

Faculty Senate Notes

February 28, 2023

Henson 103

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

Jennifer Martin, Deneen Long-White, Ellen Schaefer-Salins, Beth Ragan, Dan Ervin, Jeffrey Emmert, Mark de Socio, Memo Diriker, Vincent Genareo, Jose Juncosa, Joerg Tuske, Thomas Lamey, James Fox, Bart Talbert, David Keifer, Vitus Ozoke, Ron Siers, Leonard Arvi

Call to order (3:30 p.m.)

1. Remarks from President Lepre
 - a. Posters on the Bay was great – Governor Moore talked to all students from SU
 - b. Will be traveling to visit alumni and prospective students in the state
 - c. Students getting scholarships in the travels
 - d. May 5 at 10:00 is the Inauguration of President Lepre
 - e. Mall below campus – clearing spaces out
 - f. There will be plans for centennial of SU in 2025.
2. Approval of Minutes
 - a. A proposed change to the consortium bylaws was presented to Faculty Senate. This motion was missing from the minutes and was added to them.
 - b. Minutes are approved as corrected
3. Announcements from Provost Olmstead
 - a. Shout out to those who presented at the SU Teaching and Learning Conference
 - b. Posters on the Bay was great.
 - c. Inauguration Week will have many activities
 - i. Three ceremonies for Inauguration
 - d. Bea Hardy will be working on centennial planning.
 - e. Blueprint for MDs future. MSDE went ahead with plan without consulting Higher Ed. A consulting firm was hired
 - f. Transfer with Success Act moving in a better direction for four year institutions
 - g. Scholars Day is Saturday
 - h. Ward Museum – Focusing on collections now. What will happen to the building?
 - i. It is not central to the mission of the university
 - ii. Too expensive to fix
4. Announcements from the Senate President
 - a. Wait to be acknowledged by senate president before speaking on motions to be discussed
5. Committee Reports

- a. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on DEI in Tenure and Promotion
 - i. Senate passed a motion to insert a DEI statement into Faculty Handbook
 - ii. Guidelines propose a requirement to increase DEI at SU
 - iii. Proposal today
 - 1. To become an Associate Professor, DEI required in teaching
 - 2. Promoting from Associate to Full Professor, DEI is required in teaching and one other area
 - 3. This will apply to new and current faculty
 - 4. Each department should develop their own criteria for DEI
 - 5. Clarification of implementation – at hiring or two years after adoption of requirements
 - iv. Discussion points shared
 - 1. Sharing feedback from people across campus
 - 2. Requiring it can backfire, increase in faculty workload, many examples are not measurable, retroactively required is difficult for current faculty, people may not want to teach here with this requirement
 - a. Make it encouraged, but not required
 - 3. Addressing concerns – we are not asking faculty to be experts, we are asking for training and units coming up with their own criteria such as making classes accessible
 - a. We have DEI requirements on website and in our handbook so we need to follow up
 - b. Some departments can do this easier than other departments such as the social sciences
 - c. Trying to decide between requiring or not for DEI, department requirements may not be enough
 - 4. Proposed amendment – rewarding DEI instead of requiring
 - a. Remove expected under #1, Remove #2 and #3
Guidelines for DEI in T&P changes were made
Remove example in #6
Remove #7
Implementation is changed
 - 5. Discussion of rewards instead of requirement in the motion
 - a. Senator supports not adding more work
 - 6. Retroactive application means that people who did DEI work in the past can be considered as new work
 - 7. There will be lack of uniformity across the university if each department makes decision of DEI – there are no minimum guidelines
 - 8. Accreditation may limit DEI work
 - 9. Mutual agreement between faculty and department

10. DEI should be all over the university and not just in T&P. People should not be punished for not doing it
 11. We have service requirements and why not other requirements?
 12. Provost – Campus not ready? We are talking about removing barriers to allow all to participate. Looking at access and equity. We need to recognize it. It is already done.
 13. Should proposal go to an all faculty vote?
 14. What are other institutions in USM doing?
 15. We need to get people to understand what DEI is.
 16. Motion to stop discussion was not seconded so no vote was taken
 17. Discussion continues – is this something that administration needs to do too?
 18. We cannot table motion or ask for postponement of motion.
 19. Original report did look at other USM institutions.
 20. Who would do the education on DEI on campus? Is it the people already doing the work?
 21. Senator explaining that we should accept amendments
 22. Additional amendment about instructional practices that demonstrates DEI.
 - a. Senator says that we need a minimum standard in teaching for DEI
 - b. Must be inclusive and follow ADA
 23. Motion to Table whole motion was passed
- b. GEOC motion: Updating the evaluation rubric for General Education Personal Wellness courses – Jose Juncosa
- i. Wellness had very rigid requirements. Discusses physical, emotional, and financial wellness
 - ii. Objectives come from all areas
 - iii. Is this retroactive? No courses have been approved yet.
 - iv. Motion was approved and there will be GEOC updates
- c. GEOC motion: Reaffirming the opinion of the GEOC on certain First Year Seminar issues - Jose
- i. FYS is required of all new students at SU
 - ii. First item was struck from motion requiring all students to take FYS
 - iii. Existing degree completion programs will not be required to complete first year seminar
 - iv. Amendment was made and withdrawn
 - v. Motion to call question was made and passed
 - vi. Motion does not pass
6. Senator thought DEI discussion was very good.

7. Unfinished Business and General Orders of the Day – None
8. New Business

Adjourn (4:59 p.m.)