

Page Title

SALISBURY STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of the February 16 1999 meeting

Senators Present: Jerome DeRidder Mike Garner Fatollah Salimian Don Whaley Greg Ference Peter Lade Joel Jenne Charles Long Cal Thomas Linda Bush Kathleen Shannon Dave Parker Kathy Fox Dean Defino John Kalb E.J. Crane Elizabeth Curtin

Don Whaley reported on his meeting with the chancellor and other Senate Chairs:

Shared Governance:

They talked about the extent to which faculty should be involved in the budget process. We appear to be the only ones in the system who have much of any input. The chancellor said that it was not so much a question of whether faculty should have input but how they should have it.

There is a concern about the trend of faculty bodies being just one of many university bodies in the governance structure. Towson is also adding more staff and students to the governance body. We are just ahead of everyone on this not alone. The CUSF document on shared governance pretty much follows the AAUP document.

Faculty Salaries:

Don gained a new understanding of the retention money and why we don't have it any more. The chancellor said it was put into place when we weren't getting much additional money for salaries but he wanted us to stay competitive for new faculty and keeping existing faculty. The 20% was always just a suggestion not a rule (George Marks looked like he might not have agreed so don't assume this meant our local people were misrepresenting this to us) Much more money is now available to the institutions and the budget increases should be reflected in faculty salaries. How the money is to be used is not mandated but he will ask Presidents to account for how it was spent.

Task Force Report:

The Task Force Report clearly recommended more institutional autonomy. The chancellor said that this means there must be more accountability. We must have benchmarks and aspirational peers and we will have to measure if we measure up.

Proposed Grievance Policy:

With a few more modifications the Senate was satisfied with the policy. We are now waiting to hear from the Academic Policies committee before final approval. It was suggested that a sample letter for informing parties of the committee's decision be put in the Faculty Handbook to make clear what the policy says about proper notification.

Dave Parker's Motion:

- 1) That any committee transferred from the University Forum to the Faculty Senate be accepted by the Faculty Senate as an *ad hoc* committee (in accordance with the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate Article III Section 2.D.i.);
- 2) That the Membership and Elections Committee of the Faculty Senate assume responsibility *immediately upon transfer of such a committee to the Faculty Senate* for electing or appointing members of the committee (in accordance with the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate Article VII Section 1.D-F);
- 3) That *wherever possible* the purposes responsibilities and membership of each committee remain the same as existed under the University Forum Bylaws and those committee members whose terms have not expired shall continue to serve; and
- 4) That this *ad hoc* status of the committee continue until such time as either the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate are amended to include the committee or the Faculty Senate votes to disband the committee.

Was passed unanimously after some discussion. The main point of the discussion was that this enabled us to say that we are ready to accept any committees which the forum votes to send to us. We are not being precipitous only prepared. Don Whaley will talk to Becky Emery about the IT committee and that out. We invited the Instructional Technology Sub Committee to function as an ad hoc committee of the Senate but since they are still technically a subcommittee of a Forum committee that means they are reporting to 2 different bodies at present. The question arose as to the expanded make-up if the IT committee and it's apparent change in charge as there have been no corresponding changes to the Forum Bylaws. But that is an issue for the Forum not the Senate.

Faculty Workload Issues: Many of us have rethought where we were heading at the last workload meeting. Instead of spinning our wheels defining the SSU faculty member it was suggested that we need to get down to brass tacks. We need to collect all the USM campus policies on workload and the system policy on workload. Peter Lade CUSF representative agreed to get these for us. The issues to be discussed next time include:

Should we formally adopt the Glassick/Boyer model of scholarship. What should we do about the citizenship stuff that won't die - the dean's statement about faculty citizenship activities?

Everyone should bring their faculty handbooks to the next meeting.

Comments and questions about this page can be directed to the [Senate Webmaster](#).