

## Faculty Senate Minutes

March 28, 2023

The regular business meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, March 28, 2023 at 3:30pm in Henson 103. The Senate President was in the chair and the Secretary was present. The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

President Lynn Lepre made announcements  
Provost Karen Olmstead made announcements.  
The Senate President made announcements.

The minutes of the March 14 meeting were accepted as written.

Senate approved extending the deadline for the LLRC charge to revise the “Technology Fluency” and “Technology-Mediated Instructional Materials” sections of the Faculty Handbook

**The Following Motion** “to accept the report and move forward on how to implement the changes” was proposed by Senator Long-White. After debate the motion passed with 9 votes in favor and two opposed.

### **Faculty Handbook Ad Hoc Committee Report**

Committee Members: Annette Barnes, Steven Binz, Jessica Walter - March 23, 2023

During the October 25th, 2022, meeting, the Faculty Senate approved a motion to form an ad hoc committee to review specific topics and feedback from standing committees pertaining to the Faculty Handbook. The committee has worked diligently to meet the deadline of March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2023, by providing recommendations for revision of various sections of the Faculty Handbook to address the questions and issues in the order received.

In consideration of overall issues identified with the Faculty Handbook and in response to the 11<sup>th</sup> charge, the ad hoc committee does want to emphasize their recommendation that the Faculty Handbook be rewritten to address inconsistencies, missing sections, and to convey a consistent voice. This suggestion aligns with recommendations from the Promotions and Faculty Welfare Committees.

A listing of each charge and the ad hoc committee’s recommendations are respectfully submitted as provided below.

#### **1. Chapter 2, “Provisions Related to Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Permanent Status”**

**Section 1. This should be clearer regarding who is the one making decisions about the appointee (status review, formal review, etc.). Anyone denied tenure or permanent status should be given the justification of the decision in writing.**

***Charge: Provide a draft of proposed revisions, if any.***

The committee recommends revision of Section 1 by adding the following to the end:

“Status review and formal review for tenure shall include reviews by the Tenure Review Committee, the department chair/school director, Dean of the appointee's school/college, Provost, and President as outlined in Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty in this document. Status review and formal review for permanent status shall include reviews by the Library Faculty Promotion Review Committee, Dean of Libraries & Instructional Resources, Provost, and President as outlined under Faculty Engaged in Exclusively or Primarily in Library Services in this document. An appointee who is denied tenure or permanent status must receive justification of the decision in writing from the President.”

**Sections 2-4. An appointee who is denied tenure should be given the justification of the decision in writing. This should be included in each section.**

***Charge: Provide a draft of proposed revisions, if any.***

The committee recommends revision of Section 2 by adding the following to the end:

“Formal review for tenure shall include reviews by the Tenure Review Committee, the department chair/school director, Dean of the appointee's school/college, Provost, and President as outlined in Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty in this document. An appointee who is denied tenure must receive justification in writing from the President.”

Sections 3 and 4, at the end of each section add, “An appointee who is denied tenure must receive justification in writing from the President.”

**Additional recommendations for this section:**

In the second paragraph of section 2, it states “paragraphs in 3 below”. It would be clearer if worded as “section 3 below”.

## **2. Chapter 2, “Faculty Ranks and Criteria”**

**Regarding Section B1, last line: Should the relative weight of the criteria be listed here or at least have a link to a different section of the handbook where it is located?**

***Charge: Investigate whether a clear statement of the relative weight of the criteria exists. If such a statement exists, provide a draft of how to incorporate that into this section (a textual statement and/or a link) if deemed desirable. If no such statement exists, make a recommendation on whether such a statement should be formulated.***

The committee found a clear statement of faculty “workload” in Chapter 4 section IV. However, no formal statement was identified in the handbook that directly correlates “relative workload” to weighting of categories used to determine promotion and tenure for faculty.

The committee recommends that a clear statement regarding the relative weight of the categories for promotion and tenure for the faculty ranks should be formulated. We further recommend that the statement be updated to reflect the USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures referenced in Chapter 4 (provided below) which is different than Chapter 4, Section IV Standard Workload Expectations (provided below) table for relative weights.

- Chapter 4, Faculty Workload and Responsibilities Section I provides a link to [USM Policy on Faculty Workload and Responsibilities](#) (last update June 21, 2019):

USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents			
INSTITUTION TYPE	TEACHING	RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/ CREATIVE ACTIVITY	SERVICE
COMPREHENSIVE % of Total Effort	60-75	15-30	5-20
RESEARCH % of Total Effort	45-55	35-45	5-20
DEGREE-GRANTING RESEARCH CENTER % of Total Effort	5-15	75-85	15-25

- Chapter 4: Faculty Compensation, Workload, Benefits, Awards and Personnel and Other Policies, Section IV:

**IV. Standard Workload Expectations**

A. The standard workload and responsibilities expectations for tenured and tenure track faculty at Salisbury University are as follows:

	Teaching	Research/ Scholarship	Service
Percent of Effort	65-77 (7-8 three-credit Course Units/Years)	15-25	5-15

And the standard workload and responsibilities expectations for full-time non-tenure track faculty at Salisbury University are:

	Teaching	Research/ Scholarship	Service
Percent of Effort	77 (8 three-credit Course Units/Years)	5-20	3-20

Percent of effort in a given term for part-time non-tenure track faculty at Salisbury University is 100 times the number of three-credit course units taught in that term divided by 5.

Additional information reviewed regarding relative weight(s) included:

- Chapter 4: Section IV E. further states:
  - “The balance among teaching, research/scholarship and service for a faculty member may change over the faculty member’s career. This balance may be adjusted annually when faculty and department chairs set workload and responsibilities expectations for the year. In all cases, the addition of the percentage of effort in each area equals 100% of the faculty member’s effort.”
- Chapter 2, Faculty Engaged Exclusively or Primarily in Clinical Teaching, “Criteria for Clinical Faculty Promotion”, no relative weight provided.
  - “Although no equations are offered to measure relative importance of the criteria for evaluation, it is clear that excellence in teaching, the primary consideration for promotion, derives from a dedication to clinical expertise, professional development and a concern for the integrity of the profession and the institution. Therefore, attention will be given to effective teaching and clinical expertise. The various departments, programs, schools, and colleges should provide guidance.”
- Chapter 4, Faculty Workload and Responsibilities, Section II
  - “This policy does not apply to individuals.....nor does it apply to library faculty, *e.g.*, Librarians I, II, III, IV.”

### 3. Chapter 2, “Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty”

**Table 1, (Timeline for Faculty Seeking Tenure), step “Faculty responds to Tenure Review Committee Evaluation” and Table 2, step “Faculty responds to Tenure and Promotions Committee(s) Evaluation”:** Why not just keep the 5-day deadline in Faculty Success? This seems like it adds extra confusion and may dissuade faculty from taking full advantage of their five days.

*Charge: Make a recommendation to Senate as to whether the process in Faculty Success should be changed.*

The committee concurs that although most faculty do not use the full five days; they should not be dissuaded or discouraged from doing so as it is provided by the Faculty Handbook. The handbook is also ambiguous regarding how to obtain the full five days to respond after each step or if the five days is applicable only for response to the Tenure Review Committee Evaluation. If only for one step, it would be inconsistent with the “Procedures for Promotion of Faculty” section that allows for five (business) days to provide a response to “any step” of that process.

The committee recommends the handbook should clearly state that five business days are allowed for faculty to provide a response at each level of the tenure process, as this aspect is alluded to in the handbook but is never explicitly stated. In addition, the workflow in Watermark Faculty Success should then be changed to match the revision of the Faculty Handbook.

Also, the current wording for providing an appointee the right to submit a rebuttal in the Procedures for Promotion of Faculty section is outdated and does not match the workflow of Watermark Faculty Success. The committee recommends replacing paragraph 5.e.6 in Procedures and Policies for Granting Tenure to Faculty and the second half of paragraph 1.c under Procedures for Promotion of Faculty starting with “At any step of this process the...” with the following text:

**“At any step of this process before the provost's recommendation, the candidate may, within five (5) working days of a recommendation being posted to the relevant Watermark Faculty Success workflow, submit a written rebuttal in any professionally reasonable manner to the relevant Watermark Faculty Success workflow.”**

#### **Additional recommendations for this section:**

Five (5) days is used as a period of time for response in a number of situations in Chapter 2. The five days are referred to in a variety of way as follows:

- five (5) business days
- five business days
- five (5) working days
- five working days

The committee suggests changing the wording to “five (5) working days” for consistency.

For transparency, the committee further recommends the addition of wording that provides justification to the applicant and prior level whenever a person or committee in the process makes a recommendation which is in opposition to the prior level. Also, if the departmental/school level committee decides not to recommend tenure, then they must provide a justification to the applicant.

**Related question:**

Library faculty are only allowed to provide a rebuttal if the recommendation is negative. This process is different than the one for other faculty; therefore, the committee asks if the inconsistency is intentional?

**4. Chapter 2, “Procedures for Promotion of Faculty”**

**Section (e): If a faculty member is denied a recommendation for promotion by the promotions committee, the committee should provide written justification for their decision.**

**Section (h): If a faculty member is denied promotion from the president, the president should provide written justification for the decision.**

*Charge: Provide a draft of proposed revisions, if any.*

The committee proposes an addition to the end of Section (e): “The committee must provide justification for the promotion recommendation in writing to the candidate and the Provost.”

The committee proposes an addition to the end of Section (h): “If the President denies a candidate promotion or makes a decision that differs from the recommendation of the Promotions Committee, then the President must provide justification for the decision in writing to the candidate and Promotions Committee.”

**Additional recommendations for this section:**

- Regarding Section (c). For transparency, the committee further recommends addition of wording that provides justification to the applicant and prior level whenever a person or committee in the process makes a recommendation which is the opposite of the prior level. Also, if the departmental level committee decides to not recommend promotion, then they must provide a justification to the applicant.
- Proposed addition to the end of Section (g): “If the Provost does not recommend a candidate for promotion or makes a recommendation that differs from the Promotions Committee, then the provost must provide justification for the decision in writing to the candidate, Promotions Committee, and the President.”
- The committee was unable to locate the portion of the Faculty Handbook referenced in section 1, subsection c as **D 1C**. This reference is removed by a recommendation that resulted from charge 3 above.

**5. Chapter 2, “Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty”**

**“Departmental Role, Peer Review and Criteria for Evaluation” section: The handbook states “The faculty member under review will be the principal provider of the information for the comprehensive review. This need not exceed the submission of the annual self-evaluations of the previous five years. They will provide the reviewer(s) with the necessary information by February 1 of the year in which the review is to take place, and the reviewer(s) shall provide a report to the faculty member by the same deadline as the annual review. As in the annual reviews, the five-year comprehensive review must be based on multiple sources of information.” This sounds like the person under review needs only to provide self-evaluations for the last five years, although the committee needs multiple sources of information. If the committee asked for chair evaluations for the last five years, could the person under review refuse based on the wording here? Could the sentence stating that the person under review need only provide self-evaluations be removed?**

*Charge: Provide a draft of proposed revisions, if any.*

Upon review, the committee found that the Faculty Handbook is mostly consistent in stating the faculty member undergoing review cannot be asked to supply any more documentation than requested during the previous five (5) annual reviews. However, the handbook also states, “This need not exceed the submission of the annual self-evaluations of the previous five years.” which seems to contradict the following:

“They must provide adequate information but cannot be required to supply information above and beyond that which was required to satisfy evaluation criteria applied in previous years.”

“As in the annual reviews, the five-year comprehensive review must be based on multiple sources of information.”

These two identified statements draw a parallel between the comprehensive review and annual reviews; but the annual review is not documented in the Faculty Handbook except for pre-tenured faculty which cannot be directly applied to tenured faculty, because tenured faculty do not have a tenure committee.

Currently, annual evaluations of faculty require submission of a self-evaluation, student course evaluations, and a chair/director evaluation. Depending upon interpretation, you could decide the faculty member needs to provide their self-evaluations, student course evaluations, as well as the chair/director’s evaluations.

The committee proposes the most reasonable interpretation is that a faculty member is not required to provide more information during the comprehensive review than provided during annual reviews; therefore, faculty could be required to provide self-evaluations, student course evaluations, and chair/director evaluations. In our attempt to not change the spirit of the document in its entirety, we propose to change the following statement:

“This need not exceed the submission of the annual self-evaluations- of the previous five years.” to read as below:

**“This information need not exceed the documents required to be submitted for the previous five annual reviews.”**

Therefore, this revision clarifies that the annual chair's reviews would be included with the documents required and reinforces that multiple sources of information can be used. In addition, the relevant USM document does not identify information that the faculty member needs to provide and mirrors what is found in our Faculty Handbook.

<https://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II119.html>,

**Additional recommendations related to this section:**

- Under the heading “Policies and Procedures for the Five-Year Comprehensive Reviews of Tenured Faculty Members”, it refers to “Section IV” which we recommend should be “Chapter 4, Workload and Responsibilities, Section IV”. Also, adding a hyperlink would save readers' time.
- “desires” should be “desire” in this section.
- Annual reviews and their requirements should be explicitly defined in the Faculty Handbook.

**6. Chapter 2, “Faculty Grievance Policy”**

**Part-Time faculty are not considered “Faculty” (with a capital F) if they do not teach a full credit load according to the current definition [with the possible exception of tenured and tenure-track part-time faculty, depending on the Bylaws referendum vote]. These people cannot be part of the Faculty Senate or on its committees. Which committees would be responsible to look at a faculty grievance for a part-time faculty?**

*Charge: The Faculty Senate President has reached out to the Adjunct Caucus for their opinion on this matter and will pass the feedback along to the ad hoc committee. Based on their feedback, make a recommendation either for or against changing the procedures for part-time faculty who aren't constituents of Faculty Senate. If recommending a change, include the specific language for the proposed change.*

The committee received input from the Adjunct Caucus which expressed support of part-time faculty submitting grievances to the Faculty Senate. As such, the committee proposes the following change to the first paragraph of the Faculty Grievance Policy:

“Salisbury University has established the Faculty Grievance Policy to give faculty members, **both full-time and part-time**, of the University community a forum in which to address concerns related to matters involving the interpretation or application of University policies including disciplinary action. This policy provides a method for aggrieved faculty to express substantive complaints about denials of tenure, academic policy concerns, or other faculty issues and have them resolved by the appropriate University officials in a timely fashion. The following matters are not covered by these grievance procedures...”

**7. Chapter 4, “Tuition Remission”**

**We do not believe that faculty/staff should have to pay the same amount of fees as students, as faculty/staff have access to as many of the items that student fees go towards (access to Maggs, entrance into athletic events, etc.).**

***Charge: Make a recommendation on whether Faculty Senate should ask the administration to waive such fees for faculty and staff taking courses at SU.***

Although USM Section VII 4.10 Policy on Tuition Remission and Reimbursement (Link: <https://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionVII/VII410.pdf>) states “Tuition remission does not include mandatory fees, which remain the responsibility of the eligible employee or retiree.”, the committee recommends that the Faculty Senate should request that the administration waive fees that cover items already included in the benefits related to employment so faculty/staff do not have to pay twice.

## 8. 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.***

The committee will provide a definition to the Faculty Senate in conjunction with work by the APC on academic integrity which is ongoing at the time of this report. Initial review for consideration of a definition includes:

In USM Policy (III-1.00), “Academic Integrity” is defined as “A commitment, even in the face of adversity, to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage.”\*

In Chapter 6, Teaching and Learning at Salisbury University, academic integrity is discussed stating:

- “The spirit of academic integrity denotes adherence to the precept that one’s work is one’s own.”
- “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....”

Integrity: Following and upholding the principles of the university and those of the relevant professional organizations.

## 9. Chapter 2 Reorganization

**Chapter 2 should be reorganized to make the topics clearer. In addition, the discussions of all positions should have a somewhat parallel structure within the handbook. A single example of how it could be organized is provided on pages 5-7.**

**In Section C. “Faculty Ranks”, both clinical faculty and library faculty are not listed; they are found later in the document in a section called fulltime non-tenure track faculty. It seems that separating the clinical and library faculty ranks separately suggests a lack of equity. There has got to be a better way to lay out this section, so it doesn’t look like clinical faculty and library faculty are different and almost an afterthought.**

*Charge: Make a recommendation on whether or not Chapter 2 should be reorganized. Take into consideration your recommendation on revising the full Faculty Handbook. If recommending reorganization, provide the recommended new organization. The committee agrees the proposed organization of Chapter 2 of the Faculty Handbook is reasonable but did not and could not address the equity and organization issues mentioned in the charge for this committee. We believe that reordering the content will not provide a sufficiently parallel structure and that rewriting large sections is required to accomplish this goal.*

The committee agrees that listing all faculty ranks in one place is ideal, and listing the types of rank in alphabetical order would reduce the appearance of inequity. For example, Clinical Faculty and their associated ranks would be listed first, then Faculty, and then Library Faculty; though other organization methods could be more useful.

## 10. Language Consistency

**Within Chapter 2 in particular and throughout the Handbook, there are multiple terms used to describe the same four things.**

- teaching, scholarship and creative activity, service
- teaching, scholarship or research, creative activity and community and professional service
- teaching effectiveness including student advising; (b) research, scholarship, professional development and, in appropriate areas, creative activities; and (c) relevant service to the community, profession, and institution.
- Instruction, Research and Service
- teaching, scholarship, and service
- teaching, professional development, and service
- teaching/advising, scholarship and creative activities, and service
- a) Excellence in Teaching... b) Professional Activity... c) Service
- effective teaching, scholarship, and service
- Teaching and Advising, Professional Development, Service to the University and Community
- service to the University, their profession, and the community
- teaching, service to the institution and community, and evidence of professional development

**This language should be consistent and uniform throughout.**

*Charge: Decide which language should be used. If the committee finds any other variations in the terms used, add them to the list.*

Although the committee does not believe the list of terms provided always refer to the exact same thing, we did not read the entire document to verify this. However, where applicable, we propose the wording be changed to the following:

“Teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service to the University and/or professional field.”

Since these terms are used frequently, the ad hoc committee recommends keeping the terminology short, clear, and not requiring review of the glossary for full understanding. In addition, because the University does not count service to the “community” in a significant way, the statement excludes that component and instead includes the two types of service (i.e., University professional field) that currently contribute significantly toward promotion and tenure.

**Additional recommendation for this section:**

It may be appropriate to review the types of service that contribute meaningfully to promotion and tenure as it is possible the current faculty may want to give more weight to service to the community.

**11. Revising the full Faculty Handbook**

**The Promotions Committee would like to emphasize that making those improvements below is not sufficient for the creation of a workable Faculty Handbook. The version we were given is far from a final draft with numerous spelling mistakes, redundancies and other errors. Fixing these is not a task that can be completed by three committees in a short period of time. We suggest that the Faculty Handbook be edited by an expert editor and restructured to get rid of redundancies. After that it should be read by the various committees, the Faculty Senate and the General Counsel.**

**Statement from the Faculty Welfare Committee**

**We have found that the latest version of the faculty handbook is based on an older handbook that is neither clear nor concise. Both versions of the handbook have poor structure, are difficult to understand, and are at times redundant. There is little consistency with the layout of sections of the handbook, and we feel that the current version of the handbook needs major reworking with significant revisions. We understand that starting over with the handbook is a monumental task, with a tremendous amount of editorial work. However, we believe that a lack of clarity within the handbook hurts faculty, and we urge the faculty senate to take up the task of developing a better version of the faculty handbook.**

**There are many ways to go about this, but we would like to offer a suggestion. We encourage a small group of faculty senators or interested faculty to design the general layout of a new handbook. One resource for this work would be the AAUP Faculty Handbook Guide (<https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/legal-program/faculty-handbooks-guide>). After the general structure has been determined, we suggest giving a single person with experience in writing and editing the task of constructing the faculty handbook. Policies and wording can be gleaned from the current and past editions of the handbook. Having a single person write the handbook will give the document a single voice, as well as eliminate many of the redundancies currently found in the handbook. After the document is written, the faculty senate can send out sections to different faculty senate committees for review. The committees can then offer feedback,**

**and the faculty senate can work with the writer to incorporate the feedback in a meaningful way.**

**Since this document defines and explains the rights of faculty members, we also suggest that the University legal counsel give it a thorough review before completion.**

***Charge: Make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate on what, if anything, should be done in terms of wholesale editing or re-writing of the Faculty Handbook. If recommending changes, the recommendation should include a specific recommended process to follow.***

The ad hoc committee agrees with the Promotions Committee and the Faculty Welfare Committee that the Faculty Handbook needs to be rewritten. The ongoing work by the Faculty Senate and members of the provost's office has improved the handbook, but starting over would likely be less work and cause fewer pitfalls than continuing to revise it incrementally. Honestly, even within the ad hoc committee's small charge, it was sometimes overwhelming trying to keep track of inconsistencies and errors. Beyond what we were asked to investigate, the committee found at least seven typos, bad links, and omissions such as the annual review process or requirements for tenured faculty.

We believe that the process laid out by the Faculty Welfare Committee is reasonable but emphasize ensuring that a diverse group of faculty participates in the process, so the result reflects the full faculty body, including those who are part-time. We also suggest requesting standing committees review the current handbook and make suggestions for content changes, as appropriate, so the new handbook would include content changes as well as correcting other issues with the current handbook. Reorganization of Chapter 2 would then be included as part of the process and the minor changes suggested could improve the flow of content.

What follows is a suggestion regarding how the Faculty Handbook should be rewritten, borrowing heavily from the Faculty Welfare Committee's suggestion, and including our own thoughts:

We encourage a group of faculty senators or interested faculty from each division and varying ranks to design the general layout of a new handbook. Coinciding with this effort, we recommend that all Faculty Senate Committees and other interested parties review the sections of the Faculty Handbook most relevant to their charges for possible content changes or additions. If these suggestions are approved by the relevant committees and administration, then they can be included in the first draft of the new handbook. After the general structure has been determined and content changes have been agreed upon, we suggest giving a single person or small committee, with experience in writing and editing, the task of constructing the faculty handbook. Policies and wording can be gleaned from the current and past editions of the handbook as well as the changes approved by the Faculty Senate. New questions that arise should be brought to the Faculty Senate who could then delegate the question to an existing committee. Having a single person or small committee write the handbook will give the document a consistent voice, as well as eliminate many

redundancies currently found in the handbook. After the document is written, the faculty senate can send out sections to different faculty senate committees for final review. The committees can then offer feedback, and the faculty senate can work with the writer(s) to incorporate the feedback in a meaningful way.

The person or committee writing the faculty handbook should complete this work as their full-time position. This assignment could require hiring a professional or providing significant course release for those involved with the writing. The required release time would depend upon the number of faculty involved, but we would anticipate writing the handbook to take at least one full year with partial course release for two or three subsequent semesters to make changes according to the suggestions of campus committees.

For each section of the handbook, someone should ask the following questions:

- Who does this section impact?
- Is there a similar section for those not covered by this section? If not, should there be?

In addition, revision should ensure that all faculty processes are included in the handbook. For example, annual reviews that are currently omitted.

It may also be a good idea to make it easier to reference individual sections of the handbook. For example, currently we must reference faculty workload and responsibilities as, “Chapter 4, Faculty Workload and Responsibilities, Section IV” which is a bit cumbersome. A recommendation for revision is “Chapter 4, Section IV, Subsection 4” which could be abbreviated to C4.IV.4 or something similar.

The final committee recommendation is to ensure that “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)” are emphasized throughout the handbook.

### **Summary**

The members of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee have worked diligently to execute their charge, providing recommendations to answer specific questions raised by Faculty Senate standing committees and identifying additional considerations for revision of the Faculty Handbook. The ad hoc committee members are grateful for the opportunity and recognize the tremendous amount of time and collaboration required to not only capture specifics related to faculty workload, evaluation (i.e., review, promotion), and benefits, but also provide this important information in an organized and accessible format.

**The following MOTION** was passed after debate and amendment, “That we accept Model B as proposed by the Faculty Welfare Committee (see below), including COLAs from April 2019 forward, and ask the Provost to continually update the model to match COLAs and that the Faculty Senate send the recommendation to the Provost to provide backpay to faculty who taught Winter 2023 to match the updated Special

Session compensation model. In addition, we ask that the Provost update the Faculty Handbook accordingly.”

**The following MOTION** was passed after debate and amendment, “To charge the FWC to look into aligning overload pay with special session compensation, and to evaluate and make recommendations regarding chair compensation, program director compensation, and graduate student assistantships (in consultation with representation from the Graduate Council)”

**The Faculty Welfare Report was received as follows:**

To: Salisbury University Faculty Senators From: Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC)

Date: 3/25/2023

Re: Special Session Compensation

As part of the faculty senate motion approved on May 17, 2022, a model that described how faculty teaching summer/winter sessions would be compensated (referred to hereafter as special session compensation) was submitted for inclusion in the Salisbury University faculty handbook. As part of the motion, the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) was given a charge to explore with the administration the current status of this policy and report any proposed updates to the Faculty Senate by the last meeting in March, 2023.

**Background**

The model for special session compensation included in the May 2022 motion was the model that had been included in the previous version of the faculty handbook (hereafter referred to as Model A). This model bases the compensation of faculty in special sessions on (1) the number of students, and (2) a percentage of the tuition money the students are paying to take the course. In discussions with Provost Karen Olmstead, the FWC learned that the University stopped using this model in 2015. According to Provost Olmstead, this decision was made by an administrator who has since left the school. This decision seems to have been driven by the concern that Model A paid instructors substantially more than if the same course was taught as an overload course during fall or spring semesters. A new model (hereafter referred to as Model B) was put in place where faculty were paid a set amount per student per credit hour. For example, for a four-credit class, faculty were paid \$557/student (approximately \$139/student/credit hour). For each student in the course, the faculty would receive an additional \$557 in compensation for the first 10 students. For every student after the first 10 students, the faculty would receive an additional \$116 for a four-credit course (\$29/student/credit hour). The FWC is unable to determine who

came up with this model. Still, Model B has been used for special session compensation since 2015 with no modifications whatsoever (no change in compensation due to cost of living, merit, etc.). It is our understanding that Model B was not brought to the faculty senate for discussion at the time. In 2017, Provost Olmstead realized that Model B was being used, and that it did not match what was in the faculty handbook, and made the faculty senate aware of the issue. In the fall of 2019, the provost, associate provost, and members of the FWC held a meeting where options for special compensation were discussed. No progress was made on this issue from that time until Spring 2022, in a large part, due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

### Methodology

The FWC and Provost Olmstead started to exchange emails discussing this issue in the fall semester of 2022. Due to some other work assigned to the FWC, we asked to set up a meeting with Provost Olmstead during January 2023. At this time, we met and learned the history of Model B, as well as Provost's Olmstead's attempts to deal with this issue in the past. Provost Olmstead spoke of her misgivings about Model A, as no other faculty compensation is based on the amount of tuition students pay to take that course. Provost Olmstead also mentioned that when Model A was initially put in the faculty handbook, all special session tuition was set aside in a special fund and may have been considered "extra" money for the University. Now, all tuition from special sessions goes directly into the university budget, and is not set apart from other institutional funds. The FWC asked the Provost to provide some data regarding these special sessions. In particular, we asked if data could be provided as to how much tuition was brought in during these special sessions, and how much of tuition went to pay faculty and how much went to the University. In addition, we asked the Provost to update Model B to include cost of living adjustments in order to more accurately compare it to Model A. We met again with the Provost in late February 2023, where she provided the information we requested (see Appendix of report), and we discussed the positive and negative aspects of both models.

In looking at the 10-year summary of how much total revenue is brought in to the university during winter/summer sessions and comparing it to how much faculty were paid by the University, it became clear that the University could fiscally sustain either model (see Appendix). Please note in this document that the recorded expenses are faculty compensation only, and does not include other expenses related to these courses such as overhead, IT expenses, housekeeping costs, etc.

When comparing Model A (using SU's current undergraduate tuition cost) and Model B (with Cost of Living Adjustments (COLAs) since April 2019 included), the two models provide very similar compensation to faculty. Some differences include that Model B typically pays slightly higher for small class sizes (less than 25 students), while Model B also pays the same rate for faculty, no matter their rank. The compensation for each model based on the number of students can be found in the Appendix. Please note that (1) Model B is the model highlighted in yellow,

and (2) both models are significantly higher than the compensation faculty would be paid for teaching the same course as an overload during the spring semester.

### Recommendation

Although both models are both fiscally viable, and both currently would pay roughly the same amount, we recommend model B. We prefer this method because it does not directly link faculty compensation with tuition (which some of our committee members found unsettling), and it provides the same compensation for all faculty, no matter their rank. Still, we feel that if the faculty senate moves forward with model B, the COLAs given to faculty since 2019 must be added to what is currently being used. In addition, the model must be clearly described in the faculty handbook, including how faculty compensation for special sessions is tabulated, and language must be included stating that this model will continually be adjusted when COLAs are given to university faculty/staff.

We would like to strongly recommend that faculty members who taught during the Winter 2023 semester be given backpay to account for the discrepancy with the current Model B (without COLA) and whatever model the faculty senate chooses, as this matter was initially brought up prior to that contract period, but scheduling conflicts pushed the discussion into the new year. We discussed this matter with the provost, and she mentioned that this definitely is a possibility. In addition, we would like to voice our strong displeasure with the administration who made the unilateral decision to change the model of special session compensation without discussions with the faculty senate at the time. This type of behavior is egregious, and if the people who made this decision were still at SU, we would recommend that the faculty senate publicly censure those individuals. This is a great example of how administration overreach can hurt the concept and process of shared governance. We would also like to voice our belief that even when the administration's action was discovered and brought to the faculty senate's attention in 2017, special compensation should have gone back to Model A (and not stayed with Model B) until the faculty senate had decided on this issue.

It is very clear that when the administration put Model B into place in 2015, there was no discussion about this with faculty. We are very concerned that administrators outside of the Provost's office were able to unilaterally make the decision regarding faculty compensation, going against the policy in the faculty handbook. We are unsure of what faculty can do about this, but it would be nice to know if there is a policy within the University to keep this from happening in the future.

### Closing Thoughts

As stated earlier, both models currently pay faculty very similar amounts. However, this would not have been the case if we went back to 2021. We have had a string of COLAs in the last two years, which has brought Model B compensation up to be competitive with Model A. We are

aware that Model A compensation will go up more often, as tuition increases happen more often than COLAs. We do not have enough data to project which model will give greater compensation for faculty in the future. We suggest that the faculty senate compare the two models every five years to get a better feel for how the two models may differ over time.

Lastly, it is purported that one of the reasons that Model B was put in place was the discrepancy between Model A and overload pay. During our meetings with the Provost, we suggested that a solution to this discrepancy would be to increase overload pay. The Provost asked if the FWC could take a look at overload pay in the near future.

Faculty Welfare Committee

Angeline Prichard, Claudia Burgess, Echo Weaver, Lisa Seldomridge, Matt Bailey (Chair), Tom Goyens

**The following MOTION** was tabled “Guidelines for a DEI requirement in faculty evaluations” was proposed by Senator Tuske:

**Resolved, that the Faculty Senate adopt the attached guidelines on DEI in the faculty evaluation process.**

The Faculty Senate ad hoc committee, based on the recommendations of the DEI in T&P Working Group, proposes the following changes to the Faculty Handbook, in addition to the two motions already passed by the Faculty Senate. We also propose to adopt the listed recommendations by the Working Group:

**1. The incorporation of a general statement on DEI expectations in faculty work.**

(Suggested location: “Faculty Ranks and Criteria”)

***Inclusion of DEI in T&P criteria***

*Salisbury University is an intellectual community enriched by diversity across several dimensions, including age, ancestry/national origin, color, ability/disability, education, gender identity/expression, genetic information, marital status, parental status, political affiliation, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, veteran status, and wealth. This ensures an inclusive learning environment and provides our students with an education rich in perspectives and lived experiences. Creating this rich, collaborative, and inclusive community requires a continued commitment by faculty, staff, and administration. Faculty commitment to incorporating DEI into teaching, scholarship, and service is expected, recognized, and valued in faculty evaluations, and in the tenure and promotion processes.*

**2. We propose the incorporation of a statement on DEI expectations being communicated clearly in the hiring process** (Suggested location: “Faculty Search Process”)

*Contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion as a requirement of tenure and promotion must be clearly delineated in the position description during the hiring process so that newly hired faculty are aware of expectations.*

**3. We propose the following expectations:**

***For tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor***

(Suggested locations: “Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty” and “Procedures for Promotion of Faculty”):

*Evidence of commitment to increase diversity, equity and inclusion are, at a minimum, required in promotion and tenure dossiers in the area of teaching. Evidence of commitment to increase diversity equity and inclusion in this area should be a necessary condition for tenure and promotion. In addition, candidates are required to meet all other unit and university requirements for tenure & promotion.*

***From Associate Professor to Professor*** (Suggested location: “Procedures for Promotion of Faculty”):

*Evidence of commitment to increase diversity, equity and inclusion are, at a minimum, required in promotion and tenure dossiers in the area of teaching plus in one of the other two areas (scholarship/creative activity or service). Evidence of commitment to increase diversity, equity and inclusion in these areas should be a necessary condition for tenure and promotion. In addition, candidates are required to meet all other unit and university requirements for promotion.*

**4. Including a subheading for introducing the expectation of DEI contributions in faculty research, teaching, and service for promotion guidelines** (Suggested locations: “Procedures for Promotion of Faculty” and “Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty”):

*Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process and should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements.*

**5. Guidelines for DEI in T&P**

Departments/units/schools are required to develop guidelines for DEI in T&P. Such guidelines shall be part of any faculty recommendation, including post-tenure review.

**6. Including a list of examples of DEI in faculty research, teaching, and service** (Suggested location: “Procedures for Promotion of Faculty”)

***Examples of DEI in faculty work***

*Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process and should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs*

of Salisbury University's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Examples of activities include but are not limited to:

**Teaching:**

- Ensuring equal representation of diverse people/participants in cases studies, graphics and other media, presentations, etc.
- Incorporating a diversity/inclusion section in your syllabus to ensure that the DEI culture of your classroom is clear and respected.
- Fostering an inclusive classroom environment that values diversity, takes into consideration students from a broad variety of backgrounds and learning styles and challenges students to their best efforts.
- Ensuring equity in the classroom by removing barriers that might otherwise prevent students from being able to participate.
- Developing courses or curricular materials that focus on themes of diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Mentoring and advising of students from groups underrepresented in the faculty member's discipline/profession.
- Development of inclusive techniques of instruction that meet the needs of students from groups that are underrepresented in the field of instruction.
- Participation in teaching workshops to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom.

**Research and Creative Activity**

- Invited presentation, creative work, and or publication focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Grant writing to fund research that focuses on diversity, equity, and inclusion.
  - Participation in professional development programs in the faculty member's discipline to improve ability to incorporate DEI into their research/creative work.
  - Recruitment and mentoring of students from groups underrepresented in the faculty member's discipline for work related to the faculty member's research/creative activity.
  - Contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity within a faculty member's discipline/field.
  - Scholarship that examines representation, incorporation or inclusion within a faculty member's area of expertise
  - Research contributions to understanding the barriers facing women and underrepresented minorities in science.

- *Research in areas that will contribute to diversity, equity, and inclusion opportunity in higher education such as research that addresses issues such as race, gender, diversity, and inclusion.*
- *Research that addresses health disparities, educational access and achievement.*
  - *Research that addresses political engagement, economic justice, social mobility, civil and human rights.*
  - *Creative activity that reflects culturally diverse communities or voices underrepresented in the arts and humanities.*

***Service:***

- *Curricular design in general education or at departmental levels that foster inclusivity.*
  - *Participation in professional development programs designed to improve knowledge of needs for supporting a diverse student population.*
- *Mentoring faculty members from underrepresented and underserved populations.*
  - *Participation in activities that support successful recruitment, retention, and graduation of students from underrepresented and underserved populations.*
  - *Participation in activities that support successful recruitment, retention, and promotion of faculty from underrepresented and underserved populations.*
  - *University-wide collaborations to enhance recruitment/retention effort (collaborating with Admissions, Center for Student Achievement, TRIO, etc.).*
- *Commitment to a professional organizations' equity, inclusion, and diversity work.*
  - *Membership on departmental or university committees related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.*
  - *Service on local and/or statewide committees focused on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.*
  - *Leadership in organizing unit-level or campus-wide events that encourage self-reflection and education regarding issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.*
  - *Serving as an advisor to programs such as Women in STEM or other similar professional organization.*
  - *Serving as an advisor for minority student clubs & associations at the university.*

**7. We propose incorporating DEI-related sections to Watermark Faculty Success/Digital Measures for tracking evidence of commitment to DEI.**

**8. Implementation of these proposals:**

For future faculty hires these guidelines will take effect with the beginning of their employment at SU. For current faculty these guidelines will be applied to all evaluations, including post-tenure reviews, covering the evaluation period beginning 2 years after adoption.

**9. Faculty development & incentives:**

1. Salisbury University shall provide professional development in the area of DEI for faculty. Professional development should include but not be limited to providing workshops on how DEI can be incorporated in the teaching, scholarship and service. These professional development opportunities should be offered regularly and frequently.
2. Salisbury University shall provide funds to present/publish DEI-related work.
3. DEI-related work shall be considered in sabbatical decisions.
4. Salisbury University shall provide course release for professional development or DEI-related service work (mentoring, initiative building, outreach, etc.).
5. Salisbury University shall provide stipends for professional development or DEI-related service work (mentoring, initiative building, outreach, etc.).

**10. Further recommendations:**

We recommend that the SU administration consider the additional points recommended by the Working Group:

1. Revising the student evaluation process to limit the inherent biases that affect women and minorities at a higher frequency.
2. Delineation of DEI in T&P expectations during the hiring stage (from initial position description through the interview).
3. Guidance for incorporation of DEI expectations at the unit level (including faculty evaluation).
4. Expectations for instructors to incorporate DEI into their teaching.

After debate a proposed amendment to the Motion was made by Senator Juncosa; after amendments, the proposed amendment reads as follows below. The Motion was tabled.

**Resolved, that the Faculty Senate adopt the attached guidelines on DEI in the faculty evaluation process.**

The Faculty Senate ad hoc committee, based on the recommendations of the DEI in T&P Working Group, proposes the following changes to the Faculty Handbook, in addition to the two motions already passed by the Faculty Senate. We also propose to adopt the listed recommendations by the Working Group:

- 1. The incorporation of a general statement on DEI guidelines in faculty work.** (Suggested location: "Faculty Ranks and Criteria")

***Inclusion of DEI in T&P criteria***

*Salisbury University is an intellectual community enriched by diversity across several dimensions, including age, ancestry/national origin, color, ability/disability,*

*education, gender identity/expression, genetic information, marital status, parental status, political affiliation, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, veteran status, and wealth. This ensures an inclusive learning environment and provides our students with an education rich in perspectives and lived experiences. Creating this rich, collaborative, and inclusive community requires a continued commitment by faculty, staff, and administration. Faculty commitment to incorporating DEI into teaching is expected in faculty evaluations, and in the tenure and promotion processes.*

**2. We propose the incorporation of a statement on DEI expectations being communicated clearly in the hiring process** (Suggested location: “Faculty Search Process”)

*Contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion as a requirement of tenure and promotion must be clearly delineated in the position description during the hiring process so that newly hired faculty are aware of expectations.*

**3. Including a subheading for introducing the expectation of DEI contributions in faculty research, teaching, and service for promotion guidelines** (Suggested locations: “Procedures for Promotion of Faculty” and “Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty”):

*Contributions that promote DEI are required in the area of teaching and will also be rewarded in the areas of research/creative activities and service in the academic personnel process and should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements.*

**4. Guidelines for DEI in T&P**

Departments/CHHS schools are required to develop guidelines for DEI work in evaluation and T&P by the beginning of the Fall 2025 semester. Such guidelines shall be part of any faculty recommendation, including post-tenure review. In addition, the guidelines must be developed in such a way that overall faculty workload does not increase when considering the extent of the faculty member’s DEI efforts. Further, the amount of DEI efforts by any given faculty member may only be limited by documented reasons related to program accreditation and/or USM guidelines.

**5. We propose incorporating DEI-related sections to Watermark Faculty Success/Digital Measures for tracking evidence of commitment to DEI.**

**6. Implementation of these proposals:**

These guidelines will take effect immediately after the department/CHHS school guidelines are established in so far as they apply to teaching. Retroactive application of

the new guidelines in the areas of research/creative activity or service may be considered after mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department/CHHS school responsible for the guidelines.

**7. Faculty development & incentives:**

1. Salisbury University shall provide professional development in the area of DEI for faculty. Professional development should include but not be limited to providing workshops on how DEI can be incorporated in the teaching, scholarship and service. These professional development opportunities should be offered regularly and frequently.
2. Salisbury University shall provide funds to present/publish DEI-related work.
3. DEI-related work shall be considered in sabbatical decisions.
4. Salisbury University shall provide course release for professional development or DEI-related service work (mentoring, initiative building, outreach, etc.).
5. Salisbury University shall provide stipends for professional development or DEI-related service work (mentoring, initiative building, outreach, etc.).

**8. Further recommendations:**

We recommend that the SU administration consider the additional points recommended by the Working Group:

1. Revising the student evaluation process to limit the inherent biases that affect women and minorities at a higher frequency.
2. Delineation of DEI in T&P considerations during the hiring stage (from initial position description through the interview).
3. Guidance for the development of DEI guidelines at the unit level (including faculty evaluation).

Meeting Adjourned at 5:10 after motion for extension was approved.

Ellen Schaefer-Salins  
04/05/23