

Faculty Senate Notes

February 22, 2022, 3:30pm

Via Zoom Webinar: <https://salisbury.zoom.us/j/98185343114>

FS website: <http://www.salisbury.edu/campusgov/facsenate/>

Quorum: 17 of 18

Anita Brown (President), Jeffrey Emmert, Mark de Socio, Dan Ervin, Christina Harper (Webmaster), Jose Juncosa, James Fox, Mike Koval, Thomas Lamey, Deneen Long-White (Secretary), Jennifer Martin (Vice-President), Fulbert Namwamba, Vitus Ozoke, Elizabeth Ragan, Ellen Schaefer-Salins, Teddy Stocking, Bart Talbert

Called to order (3:30 pm)

1. Remarks from President Wight
 1. The President provided updates on the Zoom bombing event that occurred last week.
 2. The President shared that he and other members of his team went to Annapolis on 2/18 to provide testimony to the Maryland Senate on the budget. They will do this again with the House via zoom on 2/23. The testimony is available on Salisbury's website.
 3. Last Friday (2/18) Governor Hogan visited the Dave and Patsy Rommel Center for Entrepreneurship and announced that \$50 million dollars was being given for rural economic development in rural counties in Maryland.
 4. The University Health Team has updated the masking guidance to allow unmasking in certain areas and buildings on campus. The University will continue to monitor the situation and make adjustments as needed.
 5. Nominations for the President's Diversity and Inclusion Champion Awards will be open soon. The President encouraged everyone to nominate individuals who have shown a commitment to create a more inclusive campus environment.
 6. Questions (Q)
 - i. Senator Schaefer-Salins reminded everyone about the upcoming town hall (2/28) sponsored by the Council of University System Faculty.
2. Approval of Minutes from 15 February 2022
 1. The minutes were approved as amended.
3. Remarks and Discussion of Announcements from Provost Karen Olmstead (See Attachment 1)
 1. Commencement/Honors Convocation
 2. University's FY22 Budget Report
 3. Timing of 10-month faculty salary adjustments (COLA, Merit, and Bonuses)
 4. Faculty Handbook Missing Topics
 5. DEI and T&P
 6. COVID Questions & Answers
 7. Questions
 - i. (Q): Is the document going to be sent to the individual senators for comment? Collegiality is subjective and can be abused. Collegiality

should be scored on points.

- ii. Response (R): There is a lot that can be improved in the tenure and promotion process. These are important issues but they are not tied directly to how we are going to evaluate DEI in the tenure and promotion process.
 - iii. (R): If it becomes a natural part of today's discussion you can bring it up again during that discussion.
4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate (FS) President
- 1. Procedures for Faculty Senate (FS) Faculty Zoom Meetings: The FS President explained how FS meetings will work, i.e., taking questions, counting votes.
 - i. When we take a vote, unless it is a 2/3rds vote, the majority will be based on those present, whether they abstain or vote.
 - ii. There were 17 senators present. Therefore, a majority vote will require 9.
 - iii. When senators wish to speak they can raise their hand.
 - 2. We are still seeking a time for an all faculty meeting for the representatives on the Presidential Search Committee to meet with faculty. The FS President is working with the representatives to identify a date and time for that meeting.
 - 3. The FS President echoed the importance of having a discussion about the inclusion of DEI in tenure and promotion. This discussion should be done in a respectful way.
5. Committee Reports
- 1. Working Group on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Tenure and Promotion
 - i. The Workgroup worked during the summer to generate the report. The facilitator was Jessica Clark from the Provost's Office.
 - ii. This is part of a multifaceted project in support of equity in faculty careers at Salisbury University. In early 2021, the Provost's Office reviewed tenure and promotion guidelines at the university and program/departmental level. At that time, there was not a description of activities for DEI in tenure and promotion. The faculty handbook has limited guidance. The working group looked at best practices from other institutions and developed recommendations on how we could more effectively reward contributions related to DEI. This is not a punitive system. We want to make it a part of the culture to better reflect our value system without impinging on academic freedom. The recommendations are based on what we found. This will start at the hiring process and should be incorporated in the faculty handbook. There should be some evidence to support DEI efforts in 2 of the 3 pillars (service and teaching) to move from Assistant to Associate. To move from Associate to Full there should be some evidence in all three areas (service, teaching, research).
 - 2. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Review of Workgroup

Report on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Tenure and Promotion

- i. The Committee was in support of the report and felt that it is reasonable to expect faculty going up for tenure and promotion to explain how they engage in having a diverse student body. However, the Committee was concerned about any attempt to mandate DEI work in all three areas as a requirement for tenure and promotion. This seemed to be a potential red flag and infringement on academic freedom.
3. Faculty Welfare Committee Review of Workgroup Report on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Tenure and Promotion
 - i. Comments by the FWC and Promotion Committee were provided by one representative.
 - ii. The Boyer model was not followed. It seemed that curriculum work could count toward DEI work. However, curriculum work was counted under service. Under the Boyer model it is counted under professional development. This needs to be clarified. It would be good for each unit to define what DEI work looks like under its discipline.
 4. Promotion Committee Review of Workgroup Report on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in tenure and Promotion
 - i. (Q): Between the universities that you looked at, what percentages required verses encouraged evidence of DEI for tenure and promotion?
 - ii. (R): The places that implemented it fully followed at least an expectation of 2 of the 3. For universities that encouraged it, it was not clear.
 - iii. (C): Now that the faculty handbook is publicly available it is obvious that we do not speak to this. Faculty who are seeking appointments here may wonder do we value this and how do we reward it. We need to start with the recommendation first to say something about it in the handbook and then have an incremental adoption of the recommendations. Perhaps the focus on teaching and then move to the others. This is a framing document and we are looking for how it might be operationalized.
 - iv. (C): The Promotions Committee put forward the idea that if DEI work is required then it should say that. We need a clear mandate that it is required.
 - v. (C): Each unit should be able to develop their own criteria. It may be difficult to get uniformity.
 - vi. (R): I understand where you are coming from. It could be that we start with 2 out of 3.
 - vii. (Q): What if the department feels the candidate has met the requirements for DEI and then it goes to the University Committee, will they use our criteria? How has this worked at other universities?

- viii. (Q): Could we make evidence of commitment to DEI a fourth category? This would avoid impinging on academic freedom.
- ix. (C): There were faculty across the disciplines on the committee that developed the recommendations including faculty from the hard sciences.
- x. (C): Departments will need to tackle this collectively with perhaps faculty development to encourage faculty to assess this in their courses.
- xi. (C): We are overdue for recognizing DEI in tenure and promotion. Many of my constituents are scared about this. They have questions such as will this apply to people who are already on track for promotion or just new people, or what about the limited opportunities for DEI in their field. There are many concerns about academic freedom. Do they need to start including diversity and inclusion in classes. We are hard scientists. We are no experts in diversity and inclusion. How will that work?
- xii. (R): There is going to be a big requirement for faculty development. The goal is to support some of this work. This creates the framework for departments to create their own expectations to drive the process forward. These are legitimate concerns.
- xiii. (C): On the issue raised on not having enough multicultural students, when you go to an open house the students have already made up their minds about what they are going to study. However, at my previous university we had summer programs which encouraged students to enter the hard sciences. Inside the department you do not have the power. It calls from help from the university body to figure out ways of recruitment.
- xiv. (C): I received feedback from the Henson School on the report. I heard a lot of concerns that I have heard here. There is a big leap between rewarding and recognizing DEI contributions, which was the charge to the workgroup, and requiring it. If it is required there is going to be resentment.
- xv.(C) There is an opportunity here to recruit undecided students. Outreach programs are perfect places to better serve underserved communities in terms of educational preparation or access to resources. This is about teaching your class in a way that is more accessible to diverse students no matter their background is.
- xvi. (C): DEI is not just about race. It could be getting more women in the hard sciences or working with people with disabilities. There are many aspects to DEI.
- xvii. (C): They think the understanding of DEI in the classroom requires discussing and/or covering DEI topics. This is not how we defined it in our documents.

- xviii. (C): There are a variety of ways this can be approached such as incorporating a discussion on more underrepresented scientists. We are not encouraging people to teach anything outside of their realm.
- xix. (Q): If this is implemented, how can, in Chemistry, this can be incorporated for research?
- xx.is (C): Requiring DEI, however it is defined, puts the burden on the larger faculty. Rewarding DEI puts the burden on minority and marginalized faculty.
- xxi. (C): As a member of the Committee, I understand everyone's reservations. However, our students and the public need to see a requirement and not just encouragement. With encouragement the University appears to suggest that recognizing DEI in service, research and teaching is optional. There are other schools that see DEI in at least 2 out of the 3 areas.
- xxii. (C): The Promotion Committee felt it was feasible for departments to choose their requirements/guidelines. The Promotions Committee is always dependent on what the school/department requires. The same would be possible for DEI.
- xxiii. MOTION by Senator Juncosa "Resolved, that the Faculty Senate submit the Ad-Hoc committee report on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Tenure and Promotion and its associated Senate Subcommittee reports to each Unit for feedback, and request a written response from each Unit by Tuesday, April 5, 2022" was seconded by Senator Martin.
- xxiv. (C): DEI is something that many of us do already. This would be an opportunity to articulate what we do. There has been talk about diversifying the student body. How does that fall on the faculty? Are we expected to make trips to high schools and middle schools? I wholeheartedly agree that we need to diversify the student body.
- xxv. (R): In terms of the responsibility to diversify the student body, our goal should be to support having a student body that reflects the citizens of Maryland. My hope is that we do not ask faculty to drive to other counties in Maryland to recruit. If you can see it, you can be it. Would it be useful to ask for structured feedback or broad feedback without prompts?
- xxvi. (Q): Are we able to address/clarify some of the comments that were made before this goes to departments for feedback?
- xxvii. (R): You have made it known to the Senators that you would like to do that.
- xxviii. (Q): Can we move the date back? We need more time than April 5th.
- xxix. (C): Senator Juncosa made an amendment to the motion to insert after "its associated Senate Subcommittee reports" the phrase "**and a clarification document from the Workgroup**". It was seconded by Senator Martin. There were no objections. The

- amendment was accepted by consensus.
- xxx. (C): Senator Juncosa made an amendment to the motion to insert “including suggested modifications,” after “written response,”. Senator Martin seconded the amendment. There were no objections to the change. The amendment was accepted by consensus.
- xxx. (C): Senator Juncosa made an amendment to the motion to change “Tuesday, April 5, 2022” to, “May 3, 2022.” Senator de Socio seconded the amendment.
- xxxii. (C): I expect that because the last meetings of this year will be about general education, if we push back the date we are pushing it back to next year. That is why I prefer to see it kept at April 5th.
- xxxiii. (Q): What do written responses look like? Who within the unit prepares those written responses? Is it the responsibility of the senator for the unit? If not, should we communicate what that looks like within this motion?
- xxxiv. (Q): By units do we mean schools or departments?
- xxxv. (R): Unit refers to schools.
- xxxvi. (Q): Units may need some guidance as they discuss this. Will the workgroup be the body to offer guidance?
- xxxvii. (R): We need to handle the May 3, 2022 change.
- xxxviii. (C): There is uncertainty about the report. We need to push the timeline back not make it closer.
- xxxix. (C): If there is no further discussion about the May 3, 2022 change we will consider that the discussion has come to a conclusion. There are 14 senators. The majority will be 8. VOTE: to change the date from April 5, 2022 to May 3, 2022. 10 yes and 1 no. The amendment is carried.
- xl. (Q): Should departments be provided with the entire report from the DEI in T&P Committee? My understanding is that the entire report is what will be sent.
- xli. (Q): Does this motion need to have a specific recipient?
- xlii. (R): No, that is not part of parliamentary procedure.
- xliii. (C): Senator Juncosa made a motion to change “Unit” to “Unit’s Dean”. Senator Martin seconded the amendment. There were no objections to the change. The amendment was accepted by consensus.

5. Motion to adjourn.

Adjourned (5:03 p.m.)

ATTACHMENT 1
Provost's Announcements to the Faculty Senate
February 22, 2022

1. **Commencements/Honors Convocation:** As noted at the last regular FS meeting, we will be seeking input on potential permanent changes to our commencement exercises. This creates an opportunity to reconceptualize Honors Convocation, perhaps as a school/college-level event that could be connected to Commencement or other activities. This year, Honors Convocation will take place in the form of unit-level celebrations or recognition of students at Grad Walks. **FS Action Requested: None at this point, just wanted to give an update on conversations on-going discussions.**

2. **University's FY22 Budget Report** is now available [online](#). The report, developed by SU's Budget Office, reflects SU's planned budget at the start of the fiscal year (July 1, 2021). It does not include January/February salary adjustments. The goal of this report was to create a transparent record of how SU allocates its fiscal resources to its mission. **FS Action Requested: None; happy to take any feedback or questions.**

3. **Timing of 10-month faculty salary adjustments (COLA, Merit, and Bonuses):** I have been asked to comment on the timing of the compensation adjustments for 10-month faculty. The 1% COLA and 2.5% merit increases will be added to the base salary for 10-month faculty effective February 23, 2022 (see attached salary guidance sent from HR on 1/21/22). Faculty can check their compensation histories in Gullnet (COLA and merit adjustments will show as COLA-Mass Change). Merit increases were available based on prior year evaluations indicating merit eligibility (e.g., meets expectations or above). A one-time \$1,500 bonus should have been paid on 2/16/22 to tenured and tenure track faculty (2/23/22 for FTNTT contingent faculty) who were actively employed on the payroll as of December 31, 2021. The difference in the dates that these increases are made to 10- and 12-month employees has to do with the start date of annual pay cycles (e.g., July 1 or closest Weds. for 12-month employees and around the second Wed. in August 10 for full-time faculty). **FS Action Requested: None; happy to take any feedback or questions.**

4. **Faculty Handbook Missing Topics:** As we identify topics that are not covered in the Faculty Handbook (e.g., international travel policies and parameters), the Provost will bring them forward as either 1) draft sections for review by the appropriate FS committee(s); or 2) requests for development of sections by the appropriate FS committee(s). Sections in need of development and their status will be noted in the Updates section of the Faculty Handbook. **FS Action Requested: None; happy to take any feedback or questions.**

5. **DEI and T&P:** I want to thank the DEI in T&P Work Group for their recommendations regarding increased equity in faculty careers and members of the FS Committees that reviewed these recommendations. Undoubtedly there will be much to discuss regarding the recommendations themselves, the implementation of any changes in our T&P process, and the impact on current and future faculty. It's my hope that Faculty Senators feel free to

ask questions or bring-up alternative approaches for discussion without fear of others assuming that they are opposed to increasing equity in faculty careers and diversifying our faculty. Indeed, if we are going to move forward on these important issues, we need to have a well-developed plan with goals, benchmarks and transparency of operational impacts of implementation. Developing such a plan, benchmarks, and operation understanding will require a thorough and thoughtful examination of the proposal. **FS Action Requested: None; happy to take any feedback or questions.**

COVID Questions & Answers: Continuing to trend in the right direction! At the end of the week of 2/14/22, the weekly positivity rate was less than 2%. Please note that the positivity rate may be drifting up as our testing is now largely of individuals with symptoms or those who are unvaccinated with exemptions (so not a representative sample).

- The University Health Team has modified mask policy as follows: Effective 3 p.m. Friday, 2/18/22, face masks will no longer be required during normal operations in the following spaces:
 - Faculty and staff offices (masks must still be worn in common areas, such as hallways)
 - Meeting and conference rooms
 - East Campus facilities (including athletics complexes)
 - SU Downtown
 - Dining Commons
 - Guerrieri Student Union
 - Residence halls
- Face masks continue to be required in instructional settings (except of instructors/presenters who are at least 6 feet from others) and may be required during certain events (e.g., densely-populated activities at which appropriate physical distancing may not be possible).
- As of this writing (2/19/22), there are 2 faculty/Academic Affairs employees who are not medically cleared (out of ~1000 total employees).
- KN95 masks continue to be available at the GSU information desk.

FS Action Requested: Happy to take any questions or feedback.

ATTACHMENT 2 (Original Motion)
SALISBURY UNIVERISTY FACULTY SENATE MOTION
 Submit this form to the Faculty Senate President

TITLE: Faculty and Unit input on DEI in T&P

SENATOR PROPOSING MOTION: Jose Juncosa

SENATOR SECONDING MOTION:

MOTION (this section alone will be recorded in the minutes):

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate submit the Ad-Hoc committee report on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Tenure and Promotion and its associated Senate Subcommittee reports to each Unit for feedback, and request a written response from each Unit by Tuesday, April 5, 2022.

JUSTIFICATION:

The proposed changes will likely have different impacts on various disciplines, so asking each unit to provide feedback, where they can hear from individual department, will give the Senate a more thorough understanding of all the consequences (intended or unintended) that would occur if the current language on DEI in T&P were to be adopted.

ANTICIPATED IMPACT:

Negative: The inclusion of DEI in T&P would be delayed for a few weeks.

Positive: The Senate will have a clearer picture of the effects of the language in the functioning of all Units and Departments within our institution. Therefore, all Senators will be better able to make an informed decision on adopting this language, or proposing modifications, if needed.

Is this a recommendation to the Provost? Yes____ No__X__

Is this a recommendation to someone else? No__X__ Yes, to _____

VOTE: Number of Senators Present:

Motion Passes or Fails:

ATTACHMENT 3 (Motion as Currently Amended)
SALISBURY UNIVERISTY FACULTY SENATE MOTION

Submit this form to the Faculty Senate President

TITLE: Faculty and Unit input on DEI in T&P

SENATOR PROPOSING MOTION: Jose Juncosa

SENATOR SECONDING MOTION: Jennifer Martin

MOTION (this section alone will be recorded in the minutes):

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate submit the Ad-Hoc committee report on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Tenure and Promotion, its associated Senate Subcommittee reports **and a clarification document from the Workgroup** to each **Unit's Dean** for feedback, and request a written response, **including suggested modifications**, from each **Unit's Dean** by Tuesday, **May 3, 2022**.

JUSTIFICATION:

The proposed changes will likely have different impacts on various disciplines, so asking each unit to provide feedback, where they can hear from individual department, will give the Senate a more thorough understanding of all the consequences (intended or unintended) that would occur if the current language on DEI in T&P were to be adopted.

ANTICIPATED IMPACT:

Negative: The inclusion of DEI in T&P would be delayed for a few weeks.

Positive: The Senate will have a clearer picture of the effects of the language in the functioning of all Units and Departments within our institution. Therefore, all Senators will be better able to make an informed decision on adopting this language, or proposing modifications, if needed.

Is this a recommendation to the Provost? Yes____ No X

Is this a recommendation to someone else? No X Yes, to _____

VOTE: Number of Senators Present:

Motion Passes or Fails: