

Draft Minutes of the
SU Faculty Senate Meeting
Dec. 5, 2006
HH 119

Senators present : Curtin, DeRidder, Egan, Groth, Hammond, Hopson, Lawler, Morrison, Mullins, Parker, Rieck, Ritenour, Robinson, Scott, Shannon, Shipper

Senators absent: Howard, Khazeh

1. Pres. Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:32 PM. A quorum was present.
2. Mullins apologized for not sending the minutes from the Nov. 28 meeting out in advance of this meeting. Approval of those minutes was postponed until the next meeting.
3. Announcements from Pres. Mullins
 - The BOR approved the SAT optional proposal at their Dec 1 meeting. Dave Parker, as chair of CUSF, was at that meeting and said that their discussion was similar to that of the senate.
 - Follow-up on Reclassification Issue – Administrative assistants have been told that in order to get a copy of their desk audit they will have to pay .25 per page for their entire personnel folder (which may amount to \$50+) and even then there may be sections that they are not entitled to receive. Although this issue is not in an adversarial situation yet, it is being kicked up to the lawyer level. A couple senators who are also chairs mentioned some inconsistencies between what admin assts. were told at different times –that “permanent changes in job duties” was initially indicated as a reason for a reclass, and that, before the MOU was ratified, supervisor approval for slight variations from stipulations in the MOU was considered OK. We need to keep following this issue.
 - Dave Parker mentioned that he brought up the issue of the lack of full benefits for FTnonTT faculty at the recent BOR meeting. Regents were surprised and disturbed by that fact. We may hear back from the BOR about this in early Feb.
4. No words from the Administration
5. New Business –
 - a). Announcement from University Writing Center – Nicole Munday. The Writing Center experienced much growth this past semester (twice as many sessions as in the previous), due in part to faculty including a statement on their syllabi. They are recruiting new consultants and Nicole asks faculty to e-mail her the names of excellent student writers from all disciplines. Interviews will be in Feb., consultants are trained for a whole semester so, students graduating in Spring 2007 are out. This is a great way for students to further improve their own

writing skills and get 1 credit. Applications are on the web site at <http://www.salisbury.edu/uwc/Jobinformation.htm>. In terms of referring students to the Center for assistance, it should be stressed that it is best for students to come early as the consultants can then help them with the whole process; proof-reading and grammar are just a small part of what they do. On a related issue, Writing Across the Curriculum will pick the top 10 examples of student writing in the spring.

b). Language of new faculty contracts – Bob Tardiff. Bob passed out a handout and mentioned that this would be sent out soon. This is not changing what is done but just the wording of contracts to make clearer and follow what is in the ART document. It changes two problem areas. First, it clarifies the timing of renewal for each of the first three years unless the appointee is notified by specific dates (specified in the contract). Second, it makes clearer the year in which the appointee will be eligible for tenure and promotion review, unless that date is changed by mutual agreement of all parties. A couple senators were concerned about the dates for the renewals in the first three years, but that will be discussed under the next item of new business. Motion made by Mike Scott that we endorse these changes, seconded.

Voice vote, motion carries.

c). Continued discussion of Faculty Welfare Committee proposal to change the deadline for annual faculty evaluations. Senators had received copies of the proposal and a listing of current deadlines from the faculty handbook in advance of meeting. Dave Parker distributed another proposal that included different dates for chair's evaluations of different groups of faculty – Feb 1 for all untenured TT faculty, for all faculty who are candidates for promotion and for all faculty undergoing post-tenure review, and Mar 15 for all other faculty members. Some argued that Parker's proposal would result in an increased burden not just for chairs but also for tenure committees, particularly for large departments, growing departments (as many are now), departments that have retirements coming up in near future. It amounts to making a system that is relatively uncomplicated and works well in most situations into a very complicated system just for a few unusual cases. It also muddies the waters, and gets away from one goal of FWC proposal to separate annual evaluations from non-renewal of contracts for new faculty. These senators favor one-on-one meetings between the chair and the new faculty to discuss progress in the fall semester. Other senators were concerned that the FWC proposal could lead to someone being dismissed during first year without having any evaluation that they could respond to. The idea of "hire at will/fire at will" has been overturned in many states. Others countered that FWC proposal doesn't favor firing of new faculty without input from chair or colleagues, just that it is not a full tenure review which is a big commitment. Also, it has been difficult for chairs to meet the current published deadline of Feb. 1, so it is important to have realistic deadlines that can be met and deadlines should be the same for all faculty.

Shannon made a motion to “Accept the FWC proposal for changing the annual evaluation process deadlines and ask them to develop and propose a procedure for giving feedback to first and second year faculty”. Motion was seconded. More similar discussion followed – including how this would affect other deadlines in faculty handbook. But promotion just requires last 4 years annual evaluations and post-tenure review the last 5. Faculty in those situations could simply submit the last ones they currently have, so that need not be affected.

Vote on Shannon’s motion, 11 in favor, 3 against, 0 abstentions. Motion carries.

d). Proposal for compensation for teaching oversized classes – Frank Shipper. Senators received a copy of his proposal and a table of growth allocations Shipper had received from Gregg Mitchell. As enrollments are increasing so are student/faculty ratios and class sizes which make recruitment and retention for new faculty more difficult. SU is receiving an additional 3.3 million in allocations and some should be directed to increased compensation for faculty that are teaching larger classes. Concerns about the proposal included: the suggestion that “if you pay me more, I can teach more”, we have looked long & hard at appropriate class sizes; the variation already seen in class size; concerns about the treatment of overload; differences in the amount of work for different courses (some small classes are more work than some larger classes); against the idea of tying class size to money. But supporters say, class sizes are going to increase anyway, shouldn’t we be paid more for having to work more. In an ideal situation, the class sizes would be kept small, but that is not likely to happen. Others agree that we need more support, but in way other than money (increased travel budgets, more administrative assistants) and requesting more money for our pockets at this time would appear self-serving. Other felt we should be more adamant about keeping class sizes at appropriate levels, adding sections when possible. Another concern, that low enrollment courses may be cancelled and faculty reallocated to high enrollment courses. Some departments allow the enrollments in some courses to go high in order to preserve their low enrollment courses.

A motion was made and seconded to table the motion. Voice vote, motion carries.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Ellen Lawler, Secretary