

Senate Meeting 2/3/09

Senators attending: Wood, Curtin, Welsh, Rieck, Khazeh, Gilkey, Weaver, Scott, Shannon, O'Loughlin, Ludwick, McDermott, Parker

Senators absent: Clarke, Walton, DeWitt, Street, Robeck

I. Announcements from the Senate President

O'Loughlin called meeting to order at 3:31. Quorum was present at 3:33

Welcome back for the spring semester. Welcome to Senator Parker of the Department of Mathematics. Parker is a one-semester replacement for Zaprowski, who is on sabbatical

II. Remarks from the Provost, Dr. Tom Jones

Budget:

The USM is in a "hold mode" as the legislative session begins. Legislators are looking for places to make cuts. Governor is trying to protect higher education. He added 4% increase over last year's budget, enabling system schools to hold the line on tuition increases for the 4th straight year. By the end of February/beginning of March, we should have a better idea of what budget we will be left with. State revenue estimates are uncertain. USM budget looks good, given the state's fiscal circumstances. Because the budget for next year is built from our reduced budget from this year, assumes the hiring freeze stays in place for 2010, and doesn't compensate for inflation, a flat budget is really a reduced budget

Hiring:

Of 16 needed tenure-track faculty replacements, 8 searches moving forward, 4 are on hold in reserve, and 4 moving to full-time non-tenure track faculty

Enrollment: likely to be the same as last year, perhaps fractionally higher

Khazeh – Asked for clarification regarding what would happen if the governor's proposed 4% increase was cut by legislature. Jones responded that we would be forced to raise tuition

III. Approval of minutes from Senate meetings of November 25 and December 9, 2008

Motion made to approve the minutes of 11/25 by Curtin. Rieck seconded.

Motion approved, ayes carry.

Motion made to approve the minutes of 12/9 by Curtin. Rieck seconded.

Khazeh had some changes he'd like to make to the minutes regarding his comments during the furlough discussion.

Shannon had sent some changes to Walton that had not be incorporated into the present version of the minutes

Motion made to table the motion to approve the minutes of 12/9 by Scott. Parker seconded.

Motion carried.

IV. Committee Reports

Academic Policies – presented by Ludwick

Fall semester was spent working on policies regarding program dismissals. Key discussion was “is APC a process committee or an appeal committee” on program dismissals. Ludwick suggested posting the entire draft policy in MyClasses so that a discussion can ensue without burdening email boxes.

Provost – very important that Senators review this policy

Ludwick stated that the policy had been checked by the Univ AAG and that any changes made by the Senate would also have to be checked by the Univ AAG.

O'Loughlin – the policy will be on the agenda for Feb 17th

CUSF – presented by Keith Connors (Teacher Education)

Attended the Jan 23, 2009 meeting at Adelphi. Sensed that information from Vice Chancellor Goldstein and Chancellor Kirwan was candid and forthright.

Budget is better that it could have been – governor is trying to hold the line on tuition but USM is concerned it will face cuts in the legislature

USM personnel system is independent of the State of Maryland so decisions about furloughs, layoffs, etc are at the discretion of the Presidents of the USM institutions.

Hiring freeze is as much a signal to the legislature that the USM is doing all it can in this time of crisis as it is a budget necessity. Univ presidents will decide how strictly to enforce the freeze

A bill is expected in the legislature related to a union for GA's and adjunct professors

Enrollment yields are historically high in times of fiscal crisis

STEM conference April 21-22

A bookstore policy is being drafted by USM in order to head off legislation that would mandate the process that profs can adopt or update textbooks (House Bill 85)

Overall state budget is down 1.8%, USM is up 2% but situation could change as more is known about revenues this quarter. Governor's budget assumes \$350M for MD. Statewide layoffs do not include USM

Khazeh – any idea about what happened in 2nd half of meeting that Conners could not attend. Conners – not much as far as he could tell.

Parker – usually 2nd half of CUSF meetings do not contain anything substantial

Parker – in USM, the budget is the overriding concern, but textbook interference is also worrisome

V. Old Business

None

VI. New Business

O'Loughlin – asks Khazeh to make a motion as the designated Senator for Faculty Welfare Committee

Motion made by Khazeh to approve the language for procedures for promotion that was distributed earlier. Shannon seconded.

[See <http://www.salisbury.edu/campusgov/facsenate/08-09/minutes.html> for the document]

Rieck – Univ Promotions Committee has a concern...do promotion applicants have an opportunity to respond to negative letters as the promotion process moves forward?

O'Loughlin – will create a charge to the UPC to study the issue

Lisa Seldomridge (Nursing and chair of FWC) – Committee had a narrow charge. This is in response to an appeal last year and the language only deals with the issues raised in that appeal.

Shannon – the motion on the floor and the rebuttal issue can be dealt with separately

McDermott – this new language does not significant change the current process, just clarifies how the process should proceed

Khazeh – in the past, in the past, some applicants sent their promotion files directly to the UPC. Does this language keep this from happening? Seldomridge – yes.

Shannon - Motion to call the question.

Motion carried.

Motion regarding changing the language in the wording of the Faculty Handbook regarding the application process for promotion passed unanimously.

Khazeh – should Assoc profs be evaluating their peers for promotion to Full profs? Could this cause grievances? Should this be explored? Perhaps UPC should be a grievance committee, not a process committee.

Shannon – Agrees with Khazeh. Optimally, all profs on UPC would be Full profs. This would remove conflicts of interest.

O'Loughlin – asked for a motion to approve the Clarke Amendment to sabbatical guidelines

Motion made by Scott to approve the Clarke Amendment to sabbatical guidelines.
Shannon seconded

O'Loughlin – Administration accepted the sabbatical guidelines we passed in Fall 2008 but there were a couple problems. This amendment attempts to fix those problems by putting back some of the original language crafted by FWC over the summer of 2008.

McDermott – Who created the amended language and for what pupose?

O'Loughlin – Senate officers made the change to meet Administration needs

McDermott – Friendly amendment to the motion – change language to read “including but not limited to” rather than just “including.” Amendment accepted by Scott.

Shannon – Motion to call the question.

Motion carried.

Motion to modify the language of the sabbatical guidelines carries with 1 abstention

Khazeh – where does a faculty member go to appeal being turned down for sabbatical, as FWC is part of the selection process, thus not available as a grievance committee

Curtin – FWC used to operate that way, and resist the approval/disapproval decision

McDermott – FWC should be an appeal body – Admin has final call on approval of sabbaticals

Shannon – FWC should move to being an appeal body and discontinue current process

Seldomridge – as chair of FWC, can see both sides of the issue. Thinks that proposals moving through FWC first makes them stronger sabbatical applications and allows FWC to be a champion for sabbaticals. However, agreed that the appeal process is important.

O'Loughlin adjourned the meeting at 4:16 pm