

Faculty Senate Minutes

May 9, 2023

The regular business meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, May 9, 2023 at 3:30pm in Henson 103. The Senate President was in the chair and the Secretary was present. The minutes of the 4/25 meeting were approved as written.

President Lyn Lepre made announcements

Provost Karen Olmstead made announcements.

The Senate President made announcements.

Officers were elected for the 2023-2024 academic year

Vice President – Joerg Tuske

Secretary – David Keifer

Webmaster – Jeffrey Emmert

Report for APC on Avoiding Multiple Exams and the Last Day of Finals was received. Motion from APC on final exams by Elizabeth Ragan PASSED after debate as follows:

MOTION: The Faculty Senate asks that the recommendations made by the APC in the attached report for faculty wishing to avoid multiple (or any) exams on the last day of the Final Exam/Assessment Week be posted on the Faculty/Staff Resources section of the Registrar's Office webpages.

Attached Report: Faculty Avoiding Multiple Exams on the Last Day of Finals, Academic Policies Committee, April 7, 2023

The APC has been charged by the Faculty Senate to examine the current Final Exam/Assessment (FE/A) Week Policy to determine whether there is a way that faculty can avoid having multiple exams on the final day. Increasingly, there are less than three days between the last exam period and the deadline for posting grades, with Commencement—where faculty are expected to attend—taking a significant block of that time.

For background, it should be understood that the FE/A schedule is created by the Registrar's Office for each Fall and Spring semester. The 5-day schedule consists of blocks (5 per day) that are based on class time periods (Monday through Friday) that occur during the semester. Due to the complex nature of all of the courses that are offered by each department, representing an increasingly diverse set of course schedules, there is no practicable structural way to identify and reschedule an individual faculty member's exams. (This can be done manually, but due to the time and effort involved, should be reserved for unusual/exceptional situations.) In consultation with the Registrar, the APC makes the following recommendations for those wishing to avoid multiple (or any) exams on the last day of FE/A Week.

- Use established time periods when creating course schedules

The Final Exam/Assessment Schedule is based on the traditional time periods that were established by SU and many other USM institutions. The meeting pattern for MWF courses is 50 minutes followed by a 10-min change of class time beginning at the top of each hour – 8:00 am, 9:00 am, etc. The meeting pattern for T/Th courses is 75 minutes followed by a 15-min change of class. Thus, each time period begins every 90 minutes – beginning at 8:00 am, followed by 9:30 am, 11:00 am, and so on.

Unfortunately, GullNet cannot enforce those established time periods when creating courses; therefore, some departments and/or instructors have created time periods that fit their own schedules, which have affected not only students' schedules, but room availability as well.

Example: A Tuesday/Thursday course should officially be offered every 75 minutes followed by a 15-minutes change of class time. Thus, the first class would begin at 8:00 am, the second at 9:30 am, and so on. If a course is offered, however, from 10:00 – 11:15 am, it will cover two traditional time periods (9:30 – 10:45 am and 11:00 – 12:15), which makes it impossible for a traditionally scheduled course to use that room from 9:30 am to 12:30 pm.

Unfortunately, this isn't an arbitrary example – a course has been scheduled from 10-11:15 am for Fall 2023, which has caused issues with room scheduling

- Advance availability of Final Exam/Assessment Schedule

Prior to each semester's course scheduling preparation period the FE/A Week schedule will be made available online (<https://www.salisbury.edu/administration/academic-affairs/registrar/exam-schedule.aspx>). When preparing course schedules instructors will be able to determine exactly when their final assessment block is scheduled in relation to when they schedule their course offerings.

- Assess exam/assessment blocks early

It is understandable that some faculty have preferred times when they wish to teach, however, in doing so they must also review the FE/A schedule because it changes each semester. Thus, faculty should assess their final exam schedule before the semester begins or at least within the first week of classes

- Poll students

If a scheduling problem has been determined, faculty could poll their students within the first week of classes for potential alternative assessment times.

- Assistance from the Registrar/Registrar's Office

The Registrar's Office is always available to assist faculty who have a FE/A Week scheduling conflict(s). We examine the schedules of every student within the course as well as that of the instructor to come up with possible alternative time blocks.

MOTION from APC on Latin Honors by Elizabeth Ragan PASSED after debate.

The Faculty Senate recommends that the number of credits a student must complete at SU to qualify for Latin Honors (*cum laude*, *magna cum laude*, *summa cum laude*) be changed from 56 to 50.

Our policy for granting Latin Honors has been that students needed to complete 56 credits here at SU. That was based on the maximum limit of transfer credit allowed at the time. That limit was 64 credits. Since students need 120 credits to graduate, it gave transfer students the opportunity to meet the 56-credit limit.

Moving forward, partly due to the Transfer with Success Act, we will allow 70 credits to transfer if a student has earned an AA, AS, or AAT degree. That means that in order for them to qualify for Latin Honors here, the credit limit needs to be lowered to 50 credits.

MOTION: Extension for updating SU Academic Integrity Policies to new USM Standards by Elizabeth Ragan PASSED.

The Faculty Senate extends the deadline for draft revisions to SU's academic integrity policies from the Academic Policies Committee to the first Senate meeting in November 2023.

The report from LRAP on desired charges was received.

MOTION: Motion by Danny Ervin PASSED after debate and amendment.

The Faculty Senate request the Long-Range Academic Planning Committee complete the following tasks.

- The LRAP will identify other institutions who offer a clinical faculty career ladder, and report on such practices. These positions can focus on teaching as the entirety of their work, perhaps with a focus on early career students. These might be contractual lecturers with longer contracts, or opportunities to move from "assistant clinical professor" to "associate/full clinical faculty." This has the downside of maintaining different tiers within the university, but offers more confidence and compensation.
- The LRAP will work with the Dean of the Seidel School of Education to understand current conversations with area high schools about student preparation, necessary supports, and the potential for programs like "Taste of College" or other dual-enrollment offerings. The LRAP will prepare a report on the nature of those conversations, and include suggestions regarding their nature or how information is disseminated to campus.
- The LRAP will meet with the Associate VP of Enrollment Management and other relevant members of administration to better understand SU enrollment projections and targets, and report back concerning two key questions:
 1. What is the "right size" for SU?
 2. How might changes in delivery of curricula (e.g., online vs face-to-face) affect enrollment projections?
- The LRAP will explore options and identify and evaluate current efforts to identify students who need remediation during early coursework, and devise supports (perhaps to include purposeful courses, perhaps taught by the clinical faculty mentioned above) in key areas associated with

established student outcomes in the General Education plan. Such supports could help SU supplement resources that students may have missed during their K-12 education and move towards the USM goal of “achieving true equity and an inclusive culture” (*USM Strategic Plan*).

- LRAP will explore the possibility of establishing an officially recognized and binding minimum percentage of tenure-track faculty instruction at an institutional level at SU, as per the suggestion in the previous SU Strategic Plan: “Aim to staff academic programs so that at least 75% of instruction [at SU] is delivered by tenure-track faculty.” If achieving this level is not feasible, LRAP shall propose alternatives.

Report from AFT on academic freedom and offensive language was received.

MOTION on Faculty Service by Jose Juncosa PASSED after debate and amendment, with 8 in favor, and 2 against, of 15 present.

Resolved: Faculty Members at Salisbury University shall have the option to engage in service activities to the maximum extent allowed by the USM BOR Bylaws, Policies and Procedures. If Faculty workload increases as a result of service activity, Faculty expectations in Research/Scholarship/Creative activity shall be adjusted within the confines of the USM BOR Bylaws, Policies and Procedures so that total Faculty workload does not increase.

The Academic Freedom and Tenure, Faculty Welfare, and Promotions committees are charged with proposing any required changes to policies and procedures and/or the Faculty Handbook necessitated by the policy stated above.

MOTION on developing a new section in the Faculty Handbook dedicated to FTNTT Faculty by Jose Juncosa PASSED after debate and amendment

The Faculty Senate shall establish an ad-hoc committee charged with writing a separate section within the Faculty Handbook pertaining to Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty as recommended by the Faculty Welfare committee through their report dated 12/5/2022. The committee shall consider the recommendations within that report during this process, as well as the draft language provided by the Provost dated 08/26/22. The committee shall also indicate where their text should be placed within the Handbook and any edits necessary to other sections necessitated by the introduction of this text.

The committee shall include at least one Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty member.

The committee shall present their final report by the second-to-last Faculty Senate meeting of the Spring 2024 term.

MOTION by Jose Juncosa on the Faculty Senate establishing an ad-hoc committee for the New Faculty Handbook did NOT PASS.

The Faculty Senate shall establish an ad-hoc committee charged with the following:

- Designing the general layout of a new Faculty Handbook.
- Recommending a single person or team with experience in writing and editing who would be willing and able to carry out the task of constructing the new Faculty Handbook. If the recommendation involves (a) Faculty member(s), the committee shall also indicate the amount of course release and/or other incentives needed. If the recommendation involves an external hire, the committee shall consult with the Provost about the feasibility of such a hire.
- Proposing a mechanism and timeline for the crafting, editing, and vetting process involved with the creation of a new Faculty Handbook.
- Proposing a mechanism for upkeep of any new Faculty Handbook.

The committee shall consider the recommendations from the Faculty Welfare report on the Faculty Handbook dated 5/3/22 during their deliberations.

The committee shall present their final report by the second-to-last Faculty Senate meeting of the Spring 2024 term.

MOTION by Jose Juncosa on obtaining specific language for the Promotions Committee recommendations on the Faculty Handbook PASSED after debate.

The Promotions Committee is charged with crafting specific proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook related to the issues listed in the attached report titled “Promotions Committee Handbook Charge 050323”. The committee will report its proposed changes by the second-to-last Faculty Senate meeting of the Fall 2023 term. If the committee believes some of the issues presented should not be addressed, they should still propose associated language, but they may include an explanation on why they believe that change should not be made. If the committee finds other issues in the handbook that need to be corrected, they may add new proposed changes as needed, with a written justification for each.

Promotions Committee Handbook Charge 050323

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”

Additional recommendations for this section:

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”

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.

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

Additional recommendations related to this section:

- Annual reviews and their requirements should be explicitly defined in the Faculty Handbook.

Additional post-meeting information from a committee member:

I realized the USM almost certainly has a policy on annual faculty evaluations so we probably could have included a link to it in our report where we recommended we add language on annual self-evaluations to the faculty handbook. Here is the link:

<https://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II120.html>

It is an old policy and is pretty vague but it does require us to “establish and publish policies and procedures for a periodic evaluation of the performance of its faculty members.”

Interestingly, the USM policy on comprehensive reviews (<https://www.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionII/II119.html>) references “annual reviews” but the POLICY ON EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE OF FACULTY only requires “periodic” reviews.

In any case, I think the USM policy means we have to form a policy on annual reviews. Also, if a new handbook is written the writers should check on all the USM policies to make sure we are following all of them...

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

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.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:00 pm

Ellen Schaefer-Salins
05/15/23