so that institutional memory regarding procedures, etc. would reside with the committee members and be transmitted as new committee members joined a particular committee. This would also allow committee members to develop expertise in the committee's work and policies, which would enable the committee members to recommend continuous improvements as to how the committee functions.
- The committee chairs would join the management committee meetings as needed to improve communication and to work with the dean and division directors on issues facing the school.
- The Faculty Senate would elect faculty representatives to university level committees

Process

- Committee chairs will work with the dean, associate dean and division directors as needed, at the beginning of the school year to determine goals and outcomes.

- Committee chairs will distribute a list of their goals and expected outcomes to the faculty at the beginning of the year in order to enhance communication.
- Faculty meetings will involve some or all of the following as appropriate: updates from the dean, reports from committees or divisions, and open discussion. Division and committee reports will include suggestions and recommendations to the faculty for discussion or approval as necessary.
- Committee chairs would be asked to evaluate the contribution of committee members in terms of timeliness, preparation, attendance, taking on and fulfilling committee tasks, helping to set the committee goals and other dimensions that we can delineate as we refine this proposal.

Additional Issue to Discuss

- We need to resolve the issue of representation of adjuncts in the Merrick School Faculty Senate. All adjuncts could be invited to attend. Or adjuncts could elect one or two or some proportional number to attend and represents all adjuncts.

ATTACHMENT B

MERRICK SCHOOL OF BUSINESS FACULTY COMMENTS ON DEAN McCARTHY'S PROPOSAL FOR A REVISION OF THE FACULTY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM

COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE MAY 9 FACULTY SENATE MEETING AND BEFORE THE MAY 20 RETREAT

One Faculty Member Wrote:
As a preamble to my comments, I hope it is clear that the faculty care deeply about the future of this school and university. It is generally a concerned, mature, and reasonable group that acts in good faith. The issue is really one of its role and its voice in moving us forward.

1. I'm not sure that I share the Dean's view that the Senate and/or committees have been "dysfunctional". Other than the expansion and contraction of the Curriculum Committee's size, no other evidence has been offered in support of this claim. It may be true that desired outcomes were not reached but as long as the committee does it work properly, specific outcomes cannot, and should not, be guaranteed. It is indeed the case that too much Faculty Senate time is spent on things that should be discussed prior to the meetings and that some committee members may be obstructionist and don't fulfil their committee assignments but these are procedural issues that have to be dealt with separately. They are not a reason for doing away with the Senate.

2. I agree with the Dean's proposed committee structure. However, the members have to be elected, and not nominated, by either the Divisions or the full faculty.

3. To narrow the Management-Union perception that in my mind is creeping in, an independent faculty voice is crucial. Even if our role is advisory and our opinions are ignored, we should have a forum for our views. Clearly, our motivation to participate is a function of our perception of having a voice in our shared future. If we have a Senate headed by a Dean, I fear those voices will become silent. There are many areas where the Dean may rightly choose not to ask for faculty advice but with curriculum and promotion and tenure matters in particular, faculty leadership is key.

4. In order to effectively accomplish her agenda, the Dean needs and deserves the support of the faculty. Regular meetings between the Executive Committee and the Dean may help ensure that her concerns and priorities are brought to the faculty for prompt consideration and action where necessary. This will also enable open communication, sharing of views and more importantly, send a signal of our shared commitment.

5. Democratic governance demands that arguments are won by force of ideas and the inherent merit of proposals. If the Dean wants the faculty's advice and help, she must be willing to accept that not all her ideas will be endorsed by the faculty. She is entitled to

expect a complete, honest and prompt consideration but in the long term I think she will be better served with the current process (with the necessary modifications to ensure that elected committee members do their jobs efficiently). I say this because I feel that anything that is the product of vigorous and open debate (hopefully a speedy one) is far better than one that comes from a passive, compliant and apathetic faculty.

Another faculty member wrote:
I am in favor of creating the Committees proposed by the Dean, but the members should be elected by the departmental faculty, not appointed by the Division Directors. I agree with the Dean that Democracy is not efficient, but in the long run Democracy is effective, while other forms of government are not.

Our existing governance is a compromise between having the Administration deciding on all matters with a token consultation of the faculty together with a faculty Union to defend faculty interests, compensation, working conditions, etc. The proposal of allowing faculty to unionize has been consistently defeated by the State legislators because faculty is seen participating in a shared-governance model through the Schools and Universities Faculty Senates. I would not like to see the MSB or UB become unionized.

Deans Costello and Hatfield felt the same way Dean McCarthy feel: the Senate is inefficient, not all that could be accomplished is accomplished in one academic year, etc. The Senate makes much more difficult to do things and requires a greater effort of negotiation and persuasion to have something done, besides delaying most actions. These are all prices to be paid for faculty empowerment, sense of belonging, and commitment to the institution. In this the Senate succeeds -- we all have opinions, we all fight for our ideas, we all have a stake in the destiny of the School. In many Schools I know the Faculty is apathetic and once this happens, even less is accomplished.

The Senate can be better managed or not -- it depends on a positive and constructive cooperation between the Dean, Associate Dean, Faculty Senate President, Committee Chairs, etc. This is not a criticism of anybody, nor am I saying if this exists now or not. What I am saying is that unless this cooperation happens, the Senate does NOT fulfill its mission. I believe that this cooperation should happen, or we will end up with fights on the Newspapers (the ones we see in our e-mails broad-cast to the community), or in bitter Union disputes. I saw both happening and both are ugly. We need to recruit students, not to make our problems public, which accomplishes exactly the opposite.

I have no doubts that we always can improve our present shared-governance model, BUT I believe that any shared-governance model is better than an antagonistic Administration vs. Union relationship. My vote and suggestion is to find ways to improve the charges to the Committees, to have regular meetings of the MSB Administration with the Faculty Senate leadership in order to guarantee that we move ahead as fast as we can with the School objectives.

The Dean is our leader and should set objectives and expect that we react positively to these objectives. We may disagree with some of these objectives and may need to be persuaded of their importance, but it is the job of the Senate and its Committees to make us engage in a constructive dialog to agree and achieve objectives which enhance the School programs.

One Philosophical Faculty Member Wrote:
In relation to the "governance" "proposal" to "dissolve the existing Faculty Senate", you may find it instructive to consider the following quotation:

"IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT DEMOCRACY IS THE WORST FORM OF GOVERNMENT EXCEPT ALL THOSE OTHER FORMS THAT HAVE BEEN TRIED FROM TIME TO TIME."

[Sir Winston Churchill, 1874-1965]

Another Philosophical Faculty Member commented:
As some of our colleagues observed, on some issues the faculty and administration see the world differently. Einstein wrote: "Whether you can observe a thing depends upon the theory that you use." Both sides, as a colleague pointed out, are likely to be frustrated as each feels that the other is missing essential points.

The whole is contained in the part. How you do anything is how you do everything. In the short exchange at end of the last Senate meeting, in my opinion, we helped to indict ourselves. Someone suggested setting up a web Forum to discuss the issues proposed by Anne. In seconds that proposal was collectively dismissed as impractical because no one would participate. Yet more than one faculty member pointed out that a properly functioning Senate should be basically for voting - the difficult work should be done through dialogue before. The problem is that, with a few exceptions, a dialogue prior to a Senate meeting has never happened.

Centuries ago John Milton wrote: "To be free is precisely the same thing as to be pious, wise, just and temperate, careful of one's own, abstinent from what is another's and thence magnanimous and brave...To be an opposite of these is the same thing as to be a slave...So it comes to pass that the nation which has been incapable of governing and ordering itself and has delivered itself up to the slavery of its own lusts is itself delivered against its will to other masters, and whether it will or not, is compelled to serve." In other words, we have co-created the current situation. To paraphrase Dee Hock, Anne will soon find out that a faculty incapable of governing itself is not governable.

Rose Wilder Lane, who ghost wrote much of "The Little House on the Prairie" books for her mother Laura Ingalls Wilder, was a great journalist and historian. She wrote: "A time comes when every normal human being is a responsible human being. His energy creates a part of the whole human world of his time. He is free; he is self-controlling and responsible because he generates his energy and controls it. NO one and nothing else can control it."

As gasoline powered engine can't run on water, human beings don't function well on fear and force. What a human being runs on is his principles and values and responsible application of them. Dee Hock, founder and former CEO of Visa observed: "An organization's success has more to do with clarity of shared purpose, common principles and strength of belief in them than to assets, expertise, operating ability or management competence, important as they may be."

We tend to focus on the latter half of Hock's list of success factors. Why? They are more tangible and when one is in short supply we have something to blame for our lack of responsibility. But I assure you that Hock's statement is not mere hyperbole - he believes it and put it into action in Visa. If Hock is correct, and I believe he is, should we not be focusing on: what is and should be the Merrick School's "shared purpose, common principles and strength of belief of them"?

To reach the point that we understand and are committed to shared values, principles and purpose is a difficult, time-laden journey. Our principles are frequently invisible to us and lie within our individual consciousness. To bring these to light require more than wordsmithing a Mission statement. They require an ongoing and sustained dialogue. There is really no alternative. Force and control is life consuming and it must constantly be fed by ever greater applications of control and fear. Power that comes from collective principles and values energizes and gives life to our efforts.

Management consultant and author, Peter Block in his excellent new book, "The Answer to How is Yes" writes: "When a discussion is dominated by questions of How? we risk overvaluing what is practical and doable and postpone the questions of larger purpose and collective well being." Block proposes: "If we could agree that for six months we would not ask How? something in our lives, our institutions, and our culture might shift for the better. It would force us to engage in conversations about why we do what we do, as individuals and as institutions." The result would be that: "It would create the space for longer discussions about purpose, about what is worth doing...We might realize that real service and contribution come more from the choice of a worthy destination than from limiting ourselves to engaging in what we know will work."

In other words, the real issue here is not whether or not to abolish the Senate. The real issue is are we willing to have the conversation that Block calls for. Dee Hock says it takes a full year to get to the starting gate for organizational change. Why? It takes a year to have buy in and willingness to have the type of genuine conversation that creates change.

Margaret Wheatley in "Leadership and the New Science" has pointed out that: "We can never direct a living system. We can only disturb it." Clearly our system is being disturbed. But being disturbed is neither necessary nor sufficient for positive change to occur.

I realize that my comments here contribute nothing to the question of how to organize our governance structure. Block writes: "Part of the appeal of making How? the question of choice is that it lifts the requirement of going deeper and reflecting on our ideals...The dilemma is that we do not want to pay for our freedom...We want someone else to assure of a safer tomorrow. We want to know how: how to do it, how much it costs, how long it will take, how to get those people to align with us, how to measure it, and who else is doing it...As long as we wish for safety, we will have difficulty pursuing what matters."

Another Faculty Member Wrote:

The following excerpt is from the document called "I - 6.00 POLICY ON SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND," approved by the Board of Regents October 4, 1996, and amended on August 25, 2000 --

"While some members of shared governance bodies may be appointed, the substantial majority should be elected by their constituencies. Such bodies should elect their own presiding officers."

Elsewhere in the same document it is noted that "Each constituent institution within the USM shall have either a single shared governance body for the institution as a whole, or separate bodies for faculty, staff, and students. At least 75% of the voting members shall be elected by their constituencies. This percentage shall not apply to paragraph G. below. These bodies shall have written bylaws and shall meet regularly."

The entire document is available online at
http://www.usmd.edu/Leadership/BoardOfRegents/Bylaws/SectionI/I600.html

COMMENTS ON DEAN McCARTHY'S PROPOSAL
DRAFT 9 MAY 2003 MSB FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES EXCERPT

The remaining faculty senate meeting time was spent discussion Dean McCarthy's proposal for dissolution of the current Faculty Senate, and replacement of current committees with new committees. Faculty Senate members also discussed the proposed change from election of representatives to appointment by the Dean based on recommendations from the Division Directors.

- **LEGAL ISSUES**
  A question about whether the MSBFS had the power to control the process.
  Dr. Richardson indicated that the Attorney General's office appeared to say that no administrator could change what is in place without working through the existing structure. However, he indicated that this interpretation was not clear, so we don't know if this body has the right to vote on the issue.
- **SELECTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS**
  Another question related to whether or not the proposed committee members would be elected. Regina Bento and Chris Nielsen responded giving their understanding of what the Dean had said in a meeting with the Executive Committee earlier during the week. According to their understanding, division heads would recommend faculty members to the Dean, and she would make the appointments. One big question to be raised at the retreat would be: ***Would faculty members vote for members of the committees? If they are to be elected, Who Votes?***
- **WHAT IS BEST FOR THE MERRICK SCHOOL**
  One faculty member asked: How good a job are we doing [within the current Faculty Senate structure]?
  President Nielsen said that we all share the goal of working toward improvements in our current processes so that the institution can succeed. She felt we needed to address the issue of whether a change in structure would be the best mechanism to make the school run better. A change in structure might not necessarily lead to better functioning systems. It may be some processes that need to change instead.
  Another faculty member suggested that the two alternative structures need to be analyzed under different scenarios. What would be the worse case scenario under each system, for example? One member expressed the opinion that the faculty has little power now, and questioned the wisdom of relinquishing what we have.
  Another faculty member said that the case had not been made that the current system is dysfunctional. Another faculty member pointed out that under the current system the President of the Faculty Senate has a voice, and we'll lose that voice. In addition, we will lose the ability to evaluate administrators. The opinion was expressed that the new structure would give the Dean more power and would be like the law school where the Dean makes all decisions. Another faculty member said that we have power over the curriculum now, and we are, for the most part, happy with the curriculum. He pointed out that the hours spent in faculty senate meetings are painful, but that the results are worth the pain. At the end of it all, we understand each other, and reach if not a consensus, at least a majority opinion where everyone feels that

their opinions have been heard and considered. Another comment was about efficiency versus effectiveness. Perhaps effectiveness is more important over the long haul. Another member suggested that we consider how much we have accomplished during the past two years under difficult circumstances. This member felt that problems with the curriculum committee occurred because this was a year of transition. A Division Director pointed out that trust is the key. The Dean is working to make things better, and we need to work with her to make things better. Another faculty member suggested we look at the Curriculum Committee issues separately from the issue of Faculty Senate. Another faculty member said that there are many problems, and that we can best meet these challenges by working with the Dean to solve the problems.

ATTACHMENT C

Summary of AACSB Issues Based on Dean Gregory Bruce's Meeting with Faculty May 9, 2003

* Dean Bruce was very helpful in terms of what we need to accomplish for reaccredidation.

* A serious effort is needed at strategic planning in the Business School. This effort should include working with all of the stakeholders of the Business School including the faculty, business community, employers, students and Alumni.

* Dr. Bruce answered many questions from faculty by saying that we appear not to have a current mission statement or strategy for the Merrick School of Business. He cautioned us that the new or revised mission statement should be consistent with the nature of the school as a professional institution with a focus on applied business education, and professional training geared to the regional business community.

* Some faculty members believe we are floundering for lack of a strategy for the Merrick School.

* Faculty are concerned that the university-level strategy being developed may preclude appropriate choices for the Merrick School's long-term strategies.

* Curricula need to be mission and strategy driven. Curricula should reflect who we are, who our students are, and who the students' employers are.

* Dean Bruce recommended that our emphasis should be in applied research, rather than traditional forms of academic research. The student profile of the business school demands strong doses of reality. However, it is best if the School's overall profile contains a rounded research portfolio with applications, pedagogical, and discipline-specific research publications.

* He said the "currency" of research is blind-refereed, peer-reviewed journal articles.

* If the curriculum hasn't had a major review and change in the last 10 years we might be in trouble. Major change should reflect a "theme" for example international, or entrepreneurship. It should build on students' backgrounds, faculty competencies and employers needs. It is more than substituting one course in the graduate curriculum and one course in the undergraduate curriculum.

* We started a major curriculum review this year. The theme itself needs to be relevant to the nature of our school and strategies. Broader subjects such as international and entrepreneurship are appropriate.

* In a school like UB with a lot of part time students who work full time we should be working in partnership with the business community, and with our partners in the community colleges'.

* Joel Morse told Dean Bruce about our People Soft partnership. Dean Bruce wished us luck with this and said the alliance is a good idea if we are able to use it in our marketing to potential students and the business community, demonstrating the applied nature of our program.

* Dean Bruce was skeptical about PeopleSoft, suggesting it may be a temporary phenomenon of little long-term value. Dean Bruce said his business school had tried a similar type of arrangement with ERM. However, Dean Bruce's institution has discontinued the arrangement. When Dean Bruce questioned Assoc Dean Morse about the arrangement, Morse explained that the PeopleSoft donation actually is a valuation by the company of its own software's value in some real market application. (This may not reflect the value to the Merrick School of a small number of modules let to a small university.) The Merrick School did not receive cash and other resources needed to operate PeopleSoft modules in the classroom. In fact, we have had to spend money to set it up.

* Assessment of learning objectives is of major importance in the revised AACSB re-accreditation process. You need to have learning objectives, measure of the objectives' achievement, and evidence that students' achievements.

* Dean Bruce recommended the "the gold standard" for "academically-qualified faculty". Achieving this standard would mean that most of our faculty members' research records would include 2 refereed journal articles over the past five years and other intellectual contributions, including a mix of academic and professional publications, proceedings etc. He did not distinguish between "qualified at the graduate level" and "qualified at the undergraduate level".

* Service is a shared responsibility. Everyone takes their turn at La Salle's Business School. There are no course releases for service.

* Discussion with faculty following Dean Bruce's comment about service can be summarized as follows:

> "Taking a turn" is not the same as representative governance. The take-a-turn approach would put some people of little commitment and skill in positions of importance and lead to real failures of performance in the faculty senate as well as university level committees and councils. What is more important to fixing the current process would be to have an official policy about how non-performing faculty can be removed from service assignments due to lack of attendance and poor performance. Waiting until an end-of-the-year evaluation is too late.

* Enrollment is an issue for the Merrick School and it can be improved through creating a better curriculum, working with community colleges, and employers, among other ways.

* Finally, faculty students and administrators should all be on the same page. In other words, we should all know what the program is and be on board. This will come from an honest strategic planning process that features good listening, consensus, and hard work by faculty, alumni, business community, and staff and students.

* The university level strategic planning is being led by the University Council in this manner. The
faculty senate should be asked do so at the school level in cooperation with all the other stakeholders.

ATTACHMENT D
MERRICK SCHOOL OF BUSINESS FACULTY SENATE
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES[*]
For 2003-2004

President	Lee Richardson*
Vice President	Ed Kemery*
Secretary	Pete Lynagh*
Past President	Chris Nielsen
Executive Committee	Lee Richardson Chris Nielsen Pete Lynagh Rao Vemuganti Zoltan Acs Al Bento Susan Lynn
University Faculty Senate	Lee Richardson (CUSF) Zoltan Acs Al Bento Susan Lynn Rao Vemuganti
Academic Policy & Review Committee	1 opening for Curriculum Committee Chair 2003-04* Steve Isberg (continues)
Faculty Appeals Committee	Kal Singhal Veena Adlakha (continues) Susan Zacur - First Alternate (continues) Susan Lynn- Second Alternate
Information Management Committee	Milton Jenkins Jim Otto Jaya Moily
University Council	Lee Richardson Rao Vemuganti Zoltan Acs (Alternate) * Regina Bento (Alternate) * Richard Trotter (Alternate) *
Research Committee	Veena Adlakha (continues) Zoltan Acs (continues)
Scholarship Committee	Tigi Mersha

[*] These positions have not been elected. Names of nominations are provided where available

MERRICK SCHOOL OF BUSINESS FACULTY SENATE
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES[*]
For 2003-2004

Judicial Hearing Board	Edward Kemery (continues?) Anil Aggarwal (continues?) Richard Trotter (First Alternate) (continues?) Rao Vemuganti (Second Alternate) (continues?)
Awards Committee	
Fall Semester- Turner Medallion	Rao Vemuganti (through December 2003)
Spring Semester- Teaching, Research, Service, Ethics	Veena Adlakha, David Levy, Steve Isberg, Susan Zacur
Curriculum Committee	5 slots*
Personnel Committee	6 slots*

MSB Ad Hoc Committees

Faculty Evaluation and Standards Com (Continues?)	Bansi Sawhney* Rao Vemuganti* Susan Zacur* John Sigler* 2 slots open*
The **I**nternational **G**roup for **E**ducation, **R**esearch, and **S**ervice (TIGERS)	Bruce Rollier (MIS alternate)* Tigineh Mersha* Christine Nielsen* Dennis Pitta* Alan Randolph* Bansi Sawhney* Ven Sriram* Richard Trotter* Veena Adlakha* Mollie Bowers* Ed Kemery* Lee Richardson* Rao Vemuganti*

[*] These positions have not been elected. Names of nominations are provided where available

ATTACHMENT E

May 21, 2003

Dear [Administrator]:

On behalf of the Merrick School of Business Faculty Senate, I would like to share with you the results of our annual administrators' evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation process is to provide constructive feedback to you, our leadership, and to promote dialog in areas where we believe improvements can be made in the functioning of our institution. We are proud of the professional manner with which most of our colleagues contributed to this initiative. The majority of comments have been offered in the spirit of cooperation, toward our shared goal of institutional excellence. We hope you receive this summary of our perspectives and recommendations in the spirit with which they are offered.

The President, Provost, Associate Deans, Dean, and Division Directors have been evaluated by the Merrick School faculty. Over 40 faculty members in the School participated in the process, representing an 84% response rate from full-time faculty (most full and part-time administrators chose not to participate.) We are very pleased that such a significant number of faculty participated in this initiative.

The evaluation form is provided in Attachment 1. It is a slightly modified version of the administrators' evaluation form used in years past. Your evaluation is in Attachment 2. [The evaluations of those for whom you have supervisory responsibility are included in Attachment 3].

Evaluation Purpose and Process

At the April 11, 2003 Faculty Senate meeting, faculty members discussed the value of providing our leaders with constructive feedback and recommendations for improving the management of the Business School and the institution overall. The decision was reached to proceed with the evaluation, with these goals in mind. A process for anonymous submission of completed evaluation forms was designed, and an initial deadline for submission of forms was set for April 18.

The Faculty determined that the dissemination of results and comments would be as follows: Each individual evaluated would receive his or her tabulated evaluation scores and a typewritten record of faculty comments. This summary would also be supplied to each administrator's supervisor. Evaluations of the Dean and the Associate Deans will be provided to the Provost and President. Faculty Senate members present at the Faculty Senate meeting decided that the most appropriate means for disseminating results to the Faculty would be through a presentation of the results by the Executive Committee at a Faculty Senate meeting. The Faculty would not receive the results in writing.

The Executive Committee made the decision to extend the deadline for submission of responses to encourage full participation in the process. (The original 7-day turnaround period to notify all faculty members, and receive their completed forms proved to be unrealistic.) Executive Committee members contacted approximately 10 faculty members who had not yet turned in their forms, and encouraged them to participate. The message to these individuals was: *We value your participation. Our results will be meaningful to the extent that they represent the entire range of faculty perspectives.*

Thank you, in advance, for your thoughtful attention to our evaluation results. All of us realize that this has been a difficult year for higher education in the State of Maryland. Meeting the challenge of institutional excellence has never been greater. We look forward to working with you in areas of mutual concern, in order to strengthen our School and our University.

Sincerely,

Christine Nielsen
Faculty Senate President