

Minutes of the  
SU Faculty Senate Meeting  
April 22, 2008  
HH 119

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

Senators absent – Root, Rutuelo

1. Pres. Curtin called the meeting to order at 3:32; a quorum was present.
2. The minutes from the April 8 meeting were accepted as written.
3. **Announcements from Senate President - Elizabeth Curtin –**
  - We will have an **additional meeting next week, April 29, and, hopefully our final meeting, to elect offices, will be May 6.** Next week's meeting will feature discussion of Sen. O'Loughlin's proposal regarding evaluation criteria and, perhaps, a continuation of the Communication Across the Curriculum proposal.
  - Pres. Curtin called on Senate VP Michael O'Loughlin who read the following resolution, "Be it resolved: On behalf of the faculty at Salisbury University, the Faculty Senate would like to acknowledge and commend all those responsible for the successful NCUR event on our campus from April 10-12, 2008. We particularly want to commend the students and staff whose efforts made the campus events run smoothly, the faculty who reviewed abstracts and monitored sessions, and the steering committee, including Ron Dotterer, Creston Long, and Carolyn Collins, who worked tirelessly over the last two years to organize such an outstanding event". O'Loughlin made a motion in support of the resolution, seconded.

Voice vote – motion carries unanimously.

- Curtin reported on a recent meeting of USM faculty senate presidents, with some CUSF reps there. Topics discussed included: **1) Rising cost of textbooks** – a number of bills in the legislation, did not pass, but this topic may come up again next session. CUSF has been working on this aggressively; Curtin had forwarded to senators a letter from CUSF describing things faculty and universities can do to try to keep textbook costs down. Bookstore Director Lisa Gray mentioned that they have been working with other college bookstores in the system and state to adopt "Best Practices" procedures to be pro-active and show legislatures that they are concerned about the problem. She mentioned that one of the key components, the book publishers, have not been involved in these activities. Gray is concerned that when the bookstore starts to post ISBN numbers (as they are being asked to do), there may be errors in purchasing and students will come to the bookstore wanting it to make the correction. She mentioned the importance of timely adoptions and using the old edition of a text as long as academically possible. If we show the legislators that we are working on this, it may help. **2) VSA** – most seems innocuous; but one section involves a pilot, 5 year test of "college learning outcomes" run by ETS. (Afraid it's like an extension of No Child Left Behind to the college level). **3) As a**

result of a change in rules, **faculty on 12 month contracts may have to sign a form soon.**

- The Provost asked for the senate to recommend faculty reps for 1) the search committee for the Admissions Director, 2) the search committee for the Police Chief and 3) the Enrollment Strategic Planning Committee – although there is probably a member of Admissions & Readmissions already on that committee. (Designated senator Shannon will check on that).
  - Curtin recently met with SGA President Lili Afkhami. SGA is concerned about our request regarding the changes in parking regulations; in particular, whether all daytime parking restrictions (various colors – green, blue, etc) will continue in effect until 8 PM. These would affect student activities in evenings. We were only concerned about spaces restricted to red permits, but perhaps need to look at others as well.
  - Relay for Life – Curtin encouraged faculty to support – financial, attending, etc - it begins on campus the evening of May 2. In the last few years, SU has been third nationwide (after Cornell & Harvard) in terms of per capita donations. Sen. Diriker said it's very easy to make an on-line donation through the American Cancer web sit – he will forward the web address.
  - Sen. Shipper reminded Pres. Curtin that Chief Lashley agreed last week to forward his references on the local crime statistics to the senators. She will check on that.
4. **Old Business – M and E Revisions – Sen. Zaprowski** – The M and E committee revised their proposal (regarding the 4 committees that are only active under special circumstances) to incorporate the suggestions from the last meeting (revision sent out with agenda). Curtin thanked the committee for their hard work in making the changes so fast. A motion was made to accept the proposed changes, seconded.

Hand vote – 15 yes, 1 abstention, motion carries

5. **New Business – Faculty Welfare Committee Sabbatical Proposal – Lisa Seldomridge, FWC chair.** Provost Jones met with FWC in Sept. and gave them following charges 1) develop guidelines for proposals (there are currently none) 2) clarify the roles of chairs and deans in the review process (an additional step in the process – Deans reviewing as a group after FWC instituted by Buchanan is still in place but not in handbook) and 3) consider priorities for funding. (Their draft proposal, suggested revisions to the relevant forms and description of their rationale had been sent to senators and to the Provost before the meeting). The committee wanted a document that would supplement the info in the Faculty Handbook, help guide applicants and would indicate that sabbaticals are essential and contribute to our being such a quality institution. They also felt that dept. chairs should have a major say as they are in the best position to judge merits of the proposals and also any staffing implications. But chairs need to give strong letters; more than simply “I support this”. As for funding priorities, the committee did not think that first time applicants should get priority over repeat applicants, but repeat applicants need to show outcomes of previous sabbaticals, through submission of Part B. The committee made a few changes to Parts A and B. **Discussion** - Pres. Curtin thanked the committee for their work on this and asked how frequently there is a problem of too many applications. Seldomridge – that is the exception rather than the rule, but administration is concerned that as we increase in faculty size the number of applications will increase. The committee thinks that the number of sabbaticals should

keep pace proportionately with the growth in faculty. Senator Shannon (who had distributed a memo of her concerns with the proposal before the meeting) mentioned that she was concerned that the guidelines seem to focus on a product – such as a publication - as the outcome of the sabbatical. She felt that “faculty renewal” and the changes in the classroom were the most important outcomes, more important than getting SU’s name “out there”. Sen. Khazeh agreed with much of Shannon’s memo, but “shouldn’t faculty provide some tangible proof that they accomplished something on sabbatical?” The six types of projects listed by the committee suggest that there are acceptable projects other than those that lead to publication. Sen. Mullins asked “what is the problem we are trying to solve?” Isn’t the committee trying to increase the rigor in the process, which will make it harder for the administration to take a hatchet when money is low? Curtin replied that the administration perceives that we will soon have too many sabbaticals to fund and that improved proposals may not be enough. Also, system gives administration a hard time regarding the number of sabbaticals here. A few other senators shared Shannon’s concerns and felt that the guidelines would discourage some faculty from applying. Sen. O’Loughlin - there needs to be language to encourage the two models of sabbatical, what Sen. Shipper called extension sabbaticals and renewal sabbaticals. Mullins – “peer-reviewed product shared with larger audience” doesn’t necessarily mean publication. Shipper – taxpayers have a right to expect something for their investment in sabbaticals. If faculty member desires a “renewal” sabbatical, the rationale needs to be addressed in the proposal. Shipper was also concerned that the statement on Part A regarding financial gain would discourage some faculty from applying. Seldomridge replied that the only thing changed on Part A was the directions to attach Part B from previous sabbatical. Shipper mentioned the need for Dean’s to write more than “I concur” as their endorsement of a proposal; Curtin - that is a disciplinary problem, rather than a change in policy. Responses from FWC members – Nancy Michelson – the committee worked on this in response to provost’s charge; they welcome our input, it is helpful to have more involved in the discussion. Grace Clement – the senators’ perceptions differ from the committee’s intentions, they were taking a stand that sabbaticals should not be cut and they want to support what the chairs and deans support. They wanted to give guidance to get strong proposals and strong statements of support from chairs and deans; didn’t mean to say “must publish”. Sen. Diriker was afraid that the guidelines might have unintentional consequences in the future – a more specific list of acceptable types of projects may help administration to find more ways to deny. Perhaps adding “including, but not limited to” to bullets may eliminate that possibility. Also need to stress that first and foremost the sabbatical is to benefit SU and the students; that is more important than a publication or contribution to the world. O’Loughlin suggested that either the committee or senate should rework the proposal and add language regarding “renewal” sabbaticals and make it clear that there are different ways to proceed. Shannon agreed that changing the emphasis in the proposal could make a big difference. She also suggested that an update to Part B one year after may not be valuable – work may still not be completed; better to have the update on the next proposal. Sen. Scott said he would rather see faculty (as opposed to administrators) deciding which sabbaticals are not funded. We should make a stand that all good proposals be funded, but the reality is that in some years that might not be reasonable. Shannon – Administration should tell us why sabbaticals can’t be funded at same rate as in past, especially as they have been suggesting that SU’s funding is getting better. They should tell us what a reasonable number of sabbaticals and a reasonable variance are. Perhaps there should be an “intent to apply” form due way in advance, to help avoid a glut of sabbaticals in any

one semester – could work with applicants and encourage some to delay sabbatical before they've written the actual proposal. Sen. Hopson would like to have administrators tell us how they make these decisions and whether peer-review publications are needed as the sabbatical outcome. If SU needs to move this way for funding, we need to know. Diriker – sees a different side of things on the Fiscal Review Committee; their concern is about costs, not pubs; as costs increase overall, they question where to find money for sabbaticals. Mullins – we need to keep in mind the proposed motion regarding a change in faculty evaluations and how this influences that. Seldomridge – thinks this (final proposal) needs to come from the senate, if we think it should wait until the evaluation question is decided that is OK. Mullins – should tell the Provost that the senate will take it (draft) from here. Curtin agreed and will write a memo to Provost and FWC that the senate will do the tweeking of the FWC draft. Not sure whether it will be ready by next meeting. Shannon thinks this “attack on sabbaticals” is just one part of an erosion on the quality of faculty life; would like to see open faculty meetings to discuss. Curtin asked senators to send her their comments to make sure that they are considered in reworking of the proposal.

6. **Other Business – Sen. Diriker** – Nominations for the Distinguished Faculty Award are due soon. Please consider nominating and encouraging others to nominate colleagues. Announcement was just sent to Deans and Chairs; will go out to all soon.
7. Adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Motions made and passed at meeting -

1. A motion to acknowledge and commend all those responsible for the recent successful NCUR.
2. A motion to accept the revised proposal from Membership and Elections regarding the four senate committees that only meet when a need occurs. This will be forwarded to the full faculty for a vote.

Respectfully submitted by Ellen Lawler, Secretary