Faculty Senate Minutes
February 27, 2024

       The regular business meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, February 27, 2024 at 3:30 pm in Holloway Hall 119. The Senate President was in the chair and the Secretary was present. The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

       Provost Laurie Couch made announcements.
       The Senate President made announcements.

The minutes of the February 13 meeting were approved as written.

After amendment, the MOTION on the Faculty Handbook Ad Hoc Committee Report proposed by Senator Binz PASSED. The report is appended to these minutes.

> Resolved, that the Faculty Senate accept the Faculty Handbook Ad Hoc Committee Report updates and pass them along to the Provost to make the recommended changes to the Faculty Handbook.

The Faculty Senate passed a motion to go into closed session to discuss the MOTION, proposed by Senator Tuske, to send the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Concerns' report to the SU President. After discussion, the MOTION PASSED. The report is appended to these minutes.

> Resolved, that the Faculty Senate charge the Faculty Senate President with forwarding the attached report by the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Concerns to the SU President. If any amendments are made to this report during the meeting of the Faculty Senate, the SU President shall receive only the final amended version, without visible changes.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:28 pm

David Keifer, Secretary
Written 02/28/2024

Approved March 12, 2024.

Faculty Handbook Ad Hoc Committee Report

Committee Members: Annette Barnes, Michael Desper (Interim Member Fall 2023), Steven

Binz (sabbatical Fall 2023), Jessica Walter

December 12, 2023

To update the Faculty Senate regarding the final charge of the Ad Hoc Committee from Spring 2023 regarding the review of the Faculty Handbook, we provide the below information for consideration and conclusion of the committee's work.

The remaining charge from Spring 2023 was related to the glossary for the faculty handbook as below:
> Glossary: The entry for "Integrity" was removed as the "definition" provided was not, in fact, a definition. An actual definition is needed.
> *Charge*: Draft a definition of "integrity" that aligns with other entries in the glossary.

Based on the Ad Hoc's work in collaboration with the Faculty Senate's Academic Policies Committee (APC) in Fall 2023, the terms "integrity" and "academic integrity" were identified as separate terms used throughout Chapter 6. Of note, the USM definition as provided in III-1.00 is included in Chapter 6 and linked from SU's webpage for forms and policies for "Student Accountability and Community Standards". Based on the review of this information and APC's input, the Ad Hoc Committee proposes the following:

1. Addition of two glossary terms with definitions as below:
   a. **Integrity:** Moral behavior that adheres to the six fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage.
   b. **Academic integrity**- The commitment to and demonstration of moral behavior that ensures your learning is genuine. This moral behavior will include unwavering adherence to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage.

2. Including the definitions in the Faculty Handbook Chapter 6 as below:
   a. **Faculty, Student, and Institutional Rights and Responsibilities for Academic Integrity**
   Integrity is a principle that permeates all activities of the University and guides the behavior of faculty, students, and staff. Integrity is demonstrated by moral behavior that adheres to the six fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage. Salisbury University manifests the principle of academic integrity by the spirit in which truth is pursued. The University further demonstrates the principle by establishing processes that enable students to learn about the concept of integrity and that determine individual accountability for standards of integrity.
   The spirit of academic integrity denotes adherence to the precept that one's work is one's own with a commitment to and demonstration of moral behavior that ensures learning is genuine. The process by which integrity is upheld assumes clear communication of university

expectations, standards, and policies and of students' and faculty's rights and responsibilities. The procedure is grounded in the commitment to the protection of individuals' rights.

Of note, policies listed below that specifically mention SU represent the University's unique perspective on the classroom and related responsibilities of the faculty. These SU-specific policies have been developed by the faculty independent of the University System of Maryland as an expression of faculty commitment to the University as a teaching institution.

b. Student Academic Misconduct (SU)

Integrity is a principle that permeates all the activities of the University and guides the behavior of faculty, students, and staff. The spirit of academic integrity denotes adherence to the precept that "one's work is one's own" with commitment to and demonstration of moral behavior that ensures learning is genuine. This moral behavior will include unwavering adherence to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage. Honesty refers to being truthful, giving credit to others, and providing factual evidence. Trust refers to being transparent, trusting others, giving credence, and striving for mutual understanding. Fairness refers to applying rules consistently, engaging with others equitably, being objective, and taking responsibility for your own actions. Respect refers to seeking open communication, receiving feedback willingly, recognizing the validity of others' thoughts and the impact of your words and actions on others. Responsibility refers to following institutional rules and conduct codes, holding yourself accountable, following through with tasks and expectations, engaging in difficult conversations, and modeling good behavior. Courage refers to taking a stand to address wrongdoing and supporting others doing that, being undaunted in defending integrity, being willing to risk failure, and enduring discomfort for something you believe in.

The process by which integrity is upheld assumes clear communication of university expectations, standards, and policies and clear communication of students' and faculty's rights and responsibilities. The Student Academic Misconduct Policy is intended to foster student academic integrity and address cases of student academic misconduct which includes, but is not limited to, lying/fabrication, cheating, plagiarism, and misappropriation of intellectual property.

This policy, and related procedures, apply to both undergraduate and graduate students and can be found **here** in their entirety.

3. Including the definitions in the policy below which links from #2 and is verbatim:

Student Academic Misconduct Policy

Integrity is a principle that permeates all the activities of the University and guides the behavior of faculty, students and staff. The spirit of academic integrity denotes adherence to the precept that "one's work is one's own." with commitment to and demonstration of moral behavior that ensures learning is genuine. This moral behavior will include unwavering adherence to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage. Honesty refers to being truthful, giving credit to others, and providing factual evidence. Trust refers to being transparent, trusting others, giving credence, and striving for mutual understanding. Fairness refers to applying rules consistently, engaging with others equitably, being objective, and taking responsibility for your own actions. Respect refers to seeking open communication, receiving feedback willingly, recognizing the validity of others' thoughts and the impact of your words and actions on others. Responsibility refers to following institutional rules and conduct codes, holding yourself accountable, following through with tasks and expectations,

engaging in difficult conversations, and modeling good behavior. Courage refers to taking a stand to address wrongdoing and supporting others doing that, being undaunted in defending integrity, being willing to risk failure, and enduring discomfort for something you believe in.

The process by which integrity is upheld assumes clear communication of University expectations, standards and policies and clear communication of students' and faculty's rights and responsibilities. This policy applies to both undergraduate and graduate students.

Summary

The Ad Hoc Committee members appreciate the chance to complete their work regarding the charges to address questions and provide updated for the Faculty Handbook.

Ad Hoc Committee Report on Faculty Concerns

Charge and Overview

The committee has been charged by the Faculty Senate President with the following:

1. Provide a summary of key Faculty concerns.
2. Prioritize those concerns.
3. Provide recommendations on how the Faculty Senate should communicate these concerns to the President.
4. Provide recommendations on ways (e.g., town hall, email, etc.) in which the President can respond to the concerns in the report.
5. Provide recommendations on a reasonable timeframe for the President to respond

The committee, consisting of Faculty Senators Memo Diriker (Perdue), Dave Keifer (Henson), Sally Perret (Fulton), Joerg Tuske (Fulton), and Erin Weber (Libraries), submit this report to the Faculty Senate.

Charges 1 and 2: Provide a summary of prioritized, key Faculty concerns.

This committee has gathered information on Faculty concerns about the SU administration from several sources: the letter of Faculty concerns sent to the Faculty Senate for the November 14, 2023 Faculty Senate meeting, discussion at the November 14 and November 28, 2023 Faculty Senate meetings, the comments made by Faculty during the December 12, 2023 special session Faculty Senate meeting (not the regular business meeting), and concerns sent by Faculty to Faculty Senators via email or letter.

Based in part on feedback from Faculty, this committee has determined that concerns directly related to the budget are of the highest priority, followed by Faculty workload and work-life balance, and finally, communication and transparency.

Specific concerns within each category are prioritized below. Prioritization was based in part on the number of times each concern was brought to the Faculty Senate and based in part on this committee's assessment of the severity of each concern.

Priority Number 1: Budget

Budgetary control of PIN lines

The President and Cabinet have full control of how PIN lines are allocated and how money associated with PIN lines is used. It is not clear to Faculty how the President and Cabinet have been making decisions regarding those PIN lines. Faculty strongly believe that decisions regarding PIN lines originally designated for Faculty should remain at the Academic Affairs level.

Moreover, many requests for Faculty searches have remained unapproved for an extended period. The administration's justification for the delay is that the next academic year's budget will be more accurately known once enrollment numbers are solidified in the spring. However, Faculty searches are typically done in the fall, so waiting to approve them until the spring means that those searches will likely be unsuccessful.

Proliferation of administrative positions

According to SU's FY 2023 budget report, Faculty positions (including Librarians) have increased by 4.8% since FY 2014, while non-Faculty, exempt PIN positions have increased by 31.0%. Most of that time period was before the current President took office, yet it reflects a trend that seems to be continuing.

While it has been difficult to hire new Faculty recently (see above concern), it seems to be relatively easy to hire administrators in new positions such as the Senior Advisor to the President, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Engagement, and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Communications. It is not clear to Faculty why those new positions were necessary or what roles they fulfill on campus.

Contracts for non-tenure track Faculty

Several non-tenure track Faculty have had the lengths of their contracts reduced from five years to year-by-year contracts. At least one non-tenure track Faculty member has left SU, largely due to this change. It is also difficult to hire quality non-tenure track Faculty due to non-competitive wages. All those factors reduce job security, increase job pressure, and lead to lower Faculty morale.

Underfunded student resources

Faculty expressed concerns about underfunded student support services, such as the Disability Resource Center, University Writing Center, and the Counseling Center. One result of not funding student support services sufficiently is an increased workload for Faculty, who feel that they must take on some of the work of those services. This is expanded on in Priority Number 2 below.

Expensive consultants

Faculty are concerned about the overreliance on third-party consultants: training consultants, brand consultants, consultants to investigate a marching band, consultants to investigate HR practices, etc. Undoubtedly consultants have value, but in some cases, it may be possible to draw on the expertise already on campus rather than paying for expensive consulting.

Study abroad

Faculty would like to better understand the "self-sustaining" budget model that the Center for International Education is now using. The new budget structure has changed the types of trips Faculty can make with students. It is also not clear who is involved in making these decisions about how global resources are used.

Priority Number 2: Faculty Workload and Work-Life Balance

Due to the budget cuts, post-Covid recovery, and a perception of rising expectations, several Faculty expressed that they have had to take on excessive day-to-day work. Because campus resources like the Disability Resource Center and University Writing Center are stretched thin with few staff and appointment times available, Faculty have attempted to pick up this slack by providing support to individual students, including vital support for minority students. However, this work takes away from their prep time, research, committee work, and new projects. Library Faculty raised one such example of additional work from the administration prior to Inauguration Week. Librarians were asked to hold a Publication Night for Faculty research and projects with insufficient notice.

There is also an increasing emphasis on data collection at the course and program levels for administrative and promotional purposes, such as expecting departments to collect data on marketable skills and success on the job market. This adds hours of extra work and often goes against academic freedom. Faculty are concerned with how implementing constant data collection will affect the time and energy they have for teaching, service, and professional development. In addition, Faculty expressed a desire to implement more family-friendly work practices by, for example, facilitating child-care on campus and allowing for flexible meeting schedules.

Priority Number 3: Communication and Transparency

Budgetary communication

A list of Faculty concerns regarding budgetary constraints is detailed in Priority Number 1. Nonetheless, the communication surrounding these fiscal matters is disconcerting enough to Faculty to warrant its prominence in this report. Faculty requested more communication around PIN lines and hiring specifically, as detailed above. Faculty also feel there is not enough communication around the role of newly created administrative and Cabinet positions, such as the Senior Advisor to the President, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Engagement, and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Communications. While the budget presentation on December 8 was a valuable demonstration of fiscal transparency and the university's finances, this was only a first step.

Marketing and public relations

Faculty expressed a preference for a more candid style of communication with less emphasis on polished precision and corporate jargon. When issues are discussed on the surface, it feels dismissive to

the Faculty struggling to bring forth substantive and critical issues. It also ensures those issues do not have a resolution.

Charge 3: Provide recommendations on how the Faculty Senate should communicate these concerns to the President.

The draft language hereby provided by this committee can form the basis of the report from the FS to the President. This report and a transmittal letter from the Senate President should suffice.

Charge 4: Provide recommendations on ways (e.g., town hall, email, etc.) in which the President can respond to the concerns in the report.

The President can respond via a letter to the Faculty Senate President and endeavor to attend the FS meeting following the transmittal of this letter so that members of the FS can ask additional questions as needed. This letter should be shared with all Faculty before the FS meeting. The FS Senate should move its meeting to a larger venue to accommodate Faculty members who might wish to attend.

Charge 5: Provide recommendations on a reasonable timeframe for the President to respond

Many of these issues have already been addressed or are being addressed. Others can be addressed in a week or two. Members of the Faculty Senate understand that some of these issues may require additional time. It would be much appreciated if the President would give the FS a reasonable timeline for responding to such issues during the spring 2024 semester.