

**Faculty Senate**  
**HH 119**  
**October 8, 2002**

**Minutes**

**Present:** E. Curtin, Jerome DeRidder, V. Hutchinson, R. Long, D. Marshall, D. Mathews, , R. McKenzie, K. Milner, M. Mitchell, D. Mullins, M. O'Loughlin, D. Parker, D. Rieck, D. Rotondo, B. Talbert, D. Whaley

**Absent:** N. Hopson, P. McDermott , M. Mitchell, D. Parker

**Announcements** - Rich McKenzie, Chair

1. Promotions proposals: Dr. McKenzie announced that the UPC was asking departments to look at the possibility of accepting last year's proposal to form school committees and to consider departmental expectations for promotion. He further suggested that the October 29 usual Faculty Senate meeting time be given up so that Senators can meet with faculty in the schools that they represent to discuss the proposals. At-large senators might meet with schools other than their own to get a broad view of faculty opinions on the issues
2. Volunteers for Ad Hoc Committees: Dr. McKenzie explained that when possible he would ask for volunteers for committee assignments that he is asked to fill. He explained also, though, that the same people are often asked to serve on many committees, so he is trying to spread around the work when possible and ask people who have not volunteered to serve on some of the committees he is asked to fill.

**Remarks from the Provost** - David Buchanan

1. Rental property issues: Dr. Buchanan said that Dr. Carol Williamson has been named the university point person for the rental property controversy. She sits on the town committee that is examining the problem and would be happy to meet with small groups of faculty who would like to discuss the issues. She also would come to a Faculty Senate meeting if the Faculty Senate would like her to do so.
2. State Budget: So far we are operating with a balanced budget for this year. The concern is over the next fiscal year's budget. There is another new hiring freeze that does not affect faculty. There is also talk that the university may be asked to return 5-10% of our PIN lines, not to include faculty positions. President Dudley-Eshbach sent a letter to the Chancellor asking him to ask the Board of Regents to ask for a dollar amount to be returned rather than a percentage of PIN lines, which could vary in cost greatly. The Chancellor supported her request and will send it with his support to the B or R.

3. Board of Regents Faculty Awards: The Board of Regents has asked for nominations for their faculty rewards in several categories. The nominations must come from the faculty, but the Provost's Office will help nominees put together packets of materials to submit. Dr. Memo Diriker pointed out that at a recent CUSF meeting, it was noted that SU was the only university that did not submit nominees in two of the categories last year.

4. Follow-up on remarks from opening session: A version of the remarks Dr. Buchanan made at the opening meeting is on the Web. He wants us to bring the Tenure and Promotion to associate professor more in line so that faculty could use the same materials for both. He also hopes that departments will develop written statements of their expectations for promotion as well as for tenure. Dr. Marshall indicated that the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is developing guidelines for tenure procedures. Dr. Buchanan further stated that he and the deans would welcome an opportunity to be involved with discussion at the departmental or school meetings.

### **Approval Of Minutes**

Sept. 24 (attached)

### **Business:**

I. Status of General Education Assessment Committee - Arlene White  
Because of a prior commitment, Dr. White was unable to attend this meeting. She will report on the status at the October 22 meeting.

II. Honorary Degree Committee - Rich McKenzie

The Provost has requested that we provide guidance about forming an Honorary Degree Committee. According to the B of R, this committee must be elected by the faculty from among our Full Professors.

**A motion was made and seconded to ask the Membership and Elections Committee to look into determining the number of people on this committee and running an election for it. The motion passed 12-1.**

III. Smoking in University cars - Jerry DeRidder/Memo Diriker

**At the request of Dr. Diriker, Dr. DeRidder made the following motion:**

**“The Salisbury University Faculty Senate recommends that, as currently is the case for all other enclosed work spaces, university owned vehicles be declared ‘Smoke Free Work Spaces.’”** A friendly amendment was proposed to add “at least 60% of” before “university owned vehicles,” but the amendment was not accepted. After considerable discussion, **a motion was made to table the motion. The motion to table passed 11 for and 2 against.**

IV. High Merit Proposal - Rich McKenzie/David Buchanan

Dr. Buchanan explained that he had shared the proposal on high merit that the Faculty Senate has sent to him last spring with the deans and that from his point of view there were three problems: no definition of standards that could be used to determine high merit (1), the exclusion of faculty librarians from those eligible

for these awards (11), and the possibility that a backlog of faculty deserving the award in years no money was available could deplete the funds in years when there is money (12). Dr. Buchanan is sending the document back to the Senate for clarification.

After discussion of the intentions of the proposal, **a motion was made and seconded to revoke Faculty Senate approval of the proposal from the previous year. The motion passed 11 for, 1 against, and one abstention.**

A second motion was made to send the document back to the Faculty Welfare Committee with the understanding that they would consult with some members of the Human Resources office or faculty who teach Human Resource Management. That motion was withdrawn, **and a motion was made and seconded to send the document back to Faculty Welfare. That motion passed 11 for, 1 against, and 1 abstention.**

IV. Reaffirmation of the Boyer-Glassick model – David Rieck

David Rieck made the following motion:

**“The Faculty Senate reaffirms its belief that scholarship should be viewed broadly as described by Boyer in his book, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Furthermore, all members of the Faculty Senate Committee on Promotions should be familiar with the Boyer model of scholarship and should consider it when evaluation applications for promotion.”**

A friendly amendment was suggested and accepted that the last “should” be changed to “will.”

Dr. Marshall proposed the following as a second friendly amendment:

“Variations in the emphasis and interpretation of the concepts of scholarship may be made by various schools.”

Dr. Rieck accepted the amendment. After discussion about how the second amendment might be interpreted, Dr. Rieck proposed that his original motion be tabled. **His motion for tabling passed 11 for, 1 against, and 1 abstention.**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.