To: Rodney D. Bennett  
President

From: Steven R. Moser  
Provost

Date: 11/19/19

Subject: Faculty Handbook Changes

Dr. Bennett,

With concurrence from General Counsel, I support the recommendations as presented from the University Faculty Handbook Committee.

Attached are the requested changes and modifications to the Faculty Handbook for academic year 2020.

REQUEST APPROVED:

Rodney D. Bennett, President

11/25/19
David Holt and Ward Sayre Proposes changes to Faculty Handbook Committee Changes Concerning 4.4.1, 4.5.2, 4.7.2 Faculty Evaluation Meetings recommendation from CoDs on October 14, 2019.

First Vote Date: 10/14/19
First Vote Results: Passes

Majority Opinion: moving from calendar to academic years. Needs a memo from Council of Directors about covering Spring 2019 in a 3-semester review for the first use

Minority Opinion: none

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: One Month, November 11, 2019

University Counsel Opinion: ______________________
Employee Handbook Opinion: No issues 10/17
Faculty Senate Opinion: ______________________
Council of Directors Opinion: ______________________
Deans Opinion: ______________________
Vice President of Research Opinion: ______________________
Provost Opinion: ______________________

Second Vote Results 11/11/19 Pass

Majority Opinion: ______ still favor the change

Minority Opinion: ______ none

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: ______________________

The original language from the handbook (with working edits from 9/30) New changes here are green.

I move that the following sections:

4.4.1 Annual Activity Report
All academic personnel must submit annual activity reports to the school director by January 31st. These reports include a summary of professional activities in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service during the year evaluated.

... 

4.5.2 Faculty Evaluation Meetings
The annual evaluation process offers an opportunity both to review activities from the previous year, and for faculty to discuss professional objectives and goals for the year ahead, and to request necessary resources with their directors.

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between February 1st and March 15th. Two distinct meetings are necessary to complete the annual evaluation process for each faculty member: (1) review
and discussion of the previous year's activities and (2) establishment of professional objectives and workload allocation for the year ahead.

The first meeting will include the faculty member, school director, and FEC members. The proceedings include discussion of the basis of the evaluation and the opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings. At this meeting, the evaluation is signed by the faculty member, school director, and FEC members, if appropriate. Faculty member signature does not signify concurrence with the evaluation, only receipt.

Prior to signing completed annual evaluations, faculty may request written communication from administrative evaluators to outline strategies for improving workload allocation issues or request resources available for high-quality teaching and research/creative activities. Faculty also may appeal the results of their annual evaluations if they disagree with the assigned ratings or written comments from the evaluation committee. If the response remains unsatisfactory to the faculty member and efforts to resolve issues are unsuccessful at the school level, an appeal can be initiated in accord with the grievance procedure outlined in Error! Reference source not found. Faculty who are repeatedly overruled in their efforts to appeal annual evaluation results but continue to appeal evaluation results are subject to reprimand and expressions of concerns regarding their collegiality.

The second meeting is between the school director and the faculty member. When a faculty member and the director are unable to agree on appropriate annual objectives, the dean serves as the final arbiter.

Although not required, quarterly or mid-year meetings are strongly encouraged between faculty and directors to revisit objectives and to promote faculty success and continuous professional development.

4.7.2 Post-Tenure Review Process

When applicable, PTR should be initiated in the spring, as soon as annual evaluations for an academic year are approved by a dean. Schools should not delay the PTR process until the fall.

PTRs are to be conducted by three faculty members selected from any school or college within the University, with one member each selected by school director, dean, and the faculty member. By unanimous agreement of the three selected faculty, up to two additional faculty may be added to the committee. The committee meets over a two-year period. When committee members cannot complete their two-year terms, replacement representatives are selected by whoever made the original selections.

Within one month of the date of initiation of PTR, or not later than September 1 of the first year to be included in PTR, the faculty member being evaluated will prepare and submit a portfolio of all relevant materials. The portfolio should include the current annual evaluation; annual evaluations from the preceding four years; goals for each of those years; an up-to-date curriculum vitae; evidence of performance contributions in the categories of teaching, research/creative activity, and service; and a new formal development plan. Additional materials may be added to the portfolio by the school director or dean at any time during the process but added materials must be shared with the faculty member.
4.4.1 Annual Activity Report

All academic personnel must submit annual activity reports to the school director by May 31st. These reports include a summary of professional activities in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service during the year evaluated.

4.5.2 Faculty Evaluation Meetings

The annual evaluation process offers an opportunity both to review activities from the previous year, and for faculty to discuss professional objectives and goals for the year ahead, and to request necessary resources with their directors.

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between June 1st and August 31st, February 1st and March 15th. Two distinct meetings are generally necessary to complete the annual evaluation process for each faculty member: (1) review and discussion of the previous year's activities and (2) establishment of professional objectives and workload allocation for the year ahead.

The first meeting is optional and may will include the faculty member, school director, and/or FEC members. The proceedings include discussion of the basis of the evaluation and the opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings. At this meeting, the evaluation is signed by the faculty member, school director, and FEC members, if appropriate. Faculty member signature does not signify concurrence with the evaluation, only receipt.

Prior to signing completed annual evaluations, faculty may request written communication from administrative evaluators to outline strategies for improving workload allocation issues or request resources available for high-quality teaching and research/creative activities. Faculty also may appeal the results of their annual evaluations if they disagree with the assigned ratings or written comments from the evaluation committee. If the response remains unsatisfactory to the faculty member and efforts to resolve issues are unsuccessful at the school level, an appeal can be initiated in accord with the grievance procedure outlined in Error! Reference source not found.. Faculty who are repeatedly overruled in their efforts to appeal annual evaluation results but continue to appeal evaluation results are subject to reprimand and expressions of concerns regarding their collegiality.

The second meeting is between the school director and the faculty member. When a faculty member and the director are unable to agree on appropriate annual objectives, the dean serves as the final arbitrator.

Schools will determine an internal timeline to accommodate the entire annual evaluation process, including the FEC review and evaluation period, when faculty members receive the reports of their annual evaluation, and when optional when meetings with FEC and/or school director occur.
Although not required, quarterly or mid-year meetings are strongly encouraged between faculty and directors to revisit objectives and to promote faculty success and continuous professional development.

4.7.2 Post-Tenure Review Process

When applicable, PTR should be initiated in the fall spring, as soon as annual evaluations for an academic year are approved by a dean. Schools should not delay the PTR process until the spring fall.

PTRs are to be conducted by three faculty members selected from any school or college within the University, with one member each selected by school director, dean, and the faculty member. By unanimous agreement of the three selected faculty, up to two additional faculty may be added to the committee. The committee meets over a two-year period. When committee members cannot complete their two-year terms, replacement representatives are selected by whoever made the original selections.

Within one month of the date of initiation of PTR, or not later than February September 1 of the first year to be included in PTR, the faculty member being evaluated will prepare and submit a portfolio of all relevant materials. The portfolio should include the current annual evaluation; annual evaluations from the preceding four years; goals for each of those years; an up-to-date curriculum vitae; evidence of performance contributions in the categories of teaching, research/creative activity, and service; and a new formal development plan. Additional materials may be added to the portfolio by the school director or dean at any time during the process but added materials must be shared with the faculty member.

Rationale:

The DoC recommended changing the calendar evaluations to annual evaluations and approved by the provost on a memo dated June 10, 2019. The change wanted evaluations from June 1 to May 30 with the evaluation meetings occurring between June 1 and August 30. The memo references Initiative #1 1.6.3 but it aligns with 4.4.1, but dates for returning the forms and Post-Tenure Review will need adjusting.

Supporting Documents:
June 10, 2019

To: Dr. Steven Moser, Provost

From: Dr. Pat Sims, Council of Directors

Re: Annual Evaluation

The Council of Directors voted on the motion to have the Annual Evaluation period align with the academic calendar. The vote was 23 in favor and 2 opposed. In summary, the CoD recommends that the review period should be from June 1st through May 30th and the evaluation meetings are to occur between June 1st and August 30th. I have attached the approved edits to Initiative #1: Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance, 1.6.3 Faculty Evaluation Meetings. Please let me know if you need further information.
Revised 6/3/19
Excerpted from Initiative #1: Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance

1.6.3 Faculty Evaluation Meetings

The annual evaluation process should offer an opportunity for faculty members to communicate with their supervisors about professional objectives for the year ahead and to request resources necessary to accomplish those objectives. Evaluation meetings with individual faculty members should stimulate communication to achieve objectives, not merely serve as a disclosure and arbitration about activities during the previous year. Meetings should further include a conversation about how faculty can best align their professional goals with the needs and vision of the program, School, College, and University.

All faculty members of the Corps of Instruction will submit annual activity reports to the school Director by January 31st June 1. These should include a summary of professional activities in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service during the year review period evaluated. The review period is June 1-May 30. The Director will subsequently distribute the activity reports to appropriate members of the FEC for their review. Each member of the committee (Options 2 or 3; see Section 1.5.1) will be evaluated by the other members of the committee. School directors and associate deans are evaluated for all work-related categories, including administrative performance, by the college Dean and not by the other members of the FEC. However, evaluation of directors and associate deans for teaching and research/creative activities are based on specifications as outlined in the school-level documents relevant to the person in question, which are provided to the Dean by the FEC upon request. Associate directors are reviewed by the FEC in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and non-administrative service while administrative performance is evaluated exclusively by the director.

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between February 1st and March 15th June 1-August 30. Two distinct meetings are generally necessary to complete the annual evaluation process for each faculty member: (i) review and evaluation of the previous year's activities and (ii) establishment of professional objectives and workload allocation for the year ahead.

The first meeting to evaluate the previous year is optional and may include the faculty member, school Director, and/or FEC members. The proceedings should disclose rationale for the evaluation and clarify any miscommunications with respect to faculty activities during the year evaluated.

The second meeting to establish professional objectives and allocate workload percentages for the following academic year is to be done exclusively between the Director and the individual faculty member. In the event that a faculty member and the Director are unable to establish a consensus for what constitutes appropriate annual objectives, the college Dean serves as the final arbitrator.

Schools will determine an internal timeline to accommodate the entire annual evaluation process, including the FEC review and evaluation period, when faculty members receive the reports of their annual evaluation, and when optional when meetings with the FEC and/or Director occur.
The service of the FEC may extend in the summer months. The review process is completed by August 30.

Prior to signing completed annual evaluations, faculty members may request written communication from administrative evaluators to outline strategies for improving workload allocation issues and/or requesting resources available for high-quality teaching and research/creative activities. Faculty may also appeal results of their annual evaluation if they disagree with the assigned categories (i.e., "Does Not Meet Expectations" and "Meets Expectations") or written comments from the evaluation committee. In either case, if the return communication remains unsatisfactory to the faculty member and efforts to resolve issues are unsuccessful at the school level, an appeal process can be initiated pursuant to the grievance procedure outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty who are repeatedly overruled in their efforts to appeal annual evaluation results, but nevertheless continue to appeal evaluation results, are subject to reprimand and concerns regarding their collegiality.

Although not required, quarterly or mid-year meetings are strongly encouraged between faculty and directors as an opportunity to revisit objectives and to promote faculty success and continuous professional development.
David Holt Proposes changes to Faculty Handbook Committee Changes Concerning 1.9.2, the size of the DAC, on October 14, 2019.

First Vote Date: 10/14/19
First Vote Results: passed

Majority Opinion: Move a sentence earlier in the paragraph for ease of reading and removed upper limit on number of members of the DAC.
Minority Opinion: none

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: One Month, November 11, 2019

University Counsel Opinion: ______________
Employee Handbook Opinion: No issues 10/17
Faculty Senate Opinion: ______________
Council of Directors Opinion: ______________
Deans Opinion: ______________
Vice President of Research Opinion: ______________
Provost Opinion: ______________

Second Vote Results 11/11/19 Pass ______________

Majority Opinion: __ still favor the change ______________
Minority Opinion: __ none ______________

The original language from the handbook (with working edits from 9/30) new changes in green

I move that the following section:

1.9.2 Dean’s Advisory Council

The Dean’s Advisory Council (DAC) represents to the dean the voice of college faculty, staff, and school-level administrators. It works with the dean on strategic planning for the college and provides input on college priorities, initiatives, and goals. Half of its faculty members are faculty representatives; the other half are school directors. All schools are represented either through their director or elected faculty member(s). It includes at least four and no more than eight school directors, elected by their peers in the Dean’s Executive Council, and at least four and no more-than eight tenured, full-time faculty representatives elected by secret ballot by the full-time corps of instruction. In addition, the DAC includes two staff members elected by secret ballot by the college staff. DAC members serve staggered three-year terms.
1.9.2 Dean’s Advisory Council

The Dean’s Advisory Council (DAC) represents to the dean the voice of college faculty, staff, and school-level administrators. It works with the dean on strategic planning for the college and provides input on college priorities, initiatives, and goals. All schools are represented either through their director or elected faculty member(s). At least half of its faculty members are faculty representatives; the remainder are school directors. All schools are represented either through their director or elected faculty member(s). It includes at least four and no more than eight tenured, full-time faculty representatives elected by secret ballot by the full-time corps of instruction. In addition, the DAC includes two staff members elected by secret ballot by the college staff. DAC members serve staggered three-year terms.

Rationale:

The original wording limits to only 16 schools and forces the DAC size in disparate population colleges. This issue was addressed in Appendix D and the FHC recommendation 2 gives the committee the right to act on this change and move to a first vote.

Moving sentence “all schools are represented...” back one sentence is for clarity.
David Holt Proposes changes to Faculty Handbook Committee Changes Concerning 1.9.2, the size of the CPTC, on October 14, 2019.

First Vote Date: 10/14/19
First Vote Results: passed

Majority Opinion: decided that the high-end cap limits the number of schools in a college to 16. We removed the cap.
Minority Opinion: none

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: One Month, November 11, 2019

University Counsel Opinion: ________________
Employee Handbook Opinion: No issues 10/17
Faculty Senate Opinion: ________________
Council of Directors Opinion: ________________
Deans Opinion: ________________
Vice President of Research Opinion: ________________
Provost Opinion: ________________

Second Vote Results 11/11/19 Pass ________________

Majority Opinion: still favor the change ________________
Minority Opinion: none ________________

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: __________________________

The original language from the handbook (with working edits from 9/30)

I move that the following section:

1.9.3 College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The regular functions of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee are to make recommendations to the dean regarding pre-tenure review and applications for promotion and tenure.

Academic colleges must have College Promotion and Tenure Committees. These committees include at least one tenured representative per school in the college, with a minimum of five but no more than fifteen tenured representatives per college, and at least two at-large, full-time teaching professors with the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor from different schools. Representatives are elected by secret ballot by the corps of instruction of their school for staggered three-year terms. Further details regarding the specific composition and size of College Promotion and Tenure Committees are at the discretion of each college.
Members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee may participate only in decisions on candidates of a lower rank. Only tenured faculty members may vote on tenure candidates. Teaching professors may vote on the promotion of teaching-track faculty only. Faculty who are ineligible to vote on a candidate are present in discussions only at the request of the committee.

For the evaluation of interdisciplinary candidates, the committee shall have a reviewer from each of the schools (whether internal or external to the college) in which the candidate is appointed.

University administrators serving as President, Provost, associate or assistant provost, vice president, dean, associate or assistant dean, or school directors may neither vote in such elections nor sit as members or ex officio members of College Promotion and Tenure Committees. Faculty members who are candidates for promotion cannot serve as members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee during the academic year in which they seek promotion.

The proceedings of promotion and tenure committees are strictly confidential. Committee members who are related to candidates being reviewed (as per Board and University nepotism policy) must recuse themselves; they cannot vote or advise other committee members. Members reviewing candidates from their school may not vote on that candidate at the college level.

Have its language changed to:

1.9.3 College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The regular functions of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee are to make recommendations to the dean regarding pre-tenure review and applications for promotion and tenure.

Academic colleges must have College Promotion and Tenure Committees. These committees include at least one tenured representative per school in the college, with a minimum of five but no more than fifteen tenured representatives per college, and at least two at-large, full-time teaching professors with the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor from different schools. Representatives are elected by secret ballot by the corps of instruction of their school for staggered three-year terms. Further details regarding the specific composition and size of College Promotion and Tenure Committees are at the discretion of each college.

Members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee may participate only in decisions on candidates of a lower rank. Only tenured faculty members may vote on tenure candidates. Teaching professors may vote on the promotion of teaching-track faculty only. Faculty who are ineligible to vote on a candidate are present in discussions only at the request of the committee.

For the evaluation of interdisciplinary candidates, the committee shall have a reviewer from each of the schools (whether internal or external to the college) in which the candidate is appointed.

University administrators serving as President, Provost, associate or assistant provost, vice president, dean, associate or assistant dean, or school directors may neither vote in such elections nor sit as members or ex officio members of College Promotion and Tenure Committees. Faculty members who are candidates for promotion cannot serve as members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee during the academic year in which they seek promotion.
The proceedings of promotion and tenure committees are strictly confidential. Committee members who are related to candidates being reviewed (as per Board and University nepotism policy) must recuse themselves; they cannot vote or advise other committee members. Members reviewing candidates from their school may not vote on that candidate at the college level.

Rationale:

The original wording limits to only 16 schools and forces the CPTC size in disparate population colleges. This issue was addressed in Appendix D and the FHC recommendation 2 gives the committee the right to act on this change and move to a first vote.
David Holt Proposes changes to Faculty Handbook Committee Changes Concerning Many sections, editorial or minor updates to meet November 1 deadline for P&T on September 30, 2019.

First Vote Date: September 30
First Vote Results: Passed

   Majority Opinion: Needed Edits
   Minority Opinion: None

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 2 weeks, October 14

   University Counsel Opinion: ________________
   Employee Handbook Opinion: No issues 10/17
   Faculty Senate Opinion: ________________
   Council of Directors Opinion: ______ Fine ____________
   Deans Opinion: ___ Edit references ________________
   Vice President of Research Opinion: ________________
   Provost Opinion: ________________

Second Vote Results 11/11/19 Pass ________________

   Majority Opinion: ____ still favor the change ________________
   Minority Opinion: ____ none ________________

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _________________________

Editorial Corrections for Clarity or Understanding (Motioned by David Holt)

Corrections that are for clarity or fixes that should be agreeable, but are changes or additions (Motioned by David Holt)

89. 1.5 lists five vice presidents that include Vice President for Gulf Park. Why do we list them if there is a link?
   Recommend:

   1.5 The Vice Presidents (vice presidents)
   “The University has five vice presidents, whose functions and specific job responsibilities are determined by the President.” STRIKE sentence 2.

   Logic: does not align with current model (no Vice President for Gulf Park anymore) and listing them specifically forces changes in the handbook each time the VPs are changed.
90. THIS ITEM WAS VOTED TO BE REMOVED BY AMENDMENT – no changes

91. 1.8.3 Faculty Handbook Committee – first sentence needs to be changed match bylaws
   Recommend:
   
   “The Faculty Handbook Committee considers revisions proposals, modifications, and amendments to the Faculty Handbook submitted brought to it from an official university governing body or administrative office.” ...
   Logic: alignment of documents and the current language pre-dates the approved bylaws

92. 1.11.1 “This website contains current versions of all the University's official policies.”
   Kill the sentence for lack of added information.
   Logic: The next sentence states the same thing.

93. 2.4.1 “There are two types of post-doctoral positions.”
   “There are two types of post-doctoral positions: post-doctoral fellows and post-doctoral associates.”
   Logic: the original sentence seems to just stop and the 2 positions are buried in the paragraph.

94. THIS ITEM WAS VOTED TO BE REMOVED BY AMENDMENT – no changes

95. 3.3.4 last sentence: web link RIO

96. 3.4.2.5 Syllabi “requires on all syllabi (including information regarding ... Academic Integrity Policy), are available from the Provost's website.”
   “requires on all syllabi (including information regarding ... Academic Integrity Policy), are available from the Provost's website.”
   Logic: information is available on the linked website. Also, the word “website” could be hyperlinked

97. AMENDED FROM ORIGINAL 4.6.1.1 p2 s2 and s3 “For example, the jointly appointed faculty member should not have more responsibilities for unit meetings or advising than non-jointly appointed faculty. Other terms to be specified include: resources provided, physical space needs ...”
   “For example, the jointly appointed faculty member should not have more responsibilities for unit meetings or advising than non-jointly appointed faculty. Other
**Terms Expectations to be specified include:** responsibilities for unit meetings, resources provided, physical space needs ...

Logic: seems unnecessary and implies that they would not have to attend meetings for both units? Or do they choose every other meeting? We can combine it for ease of reading.

98. 5.2.2 p1 s3 “stops at the Provost’s level, while tenure decisions are finalized at the level of the IHL board.”

End sentence at “stops at the Provost’s level.”

Logic: this sentence is not necessary here. It also does not include president. Recommend it be removed.

99. AMENDED FROM ORIGINAL 5.4.2 s2 and s3 “There is no guarantee that tenure will be awarded at the conclusion of the probationary period. Neither is tenure a guarantee of lifetime employment”

“There is no guarantee that tenure will be awarded at the conclusion of the probationary period. Tenure is not a guarantee of lifetime employment”

Logic: the 2 sentences moved to parallel sentence structure
David Holt via University Counsel Proposes changes to Faculty Handbook Committee Concerning 1.9.3, 1.10.2, Clinical, Research and Artist in Residence faculty and Administration on FEC on October 14, 2019.

First Vote Date: 10/14/19
First Vote Results: Passed

   Majority Opinion: No need to cap and limit number of schools. Need to address initiative 2 recommendation to not include clinical in FEC
   Minority Opinion: none

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: One Month, November 11, 2019

   University Counsel Opinion: 
   Employee Handbook Opinion: No issues 10/17
   Faculty Senate Opinion: 
   Council of Directors Opinion: 
   Deans Opinion: 
   Vice President of Research Opinion: 
   Provost Opinion: 

Second Vote Results 11/11/19 Pass (one abstain)

   Majority Opinion: still favor the change
   Minority Opinion: none

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: 

The original language from the handbook (with working edits from 9/30) Areas of interest in original document in blue. Areas of recommended changes in Green.

I move that the following section:

1.9.3 College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The regular functions of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee are to make recommendations to the dean regarding pre-tenure review and applications for promotion and tenure.

Academic colleges must have College Promotion and Tenure Committees. These committees include at least one tenured representative per school in the college, with a minimum of five but no more than fifteen tenured representatives per college, and at least two at-large, full-time teaching professors with the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor from different schools. Representatives
are elected by secret ballot by the corps of instruction of their school for staggered three-year terms. Further details regarding the specific composition and size of College Promotion and Tenure Committees are at the discretion of each college.

Members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee may participate only in decisions on candidates of a lower rank. Only tenured faculty members may vote on tenure candidates. Teaching professors may vote on the promotion of teaching-track faculty only. Faculty who are ineligible to vote on a candidate are present in discussions only at the request of the committee.

For the evaluation of interdisciplinary candidates, the committee shall have a reviewer from each of the schools (whether internal or external to the college) in which the candidate is appointed.

University administrators serving as President, Provost, associate or assistant provost, vice president, dean, associate or assistant dean, or school directors may neither vote in such elections nor sit as members or ex officio members of College Promotion and Tenure Committees. Faculty members who are candidates for promotion cannot serve as members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee during the academic year in which they seek promotion.

The proceedings of promotion and tenure committees are strictly confidential. Committee members who are related to candidates being reviewed (as per Board and University nepotism policy) must recuse themselves; they cannot vote or advise other committee members. Members reviewing candidates from their school may not vote on that candidate at the college level.

1.10.2 Faculty Evaluation Committee

Each academic year, the school will choose one of three governance options for faculty evaluations. Governance options are chosen and Faculty Evaluation Committees (FEC) are elected by secret ballot. Those eligible to vote include all the school’s full-time members of the corps of instruction with a minimum 50% appointment within the school. Depending on the governance option chosen, an FEC faculty evaluation committee may be formed. The main function of the faculty evaluation committee (FEC) is to conduct annual evaluations of faculty in the school. FECs may also advise school directors on other personnel matters, aside from promotion and tenure.

Those tenure-track faculty members eligible to serve on an FEC include only tenured faculty with at least three years’ service at the University and rank of professor or associate professor. School directors, however, are eligible to participate in the evaluation process upon initiation of their appointment. Generally, eligible members should include only those who have workload responsibilities in all three ratings categories and received a rating of at least “meets expectation” in all three categories in the prior year’s annual evaluation.

Eligibility criteria differ slightly for teaching-track faculty members. All teaching-track faculty within the school with a minimum of three years of service with the University, a minimum 50% appointment within the school, and who hold the rank of associate teaching professor or higher are eligible for committee membership. Teaching-track faculty with the rank of instructor, lecturer, senior lecturer, or...
Assistant teaching professor are ineligible for committee membership. Teaching-track faculty members serving on FECs may evaluate only other teaching-track members.

Faculty holding appointments within a school and serving as University administrative officers in the positions of President, Provost, Vice President, or college dean may not be members of FECs. Faculty holding an appointment within the school and serving as associate dean or associate or vice provost are typically excluded from FEC eligibility, but they may be eligible if desired representation of an academic program would be unfilled because no other faculty members in the program meet eligibility requirements.

Faculty members holding the position of artist in residence, professor of practice, visiting professor, research professor, as well as those holding honorary rank, employed on a terminal contract, undergoing post-tenure review, or who are otherwise excluded for reasons specified in the rules governing school evaluation proceedings, are ineligible to serve on an FEC.

Faculty members who are related (as per Board and University Nepotism Policy) to parties being reviewed or evaluated in any personnel matter must recuse themselves from all evaluation proceedings involving those parties. They must not vote or offer advice, either directly or indirectly, to other committee members.

In consultation with the college dean, schools may create FEC subcommittees to evaluate subsets of the school’s faculty members if doing so best assures competent and fair evaluations of those each subcommittee represents.

Have its language changed to:

1.9.3 College Promotion and Tenure Committee

The regular functions of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee are to make recommendations to the dean regarding pre-tenure review and applications for promotion and tenure.

Academic colleges must have College Promotion and Tenure Committees. These committees include at least one tenured representative per school in the college, with a minimum of five but no more than fifteen tenured representatives per college, and at least two at-large, full-time teaching professors with the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor from different schools. Representatives are elected by secret ballot by the corps of instruction of their school for staggered three-year terms. Further details regarding the specific composition and size of College Promotion and Tenure Committees are at the discretion of each college.

Members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee may participate only in decisions on candidates of a lower rank. Only tenured faculty members may vote on tenure candidates. Teaching professors may vote on the promotion of teaching-track faculty only. Faculty who are ineligible to vote on a candidate are present in discussions only at the request of the committee.

For the evaluation of interdisciplinary candidates, the committee shall have a reviewer from each of the schools (whether internal or external to the college) in which the candidate is appointed.
University administrators serving as President, Provost, associate or assistant provost, vice president, dean, associate or assistant dean, or school directors may neither vote in such elections nor sit as members or ex officio members of College Promotion and Tenure Committees unless invited by a majority vote of the committee. Faculty members who are candidates for promotion cannot serve as members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee during the academic year in which they seek promotion.

The proceedings of promotion and tenure committees are strictly confidential. Committee members who are related to candidates being reviewed (as per Board and University nepotism policy) must recuse themselves; they cannot vote or advise other committee members. Members reviewing candidates from their school may not vote on that candidate at the college level.

1.10.2 Faculty Evaluation Committee

Each academic year, the school will choose one of three governance options for faculty evaluations. Governance options are chosen and Faculty Evaluation Committees (FEC) are elected by secret ballot. Those eligible to vote include all the school’s full-time members of the corps of instruction with a minimum 50% appointment within the school. Depending on the governance option chosen, an FEC faculty evaluation committee may be formed. The main function of the faculty evaluation committee (FEC) is to conduct annual evaluations of faculty in the school. FECs may also advise school directors on other personnel matters, aside from promotion and tenure.

Those tenure-track faculty members eligible to serve on an FEC include only tenured faculty with at least three years’ service at the University, a minimum 50% appointment in the school, and rank of professor or associate professor. School directors, however, are eligible to participate in the evaluation process upon initiation of their appointment. Generally, eligible members should include only those who have workload responsibilities in all three ratings categories and received a rating of at least “meets expectation” in all three categories in the prior year’s annual evaluation.

Eligibility criteria differ slightly for teaching-track faculty members. All teaching-track faculty within the school with a minimum of three years of service with the University, a minimum 50% appointment within the school, and who hold the rank of associate teaching professor or higher are eligible for committee membership. Teaching-track faculty with the rank of instructor, lecturer, senior lecturer, or assistant teaching professor are ineligible for committee membership. Teaching-track faculty members serving on FECs may evaluate only other teaching-track members.

Faculty holding appointments within a school and serving as University administrative officers in the positions of President, Provost, Vice President, or college dean may not be members of FECs. Faculty holding an appointment within the school and serving as associate dean or associate or vice provost are typically excluded from FEC eligibility, but they may be eligible if desired representation of an academic program would be unfilled because no other faculty members in the program meet eligibility requirements.

Faculty members holding the position of who are clinical faculty, artist in residence, professor of practice, visiting professor, research faculty professor, as well as those holding honorary rank, employed
on a terminal contract, undergoing post-tenure review, or who are otherwise excluded for reasons specified in the rules governing school evaluation proceedings are ineligible to serve on an FEC.

Faculty members who are related (as per Board and University Nepotism Policy) to parties being reviewed or evaluated in any personnel matter must recuse themselves from all evaluation proceedings involving those parties. They must not vote or offer advice, either directly or indirectly, to other committee members.

In consultation with the college dean, schools may create FEC subcommittees to evaluate subsets of the school’s faculty members if doing so best assures competent and fair evaluations of those each subcommittee represents.

Rationale:

Per Initiative 1, Section 1.4.2, those eligible for membership on the FEC include tenured faculty with at least 3 years’ service at the University, a minimum 50% appointment within the school, and rank of professor or associate professor. This has been inadvertently left out of the 2nd paragraph discussing tenure-track faculty. See Initiative 1, section 1.4.2 below:

1.4.2 Committee Membership Eligibility. All tenured members of the Corps of Instruction within the unit with a minimum of three years of service with the University, a minimum 50% appointment within the School (for jointly appointed faculty see Section 1.7), and who hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher are eligible for FEC membership.

Initiative 2 – 7.1.3(i) says that University administrators serving as President, Provost, associate or assistant provost, vice president, dean, associate or assistant dean, or school directors can’t serve unless invited by a majority vote by committee to participate. However, the new Faculty Handbook just simply says they can’t serve at all and does not mention being invited.

Our handbook refers to clinical professors and research professors as “clinical faculty” and “research faculty”. This change also covers all ranks in those lines.
David Holt Proposes changes to Faculty Handbook Committee Changes Concerning 1.2, the official name of IHL, on October 14, 2019.

First Vote Date: 10/14/19
First Vote Results: passed
  Majority Opinion: Need IHL to be called the right name as per their bylaws
  Minority Opinion: none
Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: One Month, November 11, 2019
  University Counsel Opinion: 
  Employee Handbook Opinion: No issues 10/17
  Faculty Senate Opinion: 
  Council of Directors Opinion: 
  Deans Opinion: 
  Vice President of Research Opinion: 
  Provost Opinion: 
Second Vote Results 11/11/19 Pass
  Majority Opinion: still favor the change
  Minority Opinion: none
Presidential Approval or Rejection with date:

The original language from the handbook (with working edits from 9/30)

I move that the following section:

1.2 Board of Trustees of Mississippi State Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL)
The Board of Trustees of Mississippi State Institutions of Higher Learning ("IHL" or "the Board") manages the eight public universities in Mississippi, including USM. The members are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board sets institutional policies and requires legal, fiscal, and programmatic accountability from its constituent institutions. More information about the Board, including its Policies and Bylaws, can be found on the IHL website.

Have its language changed to:

1.2 Board of Trustees of Mississippi State Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL)
The Board of Trustees of Mississippi State Institutions of Higher Learning ("IHL" or "the Board") manages the eight public universities in Mississippi, including USM. The members are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board sets institutional policies and requires legal, fiscal,
and programmatic accountability from its constituent institutions. More information about the Board, including its Policies and Bylaws, can be found on the IHL website.

Rationale:

As per IHL Board of Trustees Policies & Bylaws 101.02 Name, “the official name for the Board of Trustees under the constitution (Section 213-A) is the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning.” We need to use the official name.
Jeremy Scott proposes changes to Faculty Handbook Committee Changes Concerning 3.2 (page 13), Academic Freedom and Shared Governance on October 14, 2019.

First Vote Date: 10/14/19

First Vote Results: passed

Majority Opinion: passed without red letters (additions from Senate) but including the original shared governance language from the old handbook, which is more inclusive. Decided that Senate needs to vet the new language before making the “red letter” changes.

Minority Opinion: none

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: One Month, November 11, 2019

University Counsel Opinion: _______________

Employee Handbook Opinion: No issues

Faculty Senate Opinion: _______________

Council of Directors Opinion: _______________

Deans Opinion: _______________

Vice President of Research Opinion: _______________

Provost Opinion: _______________

Second Vote Results __11/11/19 Pass _______________

Majority Opinion: __still favor the change _______________

Minority Opinion: __none _______________

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _______________

The original language from the handbook (with working edits from 9/30)

I move that the following section:

3.2 Academic Freedom

All members of the faculty have the right to academic freedom. Academic freedom is the liberty of faculty to engage in research/creative activities and to teach content appropriate to the relevant academic disciplines as they see fit, without interference, intimidation, or threats of reprisal from University administrators or political authorities. Liberty is not license, however, and the right of academic freedom entails responsibilities. Academic freedom does not protect violations of law or University policy. Neither does it permit faculty members to harass or speak disrespectfully to students, colleagues, or superiors, nor does it protect classroom speech that is not germane to the course subject. Grievances regarding alleged violations of academic freedom are addressed in Chapter 7.
3.2 Academic Freedom and Shared Governance

All members of the faculty have the right to academic freedom. Academic freedom is the liberty of faculty to engage in research/creative activities and to teach content appropriate to the relevant academic disciplines as they see fit, without interference, intimidation, or threats of reprisal from University administrators or political authorities. Liberty is not license, however, and the right of academic freedom entails responsibilities. Academic freedom does not protect violations of law or University policy. Neither does it permit faculty members to harass or speak disrespectfully to students, colleagues, or superiors, nor does it protect classroom speech that is not germane to the course subject.

Academic freedom and shared governance are long-established and living principles at The University of Southern Mississippi. The University cherishes the free exchange of ideas, diversity of thought, joint decision making, and individuals’ assumption of responsibility.

Academic freedom is fundamental to the central values and purposes of a university, which in turn protects freedom of inquiry and speech. Faculty and students must be able to study, learn, speak, teach, research, and publish, without fear of intimidation or reprisal, free from political interference, in an environment of tolerance for and engagement with divergent opinions. Each faculty member is entitled to freedom from institutional censorship or disciplinary action in discussing his or her subject in the classroom, and when speaking or writing outside the classroom as an individual. It is understood, however, that with academic freedom there must be concomitant responsibility for statements, speeches, and actions. Grievances regarding alleged violations of academic freedom are addressed in Chapter 7.

The University of Southern Mississippi believes in the widely accepted principles of shared governance within the university. Therefore, the University recognizes that the faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. The University also endorses a consultative process by which academic decisions are made through a joint effort of faculty, and administrators and with the cooperation and support of the affected faculty constituency.

The President’s authority derives from the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning. As the chief executive officer of the University, the President is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new ones; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large number of nonacademic activities; and by the nature of the office is the chief spokesperson for the University. In these and other areas the President’s task is to plan, organize, direct, and represent, and in these functions the President should receive the general support of the faculty. The University recognizes that the faculty should be consulted and with respect to such matters as long-range plans for the institution, the allocation and use of fiscal and physical resources, and the selection of academic officers.

The University of Southern Mississippi acknowledges that true faculty participation in the governance of academic affairs requires good faith on the part of both faculty and administration and a genuine commitment by both to a program of shared governance.
Rationale:

This was approved by Faculty Senate on March 1, 2019. I have edited it to replace chairs with directors and departments with schools.

Red letters are from another document but are the changes that were passed by senate. Committee, after a good amount of debate, decided to pass without senate changes to put original language back in, with full expectation to revisit those changes in a future meeting.

This policy draws from the 1966 “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the American Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
David Holt Proposes changes to Faculty Handbook Committee Changes Concerning 6.4.4.6, 6.4.4.8.9, 7.2.1 7.2.2 concerning use of the term “days” on October 14, 2019.

First Vote Date: 10/14/19
First Vote Results: Passes

    Majority Opinion: work days preferred and defined in employee handbook. All uses of the word “days” needs to have “work” or “calendar” as modifiers.

    Minority Opinion: None

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: One Month, November 11, 2019

    University Counsel Opinion: ________________
    Employee Handbook Opinion: No issues 10/17
    Faculty Senate Opinion: ________________
    Council of Directors Opinion: ________________
    Deans Opinion: ________________
    Vice President of Research Opinion: ________________
    Provost Opinion: ________________

Second Vote Results 11/11/19 Pass

    Majority Opinion: still favor the change ________________
    Minority Opinion: none ________________

The original language from the handbook (with working edits from 9/30 in yellow) Recommended Changes in Green

I move that the following sections:

6.4.4.6. Notice of Termination Proceedings

In the event the President decides to close the case with no further institutional action, the President will notify the faculty member by certified mail.

In the event the President decides to implement institutional action consistent with the terms of resolution agreed upon with the faculty member, the President will notify the faculty member by certified mail of the resolution’s official terms and implement those terms.

In the event the President decides to initiate termination proceedings, or the faculty member fails to honor the agreed-upon resolution terms, the President will notify the faculty member by certified mail
of the intention of the University to initiate formal termination proceedings. The notice will include the following: a detailed statement of the grounds for termination; notice of the faculty member’s right to formally contest the charges in a hearing before the University Promotion and Tenure Committee University Advisory Committee; notice of the faculty member’s right to be advised by legal counsel during the hearing; notice of any suspension of pay or change of duties pending the conclusion of the matter; and notice that the faculty member has 14 working days from the date of receipt of the notice to contest the charges and request a hearing in writing before the University Promotion and Tenure Committee University Advisory Committee.

6.4.4.8.9. Findings and Conclusions

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee University Advisory Committee will reach its decision by majority vote. Within 10 days after the hearing’s conclusion, the committee will submit its recommendation to the President, with a copy to the Provost, and the faculty member that will contain (1) a written account of the committee’s vote, the vote constituting a recommendation to the President; (2) a written majority opinion, including the rationale therefore; (3) a written minority opinion, if applicable, including the rationale therefore; (4) the hearing’s recording; and (5) the hearing’s transcript.

7.2.1. Initiating a Grievance

Faculty grievance proceedings are initiated when an employee submits a written claim to the chair of the school’s Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) or school director. The claim must be supported with objective evidence, alleging that a specified rule, policy, or procedure has been violated, misinterpreted, or misapplied. The claim must be submitted within 10 working days of the occurrence that gave rise to the grievance or 10 working days from when the facts pertaining to it became known or should have been known to the faculty member.

7.2.2. School Response and Conference

Upon receipt of a grievance, the school’s FEC committee or school director will invite the involved parties to a conference at the earliest date convenient to both parties, to attempt to informally resolve the grievance. At the conclusion of the conference, the chair of the school’s FEC or school director will prepare a written memorandum of the grievance, including any agreement reached, and provide a copy to the involved parties within ten working days.

Have its language changed to:

6.4.4.6. Notice of Termination Proceedings

In the event the President decides to close the case with no further institutional action, the President will notify the faculty member by certified mail.

In the event the President decides to implement institutional action consistent with the terms of resolution agreed upon with the faculty member, the President will notify the faculty member by certified mail of the resolution’s official terms and implement those terms.
In the event the President decides to initiate termination proceedings, or the faculty member fails to honor the agreed-upon resolution terms, the President will notify the faculty member by certified mail of the intention of the University to initiate formal termination proceedings. The notice will include the following: a detailed statement of the grounds for termination; notice of the faculty member’s right to formally contest the charges in a hearing before the University Promotion and Tenure Committee University Advisory Committee; notice of the faculty member’s right to be advised by legal counsel during the hearing; notice of any suspension of pay or change of duties pending the conclusion of the matter; and notice that the faculty member has 10 working days from the date of receipt of the notice to contest the charges and request a hearing in writing before the University Promotion and Tenure Committee University Advisory Committee.

6.4.4.8.9. Findings and Conclusions

The University Promotion and Tenure Committee University Advisory Committee will reach its decision by majority vote. Within 10 working days after the hearing’s conclusion, the committee will submit its recommendation to the President, with a copy to the Provost, and the faculty member that will contain (1) a written account of the committee’s vote, the vote constituting a recommendation to the President; (2) a written majority opinion, including the rationale therefore; (3) a written minority opinion, if applicable, including the rationale therefore; (4) the hearing’s recording; and (5) the hearing’s transcript.

7.2.1. Initiating a Grievance

Faculty grievance proceedings are initiated when an employee submits a written claim to the chair of the school’s Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) or school director. The claim must be supported with objective evidence, alleging that a specified rule, policy, or procedure has been violated, misinterpreted, or misapplied. The claim must be submitted within 10 working days of the occurrence that gave rise to the grievance or 10 working days from when the facts pertaining to it became known or should have been known to the faculty member.

7.2.2. School Response and Conference

Upon receipt of a grievance, the school’s FEC committee or school director will invite the involved parties to a conference at the earliest date convenient to both parties, to attempt to informally resolve the grievance. At the conclusion of the conference, the chair of the school’s FEC or school director will prepare a written memorandum of the grievance, including any agreement reached, and provide a copy to the involved parties within 10 working days.
Rationale:

Initiative 3 recommended a consistency between work days to calendar days to reduce confusion. University Counsel prefers work days to calendar days. One instance of calendar days of “30 calendar days” and it was decided to leave it. One instance of just “days” and changed to “work days”

5.4.1 Employee Handbook reference to work days (hyperlink to handbook, but cannot directly link)