

Faculty Senate Minutes
March 28, 2023

Charge: Provide a draft of proposed revisions, if any.

The committee recommends revision of Section 1 by adding the following to the end:

“Status review and formal review for tenure shall include reviews by the Tenure Review Committee, the department chair/school director, Dean of the appointee's school/college, Provost, and President as outlined in Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty in this document. Status review and formal review for permanent status shall include reviews by the Library Faculty Promotion Review Committee, Dean of Libraries & Instructional Resources, Provost, and President as outlined under Faculty Engaged in Exclusively or Primarily in Library Services in this document. An appointee who is denied tenure or permanent status must receive justification of the decision in writing from the President.”

Sections 2-4. An appointee who is denied tenure should be given the justification of the decision in writing. This should be included in each section.

Charge: Provide a draft of proposed revisions, if any.

The committee recommends revision of Section 2 by adding the following to the end:

“Formal review for tenure shall include reviews by the Tenure Review Committee, the department chair/school director, Dean of the appointee's school/college, Provost, and President as outlined in Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty in this document. An appointee who is denied tenure must receive justification in writing from the President.”

Sections 3 and 4, at the end of each section add, “An appointee who is denied tenure must receive justification in writing from the President.”

Additional recommendations for this section:

In the second paragraph of section 2, it states “paragraphs in 3 below”. It would be clearer if worded as “section 3 below”.

2. Chapter 2, “Faculty Ranks and Criteria”

Regarding Section B1, last line: Should the relative weight of the criteria be listed here or at least have a link to a different section of the handbook where it is located?

Charge: Investigate whether a clear statement of the relative weight of the criteria exists. If such a statement exists, provide a draft of how to incorporate that into this section (a textual statement and/or a link) if deemed desirable. If no such statement exists, make a recommendation on whether such a statement should be formulated.

The committee found a clear statement of faculty “workload” in Chapter 4 section IV. However, no formal statement was identified in the handbook that directly correlates

Chapter 4: Faculty Compensation, Workload, Benefits, Awards and Personnel and Other Policies, Section IV:



Additional information reviewed regarding relative weight(s) included:

Chapter 4: Section IV E. further states:

- “The balance among teaching, research/scholarship and service for a faculty member may change over the faculty member’s career. This balance may be adjusted annually when faculty and department chairs set workload and responsibilities expectations for the year. In all cases, the addition of the percentage of effort in each area equals 100% of the faculty member’s effort.”

Chapter 2, Faculty Engaged Exclusively or Primarily in Clinical Teaching, “Criteria for Clinical Faculty Promotion”, no relative weight provided.

- “Although no equations are offered to measure relative importance of the criteria for evaluation, it is clear that excellence in teaching, the primary consideration for promotion, derives from a dedication to clinical expertise, professional development and a concern for the integrity of the profession and the institution. Therefore, attention will be given to effective teaching and clinical expertise. The various departments, programs, schools, and colleges should provide guidance.”

Chapter 4, Faculty Workload and Responsibilities, Section II

- “This policy does not apply to individuals.....nor does it apply to library faculty, *e.g.*, Librarians I, II, III, IV.”

3. Chapter 2, “Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty”

Since these terms are used frequently, the ad hoc committee recommends keeping the terminology short, clear, and not requiring review of the glossary for full understanding. In addition, because the University does not count service to the “community” in a significant way, the statement excludes that component and instead includes the two types of service (i.e., University professional field) that currently contribute significantly toward promotion and tenure.

Additional recommendation for this section:

It may be appropriate to review the types of service that contribute meaningfully to promotion and tenure as it is possible the current faculty may want to give more weight to service to the community.

11. Revising the full Faculty Handbook

The Promotions Committee would like to emphasize that making those improvements below is not sufficient for the creation of a workable Faculty Handbook. The version we were given is far from a final draft with numerous spelling mistakes, redundancies and other errors. Fixing these is not a task that can be completed by three committees in a short period of time. We suggest that the Faculty Handbook be edited by an expert editor and restructured to get rid of redundancies. After that it should be read by the various committees, the Faculty Senate and the General Counsel.

Statement from the Faculty Welfare Committee

We have found that the latest version of the faculty handbook is based on an older handbook that is neither clear nor concise. Both versions of the handbook have poor structure, are difficult to understand, and are at times redundant. There is little consistency with the layout of sections of the handbook, and we feel that the current version of the handbook needs major reworking with significant revisions. We understand that starting over with the handbook is a monumental task, with a tremendous amount of editorial work. However, we believe that a lack of clarity within the handbook hurts faculty, and we urge the faculty senate to take up the task of developing a better version of the faculty handbook.

There are many ways to go about this, but we would like to offer a suggestion. We encourage a small group of faculty senators or interested faculty to design the general layout of a new handbook. One resource for this work would be the AAUP Faculty Handbook Guide (<https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/legal-program/faculty-handbooks-guide>). After the general structure has been determined, we suggest giving a single person with experience in writing and editing the task of constructing the faculty handbook. Policies and wording can be gleaned from the current and past editions of the handbook. Having a single person write the handbook will give the document a single voice, as well as eliminate many of the redundancies currently found in the handbook. After the document is written, the faculty senate can send out sections to different faculty senate committees for review. The committees can then offer feedback,

and the faculty senate can work with the writer to incorporate the feedback in a meaningful way.

Since this document defines and explains the rights of faculty members, we also suggest that the University legal counsel give it a thorough review before completion.

Charge: Make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate on what, if anything, should be done in terms of wholesale editing or re-writing of the Faculty Handbook. If recommending changes, the recommendation should include a specific recommended process to follow.

The ad hoc committee agrees with the Promotions Committee and the Faculty Welfare Committee that the Faculty Handbook needs to be rewritten. The ongoing work by the Faculty Senate and members of the provost's office has improved the handbook, but starting over would likely be less work and cause fewer pitfalls than continuing to revise it incrementally. Honestly, even within the ad hoc committee's small charge, it was sometimes overwhelming trying to keep track of inconsistencies and errors. Beyond what we were asked

redundancies currently found in the handbook. After the document is written, the faculty senate can send out sections to different faculty senate committees for final review. The committees can then offer feedback, and the faculty senate can work with the writer(s) to incorporate the feedback in a meaningful way.

The person or committee writing the faculty handbook should complete this work as their full-time position. This assignment could require hiring a professional or providing significant course release for those involved with the writing. The required release time would depend upon the number of faculty involved, but we would anticipate writing the handboo

The following MOTION

The Faculty Welfare Report was received as follows:

To: Salisbury University Faculty Senators From: Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC)

Date: 3/25/22023

Re: Special Session Compensation

came up with this model. Still, Model B has been used for special session compensation since 2015 with no modifications whatsoever (no change in compensation due to cost of living, merit, etc.). It is our understanding that Model B was not brought to the faculty senate for discussion at

aware that Model A compensation will go up more often, as tuition increases happen more often than COLAs. We do not have enough data to project which model will give greater compensation for faculty in the future. We suggest that the faculty senate compare the two models every five years to get a better feel for how the two models may differ over time.

Lastly, it is purported that one of the reasons that Model B was put in place was the discrepancy between Model A and overload pay. During our meetings with the Provost, we suggested that a

Contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion as a requirement of tenure and promotion must be clearly delineated in the position description during the hiring process so that newly hired faculty are aware of expectations.

3. We propose the following expectations:

P

(Suggested locations: "Procedures and Policies for Granting of Tenure to Faculty" and "Procedures for Promotion of Faculty"):

Evidence of commitment to increase diversity, equity and inclusion are, at a minimum, required in promotion and tenure dossiers in the area of teaching. Evidence of commitment to increase diversity equity and inclusion in this area should be a necessary condition for tenure and promotion. In addition, candidates are required to meet all other unit and university requirements for tenure & promotion.

(Suggested location: "Procedures for Promotion of Faculty"):

Evidence of commitment to increase diversity, equity and inclusion are, at a minimum, required in promotion and tenure dossiers in the area of teaching plus in one of the other two areas (scholarship/creative activity or service). Evidence of commitment to increase diversity, equity and inclusion in these areas should be a necessary condition for tenure and promotion. In addition, candidates are required to meet all other unit and university requirements for promotion.

4. Including a subheading for introducing the expectation of DEI contributions in faculty research, teaching, and service for promotion guidelines (Suggested locations: "Procedures for Promotion of Faculty" and "Comprehensive Review of Tenured Faculty"):

Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process and should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements.

5. Guidelines for DEI in T&P

Departments/units/schools are required to develop guidelines for DEI in T&P. Such guidelines shall be part of any faculty recommendation, including post-tenure review.

6. Including a list of examples of DEI in faculty research, teaching, and service (Suggested location: "Procedures for Promotion of Faculty")

Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process and should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs

of Salisbury University's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Examples of activities include but are not limited to:

- Ensuring equal representation of diverse people/participants in cases studies, graphics and other media, presentations, etc.*
- Incorporating a diversity/inclusion section in your syllabus to ensure that the DEI culture of your classroom is clear and respected.*
- Fostering an inclusive classroom environment that values diversity, takes into*

- *Research in areas that will contribute to diversity, equity, and inclusion opportunity in higher education such as research that addresses issues such as race, gender, diversity, and inclusion.*
- *Research that addresses health disparities, educational access and achievement.*
 - *Research that addresses political engagement, economic justice, social mobility, civil and human rights.*
 - *Creative activity that reflects culturally diverse communities or voices underrepresented in the arts and humanities.*

- *Curricular design in general education or at departmental levels that foster inclusivity.*
 - *Participation in professional development programs designed to improve knowledge of needs for supporting a diverse student population.*
- *Mentoring faculty members from underrepresented and underserved populations.*
 - *Participation in activities that support successful recruitment, retention, and graduation of students from underrepresented and underserved populations.*
 - *Participation in activities that support successful recruitment, retention, and promotion of faculty from underrepresented and underserved populations.*
 - *University-wide collaborations to enhance recruitment/retention effort (collaborating with Admissions, Center for Student Achievement, TRIO, etc.).*
- *Commitment to a professional organizations' equity, inclusion, and diversity work.*
 - *Membership on departmental or university committees related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.*
 - *Service on local and/or statewide committees focused on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.*
 - *Leadership in organizing unit-level or campus-wide events that encourage self-reflection and education regarding issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.*

education, gender identity/expression, genetic information, marital status, parental status, political affiliation, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, veteran status, and wealth. This ensures an inclusive learning environment and provides our students with an education rich in perspectives and lived experiences. Creating this rich, collaborative, and inclusive community requires a continued commitment by faculty, staff, and administration. Faculty commitment to incorporating DEI into teaching is expected in faculty evaluations, and in the tenure and promotion processes.

the new guidelines in the areas of research/creative activity or service may be considered after mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department/CHHS school responsible for the guidelines.

7. Faculty development & incentives:

1. Salisbury University shall provide professional development in the area of DEI for faculty. Professional development should include but not be limited to providing workshops on how DEI can be incorporated in the teaching, scholarship and service. These professional development opportunities should be offered regularly and frequently.
2. Salisbury University shall provide funds to present/publish DEI-related work.
3. DEI-related work shall be considered in sabbatical decisions.
4. Salisbury University shall provide course release for professional development or DEI-related service work (mentoring, initiative building, outreach, etc.).
5. Salisbury University shall provide stipends for professional development or DEI-related service work (mentoring, initiative building, outreach, etc.).

8. Further recommendations:

We recommend that the SU administration consider the additional points recommended by the Working Group:

1. Revising the student evaluation process to limit the inherent biases that affect women and minorities at a higher frequency.
2. Delineation of DEI in T&P considerations