

Faculty Senate Notes

May 7, 2024

Holloway Hall 119

<https://www.salisbury.edu/administration/campus-governance/faculty-senate/>

Deneen Long-White, Dan Ervin, Steven Binz, Erin weber, Nicole Kulp, Mark de Socio, James Fox, Elizabeth Ragan, Mary DiBartolo, Mia Waldron, Sally Perret, Ellen Schaefer-Salins, Jeff Emmert, Joerg Tuske, David Keifer, Memo Diriker, Bart Talbert, Vitus Ozoke

Call to order (3:30 pm)

1. Announcements from President Lepre

- a. Commencement: Some unrest at other universities involving protests. SU has kept this top of mind to make sure we allow for freedom of speech while also keeping the campus safe. Commencement is an enormous event, so we need to strike a balance between freedom of speech and safety of community members. SU is talking with other faculty and administrators at other institutions that already had their commencements. Met with Council of University System Presidents to discuss what USM campuses have been seeing. College Park has been seeing more student protests and has had practice to determine and communicate their policy; they reported that communicating their policy frequently helped keep everything in check. SU will take several measures:
 - i. SU will have an area roped off outside Civic Center during commencement for demonstrations so that people protesting will have a space to do so without interfering.
 - ii. SU will also have more volunteers and marshals present.
 - iii. SU will abide by SU policies and Civic Center policies, but we cannot stop every possible incident. SU will not physically intervene with anything going on on-stage unless there is hate speech or a physical threat.
 - iv. Mics will be turned off except for the speaker's mic.
 - v. SU will have more people lining the stage so that there is less room and less time to display anything. There may be other measures taken as well.
 - vi. Last resort is to bring in security officers to intervene.
 - vii. If anyone has other strategies they know of from other universities, pass it along to President's Office.
- b. Performing Arts Center: SU will swap properties with Wicomico County Library. They will move into former Ward Museum; the Library can tap into state money to renovate that building that SU could not have tapped into. SU will take over the building where Library currently is. We are nearing an agreement to pay for planning and demolition so that we can build Performing Arts Center. It will be a community asset; county and city productions may use it when SU is not. Thank you to all the people who have worked together on this agreement. Money for it will be advocated for from state of Maryland as well as private donors. Will soon be able to share amount of money that has been raised.

- c. Question: Concerns regarding commencement because of general trends or because of SU-specific concerns?
 - i. Response: Mostly general trends. We have heard nothing concrete about any planned demonstrations. We are just trying to be prepared.
 - d. Question: Message at top of Tuesday Report saying that email was not from SU. Why?
 - i. Response: Do not know. Can check with IT.
 - e. Question: Have been told before that increasing graduate enrollment and creating Graduate School is not intended to change Carnegie classification to R2. Quote from March's last Tuesday report is, "It presents new opportunities for fundraising (to support graduate programs and students) and is an important potential elevation in our classification from SU's current master's-granting classification." Is it the administration's priority to change SU's classification?
 - i. Response: That needs to be a faculty decision. We would need to put resources into place to pursue R2. We are already spending enough on research to be R2 based on new classifications, but we would also need to have more doctoral students. We would have to graduate 20 scholarly PhDs a year to get that classification. The Graduate School is more about elevating the perception that grad students are important on campus and that they have community. Could it elevate to R2? Yes. Should it? That's up to university.
 - ii. Response from Senator: We do not all have one voice on this. Some faculty are doing amazing research and would like the extra support from being R2.
 - iii. Follow-up question: Do we 'apply' for changing classification, or does Carnegie automatically do it based on numbers?
 - 1. President: I believe that it happens automatically, but will need to check for sure. Even if automatic, we would need to invest a lot into doctoral programs to get enough students. It would need to be intentional.
 - f. Question: Faculty have felt they needed to tighten their belts but that administration has not. Can you provide some examples of how administration has had to tighten belts?
 - i. Response: We would have wanted to put on more events, to buy buses for sports teams, etc. Admin budget was cut last year just like everyone else.
 - ii. Chief of Staff: Had to pay for things from Foundation rather than from State to sunset some stuff related to government relations, community events, etc. Not best practice, but we had to. Also held onto two vacancies in President's Office and another position as well.
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. Minutes from the April 23, 2024 regular business meeting approved as written.
 3. Announcements from Provost Couch
 - a. Thank you for the camaraderie faculty has offered during my first year. Thanks to Senate and officers for the transparency and working together. Looking forward to working with next year's Senate.

- b. Provost has been setting up open office hours by school/college. Has met with Perdue, CHHS, and Fulton. Henson and Seidel next week. Many people have come by, so it may be a group conversation. Hope you will come by.
 - c. Dean search for CHHS: Committee meeting tomorrow. There have been challenges.
 - d. Associate Provost search is ongoing. That committee is meeting soon to select semi-finalists. Finalists on campus week after commencement. Encourages faculty to participate in those.
 - e. Dean search for Library: Search will launch at end of May. Candidate materials will be gathered over summer. Candidates will come early fall semester.
 - f. Dean search for Perdue: Candidates will come around same time as Library Dean search.
 - g. Dual enrollment: Blueprint lays the groundwork for dual enrollment credit. Provost's Office is looking into different models to see what works for SU. Provost is creating a task force from Academic Affairs and maybe other divisions. Let Provost know if interested. A general call will be sent out.
4. Question: Will there be Library office hours with Provost?
- a. Response: Will have an open office hour for all schools. Library could come to that one or to some over summer, since Library Faculty are here.
5. Announcements from the Senate President
- a. Reminder that GEOC is having a town hall meeting on 5/14 at 3:30 in Nanticoke Room. All faculty, staff, admin invited to ask questions about gen ed process, to celebrate new gen ed rollout, etc. Meeting will be led by GEOC chair
 - b. Senate President gets to select a distinguished member of the Faculty body every year.
 - i. Jennifer Martin is selected due to her excellent job as Parliamentarian.
6. Elections for AY 24-25
- a. Turning this part of meeting over to incoming Senate President.
 - b. Welcoming new Senators: Anita Brown, Brian Flores, Yuki Okubo, and Emily Zerrenner. James Fox and Nicole Kulp re-elected.
 - c. Webmaster: Senator Emmert nominated. Accepted. Elected.
 - d. Secretary: Senator Weber nominated. Accepted. Elected.
 - e. Vice President: Senator Keifer nominated. Accepted. Elected.
 - f. Gift given to current President: Thank you. You have been a great mentor.
 - g. Gavel given to upcoming President.
7. Committee reports
- a. Motion to suspend rules to vote on Senator Ragan's motion in new business now to make sure there is time to charge SAC with getting data over summer
 - i. Motion approved
 - b. MOTION to charge SAC to collect compensation data over summer
 - i. Question: Why not include other things regarding FTNTT faculty discussed in that report, such as healthcare benefits?

1. Response: Retirement is the only one that directly addresses compensation, so no need to include others.
 - ii. Provost: Recommend adding those other things so that we have the data.
 - iii. Amendment: add "compensation data"
 1. Amendment passes.
 - iv. MOTION passes
- c. FWC report on overload pay, chair compensation, etc.
- i. MOTION on chair compensation
 1. Question: Is this in order? It may interfere with motion for SAC.
 - a. Response: SAC motion is just to get data. This one involves recommendations that may be refined based on SAC data.
 2. Question to FWC chair: Isn't it true that you tried to get data but were unable?
 - a. FWC chair: Had no data on overload, graduate assistantships, or program directors, only old data on chair compensation.
 3. Comment: We should get this through so we do not forget about it next semester.
 4. Comment: May want to table this until next semester once we have data in case that data changes things.
 - a. Parliamentarian: Cannot table until another year. But could re-raise the motion.
 5. Question to FWC chair: Do you agree that basic compensation structure of chairs needs to change? Wouldn't data from SAC be more fine-tuning rather than changing the whole proposed structure? In which case, we may as well pass this.
 - a. FWC chair: Yes, but a new charge would be needed for FWC to work on this after this meeting.
 6. Comment from Senator: I promise that I will bring this up first meeting of Senate next year, as the motion is written now.
 - a. Several Senators promise as well.
 7. Question: Would it make more sense to have SAC use this report to guide their data collection?
 - a. Response: Yes, that makes sense, but SAC may not be able to get a lot done.
 8. Question: If we do not vote on this motion, what are the alternatives?
 - a. Parliamentarian: Could postpone indefinitely or could withdraw motion.
 9. Motion to withdraw. Motion passes.
 10. Comment: Thank you for bringing this to Senate.
- d. Report on updating FTNTT part of Faculty Handbook
- i. Co-chair on report: Thanks to fellow committee members. Summarized charge to Senate. Committee reviewed report from fall involving FTNTT faculty

members. That report gave many examples of FTNTT faculty not being treated fairly: for example, not getting PINs, not getting promoted, not able to serve on/vote on committees. Overall, FTNTT feel like second-class citizens. That report showed confusion on PIN lines. HR Director for USM said individual USM institutions had their own procedures for PIN lines for FTNTT faculty. Follow-up not responded to, so committee contacted other USM institutions. HR offices at those were very helpful. Results: Few schools differentiate between PIN and non-PIN for FTNTT. A few do. SU is the only one that uses PIN lines but where FTNTT cannot get it until year 6, and only if PIN line available. Other ones grant PINs on date of hire. SU also does not provide some benefits until PIN gotten. If PIN not gotten, they get a raise after year 6, but it is not commensurate with healthcare, etc. that they would get with PIN. Frostburg is even worse than SU with benefits for FTNTT, but this is at least clear in their job postings. SU job postings for FTNTT are not as clear. Why are two most rural USM institutions treating FTNTT worse? Provost provided draft language for report. Committee made a few changes to it: such as recommending that FTNTT added to regular payroll system to mirror that of tenure and tenure-track faculty. Committee fulfilled its charge, but it was tough because documents they needed were being changed. Even with research, PIN lines and how they are distributed is nebulous. Recommendations included in report. SU espouses DEI but does not treat FTNTT equitably.

- ii. Question: Is this not similar to overload compensation, chair compensation, etc. in the sense that we need SAC data to evaluate this?
 1. Response: This is language to the Handbook, not a commitment.
 2. Response from questioner: I would mostly agree except for the 'benefits' line, item F on last page of report.
 - a. Response: This is just a recommendation to Provost. It is not a commitment to anything.
- iii. Comment: This is about being fair, not about costing more money. It will go to Provost, and then they can deal with budgeting stuff.
- iv. Comment: It is important to show solidarity with FTNTT faculty. Provost can send it back to us if it is implausible.
- v. Comment: Main difference between report involving overload and chair compensation and this one is that previous report involved many topics; this involves only one.
- vi. Provost: Would like to be a part of fixing the inequity. Also should be aware that it will be pricy.
- vii. Comment: Feel embarrassed listening to her because it is a stain on SU's conscience. Move to call question.
 1. Motion to call question approved.
- viii. MOTION passes.
- ix. Comment: When we recognize faculty for how long they have been here, years without PIN line do not count.

1. Comment: HR did not give credit for all years of service to one person because their contract had been misclassified.
- e. Promotions Committee report on guidance for early promotion
- i. Motion to extend meeting by 15 minutes.
 1. Motion passes.
 - ii. Provost: Request was for guidelines, not policy. Policy is binding.
 - iii. Amendment: Replace 'policy' with 'guidelines.'
 1. Amendment passes.
 - iv. Question: What is distinction between 'guideline' and 'policy?'
 1. Provost: Policies are binding. Guidelines have latitude.
 - v. Question: Charge says tenure and promotion, but guidelines just discuss promotion. Why not tenure?
 1. Comment: This may only apply to promotion to full Professor because time to tenure is negotiated on hire.
 - vi. Amendment: Removing "Tenure or" from subject line.
 1. Question: So does this mean it applies to any promotion, but just not to tenure?
 - a. Response: Yes.
 - vii. Comment: Most promotions follow tenure anyway.
 - viii. Question: Would be difficult to get early promotion but not early tenure. Duplicating documents, etc. Why not say, "tenure and/or promotion?" May be appropriate to renegotiate both T&P if extraordinary work is done.
 - ix. Comment: Provost had asked for guidance on promotion.
 - x. Question: As T&P Committee chair for a department, T&P often happen at different times.
 - xi. Question: Should we remove current language on exceptions in Faculty Handbook? And also, should we have each school define 'extraordinary?'
 1. Response: Making definitive guidelines might make this more common. Keeping it vague might be better.
 2. Response: 'Extraordinary' work is not really more guidance than we already have.
 3. Response: The required letters from committee, chair, dean would cover 'extraordinary.'
 - xii. Comment: 'Extraordinary' means going beyond what is normally required for promotion.
 - xiii. Comment: Hard to define 'extraordinary.' It is up to each Faculty member to make their case that their work is extraordinary.
 - xiv. Not voted on by end of meeting.

8. Motion to adjourn approved

Adjourn (5:15 pm)