

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MOTION

Submit this form to the Faculty Senate President

SUBJECT: Obtaining specific language for the Promotions Committee recommendations on the Faculty Handbook

SENATOR PROPOSING MOTION: José I. Juncosa, Jr.

SENATOR SECONDING MOTION:

MOTION: 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.

JUSTIFICATION: Even though many of the recommendations for the Faculty Handbook from the Promotions committee were already approved by the Senate, some items remained outstanding. However, specific changes required within the Faculty handbook did not include proposed language. This motion will instruct the Promotions Committee to develop this language for consideration by the Senate in the future.

ANTICIPATED IMPACT:

Negative: Updating the Faculty Handbook will take additional time

Positive: The Faculty Senate will have specific language reflecting the Promotions Committee recommendations available to consider in the future.

Is this a recommendation to the Provost? Yes No

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

DATE: Number of Senators Present:

Votes in Favor:

Motion Passes or Fails:

The Parts of the Handbook Recommendations not sent to the Provost because Senate decisions are needed first

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):

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,

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.

Section IV:

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.