

Minutes of the Salisbury University Faculty Senate
February 28, 2012
Holloway Hall, Rm. 119

Senators Present: Thomas Anderson, Mara Chen, J. Craig Clarke, Douglas DeWitt, Greg Ference, Theodore Gilkey, John Kalb, Kashi Khazeh, Kurt Ludwick, David Parker, Elizabeth Ragan, David Rieck, Donna Ritenour, Michael Scott, Vera Street, Bart Talbert, Adam Wood

Senators Absent: Danny Ervin

- I. Senate President Gilkey called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.; quorum present.
- II. Minutes: Approved for the November 22, 2011, Note: Sexual Harassment Policy is still in process. Minutes approved for February 14, 2012 (with corrections)
- III. Remarks from the Faculty Senate President
 1. Senate President Gilkey clarified that the summer schedule features June 1 through June 15 as faculty vacation days and that the 10 month contract is from August 15 through June 15. Any work in June 1 to August 15 can be service to the University.
- IV. Two items have been implemented: The proposed changes to the academic program review process and the changes to the sabbatical policy.
- V. Provost's remarks
 1. Introduced new University General Counsel, Jen Palancia Shipp. Her office is across the hall from Provost Allen.
 2. Met with Finance Committee regarding faculty salary study. Will be presenting the matrix from the committee by April and the SU faculty salary information can be loaded and the study data will follow.
 3. Note Taking Service: The company "Note-All" has been (accidentally) contacting faculty thinking they were students. They accidentally contacted Associate Provost Perrault. She advised the company regarding our student code of conduct.
 4. Computer replacement policy: IT has identified 171 computers to be replaced and an additional 200 units that can be upgraded. These steps are funded and could be in place by the fall. New computers can be lap tops or desk top models.
- VI. Unfinished business:
 1. Collegiality issue: The issue was removed from the table and opened for discussion. Professor Marshall asked for discussion regarding the offered language. Senator Parker remarked that these issues can and have been used to squash dissent or to repress a minority view. He voiced concern that more departments could use the collegiality issue as a stick with those that disagree with senior colleagues. Senator Rieck offered that the AAUP opposes collegiality as a unique issue apart from teaching, development and service for tenure. Senator Ludwick asked if the language intended collegiality as a fourth leg or a separate and unequal element. Is the intent to have departments use this language? Senator Khazeh asked how the issue rose to the committee. Professor Marshall remarked that it was a national issue that he brought to the committee. Senator Khazeh asked if some "unique" personality be denied

tenure. Can there be a better word for democratic in the language. Professor McDermott offered that collegiality is historically used to oppose diversity. Of the three case files distributed, one was written by a University General Counsel and that the other two were in opposition to collegiality from the AAUP as a leg for advancement and described this as dangerous to faculty. Professor Shannon remarked that the University is not "Them" it is "Us" and supports the issue. Senator Scott recommends supporting the issue and has received support from colleagues and believes that the recognition of collegial behavior is a desirable thing, though he recognizes the dark side of the issue. Professor McDermott suggested that those who are "pro" collegiality sounded "Chair-ish" or managerial in nature. Senator Street offered that her feedback was overwhelmingly against the issue and suggested that this might be offered to the full faculty. Senator Kalb asked if this is a fourth leg with teaching, development and teaching or a half-leg. He suggests that it appears to be an "illumination" of service issues. He is more concerned with collegiality being considered beyond the tenure process in university life and that it not be used as a bar against diversity. Senator Parker offered that the full faculty could address this issue by senate request or by a petition of 10% of the faculty. Senator Ludwig suggested that placement of the language was questionable and that most of the issue's language is already present. Professor Marshall offered the issue was placed at the first reference to the three legs. Senator Chen suggested that collegiality seems to be aligned with service but that it should be distributed among teaching and development as well. She also offered that the language would seem to be more important for certain departments such as music and art. Senator DeWitt offered that non-tenured faculty worries that the collegiality issue could be used against them. Senator Street shares this concern and offers that there is no good definition for collegiality, some of this points to service and mentoring. How do you submit collegiality? Do we want criteria that are difficult to define? Why impose this issue if departments are already using criteria with their own language? Professor Marshall offered that courts have held that collegiality is a criteria whether documented or not. Senator Parker is concerned that we are not solving a problem but creating one. He doesn't know what collegiality means and he cannot support the issue without greater understanding. Senator Talbert offered that collegiality is not antagonistic, not hostile, and not unfriendly. Would it include "would not do my bidding", or "would not support my work"? Professor McDermott worries that new hires are supported. Senator Scott suggests that an opportunity to define collegiality or to define what it is not (like obscenity, you'll know it when you see it), that the difficulty of the issue is not a reason not to try. Professor Shannon offered that if a lack of collegiality could be used against tenure would a definition help to protect the candidate?

2. The question was called. Does the Senate accept the language on Collegiality as offered? In favor 2, opposed 9, 17 voting senators present.

VII. New Business

1. All-Faculty Meeting: Reduced / revised list of issues from the all-faculty meeting. See forwarded revision.
2. Senate Term Limit issue will carry over.

93
94
95

3. Motion to adjourn was passed at 5:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Tom Anderson, Senate Recording Secretary