

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MOTION

Submit this form to the Faculty Senate President

SUBJECT: **FWC Recommendation on Required Training and Merit Pay**

SENATOR PROPOSING MOTION: **Memo Diriker**

SENATOR SECONDING MOTION: **Thomas Lamey**

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

The Faculty Senate accepts the *FWC Recommendation on Required Training and Merit Pay* and forwards it to the Interim Provost with its full endorsement.

JUSTIFICATION:

As described in the attached recommendation, the FWC, in response to the FS charge to propose a policy regarding required training for Faculty, reviewed Salisbury University's current process for mandated trainings; performed outreach to the SU faculty, Provost's office, and the General Counsel's office; as well as examined the policies of other academic institutions. The recommendation contains such a proposed policy for SU.

ANTICIPATED IMPACT:

Negative:

Positive: **X**

Is this a recommendation to the Provost? Yes **X** No _____

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

VOTE: Number of Senators Present:

Motion Passes or Fails:

FWC Recommendation on Required Training and Merit Pay

Background:

In response to the charge to propose a policy regarding required training for Faculty from the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Welfare Committee, in order to inform its deliberations, reviewed Salisbury University's current process for mandated trainings; performed outreach to the SU faculty, Provost's office, and the General Counsel's office; as well as examined the policies of other academic institutions.

Faculty Welfare Committee's due diligence:

- **Outreach to faculty:** The committee surveyed (informally and formally) faculty across the university to obtain feedback about the questions initially posed by Faculty Senate in our charge. These faculty responses were aggregated and reviewed in our December meeting. Overall, they lean toward not tying in mandatory trainings to merit pay, based on the argument that these are good-faith civic duty obligations that faculty seem to have been performing without additional policy and reward/consequence structures.
- **Outreach to SUs general counsel:** The committee reached out to the SU General Counsel's office for feedback about how mandated trainings come to the university from the federal and state government and the implications of non-compliance with mandated trainings. Since Karen Treber has retired, the committee was referred to an email contact for the SU General Counsel Office. We did not receive a response to our inquiry.
- **Outreach to Provost's office:** The committee also reached out to the Provost's Office to learn more about the percentage of faculty who did not complete required trainings. As of February 2nd, 2026, the acting Provost did not have that data available.

To the best of our knowledge, the Faculty Welfare Committee believes that in general, faculty non-compliance with mandated trainings is rare. Given the absence of hard institutional data, our recommendation below reflects our informal research on faculty feedback and the examination of online archival documents from other institutions and thus is based on the limited SU-specific information available to us. Without data on the prevalence or institutional consequence(s) of non-compliance, the FWC does not believe it has justification to recommend additional incentives for completion or punitive consequences for non-compliance.

Recommendation:

The completion of required trainings demonstrates the faculty's commitment to responsible and informed conduct in the performance of their duties and falls under the larger domain of civic duty to the institution. Institutional policies on mandated trainings should be crafted with organizational deliberation and transparency. The timeline for completion of the trainings should be clear and communicated at least one semester in advance. Completion of the trainings should not be tied to merit pay, which becomes a long-term financial penalty for the faculty denied it. Thus, we recommend that:

First, any proposal about mandatory trainings should be based on (a) deliberation and consensus around (b) a clear rationale with (c) a clear timeline for rollout and completion and d) potential consequences if applicable. Consensus for the rationale, criteria, and scope for identifying which training is mandatory should be deliberated, and could include legal and/or affirmed institutional values such as safety or a supportive campus environment or those defined through policies around Title IX, inclusion and access or the mandate of related offices at SU such as the [Office of Access & Accommodations \(OAA\)](#), the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion \(ODI\)](#), and/or the [Office of Institutional Equity](#).

Second, Academic Affairs will decide which trainings are required for faculty in consultation with representative(s) of the Faculty Senate (FS) and the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC). In the event that proposed mandated training is not approved by these representatives or becomes contentious within the faculty at large, FS reserves the right to request further discussion prior to implementation.

Third, Faculty must be made aware of any required training at least one semester in advance, preferably before the beginning of the Fall semester for completion at the end of the winter break. Faculty should be able to verify that they have completed all required trainings on GullNet or WorkDay, and receive an email confirming completion.