

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**May 9, 2000**  
**Holloway Hall, Room 119**

Present: Carolyn Bowden, E.J. Crane, Elizabeth Curtin, Jerome DeRidder, Greg Ference, Kathy Fox, Joel Jenne, Kashi Khazeh, Peter Lade, Jim McCallops, Michael O'Loughlin, Dave Parker, David Rieck, Fati Salimian, Kathleen Shannon, Cal Thomas, Marvin Tossey, Don Whaley

Meeting began at 3:50 p.m.

**Opening Remarks - Dr. Lade**

Dr. Lade opened the meeting with a request from Bryan Price to recruit a representative from the Faculty Senate and one faculty member at large to help with the periodic review of Middle States.

This is just a review process and not a Middle States re-certification process. Dr. Lade would like wait until the Senate elections are completed so that we will know who is eligible. He also thanked the senators and guests for attending the Social today (May 9).

**Summer/Winter Pay Plan**

Lisa Seldomridge, on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee, introduced for discussion the new summer/winter pay plan prepared by a committee working with Avery Saulsbury. Mr. Saulsbury presented the plan point by point, answering questions about the plan including concerns about connections between class size and pay and about how to compensate faculty who teach classes that are necessarily small. It was pointed out that this plan was really not salary enhancement but something quite separate. This plan does reward people who have the optimum class sizes, somewhere between 12 and 28 or 35. Graduate departments such as English, history, nursing and business might have some difficulty with summer classes that need to be small. It was pointed out that the deans would have some discretion in subsidizing faculty salaries to be sure that faculty were not penalized for teaching courses for a lower number of students when there was a good justification for that smaller number. Students who were attending on tuition waivers would be counted in the enrollment count. Dr. Shannon made a motion to accept this plan with two caveats: 1) that deans be encouraged to supplement the plan when advisable for courses which promote the mission of the university's school or department and 2) that it be clearly understood that the linking of summer school or winter term compensation to class size not be seen as an indication that class size during the regular semester should be linked to faculty load counts. The motion was seconded and the floor was open for discussion. One concern was that there was no delineation among ranks. The committee felt that the amount of work for the summer/winter courses involved would be the same for everyone, regardless of rank. Apparently, there are cases where people brought in from outside are paid more. The resolution from the Faculty Welfare Committee was to endorse the summer/winter pay plan that was presented to us with the two caveats from Dr. Shannon. The

motion passed: 17 for the proposal, 0 opposed. This plan would be in effective winter 2001.

### **Bylaw Change Linking Promotion to Tenure**

A discussion of proposing a link between tenure and a promotion to associate professor took place. Dr. Shannon distributed to the Senate some language to replace the a footnote in the Faculty Handbook concerning promotion to Associate Professor to read

“Under ordinary circumstances, granting of tenure at Salisbury State University implies that these criteria [criteria for promotion to associate] have been met. Any faculty member who is or has been granted tenure without meeting these criteria will be given written notice from the provost of (1) the reason he/she is not considered to have met the criteria, (2) a description of the evidence he/she must provide in order to be considered as having met the criteria and (3) an indication of who will be evaluating this evidence and an outline of the process by which it will be evaluated.”

Dr. Shannon also introduced a second change in the handbook concerning procedures to read as follows:

“Untenured Instructors who attain a terminal degree will be promoted to Assistant Professor upon the recommendation of their department chair. Tenured Instructors who meet the criteria outlined on page 27 (2) will be promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor upon the recommendation of their department chair\* or school dean\* at the beginning of the next contract period. Tenure Assistant Professors who meet the criteria outlined on page 27 (3) will be promoted to rank of Associate Professor upon the recommendation of their department chair\* or school dean\* at the beginning of the next contract period. Assistant Professors will not be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor unless they are first granted tenure. **Footnote:** \*These recommendations will be made in accordance with department and school policies.”

This means that the departments can have promotion committees that inform those department chairs' recommendations. This will allow the school or department to decide how they want to implement their own policies. The dean and department chairs will make their own decisions according to their respective policies.

There was extensive discussion about the proposals. They do suggest a move to put a much heavier burden on the tenure decision. The motion was reinstated as a continuing motion that was made with revisions. It was clear that the proposed procedure would place the decision much more in the hands of the department and that it would suggest that tenure without a recommend for promotion would be the exception, rather than the rule. The new procedure would eliminate the role of the University Promotions Committee at the associate level rank. The department, the dean and the provost all would all make the recommendations.

After further discussion occurred about finer points, for example, what would be procedures for people who are now tenured but had not yet been promoted. A motion was made to table this issue, and it was seconded and passed 17 to 0. The charge is to make some revisions and then send those revisions by email prior to the next meeting to allow the senate to review it.

### **General Education Task Force**

The Senate had conducted a vote about the General Education documents concerning learning principles and learning goals. The next step will be to take the results of that vote to the Faculty Senate and ask for its endorsement of the documents. A motion was made to ask the Nominations/Elections Committee to conduct a second vote at the Task Force's request to indicate whether proposed gen ed models were acceptable or unacceptable. The motion was seconded and open for discussion. The ballot was distributed to the senators. Dr. Richards clarified that the Task Force would look at the results of this informational vote so that over the summer the committee could work on those models and incorporate the feedback that has been given by individuals and by departments into the models that people feel are most acceptable and not spend time on those that people find clearly unacceptable. In the fall, they would then be prepared to have an open meeting as they did in February looking at the acceptable models and asking faculty again to give input, feedback, etc.

A discussion followed that raised the following issues:

1. the role of the Senate in any final decisions
2. the possibility of maintaining the current model
3. the reconsideration of a foreign language requirement
4. the number of students who would test out of the proposed language requirements

The final motion was reiterated as follows:

“that the Senate would conduct an informational ballot, one clearly marked as informational, asking first about preferences for a language requirement and second asking which of the models was superior, acceptable or in need of revision.” The vote was seconded. A friendly amendment was made to modify the time frame to allow a reasonable opportunity for the committee to construct a ballot and include the models and the amendment was accepted. The vote was 13 yes and there were 4 opposed. The motion passed.

Two documents regarding the outsourcing were distributed explaining what ad hoc RFP committees had recommended about privatizing duplication services or the bookstore. Dr. Jones will meet with the Senate to discuss the two documents at the next meeting. Dr. Lade suggested that the senators read the two before the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

### **Motions Restated**

1. That the Senate accept the proposed plan for summer/winter pay with two caveats: 1) that deans be encouraged to supplement the plan when advisable for courses which promote the mission of the university's school or department and 2) that it be clearly understood that the linking of compensation for summer school to class size not be seen an indication that class size during the regular semester should be linked to faculty load counts. Motion passed 17-0.

A motion was made to table the change concerning linking tenure to promotion to associate professor and it was seconded. All 17 present were in favor of the motion.. The charge is to make some revisions and then send those revisions by email prior to the meeting to allow the senate to review it.

That the Senate would conduct an informational ballot, one clearly marked as informational asking first about preferences for a language requirement and second which of the models was superior, acceptable or in need of revision. A friendly amendment was made to modify the time frame to allow a reasonable opportunity for the committee to construct a ballot and include the models and the amendment was accepted. The vote was 13 in favor and 4 opposed. The motion passed.