

Draft Minutes of the
SU Faculty Senate Meeting
Mar. 11, 2008
HH 119

Senators present –Clarke, Curtin, Diriker, Gilkey, Hopson, Khazeh, Lawler, Mullins, O'Loughlin, Rieck, Ritenour, Robinson, Root, Scott, Shannon, Shipper and Zaprowski

Senators absent – Rutuelo

1. Pres. Curtin called the meeting to order at 3:34; a quorum was present.
2. There were no minutes from the Senators' Strategic Planning Workshop on Feb. 26; about 2/3's of the senators attended. Curtin reminded that senators are expected to be available at 3:30 PM on Tuesdays, unless there is an emergency.

The minutes from the Feb. 12 meeting were accepted with the following changes to topic a), under Provost's remarks (changes in bold) - So the AASCU (the Am Assoc of State Colleges and Universities) and **the NASULGC (National Assoc of State University Land Grant Colleges)** have proposed the Voluntary System of Accountability. As Brit Kirwan is the chair of the presidential advisory committee **for** the VSA, he **would like** all institutions in the system to sign up as members.

Pres. Curtin mentioned that she will be going to a meeting of USM Senate presidents in April and the VSA will be the main topic of that meeting.

3. **Old Business**

a. **Achievement/Success Center – Dean of Students, Ed Cowell** summarized the proposal for the center so far –it will enhance and expand on services offered so far (such as departmental tutorial programs), key are programs to address the first 6-10 weeks on campus, it will respond to students needs (such as known difficult courses), it will include testing (such as a math placement test). The center now has a "shell of a space" in the old Writing Center space, which has moved across the hall. Furniture has been ordered. Faculty are invited to come see the space. Once a director is hired, the range of services possible will be prioritized and will start to be phased in over the next year. The ad for the director just hit the air waves yesterday and will soon be in the Chronicle. Cowell apologized that the senate officers did not get the chance to comment on the ad, but there is still time to tweak the specifications, review of application will begin at end of March. The search committee has not yet been identified, but it will include faculty from the working committee. They hope to complete the search sometime in May. Sen. Shipper questioned about the start up funds and annual budget. Ed – that would be determined by what services are in place at start up and whether they can get any grant support (have ID'ed potential sources). There are minimal funds right now. Shipper – there seems to be a disconnect; we don't have funds for faculty travel, etc and yet we have funds for this; also we are told we have better students coming in, so do we really need this? Cowell – there is no doubt that we need such a center, it would help both the best & worst students, even our most prestigious peer institutions have such centers. Shipper – we need to focus on having the right faculty and the right mid-level management of faculty. Pres.

Curtin reminded that the senate did approve the concept of a success center at the Dec. 6 meeting. Sen. Diriker agreed but reminded that at that meeting we specifically stated that the senates “looks forward to learning more about the development and operational plans for the center (timeline, budget, operational action steps, etc.), no later than the second meeting of the Faculty Senate in the spring semester of 2008” (from the Dec. 6 minutes). It has now been 3 months since that meeting and we expected more specifics by now. Cowell – there are a number of things currently in place that could impact the funding, ex. the Chancellor’s initiative to close the achievement gap. Diriker – we have an ad out, space designated but no budget or funds, this is not acceptable. Cowell – the ideal budget would be \$250,000 for full staffing with 80% for salaries, the rest for software. Curtin – this is similar to what we were told in Dec., we expected more specific budget by now; we endorsed the concept which is not the same as endorsing the specifics. Cowell said the initial budget would be \$10,000 – 20, 000 for software. Sen. Clarke asked how the center would be assessed and evaluated. Ed – committee had discussed; it would include retention from one semester to the next, grade performance; we could adapt assessment procedures from other centers. Sen. Shannon moved that we go on to other topics, as this was not very productive, and that we get these details in a future meeting. Diriker asked Pres. Curtin to write a letter reminding the committee that we expect a detailed report; she will do so. Cowell - it’s difficult to put out specific numbers while looking at various funding streams. Sen. Scott said that to him the budget was not as important as plans for assessment, what services will be phased in & when, faculty oversight and the incorporation of academic standards.

- b. Community Safety – Ed Cowell**, filling in for VP Neufeldt – In response to student concerns brought up at a Forum meeting late last fall, a committee has been formed and it’s met weekly. It has student and administration reps and Dave Parker is the faculty rep. Reps from the Salisbury and Fruitland police depts. and Wicomico sheriff’s office have attended. Meeting later this week will focus on things to do together. These include – increased lighting in areas traveled by students (suggested by the Neighborhood Relations committee); will seek county funds for this. A student safety group has been meeting weekly and developing guidelines to educate students about using better judgment, being accountable. Also, in the future, for a landlord to be invited to renter’s fairs, they must take part in the monthly neighborhood compact meetings and give renter’s a safety checklist. The group will soon issue a safety plan endorsed by the President. Sen. Hopson asked whether they had followed up on the President’s suggestion of having an expanded jurisdiction for the university police. Cowell – our officers have already been doing that, although not officially; they are currently discussing an MOU regarding that. Pres. Curtin asked whether the perception that the city police are more interested in following up on drinking parties than violent crime had been brought up. Cowell – that will be a topic this week, and have already discussed with the mayor. There are problems on both sides; some students are not making the best choices and police need to enforce laws, but treat students with respect. Fruitland police have a good reputation for responding to complaints, making sure students get picked up by Saferide and doing without threat of citations. Last fall Saferide picked up more than 8000 students. Sen. Shipper asked whether we have an adequate number of police officers county-wide. Ed - the Salisbury Police dept. is now fully staffed and one of the goals is more cooperation between the various agencies. He can get the specific numbers.

4. **Announcements from Senate Pres. Curtin**

- a. **Strategic Plan** - She thanked the senators that came to the senator's planning workshop and hoped all were able to attend at least one additional workshop. The Steering Committee has met to sort through the responses at the workshops and post on the web site - see <http://www.salisbury.edu/president/strategicplanning/>. One of the areas identified is academic programs, and we will have more opportunities to be involved in the plan and especially in this area. It is estimated that the planning process will be completed by June, a draft written over the summer so that faculty, administration and staff can respond in the early fall.
- b. **Senate committees** – she is pleased all the By-laws changes passed, so those committees can get members (next election) and get going. The senate officers are still interested in ways to decrease the number of senate committees.

5. **Words from the Administration – Tom Jones**

- a. **Budget** - Dr. Jones commented that one reason it was hard for Dean Cowell to give specifics on the Success Center budget is that we are still waiting on decisions from Annapolis. We do have a commitment (PIN and funding for the director) and about \$10,000-20,000 for barebones funding. The funding would increase over a period of years to \$250,000 fully funded. Within a month we should know more about the budget for FY 09 and there will be more on the table to discuss.
- b. **Strategic Plan** – Agreed with what Curtin just announced; he would be meeting with Amy Hasson later today. Summarized results from the 18 workshops would soon be on the web site. We need to soon get specific regarding who works on what, ex. Long Range Academic Planning should work on Academic Programs, Enrollment Committee, etc. Then may need another round of input; draft written over summer will be distributed in August to work on and finish by Dec.
- c. **Meeting of System Provost's in Baltimore** - discussed Annapolis & budget projections. So far things don't look too bad, the Higher Ed Investment Fund (from corporate taxes) will be used to buffer the cut of 15 Million to the USM budget. But if the slots bill doesn't go through, things could get bad. There are a couple bills currently in the legislature that could affect us, but they don't seem to be going anywhere. They are - the textbook bill, a bill allowing other USM schools to go SAT optional, and a bill to send to the courts disputes between USM institutions regarding duplication of programs. The STEM initiative has been kicked up to another level; the Governor est. a task force with Kirwan co-chairing. This brings more teeth (ie. money) to the issue, in two areas – for teacher prep in STEM and for more students in STEM majors. Sen. Shipper – will that mean a STEM Center? There are so many initiatives, when we need more money for the basics. Pres. Curtin suggested putting that idea of hold as it could be a lengthy discussion. Jones mentioned that he has thought much about that and agrees with Frank.

6. **New Business**

- a. **Promotions Committee Report** – David Rieck – The committee had been charged by Pres. Curtin in fall to examine the language in the Faculty handbook regarding promotions for consistency and to encourage service (especially at the

university level). Senators received a copy of the proposal with the agenda. Proposed changes include a table of the sliding scale regarding the percent of effort for the three areas to emphasize that the percentage can vary from year to year and the addition of paragraph 3 which refers to the broad definition of scholarship (ala Boyer model) that SU embraces. That paragraph also notes that certain activities may be classified differently by different faculty as scholarship or service or teaching, so faculty applying for promotion should indicate in which category they want those activities classified. The committee also decided to classify academic student advising under teaching, thereby encouraging faculty to do other things in the service area. At the level of promotion to Professor, they added "Assuming leadership roles", although didn't specify work on senate committees. They also added a reference to Appendix M for relevant procedures. Comments from senators – Sen. Khazeh the freedom for faculty to select whether certain activities should be listed as scholarship rather than service, etc, would not work in the Perdue school as their accrediting body has specific requirements for scholarship. Shipper added that they do recognize the Boyer model, but Perdue faculty still must have peer-reviewed pubs. He also felt student advising should be listed as service. Rieck argued that doing so could fill up the service component for some faculty with large advising loads. Sen. Scott mentioned that in the recent past departments were asked to write up their departmental expectations regarding tenure – does that belong here? Rieck – No, this is just promotion. Shipper suggested adding "national and international levels" to line 59 on page 3. Rieck said he would need to take that back to the committee as they hadn't discussed. Curtin reminded that part of the purpose of the changes was to encourage service at the university level where help is needed to make thing run. Sen. Clarke suggested adding "school level" as well. Rieck - committee discussed that, but again, wanted to emphasize university level committees. Sen. Shannon again brought up the departmental expectations documents which involved a lot of effort and related to promotion as well as tenure. Faculty should include that document in their packets and Promotions Committee should add it to the checklist. She suggested that "in accordance with the applicant's departmental expectations" be added to paragraph 3, line 15, pg 2. There was some discussion as to how specific "leadership" should be; Sen. O'Loughlin suggested thought chairing a university committee should be mentioned specifically. The committee and others thought this was too restrictive. Sen. Scott suggested including "these could include chairing committees"; Sen Robinson like this wording but O'Loughlin thought it should be "should include chairing committees". Sen. Hopson mentioned the variation of work on different committees and said it should be the role of the applicant to present the case that their service was at an appropriate level. Scott liked the committee's wording of "Assuming leadership roles", as on some committees even without being committee chair a member could take a leadership role on a specific issue. Sen. Khazeh commented on another issue - that Assoc. Profs on the Promotion Committee act on decisions regarding promotions to Full Professor; Curtin - but that's not part of this charge to the committee. Shannon suggested moving forward with the committee's proposed changes with the suggestions from the senate. Rieck will incorporate and bring back next time.

- b. **Evaluation** Criteria - Pres. Curtin brought up President Dudley-Eshbach's comments regarding the balance of teaching/scholarship/service at the Jan. Faculty Development Day and asked how senators felt about pursuing that. Her

perception was that junior faculty in English considered it favorably. Should that be the focus of the next senate meeting? We could invite others & get input from our constituents prior to the meeting. Mike Folkoff asked what the procedure for such a change would be. Curtin – as it would not require a By-laws change, it would be a senate vote. Sen. Hopson wanted to be sure the meeting wasn't during program planning so faculty could attend. Next meeting would be before that, but we would need to get the word out asap. Shannon suggested that it may be too early to proceed, we need more info and it would be good to have the discussion at a kick-off day to allow for more participation. Clarke agreed. Khazeh suggested that Pres. Curtin should send out a narrative to all faculty and ask them to provide input to their senators. Dean Kotlowski indicated that this would be a fundamental change and all faculty should be involved.

- c. **Parking after 4 PM** – When faculty have to leave campus and then return to teach a class, it can be very difficult and dangerous to get a parking space; suggested a proposal to extend parking regulations to 7 PM. Sen. Shannon will draft a proposal for a motion before the next meeting.
- 7. **Proposal for By-laws** change regarding to the roles of VP and Webmaster was sent out with the agenda as a first reading.
- 8. **Other** - Sen. Mullins mentioned a previous discussion regarding the Promotions committee - that it primarily be an appeals committee
- 9. Adjourned at 4:47 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Ellen Lawler, Secretary