

Faculty Senate Notes

October 8, 2024

Henson Science Hall 103

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

Joerg Tuske, David Keifer, Yuki Okubo, Brian Flores, Jim Fox, Mary DiBartolo, Jeff Emmert, Mia Waldron, Beth Ragan, Memo Diriker, Richard Bowler, Steven Binz, Mark de Socio, Anita Brown

Call to order (3:32 pm)

1. Moment of silence for Larence Becker, a colleague in psychology who recently passed.
2. Announcements from President Lepre
 - a. Governor Moore will be on campus on 10/10 for groundbreaking ceremony for Blackwell Hall. All are welcome to come.
 - i. He will be doing a fireside chat with students as well.
 - b. Question from Senator: Will Governor be in Maggs and Devilbiss to show him need for improvements to those buildings?
 - i. Answer: He has been there before. President Lepre has been pushing for this. It is now on the capital improvement plan.
 - c. Comment from Senator: Thanks for improving parking situation.
 - i. Response from President: Work is still in progress.
3. Approval of minutes
 - a. Minutes approved as written.
4. Announcements from Provost Couch
 - a. Provost cedes her time so that we can get to agenda.
5. Announcements from the Senate President
 - a. Since the implementation of Workday, full-time faculty (and anyone on the “regular” pay schedule) are paid for contractual work on the regular pay schedule instead of on the off-weeks.
 - b. Joint session of shared governance is Tuesday, 10/15, PH 156, 3:30 pm
6. Committee reports
 - a. Promotions Committee report on early promotion
 - i. On the second amendment, which is striking out language about “extraordinary work.”
 1. Should keep that language so that people, on Promotions Committee for example, have some guidance for what qualifies someone to get early promotion
 2. Can’t each department have their own guidelines rather than it being specified here?

3. Guidelines already exist for promotion. We do not need to reiterate what is needed here.
 4. Guidelines may be out there, but it should be clear to people that you have to meet promotions requirements, so we need to keep this language.
 5. The fact that we are discussing this and disagreeing on it means that more clarity is needed.
 6. We should reject this amendment so that we have some level of guidance, and then we can have new language to replace it that clarifies things more.
 7. Call question on second amendment.
 - a. Amendment does not pass.
- ii. On the first amendment, which is striking out language about allowing early promotion “to fulfill an urgent need.”
 1. The “or” part of it allows someone who has not met promotion requirements to get promoted.
 2. Amendment passes.
 - iii. Amendment: replace “limited to cases where a faculty member has produced extraordinary work” with “and follow the established criteria for the rank desired.”
 1. Do we want to add something back in about administrative need?
 2. Amendment passes.
 - iv. MOTION passes.
- b. Summer Advisory Committee (SAC) report
 - i. SAC report usually discusses a variety of issues. This report just discusses one topic. Were notes taken on other topics, and will those be distributed?
 1. Response from someone on SAC: The Senate charged SAC with getting data on different compensation strategies, so other topics were not discussed.
 - ii. Does this mean the original charge of SAC (advising administration on faculty issues) was not fulfilled?
 1. Response from Senator: This current charge involved advising administration on faculty issues, so both charges were fulfilled.
 2. Response from Provost: One other topic was discussed involving feedback from UARA regarding APR.
 3. Response from someone on SAC: A couple other topics of interest to faculty were discussed briefly, but the meetings were mainly about the current charge to SAC.
 - iii. Typically, SAC sends out a monthly report over the summer to faculty regarding SAC’s work. Will this happen?
 1. Response from someone on SAC: Apologies. We were unaware of this norm. Perhaps we should amend the report to include the other things.

2. Response from Senator: It might make more sense to make separate reports. This report regarding SAC's special charge, and a separate report regarding SAC's normal charge.
- iv. Perhaps this report should be changed to something like, "SAC's report on Faculty Senate's charge."
 1. Response from someone on SAC: We should send out a single report to summarize other work of SAC from this summer.
- v. From motion's proposer: SAC's work was not finished over the summer, so this motion is to make sure that work gets done.
- vi. Comment from SAC member: Appreciative of administration for being open about these issues. We should figure out two things, which is why this work should continue: 1) When funds are available, how should things be prioritized? 2) When funds are not available, how should things be prioritized?
- vii. Should we charge FFOC to continue this work rather than forming an ad hoc committee?
 1. Friendly amendment: Charge the FFOC rather than form an ad hoc committee.
 - a. These issues originally came from the Faculty Welfare Committee, not the FFOC.
 - b. The scope of this is beyond the scope of the FFOC, which is part of the reason an ad hoc committee is recommended.
 - c. Perhaps the members of SAC would be willing to be on the ad hoc committee, in which case it makes sense for them to continue the work.
 - d. We could have members of the FFOC work with members of this ad hoc committee for this.
 - e. This work does fit the FFOC's charge in the bylaws.
 - f. The FFOC will continue on, so this institutional knowledge will persist. If we have an ad hoc committee do this, that committee will disband, and the knowledge will be lost.
 - g. An ad hoc committee is more beneficial because it could include interested members of SAC, FFOC, and FWC.
 - h. Even if we form an ad hoc committee, the FFOC should at least be involved.
 - i. If we are sticking with ad hoc committee, we should revise other language to get people from FFOC, SAC, and FWC on it.
 - j. Amendment does not pass.
 2. Amendment: "The committee shall consist of representatives from the 2024 Summer Advisory Committee, the Faculty Financial Oversight Committee, and the Faculty Welfare Committee."
 - a. We should probably still make sure the chair of the FFOC is on there.
 - b. Amendment to the amendment: Replace "consist of" with "include."

- i. This way, other faculty can be on there as well.
 - ii. Should we specify how many people should be on it?
 - 1. Practically, there is no need for that. It is usually hard enough to get enough people on committees.
 - iii. Amendment passes.
 - c. Amendment passes.
 - viii. Should the chair of the FFOC be included in the motion?
 - ix. The motion should specify whether ad hoc members are volunteers or are appointed.
 - x. Amendment: Replace “representatives” with “volunteers.”
 - 1. What if there is only one volunteer? Is there still a committee?
 - a. Response: “Volunteers” is plural.
 - 2. Is there any concern with too many people volunteering?
 - a. Response: The Senate President can cap the number if he wishes.
 - 3. Amendment passes.
 - xi. The report is currently going to the Senate. Should we also specify that it goes back to the FFOC and the FWC?
 - 1. The Senate should decide to do that if action is needed.
 - 2. The report will already be distributed to all faculty in the Senate meeting documents.
 - xii. Friendly amendment: Drop the “of senators” from “ad hoc committee of senators.”
 - xiii. MOTION passes.
- c. APC report on religious accommodation policy
 - i. From Senate President: Had a talk with VP of Inclusion, Access & Belonging today, who raised concerns about this report. In particular, he was concerned about students and staff needing to disclose religious affiliation and with faculty keeping detailed records for years.
 - ii. From motion proposer: In 2023, state of Maryland passed law related to religious accommodations at universities. That year’s SAC developed a temporary policy with the Provost. Senate charged APC revising that temporary policy. While APC was working on this, BOR came out with their policy on this. APC quotes the BOR policy in the suggested changes. APC’s suggestion does not say that students must submit documentation that discloses their religion. APC also decided to make this policy as parallel to SU’s emergency absence policy as possible. APC has voting members from undergraduate, graduate, Provost’s Office, Registrar’s Office. APC also reached out to Staff Senate, SU’s attorney, HR, Deans, FWC, OIE, and used feedback from all of those groups to craft this proposal. APC calls for education of faculty before this is implemented. The motion here is a process that asks for feedback from many other groups before implementing it. APC thinks that FS should still be involved even after going to

all these other groups to try to keep some ownership over the academic part of it. In other words, in accordance with SU's "[policy on policies](#)," the policy needs to have an "owner." Faculty Senate is probably the best owner because of the academic piece.

- iii. Another Senator: The "reasonable accommodation" part is very important here. Former conversations about emergency absence policy are on the mind here. We need to make sure that we have some limits in place so that students still need to be in class, when necessary. For example, classes involving whole-class discussion, hands-on work, etc.

7. Motion to adjourn approved

Adjourn (4:59 pm)