

## DRAFT

SU Faculty Senate Meeting  
8 February 2005  
HH 119

Senators present: DeRidder, Diriker, Groth, Hopson, Howard, Matthews, McDermott, McKenzie, Morrison, Muller, Mullins, O'Loughlin, Parker, Pereboom, Rieck, Shannon, Whaley

Senators absent: Venso

0. Mike O'Loughlin called the Senate to order at 3:30 pm. A quorum was present.
1. Mike had several short announcements.
  - A. The Provost and Associate Provost were out of town and unable to present report at this meeting.
  - B. The faculty members looking at curriculum delivery models, as proposed to the senate by President Dudley-Eshbach, have begun their discussions.
  - C. The Employee Relations Committee of the Form is working on its review of the possible problems with the Human Resources Office. A report is due from that committee at the March meeting of the Forum.
2. Dave Parker reported that the Council of University System Faculty recently approved a procedure which would provide a means for faculty to appeal violations of System and SU polies/procedures. A CUSF Policy-Violation Appeals Committee was established. Complete information (Rationale, procedure, and a description of the committee itself) is attached (below) to these minutes.
3. The minutes of senate meeting of 30 November were approved as distributed. The minutes of senate meeting of 23 November were approved as distributed.
4. It was moved and seconded to approve following proposal to amend the senate bylaws by creating a new committee. The proposal was prepared by the Faculty Development Committee. It was moved and seconded by Kathleen Shannon to amend the proposal by inserting, "including the Distinguished Faculty Award," immediately following "distinctions" in paragraph A. The amendment passed. (The amendment appears in italics below.)

### **Faculty Recognition and Awards Committee**

**The purposes of this committee shall be to:**

- A. **Receive from faculty, students, and administrators nominations for distinctions, *including the Distinguished Faculty Award*, presented to eligible SU faculty by non-student organizations, including USM, regional, national, and international committees, bodies, and organizations.**

- B. Develop procedures to evaluate nominations for such distinctions.
- C. Review and submit recommendations to the Provost and President of faculty to be nominated for these distinctions.
- D. Receive nominations, review and make recommendations, following USM guidelines, to the Provost and President, of candidates for honorary degrees to be granted by Salisbury University.
- E. Explore and advertise additional means of recognition afforded by both on-campus and off-campus sources.

The committee shall have five voting members, all tenured professors, one elected to serve on an at-large basis and four elected by and representing each school of the university. Members shall serve three-year terms, two retiring in each of two years, and the one retiring every third. In addition, faculty members serving on the committee shall not be eligible for any recognition under the committee's review for the duration of their service. Should an elected member not be the Designated Senator, a non-voting Designated Senator shall also serve on the committee. The committee shall elect its chairperson annually..

The Senate passed the proposal immediately above, and it will be sent to the Membership and Elections Committee for referendum by the Faculty.

- 5. The following motion was distributed prior to the meeting and was presented by Carol Williamson. It was moved, seconded, and passed.
  - The Fall Convocation opening the academic year at Salisbury University will henceforth take place in the afternoon of the day new students arrive on the University's campus. For fall, 2005, Convocation will therefore be moved to Friday, August 26 at 3:30 p.m.**
- 6. Tony Whall from the Academic Policies Committee presented a previously-distributed proposal to clarify and update the Policy on Grievance Procedures. Note: virtually everything proposed is merely a restatement of existing policy and procedures and does **not** effect significant changes. After being moved and seconded, lively discussion followed. The rewritten policy is much more easily read than is the original, and it is likely that the suggestions and concerns which emerged were due to the new clarity.
  - ! Concerns: The policy is too rigid, that the deck is stacked against the person filing the grievance, and the procedures need to be more flexible.
  - ! Concern: The clock is running while an informal process (which is clearly preferable to a formal one) is taking place, and the grievant might easily lose the right to appeal by failing to make the complaint formal.

! Suggestion: Make it clear that formal grievances must be submitted in writing.

! Comment: This document, its policies, and its procedures are not student-friendly.

A motion to table the motion was defeated. It was noted again that the proposed changes do not represent a significant change to present policies or procedures. However there remained concern that relatively minor changes could make it better. After additional discussion, the motion was tabled. **Mike asked anyone with concerns or suggestions to send them to Tony.**

7. President Janet Dudley-Eshbach had a number of announcements for the Senate.

- A. More than 120 students, faculty, staff, and alumni represented the university at SU day at the legislature.
- B. Particular kudos to Mike Scott and his students who produced land-use maps for each legislator.
- C. She sees mostly good news in the Governor's budget, and things look promising if the legislature doesn't get vindictive. We may even have additional items added later. The Governor failed to include capital funds for the new building for FY '06, but he promised to include it for FY '07. It should still open as scheduled in spite of this delay.
- D. The University System of Maryland and the Regents have been supporting SU. She quoted something extremely positive the Chancellor said about SU. She hopes to get it made more public.
- E. In budget: \$600,000 to fix the roof on the Ward Foundation plus \$200,000 for operating expenses. She noted that this is money we do not have to find somewhere else in our budget.
- F. We can expect about a 5% increase in the SU operating budget. Tuition increases will be in the range of 5 - 5.9%.
- G. She has asked the Provost and Deans to conduct a faculty salary study.
- H. Faculty raises: Estimated 2% COLA, 2.5% merit, but not all of this is funded by the Governor's budget (and would have to come out of operating expenses).
- I. The USM is allowing Janet to explore alternative tuition models (like Miami of Ohio, for example). This paves the way for a possible redesign of the way we deliver our curriculum (See item 1.B. above).
- J. Private giving has produced pledges and other types of delayed donations of about \$10,000,000 which we will see over several years.
- K. Student applications for the fall are up.
- L. Comptroller Shaffer noted that we are running a tight ship, financially speaking.
- M. Finally, she invited the Senate to her home for a social, day and time to be determined.

8. Mike adjourned the meeting shortly after 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Parker, Secretary

Attachment (noted above under item 2):

## **CUSF PROCEDURE FOR FACULTY TO APPEAL VIOLATIONS OF USM AND INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES\***

### **RATIONALE**

Students, Faculty and Staff - including Presidents, Vice Presidents and other administrators of the University System of Maryland (USM) - are required to follow the policies and procedures of their respective campuses. These policies and procedures in turn must, by law, follow those established general policies of the USM Board of Regents. According to Regents policy, every campus Senate (or organizational equivalent) must have an *elected* faculty committee charged with handling any grievances that arise from a faculty member's belief that a policy or procedure has been violated. Although faculty members are expected both to consult with their campus grievance committees and to exhaust all on-campus remedies before appealing to the Council of University System Faculty (CUSF), when a Faculty member at one of the USM institutions does bring a matter to CUSF, the following procedure shall be followed.

### **CUSF POLICY-VIOLATION APPEAL PROCEDURE**

Any member of the USM Faculty may consult with the CUSF Chair on matters in which it is alleged that a President has violated USM or institutional policy/procedures or has failed to rectify a violation of such policy/procedure by lower-ranking administrators. The Faculty member shall identify the specific policy/procedure and the particular administrative action or non-action in question, and shall provide a detailed written explanation of the facts of the matter, including supporting evidence. The Faculty member must also detail the administrative procedures he/she utilized while attempting to seek an on-campus remedy prior to consulting with the CUSF Chair.

The CUSF Chair, at his/her discretion, may either deal personally with the matter, or call a meeting of the CUSF Policy-Violation Appeals Committee to review the matter.

### **CUSF POLICY-VIOLATION APPEALS COMMITTEE**

This committee serves in an advisory capacity to the CUSF Chair on matters concerning alleged violations of USM or institutional policies/procedures.

In addition to the CUSF Chair (ex officio), the Committee shall consist of three members elected by CUSF and serving two-year terms. The three elected members

need not be members of CUSF but must be from different USM institutions. Their terms shall be so staggered that normally no more than two elected members need be elected in any one year.

After careful investigation of any matter referred to it, the Committee will issue its Findings, among which could be the following: A Finding of No Violation, A Finding of a Decision Falling within the Realm of a Presidential Authority, or a Finding of Violation of USM or Institutional Policies/Procedures. Committee Findings may also recommend corrective actions. All Committee Findings and associated evidence and recommendations will be transmitted to the CUSF Chair, who shall convey them to the Faculty member and to the USM Chancellor.

The Committee's actions will be guided by the following principles:

- ! Whenever possible, privacy and confidentiality of persons involved shall be protected.
- ! If the CUSF Policy-Violation Appeals Committee issues a Finding that there has been a violation of USM or institutional policies/procedures and that the USM or institutional remedy is insufficient, the CUSF Chair and the Chancellor's Office shall meet to review the Finding and its associated recommendations.

Ideally the Chancellor will resolve the matter with the institutional President satisfactorily by mutual written agreement. Such an agreement shall be reported to the Faculty member with a copy to the CUSF Chair.

If there is no resolution of the respective views of the Committee and the Chancellor, the CUSF Chair shall so notify the Faculty member and the CUSF.

- ! If the USM Faculty member who lodged the complaint disagrees with a Finding of No Violation or a Finding of a Decision Falling within the Realm of Presidential Authority, he/she may personally file an appeal directly to the Chancellor. The Faculty member shall notify the CUSF Chair when making such an appeal.
- ! The CUSF Policy-Violation Appeals Procedure shall operate in accordance with the POLICY ON SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND which can be found at <http://www.usmd.edu/Leadership/BoardOfRegents/Bylaws/> .

\*Approved unanimously by CUSF  
15 December 2004