

Faculty Welfare Committee Report, 2021-2022

As part of our duties as members of the faculty welfare committee, we submit this report to the Salisbury University Faculty Senate. This is a summary of the issues and items we were assigned to look at, as well as issues we chose to look at during the past academic year.

Fall 2021

- During the fall 2021 semester, we proposed a change to the Faculty Senate bylaws regarding the faculty welfare committee, as well as the faculty promotion committee. These changes are shown below (highlighted).

As written on the Committees list section of the website:

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

“Bylaws of the Salisbury University Faculty Senate, Article VII, Section 8: The committee shall have six voting members: one tenured Faculty member elected by and from each Unit. *Additionally, Faculty members serving on this committee shall not be eligible for sabbaticals during the period of their service on the committee.* Additionally, no faculty member shall serve on this committee and the Promotions Committee simultaneously.”

We proposed this change due to a situation during the 2020-2021 academic year where a grievance came before both the SU Promotions committee, as well as the Faculty Welfare committee, and some faculty were on both committees, and had to recuse themselves voting on the issue on the faculty welfare committee.

- During the fall semester, the Faculty Senate tasked the Faculty Welfare Committee with looking at two items: (1) we were asked to look at the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion proposal that had been drafted by a workgroup of faculty chosen by Provost Olmstead; (2) we were asked to look at multiple sections of the newly proposed faculty handbook to determine if there were issues with those sections.

Spring 2022

- A faculty member brought to our attention that the Accounts Payable office would not give an advance for international travel, stating that this went against USM policy. We were asked to take a look at this. Provost Olmstead worked with accounts payable, and they determined that there is not a SU or USM policy that prohibited giving cash advances for out of state or international travel. The Accounts Payable office was instructed by the Provost to work with this faculty member to remedy this issue.

- We were tasked by the Faculty Senate to review the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) proposal. We discussed it as a committee, and found several areas of our concern. These concerns included, but were not limited to:
 - Tenure and promotion should be measured by departmental expectations, and the proposal did not take this into account.
 - There was a lack of clarity regarding if faculty were expected to meet DEI expectations in all three levels (teaching, service, scholarship), and during what timeline faculty were expected to meet this requirement (yearly, or once every five years, etc.).
 - The proposal did not align with the Boyer model of scholarship.
 - A clear process for integrating DEI into Tenure and Promotion processes was not outlined.
 - The proposal was not clear who would need to meet the new requirements (only new hires, or all faculty).
 - We also suggested that during the tenure/promotion process, any negative decisions/recommendations need to be justified to the person going for tenure/promotion.

We submitted a proposal detailing our concerns to the Faculty Senate.

- We were asked by a faculty member to look at the provost's proposal to link merit pay to required online training. We discussed it as a committee, and sent an email to the Faculty Senate president explaining our concerns about this issue. In particular, merit has always been a departmental decision, and the provost's proposal would change that. We suggested that the Faculty Senate vote no to this proposal.
- We were tasked by the Faculty Senate to review a large chunk of the newly proposed faculty handbook. We made assignments, and reviewed the assigned chapters/sections. We found many issues including missing information, outdated policies, as well as grammar and spelling issues. In general, we found the new handbook problematic, and suggested that one person be tasked with rewriting the entire faculty handbook. Other policies that had been omitted or forgotten were also mentioned. We submitted a detailed report regarding our findings to the Faculty Senate.
- We have been tasked by the Faculty Senate to review the information in the Faculty Handbook regarding full time non-tenure track faculty, and submit a report by December 2022. We have met to discuss this, and came up with questions that we will investigate over the summer. After finding the answer to these questions, we hope to come up with a questionnaire that we can distribute to the full-time non-tenure track

faculty to learn more about their experience and what expectations have been placed on them.

Overall, it was a busy year for us, but we worked hard to fulfill the tasks asked of us. We are grateful for the Faculty Senate, and we wish to thank them for their service.

Matthew Bailey
Interim Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee