**Faculty Senate (FS) Agenda**

November 27, 3:30 p.m.

Senate Chambers: Holloway Hall 119

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

Senators in attendance: Chrys Egan (President), Jenn Jewell (Vice President), Christy Harper (webmaster), David Rieck, Kathleen Shannon, Anita Brown, Steve Adams, James Parrigin, Jennifer Martin, Aaron Hogue, Kosta Kyriacopoulos, Deneen Long-White, Emily Story, Chris Vilmar, Charles Boster, Adam Wood, Sandy Pope (secretary).

Quorum: 17/18

Meeting called to order: 3:30pm

1. Welcome/Introductions from President Wight
	1. No announcements; thanks to Dr. Wight for bringing cupcakes
	2. Question: Is there an option to give residents from Delmarva reduced out-of-state-tuition?
	3. Response: We already do that, called the “good neighbor policy.”
	4. Question: You mentioned wanting to grow to 10,000. Are we also looking at increased classroom space to accommodate more potential students?
	5. Response: Yes we are working on that. The new property at Court Plaza, for instance, should allow changes on the main campus such as tearing down Dogwood Village or similar spaces.
	6. Comment: Some have suggested combining faculty and staff cupcake birthday events.
	7. Response: A good suggestion worth considering.
2. Approval of Minutes (11/20/18 attached)
	1. Minutes approved, as corrected
3. Announcements from the Senate President
	1. Gull Card +1
		1. Program for faculty, staff, and family members. Benefits seem to be changing. We expect more information at the Feb 12 meeting.
	2. Consortium Traffic Committee on parking
		1. Will ask them to examine parking issues that are beyond the purview of the Faculty Senate.
	3. New faculty taxed on moving reimbursement
		1. Kevin Vedder from HR will join FS on Feb 26th to provide information on this and other items such as the results of the pilot search process.
	4. Discussion of *Leading Academic Change*. Dec 5th at 5:30 in the Faculty Lounge
	5. Faculty and Friends Friday. December 7th from 4-6:00pm in the Faculty Lounge
4. Remarks from Interim Provost – None, unable to attend due to another meeting.
5. Unfinished Business
	1. Proposed School of Graduate Studies – Chris Vilmar (5 attachments)
		1. Justifications include:
			1. Expected increased enrollments into the future. The administration and various programs desire increased growth. There are advantages to increased marketing, having a registrar, supporting recruitment, and potential new programs. The main negative is the cost, but that is expected to be offset by increased enrollments.
			2. The proposed budget has received increased detail in response to Senate requests.
			3. Review of peer institutions for best practices.
			4. Goal is having the infrastructure in place should new graduate programs find interest.
		2. Question: Have you discussed the role of faculty representation under the new “unit” structure?
		3. Response: Our bylaws have been changed to reflect unit rather than school
		4. Response: The reporting line for faculty has not been explored. There has been no commitment of funds from the administration; this needs to be more than a nameplate change on the door. This motion is giving administration impetus to perhaps consider this more thoughtfully.
		5. Comment: The motion does seem to recommend a Graduate School to the administration, not that the administration consider it.
		6. Response: If you read it that way, know that there are no resources allocated.
		7. Comment: Correct, this reads as an instruction for administration to find and allocate those resources.
		8. Response: But no resources have been allocated.
		9. Comment: Reviewing the March 13 report, the rationale lists many goals. What, short of creating a new school, has been attempted towards achieving the desired goals, and what were the results of those efforts?
		10. Response: There has been an attempt at many of the goals but they have been decentralized. The efforts are left to the individual graduate program directors. School of Graduate Studies would free the grad directors to do what they need to do, to provide direct supports for students.
		11. Comment: That is not consistent across schools. Some schools or programs have those resources.
		12. Comment: Several programs also have embedded instructional designers. The March 13 report went from half-staff to full-time staff.
		13. Response: The original report was what we thought we could get; the revised proposal reflects Graduate Council’s interest in requesting what is needed.
		14. Comment: I don’t have a good vision of how this would function as a School. Would we be moving faculty?
		15. Response: It would be like the Honors College. There is no intent to move faculty; the support would come from a centralized school.
		16. Comment: It would make more sense to request greater support for the current office and dean of grad studies and research. Making a school and changing the name does not seem to address what is needed.
		17. Response: It should provide leverage, credibility, and centralized support. We are doing the best we can, and doing a stellar job, but with the support being requested things would be even better.
		18. Comment: We already have an Office of Graduate Studies with a dean. That would be the right way to advocate for additional resources that you need. What would happen to that office if we had a School?
		19. Response: It’s not a new title, nor is it a raise. This came out of the last strategic plan, to have the conversation.
		20. Question: It seems right that we could do better with marketing, support, ID&D. In the Registrar’s Office, are graduate enrollments the greatest need?
		21. Response: Not the greatest need but if they continue to grow, we will need more support. There is a lot of work being done in departments that belong in the Registrar’s office. To grow graduate programs the ways that we’ve been told they would, we will need more staffing.
		22. Comment: USM is not providing more money, nor more PIN lines. So we have to ask where this falls in the hierarchy of needs.
		23. Comment: We are often asked to make decisions without knowing the bigger context. But we are being asked to endorse a recommendation rather than make a recommendation. The stipends for graduate directors have not increased although the requirements have.
		24. Question: As an undergraduate program director I have similar duties but no reassigned time or stipend. Reassigned time has been broached in various contexts the last year but is not included in the budget; how is that accounted for in this proposal?
		25. Response: It has not been discussed; fair compensation for faculty work needs to be addressed at all levels.
		26. Comment: Grad Council seems to be coming to Faculty Senate with the underlying sense that they need help. Perhaps we could form a suggestion that administration look at ways to alleviate the challenges, short of forming a new college.
		27. Comment: Seidel School took a hit when half the programs were removed from our unit. We are struggling with enrollments, outreach, and the same efforts mentioned here. Constituents are not supportive of siphoning $300,000 for this new school.
		28. Comment: Many of the issues are about communication and the roles that people should have. The framework for support from a potential Graduate College is not clear enough in the proposal. The general provision of resources is worth discussing but the details have not been worked out. Efforts to raise concerns about graduate issues have not been dealt with in the past; it’s not clear that this proposal will address that.
		29. Comment: The definition of a “unit” does require at least 2% of faculty. Thus we could not form a unit with the present bylaws without including faculty. Reading the motion without having read the attachments and comments would presume that the Senate is recommending (endorsing a motion to recommend) a Graduate College.
		30. Question: The number of masters programs at peer institutions is far higher (20 at most institutions, compared to 15 at SU). Is there a tipping point at which the institutions sought a school or college?
		31. Response: It is not clear, though SU does have 18 programs.
		32. Comment: Two aspirational institutions, those within USM, have offices rather than colleges. What is different about SU to justify this change when other universities have not?
		33. Response: It’s worth asking what SU needs, not what other USM schools need.
		34. A new motion was made by Kathleen Shannon and seconded by Jennifer Martin: The Faculty Senate recognizes the importance of some of the concerns included in the report from Graduate Council in which they recommend a School of Graduate Studies. The Faculty Senate asks that administration consider ways to address the needs included in the report and to identify possible sources of revenue to achieve the goals listed. Faculty Senate also asks what sacrifices would need to be made to address the concerns raised in the report.
		35. Comment: Even the re-written motion does not address many of the concerns from the Graduate College.
		36. Question: I am hesitant to draft motions on the floor. Could we ask the Grad Council to work on revising this motion and bring it back?
		37. Comment: There are aspects of the report that are important, but there are parts where I am not sympathetic.
		38. Response: I am very sympathetic to the need to look at broad supports for faculty, and for more information to be able to make strategic decisions. This could help to address the need for that information.
		39. Comment: That follows the motion from 11/20 requesting more involvement in financial affairs.
		40. Comment: All we are doing is asking the administration to look at this. We should not wait until the February meeting.
		41. Comment: The last sentence of the revised motion still requests the supports for a school of graduate studies, but it is not clear that such a school is necessary. The administration should work with program directors to identify needs and possible solutions; that may result in a School of Graduate Studies.
		42. Comment: If the motion says “A School of Graduate Studies” then people will think we are asking for a School of Graduate Studies. The goal should be addressing the issues raised in the report.
		43. **Motion to postpone to the next meeting David Rieck; Seconded Adam Wood. 9/17 motion passes.**
	2. Ad hoc All-Faculty Voting Committee clarification: for February 12 deliverables: (1) a procedural recommendation that provides a basis for voting that could be amended at the time of deliberation OR (2) changes to the bylaws of the faculty senate that would be binding without a subsequent change to the bylaws.
		1. Comment: I thought we also wanted the Senate to endorse the principles that came forward about the procedures. That would avoid the Senate rejecting a resultant proposal for not following their intentions.
		2. Question: The impetus for this is potential General Education review. Is that expected to happen this spring?
		3. Response: We don’t know. It depends on when GESC brings us a model.
		4. Question: So we need a way for people to vote electronically on Gen Ed?
		5. Response: That is part of the issue for some faculty, but many constituents ask why we can have electronic votes for electing Senators and updating Bylaws but not for voting on issues. We owe them a well-considered explanation.
		6. Response: We are also not trying to take away the all-faculty vote.
		7. Comment: This could allow a supermajority of Senate to send items to a faculty vote, with particular requirements for meetings or deliberations.
		8. Question: Does the committee have a preference?
		9. Response: The motion originally mentioned bylaws but that removed in the final charge.
		10. Comment: I am concerned about what might happen if the Senate can just call an all-faculty vote because that can remove the Senate’s role. The only way to have a binding vote is to change the bylaws.
		11. Comment: I am in favor of a bylaw change but it still warrants discussing what the Senate wants.
		12. Comment: This is not just about Gen Ed. This has been raised in the past. A move to four-credit courses was an all-faculty vote; discussions of plus-minus did not go to an all-faculty vote.
		13. Comment: Over one-third of social work faculty are not on this campus. They cannot participate in an on-campus all-faculty vote.
		14. Comment: It seems that the safer option would be for the committee to come up with a recommendation and propose that to the Faculty Senate.
		15. Comment: Then the Senate needs to review the specifics that the committee have generated thus far.
		16. Comment: In which case we will need to push back the deliverable date. This will probably not be before the Feb 12th meeting.
6. New Business
	1. Transcript Language Motion from the Academic Policies Committee – Anita Brown (attached)
		1. When students go on academic probation, the reasons are posted at the bottom of their transcript and on GullNet. It is labeled as “admission revocation” but students do not know what that means.
		2. Comment: We have never revoked anyone’s admission, but this results in questions from other institutions, including within the USM because no one else uses this term. The more accurate term is “restricted status.” That allows students to take 2 classes as non-degree seeking. Even in the result of dismissal, students can return after 5 years requesting clemency. This is an effort to clarify the terms being used.
		3. Comment: Academic Policies Committee also reviewed this and supports it fully.
		4. Comment: To make it clear, could we specify “Undergraduate”?
		5. Response: Yes
		6. **Motion to change academic standing language on undergraduate student transcripts, Anita Brown; seconded Kathleen Shannon. 16/17; motion passes**
	2. Academic Policies Committee Charge on Final Exam Schedule and Class Times – Anita Brown (attached)
		1. This would ask APC to work with the Registrar to find a better system to create and display.
		2. Question: Could we also request for the grid to come back?
		3. Response: Yes, that should be back up this week.
		4. Comment: The actual schedule is not a policy matter.
		5. **Motion to charge APC with considering changes to final exam scheduling, Anita Brown; seconded Kosta Kyriacopoulos. 16/17; motion passes**
7. Other Business

Adjourn (5:00 PM)

Submitted: Sandy Pope

Webmaster: Christy Harper