

Page Title
Faculty Senate

MINUTES: September 4 2001
Location: HH 119 3 PM

Senators present: Carolyn Bowden Elizabeth Curtin Jerome DeRidder Greg Ferrence Kathleen Fox Victoria Hutchinson Kashi Khazeh Robert Long Doug Marshall Jim McCallops Richard McKenzie Dave Parker David Reick Denise Rotondo Don Whaley

1. Welcome: Richard McKenzie Senate President

Senators introduced themselves. Two senators have stepped down. Their positions will be filled with elections. Rich's goals: efficiency and effectiveness.

2. Provost Comments: David Buchanan

Dr. Buchanan will be preparing an initial report detailing Salisbury University's current stance on Intellectual Property by September 12 so that it can be submitted by the November deadline to USM. Within this academic year decisions will need to be finalized for SU regarding intellectual property. A final report must then be submitted to the system. Dr. Buchanan plans to meet regularly with Faculty Senate President to see how Senate recommends moving this forward.

Dr. Buchanan also proposed reexamining the sabbatical leave policy. The issue of faculty workload needs to be reexamined with results that can be a win-win for everyone. He also requested the senate to look at merit pay issue before decisions need to be made...how it connects with workload and sabbaticals etc.

3. Procedure for role and voting status of designated senators to committees: Jim McCallops

Senators will not be voting members unless they have been elected to that committee. Designated Senators should plan to call the first meeting for purpose of electing chair. Names of elected committee chairs should be forwarded to Rich McKenzie. Brief written reports (monthly?) of committee meetings should be forwarded to Rich McKenzie via e-mail. Reports will be attached to minutes. If committees wish to present oral reports Rich McKenzie should be notified via e-mail no later than noon on Friday preceding the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

4. Status of Gen Ed: Elizabeth Curtin

Program principles and Gen Ed were approved by Senate Spring semester 2001. Issue of "cost analysis" has now moved forward for administrative review. Provost Buchanan is currently seeking ways to address this issue. Additional focus is on looking at how proposed program differs from what is current.

5. Bylaws Revisions: Committee Structure/Election Process: Jim McCallops

Spring semester 2001 each Senate committee examined (and reported) on its membership to ensure the presence of one member from each school. Some committees recommended bylaws changes. Those changes included the role of the designated senator...presence on committees nonvoting status. The Membership and Elections Committee will need to address how to phase in proposed changes. (Note: "Proposed Bylaws Changes" (4/3/01) were sent out by Jim McCallops.)

There was discussion of the policy regarding membership of librarians as voting members. The Senate Executive Committee will address this and correct it if it seems necessary. Dave Parker stated that we would have to amend the bylaws in order for librarians to become voting members of the faculty. No date has been set for voting on bylaws changes. It was suggested that changes could be "grandfathered" in however a procedure would need to be developed for doing this. Long Rang Planning Committee would become standing committee rather than ad hoc.

6. National Faculty Survey: Brian Price

Brian shared information regarding proposed Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey. Every three years (HERI) conducts national faculty surveys. Salisbury University last participated in 1998. Brian presented a draft of the instrument

and a recommended decision to move forward with distribution. Discussion of benefits

of participating included: (1) with over 32000 participants SU would have access to information regarding salaries workload student interaction w/faculty mission curriculum and other issues that span the three year cycle; (2) differences between full-time and contractual faculty would be available; (3) non-instructional productivity would provide expanded list for our faculty; (4) information on diversity and harassment would be available; (5) SU faculty would have comparative data on feelings/pressures they experience; (6) instructional techniques could be shared; and (7) Salisbury University has the option of adding up to 20 additional items.

Some of the negatives included: (1) some survey items are questionable/may not be relevant; (2) response rate is very important for our results to be meaningful; (3) it isn't

known which other institutions have participated (in past Brian stated over 400 participated); (4) time- it takes 20 minutes to complete; (5) faculty who don't respond will be asked (again) to participate through a follow-up contact; (6) there is possibility that data file could be accessed in such a way that others could figure out who responded; Brian did get agreement from William S. Korn HERI Assoc. Dir. for Operations that would assure our data file would be locked; (7) we might find out some things we don't like – and the media could find this out as well. Brian assured that his job is to release data that makes us look good...he will ask the tough questions to see that info is fair. Brian was seeking Senate endorsement for doing the survey...not the survey. From his vantage point he could use info for accreditation policy and planning purposes. This could support faculty's case with regard to

workload etc. if we were to look at other institutions. Controversial info is kept confidential and is given only to our administration and faculty. Brian would like to get 50% survey return rate but believed he could get up to 75% which would make it most valuable. Tenure tenure-track and fulltime contractuales would be invited to participate. Faculty voiced strong concerns that they would not want data used to make administrative decisions especially if the return from faculty participants was minimal. They stated an agreement for confidentiality was important to SU faculty. Dave Parker made a motion that we support the OIR to go forward with the survey. It was seconded. 6 support 5 against 2 abstentions. Note: following the meeting it was determined that the vote did NOT pass according to the Bylaws.

7. Other Business:

Richard McKenzie: Minutes...please read last year's on web site. Send comments to Rich.

Denise Rotondo: Intellectual property rights important issue requiring more time and discussion.

Richard McKenzie: Reminder: (Faculty wishing to bring forward additional items for discussion should submit those items in writing to Rich McKenzie no later than noon on Friday preceding the upcoming Senate Meeting.)

Meeting adjourned at 4:45.

Carolyn Bowden
Recorder

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