Faculty Handbook Committee Minutes
(APPROVED 14 October 2019)

September 30, 2019
3:00 p.m.
Ashbury Hall, 317B
Chair: Mike Forster
Historian: David Holt

Call to order 3:00
Dismissed 5:19

Opening comments by Chair
1. Approve agenda – Approved 3:10
2. Approve September 9 meeting minutes – Approved 3:10
3. Review committee’s scope of authority and standard business process
   a. Bylaws – state that the process is regularized from the committee - change from former methods of everyone could send changes – now only from governing bodies.
   b. Redirect all changes to a governing body
   c. Recommendation 2 gives authority for the committee to act on issues with current handbook
   d. Omissions can be identified and run through the process
   e. Anything new must be from a governance body
   f. Resolution template sent out to motion things to the floor in writing
4. Note any new input and recognize gallery attendees
   a. David Beckett
   b. Subrina (absent) – indicated several things that are not on the list concerning clinical and research positions in 1.8.7, 1.9.3, 1.10.1, 1.10.2
   c. Who can vote on tenure
   d. Need to add back the nepotism clause that is left out.
   e. Priority item last meeting regarding comments from the gallery – 2 types of valid input in the gallery
      i. Suggestions and concerns that the committee could address – welcome but need to be referred to the appropriate governance body
      ii. Contributions for the discussion on the table – inclined to allow any input on condition they are brief and informative, unless they impede our process
5. Review action proposals related to Priority 1 items
   a. Terminology/formatting/consistency “cleanup”
      i. Point 1 is a vote on removing auto format
         1. Motion withdrawn – no action
2. Need to have a word document of the current version of the faculty handbook.
3. Create a shared drive to hold documents
   ii. Point 2 is to add in what should be there and is already approved.
   iii. Block 3-88. approved
   iv. 89 - passed
   v. 90 – struck and no action
   vi. 91 - passed
   vii. 92 - passed
   viii. 93 - passed
   ix. 94 - struck
   x. 95 - passed
   xi. 96 - passed
   xii. 97 – Amended and passed.
   xiii. 98 - passed
   xiv. 99 – Amended and passed.

b. Chapter 1
   i. No longer UAC – what are we going to do with other functions of CAC and UAC?
   ii. Maybe create a subcommittee – FEC is part of college, is there one for the University?
   iii. 1.12 – concerning secret ballots – email should be ok.
   iv. 1.9.2, 1.9.3 – why create a max?

c. Chapter 4 – Tabled

d. Chapter 5
   i. 5.2 – strike “and the Vice President for Research” – strike -voted and approved
   ii. Other items tabled

e. Other: Tabled
   i. Second half of David Holt’s list (non editorial)

6. Tabled: Consider Council of Directors’ proposal to change faculty evaluation period

7. Next actions

Roll Call

Group One (September 2019 – August 2021)
Present: Voting, Elected Member of Faculty from College of Arts and Sciences – Stephen Judd (2019-2021)
Present: Voting, Elected Member of Faculty from College of Nursing and Health Professions – Jill Rushing (2019-2021)
Present: Voting Member of Faculty Senate (Senate Appointed) – Jeremy Scott (2019-2021)

Group Two (September 2019 – August 2022)
Present: Voting, Elected Member of Faculty from College of Business and Economic Development – Marco Wolf (2019-2022)
Present: Voting, Elected Member of Faculty from College of Education and Human Sciences – Michael Forester (2019-2022)

Present: Voting, At-Large Member of Gulf Coast Faculty – David Holt (2019-2022)

Present: Voting Elected member from Dean – Dean Trent Gould (2017-2022)


Gallery: David Beckett
Priority 1 (complete by Nov 1) work items

NOTE: References to the “current Handbook” are to the 2017-2018 version, available on the provost’s website (as is the 2019-2020 Handbook).

Highlighted bits from Initiative #3 (not present in FHB online)
1.8.7 Paragraph 2, sentence 1?
6.4.4.6 – 6.4.4.13 University Advisory Committee
Check Numbering (6.4.4.13 ... 6.3?)
Chapter 7 “Missing: current handbook has CAC advising deans on some of these issues”
7.2.3 – End of paragraph 1 and all of paragraph 2 – mention of CAC
7.2.4 CAC mentioned in 2nd paragraph

Appendix D issues
Terminology, formatting and style
“Academic staff” is used in a way that conflict with university use – change to faculty or faculty member – Academic personnel is the new language used – confirm
Verify capitalization
Verify oxford comma

Suggestions and Observations (in Bold High priority 1)
Chapter 1:
Since there is no longer a College or University Advisory Committee and instead College and University Promotion and Tenure Committees will review promotion, tenure, and pre-tenure dossiers, the other functions of the CAC and UAC need to be addressed.  (e.g. Error! Reference source not found.)

Error! Reference source not found, on procedural rules: this came from the current chapter 8 on faculty evaluations (8.2.9), although it seems more broadly applicable. The section on absentee voting says the vote needs to be submitted in a sealed envelope.  Discuss if this is necessary.

Error! Reference source not found, the Dean’s Advisory Council: the numbers come from Initiative 4, but the wording limits colleges to at most 16 schools. Is this intentional?

Error! Reference source not found, Initiative 1 specifies that eligibility for service on the FEC is tied to faculty evaluation ratings in the year prior. We do not know how this can be done.
without violating confidentiality. It also says that this “generally should” be true, which implies that there may be exceptions without making clear the circumstances warranting the exception.

Chapter 4:
Initiative #1 discusses grievance procedures for faculty evaluations, but these are inconsistent with grievance procedures in the old Handbook, which include annual evaluations as items that may be contested under the grievance process. The two processes are inconsistent. The same inconsistency applies to “teaching assignments” mentioned in old grievance procedures descriptions, but that also pertain to Initiative #1 insofar as a teaching assignment is a workload issue.

Chapter 5:
The current handbook stipulates that the chair of the department promotion and tenure committee signs the letter on behalf of the faculty. It does not stipulate this for the college level or the university level. In practice it seems that sometimes letters are signed by everyone on the committees and sometimes by just the chair.

At every level except the UAC, recommendations are sent to each of the evaluative levels that precede it. However, the UAC forwards a copy of the letter to the applicant only (current handbook section 9.9.2). Is this inconsistency intentional? (new draft section Error! Reference source not found.)

On page 99 of the current handbook, in section 9.7.2 regarding pre-tenure review the following sentence appears: “Although tenure candidates are not entitled to appear before departmental tenure committees, the committees may, at their discretion, request that parties being assessed appear before them. Departmental tenure committees conducting pre-tenure reviews may consider any matter related to tenure policies...” The sentence about candidates for tenure appearing before the tenure committee seems misplaced here. It also is not addressed elsewhere. If that is an important point and really true, it should be added in to the section on the tenure process at the school level. Does it also apply to promotion cases?

There is no policy regarding promotion of clinical and research faculty in initiative 2. The paragraph on it in new Error! Reference source not found.comes from the current handbook page 21, section 4.4.A. It says that they are not evaluated by the University Advisory Committee.

Current handbook 9.3.3 says “The President is advised on personnel recommendations by the administrative heads of the University’s academic units, the Provost, the University Advisory Committee, the college deans, the College Advisory Committees, the Vice President for Research, General Counsel, and by the other vice presidents in matters that are within their administrative jurisdiction.” We first split this into two sentences to separate the people who do advise from those who may advise. The latter should be evaluated.

Sec. Error! Reference source not found., in discussion of negative pre-tenure reviews, references “upon the recommendation of the Provost and the Vice President for
Research.” It seems in practice, however, that the VPR is not involved, and this should be changed (although we didn’t change it).

The old deferral policy (current handbook 9.6.6) permits deferral of tenure to the 7th year or later while the initiative only permits a one-year extension. Should it be the more expansive time? A second question is whether the extension needs to be requested prior to submission of the application. Third, the handbook should address whether extensions are permitted for third-year review.

The current handbook has it that department chairs may participate in departmental promotion and tenure proceedings only if approved by secret ballot of departmental committee. Should that stay the same now, substituting schools for departments and school directors for chairs, See also 9.5.2, current handbook. If school directors can be invited, it should be added to Error! Reference source not found.

Other issues
Teaching track being allowed to vote on promotion
T&P needs to be P&T and arranged in handbook that way
Editorial Corrections for Clarity or Easily Approved (Holt)

1. Generally, using auto numbering and formatting is a novel idea
   Action: strip formatting out of the handbook and manually format each chapter- internal
   hyperlinks will be broken, but better visualization will occur

2. In the section of notice:
   “Governance and standing committee bylaws shall no supersede the authority of the University
   President as designated by the State Institutions of Higher Learning Board of Trustees or the
   State of Mississippi.”
   Action: Needs to be added to the end of paragraph 1 after “controlling and take precedence. …)
   Note: this was approved by FHC and supposed to be in the version online currently. No action
   needed.

3. In section 1.8.1 of the Table of Contents
   Add Information to ToC to expand 1.8.1 Councils of Academic Excellence
   Action: add 1.8.1.1 Executive Academic Leadership Council, 1.8.1.2 Graduate Council, 1.8.1.3
   Professional Education Council, and 1.8.1.4 Undergraduate Council
   Note: ease in navigation

4. 1.8.7 last paragraph, extra “and” in “Promotion and Tenure and Committee”
   Action: strike second “and”

5. 1.9.2 5th sentence: “no more than eight tenured full-time faculty”
   Action: add comma after “tenured”

6. 1.9.3 P3 S3: “Teaching professors may vote on the promotion of teaching track faculty only.”
   Action 1: move “only” from the end of the sentence to the beginning
   Action 2: hyphenate tenure-track

7. 1.10.1 p2 s2 “on tenure decisions or promotion of tenure track faculty”
   Action: flip tenure and promotion
   Action: hyphenate tenure-track
   Result: “promotion of tenure-track faculty or tenure decisions”

8. 1.10.1 p5 s2 “promotion committee, ideally proportional to the percentage”
   Action: add comma after “Ideally”

9. 1.10.2 s2 “FECs are elected”
   Action: spell out first use – “Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)”

10. 1.10.2 s3 and 4: 50% appointment within the school. (When the school …)
    Action: combine – “within the school (when the school…”

11. 1.10.2 s5 “a faculty evaluation committee”
Action: “an FEC”

12. 1.10.2 s6 “The main function of the faculty evaluation committee (FEC) is ...”
    Action: “of the FEC is ...”

13. 1.10.2 p3 s1 “for teaching track faculty”
    Action “teaching-track faculty”

14. 1.10.2 p4 s1 “Provost, Vice President, or college dean...”
    Action “vice president”
    Note” more than one VP so not capitalized

15. 1.10.2.2 p1 last sentence “of the teaching track faculty”
    Action: “teaching-track faculty”

16. 1.10.2.3 p1 s1 “is vested in a FEC consisting”
    Action: “in an FEC consisting”

17. 1.10.2.4 p1 s1 “if a FEC member resigns”
    Action: “If an FEC member resigns”

18. 1.12 p4 s1 “An absentee vote is a vote, cast in absentia”
    Action: “is a vote cast in absentia” (kill comma)

19. 2.1.1 s1 “academic rank in a college, university or other education institution”
    Action (maybe) is to add an oxford comma, but it is part of a quote from another document, so
    we may need to leave it.

20. 2.1.2 s3 “The by-laws of each university advisory body...”
    Action: “The bylaws of each” – other uses are spelled bylaws over by-laws

21. 2.1.2 s4 “including promotion and tenure, for non-tenure track members of the ...”
    Action: “for non-tenure-track members”

22. 2.1.3 s1 “the university also employs people who by virtue of their academic training or duties
    are included...”
    Action: “people who, by virtue of their academic training or duties, are included”

23. 2.2 title “Tenure Track Faculty”
    Action” Tenure-Track Faculty

24. 2.2 s1 “classified as tenure track faculty”
    Action “tenure-track faculty”
25. 2.3 Title – “Non-Tenure Track Faculty”
   Action “Non-Tenure-Track Faculty”

26. 2.3 s1 “non-tenure track”
   Action “non-tenure-track”

27. 2.3 s3 “non-tenure track”
   Action “non-tenure-track”

28. 2.3 s3 “tenure track positions”
   Action “tenure-track positions”

29. 2.3.1 title “Non-Tenure Track Corps...”
   Action “Non-Tenure-Track Corps...”

30. 2.3.1.1 p2 end “comparable to tenure track faculty”
    Action “to tenure-track faculty”

31. 2.3.2 title “Non-Tenure Track Faculty...”
    Action “Non-Tenure-Track Faculty”

32. 2.3.2.2 “Visiting professors (of all ranks) are...”
    Action “Visiting professors (all ranks)”
    Note: for consistency in other sections

33. 2.3.2.2 “training comparable to tenure track faculty”
    Action “tenure-track faculty”

34. 2.5 p2 s3 “Typically, a Distinguished professor has a ...”
    Action “Typically, a distinguished professor has a ...”
    Note: to be consistent with use in the earlier part of the paragraph

35. 3.2 s3 “Liberty is not license, however, and the right of ...”
    Action: “Liberty is not license and the right of ...”

36. 3.3.7 last sentence “sec. 3.7 (“On Campus Consulting).”
    Action: “sec. 3.7 (On Campus Consulting)” (kill quotation mark)

37. 3.3.7.2 last sentence “additional compensation and they are normally compensated”
    Action: “additional compensation, and they are ...”

38. 3.4 end “Classroom Responsibilities of Faculty and Students.”
    Action: include the whole part in the URL hyperlink
39. 4.1 p3 s2 “clearly articulated in writing, and made readily available”
   Action: “clearly articulated, in writing, and made...”

40. 4.5.1.1 s2 “advancement, including progress toward tenure and promotion.”
   Action: “advancement, including progress toward promotion and tenure.”

41. 4.5.1.3 s3 “remarks can be used alongside the ratings for tenure and promotion decisions.”
   Action: “...for promotion and tenure decisions”

42. 4.5.2 s1 “The annual process offers and opportunity both to review activities from the previous year and for faculty to discuss professional objectives and goals for the year ahead and request necessary resources with their directors.”
   Action: “The annual process offers and 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.”
   Note: it is really more than 2 things, so “both” does not work well here

43. 4.5.2 p3 s3 “signed by the faculty member, director, and FEC members, if appropriate.”
   Action: “signed by the faculty member, school directors, and FEC members, if appropriate.”

44. 4.5.2 p5 “second meeting is between the director and the faculty member”
   Action: “second meeting is between the school director and the faculty member”

45. 4.6.1 s2 “that include the following elements:”
   Action: “that include a letter of agreement and written expectation for annual evaluations.”

46. 4.6.1.2 end “voting member of the minority evaluative unit.”
   Action: “minority evaluative unit(s).”

47. 5.2.2 p3 end “University Advisory Committee”
   Action: “University Promotion and Tenure Committee”

48. 5.3.1 p1 “tenure track faculty”
   Action: “tenure-track faculty”

49. 5.3.1 p2 “tenure track faculty”
   Action “tenure-track faculty”

50. 5.3.3 p3 “For non-tenure track faculty”
   Action: “For non-tenure-track faculty”

51. 5.4.1 s1 “Although tenure and promotion”
   Action “Although promotion and tenure”

52. 5.4.5 “If tenure is denied, a final one-year non-renewable contract”
Action: “if tenure is denied, a final, one-year, non-renewable contract”

53. 5.5.1 s1 “applications for tenure and promotion of”
    Action: “application for promotion and tenure of”

54. 5.5.1 s3 “Letters are not required for the promotion of non-tenure track faculty”
    Action: “non-tenure-track faculty”

55. 5.7.1 title “Tenure Track Faculty”
    Action: “Tenure-Track Faculty”

56. 5.7.1.5.4 p2 s2 “probationary period for either tenure or promotion must...”
    Action: “either promotion or tenure”

57. 5.7.2 title “Promotion in Teaching Track Positions”
    Action “Promotion in Teaching-Track Positions”

58. 5.8.1.1 – three occurrences of “tenure and promotion”
    Action: “promotion and tenure” for all 3

59. 5.8.1.2 p2 s1 – “tenure or promotion”
    Action “promotion or tenure”

60. 5.8.2 P1 “tenure or promotion”
    Action: “promotion or tenure”

61. 5.8.2 p2 s1 “tenure or promotion”
    Action: “promotion or tenure”

62. 5.8.2 p3 s1 “tenure and promotion”
    Action: “promotion and tenure”

63. 6.4.4.1 s2 “or will expire by its terms and the University”
    Action: “or will expire by its terms, and the University”

64. 6.4.4.6 p3 s2 “University Advisory Committee”
    Action: “University Promotion and Tenure Committee”

65. 6.4.4.7 p2 “a hearing is waived and the matter...”
    Action: “a hearing is waived, and the matter ...”

66. 6.4.4.8.2 two UAC references
    Action: change to UPTC
67. 6.4.4.8.3 three UAC references  
    Action: change to UPTC
68. 6.4.4.8.4 one UAC reference  
    Action: change to UPTC
69. 6.4.4.8.5 one UAC reference  
    Action: change to UPTC
70. 6.4.4.8.9 one UAC reference  
    Action: change to UPTC
71. 6.4.4.8.10 one UAC reference  
    Action: change to UPTC
72. 6.4.4.9 three UAC references  
    Action: change to UPTC
73. 6.4.4.10 seven UAC references  
    Action: change to UPTC
74. 6.4.4.13 one UAC reference  
    Action: change to UPTC
75. 6.3.4.14 (after 6.4.4.13) mislabeled  
    Action: change number to 6.4.4.14
76. Chapter 7 Header "Missing: current handbook has CAC advising deans on some of these issues"  
    Action: kill this statement
77. 7.2.1 s1 “school Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)...”  
    Action: “school’s Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)...”
78. 7.2.2 s1 “the school FEC committee or school director”  
    Action “the school’s FEC or school director”
79. 7.2.2 s2 “the chair of the school FEC or school director...”  
    Action: “the chair of the school’s FEC or school director...”
80. 7.2.3 p2 s3 “the written response of the school FEC or director to the original ...”  
    Action: “the written response of the school’s FEC or school director to the original ...”
81. 7.4 s1 “regarding award of tenure or promotion...”
Action “regarding award of promotion or tenure...”

82. 8.2.5.1.1 mislabeled
Action: change to 8.2.5.1

83. 8.2.5.1.2 mislabeled
Action: change to 8.2.5.2

84. 8.2.5.1.3 mislabeled
Action: change to 8.2.5.3

85. Appendix A 3rd and 4th bullet point has teaching track faculty and tenure track faculty
Action: change to teaching-track faculty and tenure-track faculty

86. Appendix A, Administrator Workload, end of first bullet point “however, more or less courses”
Action: “however, more or fewer courses”

87. Appendix A, Administrator Workload, second bullet point, second to the last sentence “with the FEC and director.”
Action: “with the school’s FEC and school director.”

88. Appendix A, Circumstantial, second bullet point “Be documented, and signed or electronically...”
Action: “Be documented and signed or electronically...” (kill comma)
Corrections that are for clarity or fixes that should be agreeable, but are changes

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
“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 and listing them specifically forces changes in the handbook each time the VPs are changed.

90. 1.6 states “the University is composed of several colleges” and then lists them.
Recommend:

1.6 “the University is composed of four colleges”
Logic: we will have to change FHB if a new college is formed, so be accurate in the number

91. 1.8.3 Faculty Handbook Committee – first sentence needs to be changed match bylaws
Recommend:

“The Faculty Handbook Committee considers revision proposals, modifications, and amendments to the Faculty Handbook submitted 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 s1. “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 s1 “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. 3.3.3 s1 “financial conflict of interest disclosure annually”
“financial conflict of interest disclosure annually, if applicable.”

Logic: not everyone had a conflict of interest and this wording makes it seem all need to fill out this form every year. Adding "if applicable" makes it necessary for an annual duty if there is a known conflict of interest.

95. 3.3.4 last sentence: should we 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: the parenthetical part seems like a personal addition when that information is available on the linked website. Also, the word "website" could be hyperlinked

97. 4.6.1.1 p2 s2 “For example, the jointly appointed faculty member should not have more responsibilities for unit meetings or advising than non-jointly appointed faculty.”

Strike the sentence

Logic: seems unnecessary and implies that they would not have to attend meetings for both units? Or do they choose every other meeting?

98. 5.2.2 p1 p3 “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. 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. Neither is tenure a guarantee of lifetime employment”

Logic: the 2 sentences can be combined for ease in reading
Outright issues or new proposals TO BE DEALT WITH IN FUTURE MEETINGS

1.8.6 Ombudsmen are chosen from a pool of 5 candidates from each college, but CoAS is much larger, should it be more equitable? In 6.4.4.11 a UTRC is selected from the Ombudsmen pool, do we need more from CoAS to reduce conflict of interest numbers?

1.8.7 – the Provost calls on the UPTC for personnel matters – do we need to create another body to serve old UAC role?

1.9.3 second paragraph. Do we purposely eliminate lecturers or senior lecturers from CPTCs?

1.9.3 second paragraph ends with a line about colleges can change size and composition of CPTCs, but the same paragraph states that CPTCs have to be between 5 to 15 tenured members?

1.10.1 p4. This paragraph is describing a very specific situation, is it relevant?

1.10.2 p2. The part about school director involvement is a bit strange. They can serve if they are just appointed? Why not just reform?

2.3.1.2 Clinical Faculty s3. Clinical faculty are included in corps of instruction – so we need an HR list that includes them when applicable?

2.3.1.2 p2 – seems to be an exception for clinical faculty with no terminal degree to hold a title of those with terminal degrees including clinical professor? This is not the case with all other ranks and is new to the handbook (I believe). Should this be allowed?

2.3.1.3 Artists in Residence and Professors of Practice can be included in the corps of instruction and need to be reflected in HR for voting rights.

2.3.2.1 Again Research Faculty are allowed promotions without terminal degrees at the end of paragraph. Should this be allowed?

2.4.1 Post docs – seems like a good bit of explanation on post-doc fellows but barely mention of associates. Need a sentence on associates.
2.4.2 p2 – adjuncts have an entire paragraph if they can be added to the web site? I find this weird and probably motivated by a specific occurrence, not sure we need this?

3.1 p2 - talks about contract periods but no mention of summer work or service – orientation, etc. could be a good place to add (section 3.3.7.1 specifically says that 9 month contracts do not include summer)

3.4.2.8 p2 – on grading the second paragraph is new the to the handbook and is it creating a rule for assignments?

4.5.1.2 s2 – what does it mean about meeting or not meeting expectations? Seems like it is missing a step or is tacitly referring to the mid year review for being reviewed?

4.5.2 p4 – what is mean by “administrative” evaluators? Also, why is service not included in teaching and research? Further, what is up with being reprimanded for not liking your evaluations? If you lose it, you lose it. This is a bullying policy and needs to be removed!

4.5.2 p6 – we could add that mid year review is required for all categories where “not meet expectations” is on the annual evaluation to give faculty all due diligence to see if they are improving in that category.

4.5.3 p4 – is the provost limited to just summary by unit or rank? Is this intended?

4.5.4 p2 – we should review this as a handbook policy statement? Assign a 4:4 is best way?

4.7.1 and 4.7.2 – need to change dates if annual evaluations are moved, but there is talk of a PTR committee without mention of who they are or how they are formed. Are they the FEC?

4.7.2 p5 last sentence – why are we saying summer “generally” excluded?

5.2 – has terminal contract on pre-tenure review always include VPR?
5.3.2.3 s2 – handbook contradicts 5.3.1 by saying research can be used for promotion criteria for teaching track. It cannot. Is this a conflict?

5.4.4 p2 last sentence – a line about collegiality seems strange to me and out of place in a handbook.

5.8 p2 s2 – the parenthetical bit about usually late September or early October could be removed and the calendar just hyperlinked

6.2 p2 The September 1 date for receiving a terminal contract should really line up with contract date. Can we get a contract and then given a terminal contract?

6.4.4.6 14 working days listed but calendar days preferred, so it should read 20 days (almost 3 weeks)

6.4.4.7 14 working days needs to be 20 days

6.4.4.8 10 working days should be 14 days (2 weeks)

6.4.4.8.1 20 working days should be 30 days (one month or 4 5 working day weeks)

6.4.4.8.2 10 working days should be 14 days

6.4.4.8.3 10 working days to 14 days

6.4.4.8.4 10 working days to 14 days

6.4.4.8.9 10 days needs to be 14 days

6.4.4.11 10 working days needs to be 14 days

7.2.1 10 working days needs to be 14 days in 2 places

7.2.2 ten working days needs to be 14 days

7.2.3 10 working days needs to be 14 days

7.2.4 10 working days needs to be 14 days

7.2.5 10 working days needs to be 14 days

7.4 30 calendar days needs to be 30 days

Chapter 8 needs to be reviewed for relevance in the FHB
This is a presumption and use of legacy language – all schools have directors now and there are no chairs

i. Observations about terminology
   1. **Priority 1** "academic staff" is used in a way that conflict with university use – change to faculty or faculty member – Academic personnel is the new language used – confirm.
   2. **Priority 2** Confirm business days only listed as calendar days (working days?)

ii. Questions of formatting and style
   1. **Priority 1** Verify capitalization
   2. **Priority 1** Verify oxford comma
   3. Specific changes by chapter – explanatory and maybe unnecessary to review

iii. Suggestions and Observations **(in Bold High priority - Nov 1)**
   1. Chapter 1:
      a. **Priority 1**: Since there is no longer a College or University Advisory Committee and instead College and University Promotion and Tenure Committees will review promotion, tenure, and pre-tenure dossiers, the other functions of the CAC and UAC need to be addressed. (e.g. Error! Reference source not found.)
      b. **Priority 1**: Error! Reference source not found. on procedural rules: this came from the current chapter 8 on faculty evaluations (8.2.9), although it seems more broadly applicable. The section on absentee voting says the vote needs to be submitted in a sealed envelope. Discuss if this is necessary.
      c. **Priority 1**: Error! Reference source not found. the Dean’s Advisory Council: the numbers come from Initiative 4, but the wording limits colleges to at most 16 schools. Is this intentional?
      d. **Priority 1**: Error! Reference source not found. Initiative 1 specifies that eligibility for service on the FEC is tied to faculty evaluation ratings in the year prior. We do not know how this can be done without violating confidentiality. It also says that this “generally should” be true, which implies that there may be exceptions without making clear the circumstances warranting the exception.
      e. **Priority 1.5**: Initiative 8 deals with school governance, but has not yet been approved. The language in the handbook draft may need to be changed (e.g. program coordinator vs leads) or other information added when it is finalized. Associate school directors may also need to be addressed.
   2. Chapter 2:
      a. **Priority 3**: The section on hiring faculty should be closely scrutinized to be sure that important points are addressed in the faculty hiring toolkit.
      b. **Priority 3**: For example, current handbook 3.8.4 says that there is a “general rule of not employing persons who have earned their terminal degrees from the University in the full-
time instructional ranks...” Is this in fact a rule? The faculty credentialing manual and hiring toolkit do not mention this policy. Nor is it mentioned in the Employee Handbook.

3. Chapter 4 on faculty evaluation
   a. **Priority 1:** Initiative #1 discusses grievance procedures for faculty evaluations, but these are inconsistent with grievance procedures in the old Handbook, which include annual evaluations as items that may be contested under the grievance process. The two processes are inconsistent. The same inconsistency applies to “teaching assignments” mentioned in old grievance procedures descriptions, but that also pertain to Initiative #1 insofar as a teaching assignment is a workload issue.
   b. **Priority 2:** Appendices from Initiative #1 presumably need to “live” somewhere, but we’re not sure where. Maybe on a new Faculty Handbook? The Provost’s website is getting crowded.
   c. **Priority 2:** The Faculty Evaluation Procedures chapter in the old Handbook has a long discussion about evaluation committee membership for the libraries (8.3.1b). We have left that out, having seen nothing about it in Initiative #1.
   d. **Priority 2:** Initiative #1 is not clear about whether the evaluative report comes before or after the first of the two meetings with the director/committee. We have written it as before. Initiative #1 does not specify when the faculty member signs the evaluative report. We have put it in the meeting based on our assumption that the report is given to the faculty before the first meeting. If this is not true, it needs to be changed also. Current practice seems to vary by legacy department or school regarding whether the written evaluation comes before or after the annual evaluation meeting.
   e. **Priority 2:** In 4.4.1, the initiative said that all academic personnel submit an annual activity report. This many need clarification regarding who needs to do this, since administrators are also typically members of the faculty. For example, do deans submit activity reports?
   f. **Priority 3:** In Error! Reference source not found., “a second consecutive assignment of does not meet expectations in one of the three categories” is ambiguous. Is it a second consecutive assignment in the same category or in any category? We assume the former is intended, but it should be clarified.
   g. **Priority 3:** Regarding 4.4.1 (p. 21), we don’t say anything regarding Faculty Leads or Program Leads. If they are included in an approved Initiative #8, they should perhaps be discussion somewhere in the Handbook.

4. Chapter 5 on promotion and tenure
   a. **Priority 1:** The current handbook stipulates that the chair of the department promotion and tenure committee signs the letter on behalf of the faculty. It does not stipulate this for the
college level or the university level. In practice it seems that
sometimes letters are signed by everyone on the committees
and sometimes by just the chair.

b. **Priority 1:** At every level except the UAC, recommendations
are sent to each of the evaluative levels that precede it.
However, the UAC forwards a copy of the letter to the
applicant only (current handbook section 9.9.2). Is this
inconsistency intentional? (new draft section Error! Reference source not found.)

c. **Priority 1:** On page 99 of the current handbook, in section
9.7.2 regarding pre-tenure review the following sentence
appears: “Although tenure candidates are not entitled to
appear before departmental tenure committees, the
committees may, at their discretion, request that parties being
assessed appear before them. Departmental tenure
committees conducting pre-tenure reviews may consider any
matter related to tenure policies…” The sentence about
candidates for tenure appearing before the tenure committee
seems misplaced here. It also is not addressed elsewhere. If
that is an important point and really true, it should be added
in to the section on the tenure process at the school level.
Does it also apply to promotion cases?

d. **Priority 1:** There is no policy regarding promotion of clinical
and research faculty in initiative 2. The paragraph on it in new
Error! Reference source not found. comes from the current
handbook page 21, section 4.4.A. It says that they are not
evaluated by the University Advisory Committee.

e. **Priority 1:** Current handbook 9.3.3 says “The President is
advised on personnel recommendations by the administrative
heads of the University’s academic units, the Provost, the
University Advisory Committee, the college deans, the College
Advisory Committees, the Vice President for Research, General
Counsel, and by the other vice presidents in matters that are
within their administrative jurisdiction.” We first split this into
two sentences to separate the people who do advise from
those who may advise. The latter should be evaluated.

f. **Priority 1:** Sec. Error! Reference source not found., in
discussion of negative pre-tenure reviews, references “upon
the recommendation of the Provost and the Vice President for
Research.” It seems in practice, however, that the VPR is not
involved, and this should be changed (although we didn’t
change it).

g. **Priority 1:** The old deferral policy (current handbook 9.6.6)
permits deferral of tenure to the 7th year or later while the
initiative only permits a one-year extension. Should it be the
more expansive time? A second question is whether the
extension needs to be requested prior to submission of the
application. Third, the handbook should address whether extensions are permitted for third-year review.

Priority 1: The current handbook has it that department chairs may participate in departmental promotion and tenure
Chapter 5 recommendations from Jeremy:

The current handbook stipulates that the chair of the department promotion and tenure committee signs the letter on behalf of the faculty. It does not stipulate this for the college level or the university level. In practice it seems that sometimes letters are signed by everyone on the committees and sometimes just by the chair.

Everyone involved should sign the letters for historical record.

At every level except the UAC [University Promotion and Tenure Committee], recommendations are sent to each of the evaluative levels that precede it. However, the UAC forwards a copy of the letter to the applicant only (current handbook section 9.9.2). Is this inconsistency intentional? (new draft section 5.8)

The wording could be changed to [(suggested by Forster) parallel language used in 5.8.1.2.3.2 – i.e. “The UPTC chair sends copies of the letter to the candidate, and to the dean, college promotion and tenure committee, school director, school promotion and tenure committees, and to candidates”].

There is no policy regarding promotion of clinical and research faculty in initiative 2. The paragraph on it in new 5.3.1 comes from the current handbook page 21, section 4.4.A. It says that they are not evaluated by the University Advisory Committee.

I believe this statement goes with the next one.

Current handbook 9.3.3 says “The President is advised on personnel recommendations by the administrative heads of the University’s academic units, the Provost, the University Advisory Committee, the college deans, the College Advisory Committees, the Vice President for Research, General Counsel, and by the other vice presidents in matters that are within their administrative jurisdiction.” We first split this into two sentences to separate the people who do advise from those who may advise. The latter should be evaluated.

This reads as if all of the list of entities are involved in every personnel recommendation. I’m thinking of how to reword this.
Sec. 5.2, in discussion of negative pre-tenure reviews, references “upon the recommendation of the Provost and the Vice President for Research.” It seems in practice, however, that the VPR is not involved, and this should be changed (although we didn’t change it).

**Strike out "and the Vice President for Research"**

The current handbook has it that department chairs may participate in departmental promotion and tenure proceedings only if approved by secret ballot of departmental committee. Should that stay the same now, substituting schools for departments and school directors for chairs, See also 9.5.2, current handbook. If school directors can be invited, it should be added to 1.10.1.

**This statement should actually be placed in Option #3, since it wouldn't apply to schools that chose Options #1 or #2.**
3.2 ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND SHARED GOVERNANCE

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 at all academic levels 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, faculty governance bodies/committees, and administrators and with the cooperation and support of the affected faculty constituency while taking into account consideration of dissenting voices from faculty and faculty governance bodies/committees.

The President's authority derives from the Board of Trustees of the Mississippi 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 and faculty governance bodies should be consulted and involved in decision making as appropriate 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, particularly for Deans, School Directors and Program Coordinators.

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.

† 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.

4.8 Directors Periodic Review.
A director is appointed by the dean of the college following consultation with the school faculty and the provost.

While a director’s performance may be reviewed by the dean at any time, under normal circumstances a director will receive annual reviews by the school leadership team and by the dean according to procedures established by the dean and approved by the provost. In addition, a director will undergo periodic term reviews as outlined below. A newly appointed director will be reviewed during the spring semester of his/her third year of service, regardless of whether that service has been on an interim or permanent basis. Subsequent terms of appointment will normally be for five years. A newly appointed director would therefore be evaluated in his/her third year and eighth year as director. There is no limit to the number of terms a director may serve; however, a director must undergo a review before reappointment for each term. The final results of the review process for the director must be presented to the faculty in the affected academic unit. In addition, the final results of the review must be presented to the provost.

A Periodic Review will proceed as follows:

1. Early in the fall semester of the fifth year of a continuing director (spring semester in the third year for newly appointed directors), the dean of the college will determine whether a director wishes to be considered for another term. At this time Directors have the opportunity to decline reappointment. If the answer is affirmative, the dean will promptly begin proceedings with the Corps of Instruction that will culminate in a vote for or against reappointment.

2. If the faculty favors reappointment, and if the dean concurs, the school and the director will be informed immediately of the director’s reappointment for a five-year term. If the faculty favors reappointment, and the Dean does not concur, the Dean will be obligated to provide the faculty with a justification for non-reappointment.

3. If the faculty recommends against reappointment, and if the dean concurs, the director will be immediately informed that his/her term as director will lapse at the close of the current contract. If the dean does not concur with the faculty’s recommendation, he/she may reappoint the director for a subsequent term. If the Dean reappoints a Director without the support of the school faculty the Dean will be obligated to provide the faculty with a justification for reappointment.

4. If the director is not reappointed, the process for filling the position should begin promptly. After discussions with the school faculty and the provost, the dean will decide: 1) when and how the search will be conducted; 2) whether an interim director should be appointed, and 3) whether an internal or external search will be conducted.

5. The director may request a hearing with the provost on a dean’s decision not to reappoint.

Note:

In the case of termination of appointment due to malfeasance, misfeasance, or nonfeasance, action may be taken immediately and is not subject to the guidelines of the term review process. Nevertheless, a director will normally receive a 90-day notice of removal.
Should a director choose to resign, the review process (if initiated) will end, and the resignation will be the means through which the appointment is not renewed.
Council on Directors’ proposal to change the faculty evaluation period

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 request necessary resources with their directors. **Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between June 1st and August 31st.**