

Faculty Senate (FS) Minutes

April 10, 2018, 3:30 p.m.

Senate Chambers: Holloway Hall 119

<http://www.salisbury.edu/campusgov/facsenate/>

Senators Present: Kurt Ludwick, Sam Geleta (President), Stephen Adams, Stephen Ford, Emily Story, Chrys Egan (Vice President), Celine Carayon, Sandy Pope, Adam Wood, Anita Brown, James Parrigin, David Parker, Thomas Calo, Thomas Cawthern (Secretary), Jennifer Jewell

Quorum: 15/19 Present

Call to Order: Faculty Senate President Sam Geleta, 3:34 p.m.

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. Approval of Minutes: March 27, 2018 Regular Senate Meeting (Refer to Website)
 1. Minimum wage increase is \$10.10/hour (section 6.5).
3. Announcements from the Senate President
 - a. Congratulations and Welcome message was communicated by Faculty Senate President to incoming new SU President: Dr. Charles Wight. Dr. Wight expressed that he and his wife Victoria are looking forward to joining the Salisbury community. He also wrote: "I look forward to working with the Faculty Senate in the spirit of shared governance as we move SU forward together".
 - b. Reminder – Faculty Senate Standing Committees end of Year report
 - c. Next Faculty Senate meeting: GenEd April 17, 2018
 1. This is the last Gen Ed meeting of the semester.
 2. The final step would be to vote on the Gen Ed reform on May 16th (reading day).
 - d. Next FF theme is "Faculty Service Celebration"; May 11, 2018.
4. Remarks from Interim Provost Karen Olmstead
 - a. New President – May 8th Address to the Senate
 1. Incoming President will be in town May 3-May10.
 2. Dr. Wight will meet with various campus groups during this time, including Faculty Senate on May 8.
 - b. Adjunct and Overload Pay Update & Clarification
 1. The miscommunication was not intentional. The adjustment will be implemented this fall.
 2. Any future changes to budgets, including potential cost increases (such as health care), are being looked at to see how those costs can/will be distributed/redistributed at the Unit/Department level.
 - c. GenEd Poll Information
 1. Dr. King will be back next week to discuss this data.
 2. Majority of those who responded are in favor of some sort of reform.

3. Gen Ed working groups have updated the model and provided/created a document that addresses common misconceptions.
 4. Some costs have now been estimated for different aspects of the proposed model. These are on the website for all to view as well.
- d. Bridges Program Expansion – Request for Data
1. By early September, the Provost would like to have a discussion with the Senate to determine how/whether a new Bridges program should be rolled out.
- e. Photos for Faculty Website Pages
1. New faculty pages will begin coming out in May.
 2. One final day for head shots is tomorrow (April 11); there will also be another opportunity later in the summer for photos.
- f. SU Application to host NCUR
1. This application would make SU the host in 2022, if SU is selected.
- g. National Folk Festival
1. September 7-9 2018.
 2. Please consider having classes get involved; volunteer opportunities are available for classes/groups across campus.
- h. Important Upcoming Dates
1. 4/21 – Admissions open house
 2. 4/26 – Riall lecture
 3. 4/27 – SUSRC
 4. 5/1 – Presidents Diversity Awards
 5. 5/3-5/10 – Incoming President, Dr. Wight at SU
 6. 5/4 – Honors Convocation
 7. 5/16 – Campus party for president Dudley-Eshbach
 8. 5/17 – Faculty retirement reception
 9. 5/23 – Graduate Commencement
 10. 5/24 – Undergraduate Commencement
- i. Did you know? SU & National Competitive Fellowships
1. SU is a top producer of Fulbright scholars as well as other Fellowships and Scholarships. Please find the details:
http://www.salisbury.edu/nationalfellowships/proof1natnflw_hndout_2017.pdf
 2. This is wonderful for our students, but also fantastic for our faculty and staff, who work so hard to help make these Fellowships and Scholarships happen.
 3. If there is anyone who would like to be involved in this, please contact Kristen Walton.
- j. New Student Reader replacement
1. There is opportunity for faculty to participate.
 2. Please follow your email and await word from Provost Olmstead on specific details regarding these opportunities.

3. This is a full-scale program for Fall 2018, rather than a pilot program as mentioned at the last Senate meeting.

5. Unfinished Business (Refer to Website)

- a. All Faculty Vote and potential for electronic voting in the final Gen Ed all-faculty vote;
 1. For an all-faculty vote to reach a quorum, 50% of the faculty plus one will be required to attend an all-faculty meeting.
 2. Questions remain, however, how voting related to Gen Ed reform will be carried out. Questions such as: How can online/electronic voting be used in place of an all-faculty vote? If an all-faculty vote occurs on Wednesday, May 16, how will this proceed? are at the forefront of this discussion.
 3. One proposal to consider is: The Faculty Senate authorizes an all-faculty poll addressing faculty preferences for General Education plans. Provided a majority of the entire faculty participates in the poll, and provided two-thirds of the participants in the poll agree on a plan, the FS agrees to approve that plan as the choice of the faculty. Otherwise the General Education plan chosen by the Faculty will be determined by a vote of the FS.
 1. Comment: The Senate is the voice of the faculty; but in order for this to occur, we debate, we discuss, etc., and so our endorsement/vote is important. However, given the importance of Gen Ed reform, the voice of the faculty should remain the voice of the faculty. I propose a 2/3 majority for those casting an opinion in the poll be the official voice and that the Senate should accept this as fact. If we conduct an electronic vote, which currently states that 75 faculty are needed for an online vote to be acceptable, then this means that as few as 40 faculty can determine the entire Gen Ed reform.
 1. Question: The role of the FS in this process is confusing as it's stated above. How can the faculty determine something that the Senate has been guiding from the start? Answer: The Senate is the body through which Gen Ed reform should have come from since the Senate represents the voice of the faculty.
 2. Question: Explain the last line – does this mean that if there's not half the faculty or 2/3 vote of the faculty (i.e., 60%), then the FS determines the outcome? Answer: Yes. If the faculty don't override the voice of the Senate then that vote stands.
 3. Comment: Both of these proposal are for online voting. Does that mean a paper ballot is off the table? Answer: At this particular time, we are just focusing on a vote cast for Gen Ed, and yes, it would just be online voting or rather called polling not to violate

Robert's Rules of Order. Comment: Seeking clarification, are we voting on which online method to use? Answer: The senate hasn't even agreed that online voting would be occurring, thus, the method is open for discussion.

4. Comment: Are you proposing a process for a new function – a polling of the faculty? My understanding for an all-faculty vote is that those are used as a mechanism to overturn a FS vote. Is this new mechanism useful for that purpose as well? Answer: Only if we adopt a Bylaw change that states as such. Whether we do a paper ballot or an electronic ballot, it's a lot less work to tabulate the results electronically.
5. Comment: If 60% of the faculty "vote" in the poll and 65% of the votes go on to approve Gen Ed reform, could the FS vote that down? Answer: Yes they could. Comment: After the FS votes, can the faculty as a whole call an all faculty meeting to overturn the vote of the FS? Answer: Yes.
6. Question: How many faculty are there that will vote? Answer: about 435 faculty would vote. Comment: If we are looking for a ratio of votes from the faculty at large to each senator, then the ratio of faculty voices to senator voices to pass/fail Gen Ed is 15:1.
7. Question: When the faculty go to vote, will they know how the senate voted? Answer: Yes. Comment: If so, then those who would vote in favor of reform likely wouldn't show up to vote because they don't need to overturn the FS vote. This is extremely problematic.
8. Comment: There are 3 distinct issues here: 1) is the voting done by paper or online? 2) what is the threshold (50%, 2/3, 75 people, etc.) by which a quorum and/or yay/nay vote is established? 3) what is the role of the Faculty Senate? In terms of the latter, I was under the impression that the Senate wouldn't have a role in the final vote other than we vote as faculty members, not as a governing body. Comment: Last year, we sat in this body and decided that the FS would vote on the model, and then after that it would go to an all-faculty vote. Comment: I would add a fourth point to the above list and that's that the all-faculty meeting requires a deliberation; a poll would not require a deliberation. Response: The paper ballot method is very tedious. Comment: Is there a middle ground? Maybe we hold town hall

meetings to hear from the Steering Committee ahead of the vote. But we shouldn't exclude those who haven't had the opportunity to participate to date.

Comment: So when will we reach the "right number" of meetings? How many more meetings/opportunities will be necessary before a vote is cast? Comment: There really have only been 2 meetings (one this past winter and one the winter prior to that); moreover the Canvas site is pretty unwieldy and clunky. It's not a great forum for untenured faculty to voice their opinion. Comment: The critical point with the poll is: is the Senate seeking guidance, or are we allowing the Senate to cast a vote and enable the faculty to overturn that vote?

9. Comment: Is the poll coming before or after the Senate deliberates? Answer: The poll is to inform the Senate and then the FS would vote; all faculty, if dissatisfied with the result of the FS vote, then can call an all-faculty vote. Comment: I'm throwing out a word of warning of what might happen if the poll votes one way and the Senate votes the other. If this is the case, the faculty could undermine the Senate (or vice versa) and this might negatively affect shared governance. Comment: Can the Senate take a vote to state that we will honor the vote of the Faculty? Answer: Yes.

10. Comment: If the Senate doesn't agree that the model is ready to go to an all-faculty vote, why send it out to a poll anyway? This isn't an ideal scenario. Is it possible to communicate to the faculty that we have reviewed portions of the proposed model, but neither agree nor disagree with the full endorsement of the model?

11. Comment: Is the Senate voting we endorse this going to a vote? Or that the Senate endorses (accepts) the proposed model?

MOTION TO TABLE THIS PROPOSAL. Vote – Unanimous.

2. A second proposal to consider is: Whereas the process of General Education review warrants the participation of as many faculty as possible, the Faculty Senate charges the Membership and Elections Committee to establish an electronic voting process for Gen Ed review following current processes used in situations such as electing Senators or conducting bylaw referendums. THIS PROPOSAL HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN.

I MOVE THAT THE FS CONSIDER ELECTRONIC POLLING WITH RESPECT TO GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM

VOTE: aye – unanimous

I MOVE THAT THE FACULTY SENATE VOTE TO ENDORSE THE FULL FACULTY ELECTRONIC POLL AFTER THE SENATE VOTES TO MOVE THE MODEL FORWARD.

VOTE: aye – unanimous.

- b. CHHS ad hoc committee Final Proposed Bylaws Amendments.
 - 1. **The Committee recommends that the Senate approve the recommended editions to send it to M/E committee and send it out for referendum.**
VOTE: aye – unanimous.

MOTION TO TABLE THE REST OF THE MEETING. VOTE – Unanimous

- 1. Can the document regarding the Counseling Center be added to the website for us to review the next time?
 - 2. Yes, that will be uploaded.
6. New Business (Refer to Website)
- a. Learning with Technology Committee recommendation: To approve IT Policy Review as submitted. Jose Juncosa, Chair.
 - 1. Reviewed and recommended
 - b. The Committee on Promotions and the Committee on Academic Freedom & Tenure proposal on Engaged Scholarship;
 - c. Counseling center staffing need: Proposal and Motion.

7. Other Business?

Adjourn (5:03 PM)

Minutes Submitted: Tom Cawthern

Web Documents: Christy Harper