The University of Southern Mississippi
Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, May 4, 2018, 2:30 p.m.
Trent Lott Center 101/102; Hardy Hall 316 (IVN)

Absent: Marcus Coleman, Miles Doleac, Amanda Schlegel, Will Johnson, David Lee, Charkarra Anderson-Lewis, Deborah Booth, Scott Milroy, Heidi Lyn

1.0 Organizational Items
   1.1 Call to Order 2:36
   1.2 Roll Call
   1.3 Recognition of Quorum (22)
   1.4 Recognition of ⅔ membership for voting on Bylaws and Resolutions (29)

2.0 Adoption of Agenda

3.0 Program
   3.1 Rodney Bennett, President – Not present
   3.2 Steven Moser, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs – Not present
   3.3 Amy C. Miller, Vice Provost – Comments follow agenda items
   3.4 Denny Bubrig, Assistant Vice President for Student Life –

Things that are going on: We’ve been working on rebuilding and enhancing the infrastructure to do better at communicating what has been going on with our successes in student life and breathing new life into some of these things that we’re doing. With the budget considerations, we’ve been working on redundancies and how to better match up programs with our services and staff (Union staff, student involvement). We hope you see some efficiencies in operation services and our ability to program. We’ve had revisions in fraternity/sorority programs. We separated with our Director in mid-fall last year and are hoping to get that area re-staffed with new and fresh ideas. We’ve created new advertising opportunities for departments and programs and student organizations and learning how to tell stories through assessment efforts. We understand that campus recreation and service-learning, as well as Greek Life, help to increases student retention and graduate rates. We are
also rebuilding and restructuring websites, and doing more with community outreach with alumni and reaching out in times of issue and during times of celebrations. We are also happy with the development of Eagle Link (student engagement portal). At some point further when we go into full implementation, I would be happy to share the full details with you. We envision that being an off-campus partnership in a number ways. Departments and student organizations will be able to share public facing information regarding events, data, and document sharing (event RSVP).

With the Union Complex we are currently seeking customer need and service data for potential vendors (previously reached out to Nike, Amazon, etc. for potential drop stations but those didn’t pan out). We have an active dialogue now with cell phone charger kiosks and Red Box, too, as a potential service to come be apart of our Union Complex.

Additionally, the Joe Paul Student Theater recently opened, so we’re looking forward to utilizing that beginning this summer. We will continue to work on a number of these items this year and will be looking to partner with many of these items.

**Comments/Questions:**

Mac Alford: Since we’re gathering a lot of these data, do we know of some student populations that we are *not* reaching very well?

Bubrig: One of the things we can be better on is inclusion of the different student populations. Right now I would probably say that we don’t have enough data to be definitive about where we stand with the African American population or transfer student population. My gut based on anecdotal information is that we’ve got some work to do in those areas from a student life perspective. One of the things we’re working on is how we can potentially bridge some of our areas up here with Gulf Park. And with their student demographic, hopefully we’ll learn more about non-traditional student needs and how to best be responsive to those.

Susan Mullican: Is there is something being done with the Gulf Coast that is similar? A website or something?

Bubrig: Right now we’re looking at the Leadership Certificate Program and how we can make that user friendly for students on the Coast. I mentioned Eagle Link earlier and we’re working with team down there for an August roll out. And also looking at how we can bridge what we’re doing with what’s going on down there. One example is why should we have two student organization registration processes. What are we doing that can be same for the event management process. Something we’re in the exploration phase of is talking about what options here that could be replicated down there (maybe like Greek Life); we’re having conversations about those things.

Susan: Since we’re going to have a residence facility nearby for 122 students, I was wondering if there will be a way for them to find out what’s going on campus?

Bubrig: When we contracted for the Eagle Link, the student engagement web portal, we started with a goal in mind that all campuses would be represented on there. It’s caused us to think about how we categorize organizations.
Lilian: Are you familiar with the Non-Traditional Student Honor societies? They are many that provide scholarships.
Bubrig: Not familiar, but please provide information.

3.5 Chris Crenshaw, Associate Vice President for Facilities Planning & Management –
(provided handouts describing specific functions of Physical Plant)

Comments/Questions:
Alan Thompson: Can you talk about how Physical Plant is approaching budget concerns and how open you might be to having an *ad hoc* task force of faculty and staff to think of ways that we might approach that?
Crenshaw: We’ve made great strides in reducing the utility costs. We have stayed under our budget amount every year, but one, from the utility perspective. What we do and what plans are is a number of things. Some of it may take capital investment, which makes it hard to do. We look for opportunities per building. It varies. When we don’t have money to do work, we look for ways to save, like replacing pumps. The university has done a great job to help save on energy, especially during the vacation time. There are a lot things we can do; it depends on the “pay back” time.
We are required by IHL to take out about 25% of energy savings and put that back into the campus every year. We follow that formula and we try to invest that into an energy savings project for the next year.
Alan: Is the Physical Plant open to partnerships?
Crenshaw: There used to be one, and it no longer exists. I’m open to ideas and not just about energy savings. We can’t be everywhere at one time. We have less human capital now and we have to be smart with how we do things and we need critical analysis and ideas. About 68% of the buildings on this campus are 25 years of age or older, so most of you are having the same problems. We have to decide what the priorities are and how to fix them. There are things to do to help: unplug computers from the wall, instead of having micro fridge, have one for the office, get away from using personal printers, things like that. So, I would welcome a committee.
Sherry Herron: I’m curious about the 13 buildings that need to be demolished? What are the buildings? Is JST on the list?
Crenshaw: I can respond in numerous ways to that, but I’ll start with JST. JST is on the university’s legislative funding request list for a $25 million renovation. We’re asking for about $12.5 million a year for two years. It’s not number one, but in the top five. The legislature is going to determine how quickly that happens. In regards to demolition list, there are approximately 13 buildings that are vacant and need to go. All of Pine Haven, Printing Center, Roberts Hall, Pulley Hall, the Beatty-Smith Clinic (which will probably be kept), and others on the list. Members of the legislature come and tour every year in May, and last year they inquired about Pine Haven still being here. Our money goes towards buildings where students and people actually are. We also have to work closely with the Mississippi
Department of Archives and History. There are some buildings they will now allow us to demolish. We now have the money to do that.

3.6 Reorganization Committee on Academic Structure and Evaluation, Jacob Breland, Chair

Committee was present to provide an overview of the process they used to get to this point and answer any questions the Senate may have about annual evaluations, promotion, and tenure.

Jacob: In the reorganization process we’ve been divided into three parts (proposal development and creation done in the fall, feedback formulated into initiatives, and eventually moving onto working with Colleges/Schools for implementation). Our proposal has been available on the Provost’s website since mid-December and we received formal and informal feedback from Faculty Senate and AAUP that has been helpful. What’s on the website and what we have now is a little different. We will update you about those differences.

There were 15 people on committee when we began in the fall. We are faculty working with faculty on issues/policy that will affect us all. We have been mindful of that from the beginning.

Members of the committee present: Josh Hill (Criminal Justice), Frank Heitmuller (Geology), Lachel Story (Nursing), Alisa Lowrey (Curriculum Instruction/Special Education), Ann Marie Kinnell (Sociology), and Bernd Schroeder (Mathematics)

**Update from changes that are new from website** –

Josh: A lot of what we’re doing is changing language from proposal to something that more resembles policy so that we can have more substantive conversation and feedback from faculty in terms of how this does get implemented. Some specific changes we’ve made is we’ve been asked to address questions regarding timeline issues, which are actually largely not changed from the previous edition of the Faculty Handbook. We’ve incorporated language to clarify that. We’ve had conversations regarding clarifying the role of collegiality in the context of tenure specifically. We took advice from the AAUP documentation on that as well as our sister institutions on how they’ve handled that issue. Additionally, we have tried to make sure that the role of annual evaluations and tenure and promotion has been clarified so that those things are more tightly connected and better protect faculty in that process. That also includes role of collegiality in that process so that no one is blindsided in their sixth year when they go up. Those are the primary things we’ve addressed, broadly speaking.

Frank: Whatever we end up with, what I would consider a measure of success is if during the annual evaluations with your directors more time is spent looking at the year ahead and defining professional objectives and development of the faculty and what’s best for the students, and how to take advantage of strategic initiatives that both the faculty member and
the unit have than spending time with a retrospective of what the year’s previous activity included and what you did and didn’t do. Getting to that would be a success. What has been modified since the original proposal was posted is there was a prescriptive approach toward workload allocation and percentages were defined in some cases. That has been backed off in the sense that it’s not so prescriptive. We have made the language that is offering guidelines that School Directors, in consultation with their faculty leads and Deans, decide should be embraced when assigning workload to faculty members. Not much of the real substance of what we put forth has changed, the specificity that was originally there, is giving us more flexibility, essentially. It’s not intended to allow for certain abuses to occur. It’s almost impossible for a School with such diversity to try to fit in to a very prescriptive way how much one particular course load should count towards a faculty member’s workload allocation. That’s where we stand with workload at this point. The other change is the notion of the “smallest evaluative unit” that was in the original proposal. That has been deferred to the School level. The School level is where decisions will occur. Now we have the School Personnel Committee and there are eligibility criteria that are not fundamentally different from those that we originally proposed. There will likely, in some cases for very large Schools, be “super” committees that get broken up into smaller committees. Those are the two major changes that have been made.

**Comments/Questions:**

Alan Thompson: How large would a School Personnel Committee be? For instances, we have multiple departments merging together. Is that still going to be a three-person committee, or will it expand to a larger number?

Frank: It will be a minimum of 3, but there is no maximum number assigned. That is specifically to make sure that the number adequately reflects the faculty who they’re representing and evaluating.

Jacob: The Faculty Governance Committee has specified minimums and maximums for the other relevant committees. We haven’t talked about having a maximum, but we will be having conversations with them and that may be revisited soon.

Mac: In terms of tenure/promotion guidelines, you have drafted something that has gone to someone and then it needs approval and then it will go to the Handbook Committee? Is that correct?

Jacob: At this stage in the process we have been having conversations and collecting information with whomever wishes to have them about the specifics of those proposals. The Provost has outlined with ARIC, the Academic Reorganization Implementation Committee, a process for approval. How that will work is once it leaves our committee, it will go to ARIC (Implementation Committee), of which I and other committee chairs are a part, then it will go to the Provost. What happens from there is whatever the Provost wishes it to be. The outline we have for that is that it will be discussed with the deans and the ALC. It could come back to us for enhancement.
Mac: I’m worried about the timeline, with new people coming in the fall. A lot of things in the *Handbook* can just remain as is, but things like tenure and promotion is something that has to be handled to avoid legal issues. Something’s going to have to be done. I think I heard the Provost say that there would be a bridge document/plan. I’m not sure what that means exactly.

Jacob: We have not talked about that in our committee, mainly because we have not been directed to do so.

David Holt: The Faculty Handbook Committee has.

Jacob: What we’re thinking for timeline is if we can have the two initiatives (Annual Evaluations and Promotion/Tenure) approved in the next month or so, then we would plan to work with the Colleges/Schools in the fall to develop documents related to promotion and tenure and then after that’s done we would move into Spring to partner with Colleges/Schools for annual evaluations. That depends on that approval process. It’s kind of an ambitious timeline, but we’re striving for it, nonetheless. The plan would be to have all of that in place in the units by the end of December 2019. We’re not doing stuff for the units, we’ll just be supportive in whatever way makes sense.

Bob Press: Is the suggestion to keep governance options for Schools, the three options? (three tenured professors, director and two tenured professors, director only).

Frank: The three options that we currently have are largely the same. There is a fourth option that could include a member of the teaching track, either an associate teaching professor or higher rank.

David Holt: Are you saying the DPC is going to stay the same way it is now? That governance option is going to stay with unit or the School?

Frank: The option stays with the School. All members that are eligible to vote for their School Personnel Committee would either vote for director only, director with other members, or committee members without director. Those are basically the three options that we have now. What is different is the fourth option. It could include a senior member of the teaching track.

David Holt: That could potentially have three people evaluating 85 people in the School of Humanities.

Ann Marie: There is no limit on size (number decided at the School level).

Tim Rehner: Going back to timeline. It sounds like that this coming fall you guys would be working with the Schools to try and get tenure/promotion documents done and annual evaluations will be done in Spring. So that means going into 2018–19, anybody I have who’s coming up for tenure and promotion would be on the old system and what you’re talking about, implementation will actually be 2019–20. Is that right?

Jacob: We’re still working out those details. So you are correct in the first 80% of that. We work on tenure and promotion in the Fall, annual evaluations in the Spring. Once the documents are in place, on our timeline by July 1, 2019, people hired in under those new guidelines, that would apply to them. We do have a number of people in the mix. We’ve been
calling it “legacy” faculty, and we have had a real concern about being fair and being mindful about those people. Most of the informal comments that I’ve received have been all about that issue. What we will likely propose is that by the time the guidelines come into play, whenever that may be, for people who have completed their pre-tenure review they will be under their existing standards or standards they were under before the reorg guidelines were in place. Those individuals who have yet to complete that process would be responsible for the new guidelines.

David Holt: How does your committee view tenure and promotion? What are the steps? If I’m brand new faculty coming in, do I go through a CAC still? Do I have a department committee? Does my department do it? Does the School do it? How do you envision me getting tenure?

Josh: We were given a clear directive about at what level we are to specify particular things. So if the Schools propose additional criteria in different disciplinary units, I think that’s a bridge we’ll have to come to as we develop whatever the criteria looks like with Schools. As currently proposed, it will be a School level committee, a College level committee and a University level committee for both tenure and promotion in that process. The normal scope would be, as it is now, it’s possible to go up in the fifth year. The normal course of events would be you go up for promotion and tenure your sixth year. So the time, for instance, doesn’t differentiate much from now. The structure of where the process is differentiates slightly because of the departamental structure change.

David: Have you looked at the size of the CAC with the College of Arts and Sciences?

Bernd: We proposed one per School, a minimum of 5, which for the large College is easy. For a couple of the smaller Colleges we need to figure out how we get from 4 Schools to 5 members. No maximum on that.

David Holt: You’re not looking at the tenure and promotion concept below the School level? So you’re relying upon the School Director and the Schools to figure that out? How do you think that’s going to manifest itself in the Handbook? Are we going to have to write a subsection for each School?

Jacob: I would imagine we would do it how we do now, where the Colleges have an extension of the Handbook that applies to the College. But, we haven’t talked about that. I can’t imagine that it would be different at all from that.

Bernd: It’s interesting to see that the Colleges as they are right now have a variety of customs that I’m not sure are uniform. There are things that the Colleges will need to decide and come to an agreement on. That’s the kind of thing that we as a committee have had pretty robust discussions about and what you see as a result is the compromise that has arisen.

David Beckett: My question is about the Faculty Handbook and I’m amazed that you guys are missing the boat, I think. I hope you realize that the university regularly gets sued over tenure and promotion, and for tenure and promotion coming this Fall, you have no process. You leave the University wide open for lawsuits by not having some kind of process ready this Fall. I thought that your committee would be passing things on to the Faculty Handbook
Committee so they could have things ready to go in the Fall; they’re apparently waiting for you guys. I think the General Counsel is wondering what is happening. My advice to them is to promote everybody and that way you won’t get sued. The University as I see it is not ready to go as far as tenure and promotion.

Jacob: I think those are issues for the Provost. Those weren’t our charges. Those issues are not in our purview. They’re in his and others’.

Beckett: Well, I guess, but it should be in consultation with the Faculty Handbook Committee. And also, the Faculty Senate should be viewing all of this ahead of time. That’s the protocol. The Faculty Handbook needs to be prepared.

David: I’m surprised that you say it’s not in your purview to provide the Faculty Handbook Committee with the language. I was specifically requested to move to procedural abeyance so that the ASEC could generate language necessary so we would be ready for the Fall. Then it got delayed and I’m still waiting for the language to move forward. This is me as the Faculty Handbook Committee chair. So, I’m confused by your statement saying that’s not in your purview.

Jacob: What I was referencing was the legality issues, and maybe I did not specify that. That particular initiative is one that is going to come much later in the game. We don’t know exactly when. We have 13 initiatives across three committees and there are others that have more immediate, pressing need in sense, related to the academic structure, staffing issues, etc.

Mullican: I am assuming that for at least the next three years, all faculty members that were hired last year, the year before that, the year before that until they go for tenure and promotion all the way are going to be grandfathered in under an old system? How is that going to work? Every time you hire somebody it should be the same as students. They go in under what is in effect that year. Am I not right?

Jacob: The sort of bridge plan for promotion and tenure is that those who have completed pre-tenure review would be under their “catalogue” year. Those who have yet to do so when the new standards come on line would be under the new standards. So, there would be this transition period, and as time passes everyone will be under the new standards in their respective units.

Mullican: I understand that the departments are going to change, but if someone was hired this past year then they were hired under what this system is currently. You can’t change that midway through or you are opening yourself up for legal issues unless you put a grandfather clause in there. Are you not?

Bernd: We’ve had pretty robust discussions about that. We’ve seen examples where it is possible and there is precedent for it. That is important for Legal Counsel.

Ann Marie: The point that’s being lost here is we are not doing this separately from Legal Counsel. Legal Counsel has been involved every step of the way. I have faith in the Counsel, and they are well aware. They have seen these proposals.
David Beckett: The question isn’t about guidelines; it’s about process. There is no process that’s going to be in place apparently, by the Fall.

Marek: In relation to the folks at the front of the room (committee), they were asked to design something called Vision 2020. Their minds have not been on Fall 2018, but rather designing something that is consistent with that new idea. So to ask them what is going to happen July 1 or what is going to happen August 29, when Jacob says it’s not in his purview, there are certain things that are the guidelines of what they’ve been asked to think about and accomplish. The question of how we get from May 2018 to Jan. 1, 2019 is frankly just not what they’ve been asked to do. I agree, these things need to be discussed and legal counsel needs to be involved. I just think that this group of people up front they’re working on the question of how we should think about tenure/promotion and annual evaluations.

Mac: Later we will discuss whether we need a June meeting. We do have one scheduled. If we have a meeting, I’m wondering if there will be something available to discuss at that time? Do you think that some bridge document or some pieces are going to come to the Handbook Committee that need to be evaluated by us in June? Do you foresee something like that?

Lachel Story: We’re (Faculty Handbook subcommittee) waiting on these initiatives to be worked out and some details there. If something came to Faculty Senate it would be from them.

Mac: I just want to make sure that people on campus know that we’re not neglecting our duties as a Senate. That if something is going to happen July 1 or August 29, that at least we’ve given some input to whatever shows up. We trust that whatever happens in the Fall and Spring, that there would be plenty of time to get that taken care of next year.

Josh: We’re talking about two levels of things here. There’s substance and process. The parts that we have had a lot of robust discussion about with stakeholder input and that we’ve been charged to craft are substantive elements of what we hope will shape the university policy. The process stuff, we’ve been asked to provide recommendations. We don’t know if that’s going to be the way that it gets done because a lot of the process piece is not in our hands.

Alan Thompson: As we sit here today, the Faculty Handbook Committee is in procedural abeyance and not preparing for this Fall because they were told that this committee was going to be preparing guidelines for them. We’re finding out today that that’s not happening. Somewhere along the way there’s been miscommunication resulting in lost time.

Marek: I think you’re right. But, what this reorganization committee has been working with the best ability, was not intended to be applied to people going up for tenure in 2018–19. There was always going to be a period of time between what they were working on and what they come up with and its implementation. What’s supposed to bridge the gap? I think it’s fair to say that we are now at a moment where we cannot answer that question. That is a question that has to be answered at the Provost level.

Josh: The document that’s currently being proposed actually contains language that maps pretty well with the department language. In the current proposal that’s on the Provost’s
website, that’s not really an issue. The issue that you’re speaking to right now actually is one that is more recent, when we were asked to move the language up from describing it in terms of what we had previously described as “smallest evaluative unit” to “Schools.” So you’re correct in so far as it is now an issue. But, as Marek has said, this is not something that we could see coming forever. The issue with timelines in terms of when the Faculty Senate Handbook Committee and the Faculty Handbook Committee are able to get that documentation, sure, that’s always been a question. But in terms of this particular issue as pertaining to our committee, that is not something that has been on the table for that long.

Alan Thompson: The language for annual evaluations, promotion/tenure piece will be done by fall and spring?

Jacob: Yes, it is our goal to submit those to the Provost for approval in the next couple of weeks.

Alan: That needs to be done sooner rather than later so that there is time to do it correctly.

Josh: Just to clarify, there are two deadlines. The first deadline is for the implementation proposals to be done, which is in the next couple of weeks, and the second is the actual development of the documentation at the School level. That will take through the Fall and Spring. During that period we’ll be working with all of the constituents and stakeholders at all the levels to clarify that. We’re also here to take input today.

Jacob: We would like to receive your comments and thoughts about the proposal on annual evaluations and tenure and promotion.

4.0 Approval of Minutes

4.1 April 2018 – Approved

5.0 Officer Reports

5.1 President – Recognized McKenna Stone, new SGA president. Thanked the Awards Committee for their work on the Awards Ceremony today.

5.2 President-Elect – No report

5.3 Secretary – No report

5.4 Secretary-Elect – No report

6.0 Decision / Action Items

6.1 None

7.0 Standing Committee Reports

7.1 Academics – (Lee Follett) Asked by SGA president McKenna Stone to look at proposal for the creation of a syllabus bank (proposal shared in March). The committee agrees to the proposal for the creation of a syllabus bank, but we have some concerns including whether it should be open to the public. We think maybe it should be accessible through SOAR only. We would also like for it to be stated clearly that faculty can change syllabi. We stress that including syllabi should be voluntary, and no one should be forced to do so. We suggest that
the first attempt should be with GEC courses only; they tend to change less. And our final point is that syllabi should be kept current, but maybe yearly and not semester-to-semester.

Comments/Questions:
McKenna: Thank you for your feedback, and I will update you on our progress and look forward to working with you all.

7.2 Administrative Evaluations – (Melinda McLelland) Chair reports are still in progress. The evaluations will be e-mailed to chairs by the end of May. Deans will also get chair evaluations by the end of May.

7.3 Awards – (Sharon Rouse) The Awards Committee would like to congratulate the recipients of the Faculty Senate Awards and thank the applicants who applied for them. A special thanks to the Office of the Provost and especially Allison Gillespie for her coordinated efforts and the committee members (Bradley Green and Lilian Hill)
[NOTE: For list of Award Recipients see the June 2018 minutes.]

7.4 Bylaws
   7.4.1 Straw poll on reorganization changes – Vote tabled until June meeting

7.5 Elections – (David Holt) Tom Rishel developed a decision tree for electing senators. It can be adapted when new rules are applied. Committee reviewed the bylaws of the Faculty Senate and noted that elected members roll off Senate at the end of their terms and are replaced by the appropriate membership as applicable. Further, every three years the Senate is charged will assessing what representation should be on Senate – note: February 2019 is the next assessment deadline. All of this is according to current bylaws. This really just leaves the question of 42–45 Senator range in question for bylaws.

7.6 Finance – No Report

7.7 Governance – (Don Redalje) The Governance Committee met by conference call on April 26, 2018, to discuss the following issues:
1. Is the statement in the Faculty Handbook on Academic Freedom and Shared Governance – Section 2.12 – a strong enough statement on shared governance, and what is our time frame for presenting an updated version of the statement for the Senate to consider should we wish to revise 2.12?

2. Do we support a much stronger involvement in the decision making process for hiring of program coordinator/chairs and directors? Can we suggest wording that will strengthen section 8.4.7 of the Faculty Handbook that defines the review process for chairs and directors to assure that the deans are actually following through with the process?
3. What is the current view on the future of academic departments as the reorganization process moves forward?

The committee discussed each of these issues and began to suggest revisions for each of *Faculty Handbook* sections 2.12 and 8.4.7 (draft appended to the end of this report with suggested changes in red). Our goal is to recommend to the Senate that we approve the suggested revisions for both *Faculty Handbook* section 2.12 and 8.4.7 and forward those to the Faculty Handbook Committee for further consideration. In this discussion, we reviewed the Jackson State University Shared Governance document, the original 1966 “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” that was developed by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the American Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. We also reviewed proposal 6 entitled “Enhancing Faculty Involvement in the Selection of Academic Leadership” that was submitted as part of the university reorganization process. That proposal focused on how “to establish formal policies and procedures that both ensure and enhance meaningful faculty involvement in the identification and selection of academic leaders at The University of Southern Mississippi.” We have addressed the first two issues listed above and are working on gathering ideas and suggestions on what might be the best solutions to suggest to the Senate to address these issues.

We are not ready to present a final version of our recommendation to the Senate during the May 4 Senate meeting. We request that the Senate leadership add completing this recommendation to the assigned charges for the Governance Committee for the upcoming 2018–2019 term. This will allow the committee more time to review and consider options and to have greater process toward the needed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook* that are currently underway.

After our meeting, we received the draft Progressive Disciplinary Policy and comments on that policy from Dave Beckett. We have not had time to review and discuss the draft policy or to discuss it as a committee. We also request that this be added to the charges for the Governance Committee for the next academic year Senate to consider.

The Governance Committee has developed a draft revised version for both *Faculty Handbook* sections 2.12 and 8.4.7. The suggested revisions are in red. Although there is a diversity of opinions on what might be best for us to suggest, there is consensus that the sections should be reviewed and the faculty and faculty governance body roles strengthened and defined more specifically. The Committee will continue to discuss potential suggested changes during the next Senate term. The section that follows is our current version of proposed revisions to sections 2.12 and 8.4.7 of the current *Faculty Handbook*. Hopefully when the Senate reconvenes in the Fall we can present a final set of suggested revisions for the Senate to consider and subsequently submit to the Faculty Handbook Committee to consider.
2.12 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.

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 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 Deans, School Directors, and Chairs/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.

1 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.

8.4.7 Chairs/Directors Periodic Review.

An academic chair or director (hereafter described simply as “chair”) is appointed by the dean of the college following consultation with the department/school faculty and the provost.

While a chair’s performance may be reviewed by the dean at any time, under normal circumstances a chair will receive annual reviews by the unit’s Personnel Committee as per the guidelines set forth in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 8, Section 4) and by the dean according to procedures established by the dean and approved by the provost. In addition, a chair will undergo periodic term reviews as outlined below. A newly appointed chair 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 chair would therefore be evaluated in his/her third year and eighth year as chair. There is no limit to the number of terms a chair may serve; however, a chair must undergo a review before reappointment for each term. The final results of the review process for the chair and/or 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 chair (spring semester in the third year for newly appointed chairs), the dean of the college will determine whether a chair wishes to be considered for another term. At this time Chairs/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 chair and the department will be informed immediately of the chair’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 chair will be immediately informed that his/her term as chair 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 chair for a subsequent term. *If the Dean reappoints a Chair/Director without the support of the department faculty the Dean will be obligated to provide the faculty with a justification for reappointment.*

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

5. Current chairs initial terms will be staggered upon implementation of this policy. Individual appointments within a college will be for 3, 4, or 5 years. The method of assigning the initial appointments is left to the discretion of the Dean.

6. The chair 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 chair will normally receive a 90-day notice of removal. Should a chair choose to resign, the review process (if initiated) will end, and the resignation will be the means through which the appointment is not renewed.

7.8 Gulf Coast – (Lee Follett) The work of the reorganization committee is ongoing.

7.9 Handbook

7.9.1 Progressive Discipline Policy (*draft*) – The progressive discipline policy was distributed for review and the request was made for committee members to provide suggested revisions for discussions.

**Comments/Questions:**
Lilian: Comments from faculty: Seems like the process is one-directional and not bi-directional. They think some mention of due process should be added. Noticed under policy and procedures, the first sentence says, “School Directors are responsible…” and the next sentence says, “School Directors are solely responsible…”

Doug Masterson: In terms of due process, I would argue that compared to what we have now, this is due process. When we met and were working on the draft what we were mindful of is that these types of procedures are not widely known.
David Cochran: Can you please send your comments to us? We are gathering all feedback to make any changes that are necessary.

David Holt: We need to move on the Progressive Discipline Policy. The timeline is stressed a lot more than it should, and we would like to move forward keeping the understanding that it can be updated if need be. We will read every comment and discuss every comment. I personally think it’s in decent shape, and that’s why we rolled it out of committee. I have no problem being transparent about this and will let you know. As a side comment: This concern about what are we doing with tenure and promotion next year, I am not happy with the fact that the Faculty Handbook Committee is now responsible for bridge language for annual evaluations and tenure/promotion, and third-year review. We’re going to try and fix it. We have a subcommittee formed to build a bridge gap document that will try to fill the needs of what’s going on. Whatever goes forward after July 1, if the Faculty Handbook changes it doesn’t go into effect until the following July 1. So we need to understand this process and who makes those decisions in regards to tenure and promotion and annual evaluations.

Saillant: It looks like there is a time period between when faculty can respond to disciplinary action. That is a short delay (5 days). Why so short?

David: The timeline is to initiate the process within 5 business days. After the event happens, there is a little bit of a cool off, but we can’t drag the process on forever. We’ll go back and re-read that and make sure everyone involved has the opportunity to respond in enough time.

David Cochran: There was an importance of not letting it sit around and that someone moves on it quickly. The process behind the document is to make this a corrective thing.

7.10 University Relations and Communication – No report

7.11 Welfare and Environment – (Bob Press)

In the March meeting, the President was presented with a list of outstanding issues that he said he supports. This is an update:

1. **Compression and inversion.** On April 5, President Bennett asked Provost Moser to come up with a specific plan by August. The Committee thanks the President for taking this action.

   It was first raised by the Senate in 2015.

Regarding the other three issues also presented to the President at the same meeting, we are waiting for a response from the President on:

2. **Equal pay for equal work.** This long outstanding request deserves attention.

3. **Setting parameters** on the on-line teaching program: how far do we go; how many courses, etc.

4. **Diversity** – would welcome information on specific steps the President is taking.

The Committee would appreciate the Senate President following up on these issues and sharing this report as appropriate

**Comments/Questions:**
Mac: The president is waiting on a committee report from Diversity Committee before making a statement about that.

8.0 Outside Committee Reports

8.1 Academic Reorganization Implementation Committee (Ken Zantow) – The committees are working constantly to try to deal with every issue that’s presented and to meet aspirational goals. It’s a difficult task. I understand that everyone wants answers, but this is not a finished thing. This type of thing, as far as continuous improvement, will be ongoing.

9.0 Consent Items

9.1 Advice and Consent on Senate Appointees from Unrepresented Schools (Approved)
   9.1.1 Erich Connell for School of Construction
   9.1.2 Jennifer Brannock for University Libraries
   9.1.3 Kimberly Ward for Speech and Hearing Sciences

10.0 Unfinished Business

10.1 None

11.0 New Business

11.1 Election of Deputy President, Secretary, and Deputy Secretary – Senate attendance fell below voting quorum, so no vote taken. The Senate will vote during the June meeting.
11.2 Retiring Senators: Debbie Booth, Dan Capper, Ken Zantow

12.0 Good of the Order

12.1 Next Staff Council meeting: June 7, 9:30–11:00 a.m., Trent Lott Center 207

13.0 Announcements

13.1 Next Senate Executive Meeting: May 8, 2:30 p.m., College Hall 104
13.2 Next Senate Administration Meeting: May 8, 3:00 p.m., President’s Office
13.3 Commencement: May 11 (Hattiesburg), May 12 (Biloxi)
13.4 Next Senate Meeting: June 8, 1:00 p.m., TBD

14.0 Recess until June

Friday, June 8, 2018, 2:00 p.m.
Union Room B; Hardy Hall 316 (IVN)

Present: Miles Doleac, Cheryl Jenkins, Nicolle Jordan, Ann Marie Kinnell, Amber Cole (Proxy), Melinda McLelland, Catharine Bomhold, Bradley Green, Sharon Rouse, Charkarra Anderson-
Lewis, Tim Rehner, Beth Tinnon, Mac Alford, Sherry Herron, Charles McCormick, Donald Redalje, David Holt, Tom Rishel, Kenneth Zantow, Jennifer Brannock, Bob Press (Proxy), Jeremy Scott (Proxy), Lee Follett (Proxy), Scott Milroy, Dan Capper (Proxy), Susan Mullican


15.0 Organizational Items
   15.1 Call to Order 2:02
   15.2 Roll Call
   15.3 Recognition of Quorum

16.0 Old Business
   16.1 Clarification of April Minutes: Senate Replacements and Additions – Senate moved that current members will remain seated through the next year (motion passed). Senators who said they wanted to resign could resign. Since only two [at that time] expressed plans for resignation, additions would be made only for Schools who were not represented on the Senate. Mac will reach out to all Schools that do not have a representative member and make sure they are represented by the time we have the retreat in August.

17.0 New Business
   17.1 Elections of Officers – Moved to table the election of officers until the September meeting so that there is full representation present to vote (Don Redalje).

   Friendly amendment (David Holt): Move to August retreat/meeting instead.

   Motion passed with friendly amendment.

   Nominations for President-Elect – Moved that the current president remains in office until August meeting (Don Redalje) (Mac Alford agreed and motion passed)

   Nominations for Secretary – Moved that current secretary remains in office until August (Don Redalje) (Cheryl Jenkins declined to serve until August). No secretary nominated, but David Holt and Jennifer Brannock agreed to help plan the fall 2018 retreat.

   Don: Offer the same motion for Secretary-Elect as President and Secretary (passed)

18.0 Adjourn (May Meeting)

Amy Miller, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (from May meeting)
Miller: We had ALC meeting Monday and I was there to receive feedback from the ALC regarding one of the proposals that’s come from the Implementation Committee, specifically the proposal on Faculty Governance and Representation. I shared that feedback with Dr. Moser.

Mac: We provided feedback together as leaders of the different advisory bodies on campus, and Amy collated all of that and provided that information to the Provost shortly thereafter. He’s aware of the discussions we’ve had here and elsewhere.

Miller: I’m presently working on issues related to faculty development and student success, broadly speaking. I’m also working on other things as they arise. I do oversee the Office of Online Learning and I’m happy to address questions in regards to the resolution if there are any. My reaction, I received the resolution in our office following the last meeting and I sent it on to the Online Steering Committee because I would like to get their feedback in response to that. I’m looking forward to hearing feedback once it’s been discussed. So, I’m not wedded to the current structure in any way, and I’m happy to adjust it if that’s what’s best.

Bob: – Do we have any measure on how successful we have been on reaching students in Student Success? If we’re not reaching students, is there anything we can do better?

Miller: We have an array of programs (Student Success). We look at student success in a very holistic way. We’re talking about from the moment a student enters, there are transfer students and true freshmen. How do we get those students to get engaged in a number of ways. When you ask if initiatives have been successful, that’s a full question. The real question is about particular initiatives and what kind of successes we are having with whom. It depends on what you’re looking at (e.g., JUMP program, Living/Learning Community). At this point there is no single program that reaches everybody simultaneously that you can statistically measure as having an impact on something like their GPA. We certainly assess and do what we can to adjust. We know where we have needs to better impact student progression.

Bob: If it’s possible, maybe we can get specific data to show what’s working and what’s not working and what steps faculty could take to help implement some of these programs.

Amy: I would be happy to provide presentations or whatever format people would like. We all know communication is a challenge on campus and determining how much to communicate about what. Advisement is something we’ve been working on very aggressively this past year. We just did our second survey on advisement thanks to Dr. McLelland’s class. The survey helps to assess the student advisement experience and the potential advisement center. Pedagogy is another area we’re working on and getting faculty to participate in different initiatives to enhance teaching and give more support for teaching. There are many different facets at work. It’s hard to summarize quickly the data involved, but we have lots of data and we go where it tells us we need to go.

Mac: Has a decision been made on who will lead the Office for Faculty Development?

Miller: Not fully. We have a Center for Faculty Development that’s been in place for a little over a year. Bonnie Cooper works as an assistant to the Provost for Faculty Development. That is sort of an umbrella for initiatives like the Teaching Forum Series, First Year Faculty Foundation Forum, AQ, Research Working Groups. There’s just a lot of potential there. In one of the
Reorganization proposals there was a suggestion for a Faculty Leadership Institute. We would love to have that in place. We are doing an internal search for a director. There is a committee of faculty involved in that search, and we’re hoping to have that settled within the next couple of weeks.

Alan Thompson: That Leadership Institute emerged from a proposal that came out of a AAUP open forum. Have you given thought to what the institute looks like?

Amy: I looked at the proposal and there were some good things and it provides a good model for a program. I haven’t gotten to the point of specific details, but it needs to be a faculty-led program with probably an advisory group to help plan details. I do think we have a great template because of that proposal.

Mac: With these Living/Learning communities, do we actually have faculty who live on campus with students?

Miller: We don’t right now. We have right now a Living/Learning Community in place for a group of 66 students who are nursing majors. In the fall of 2018 we’ll have four communities with students who are majoring in biological sciences, nursing, are “first generation,” or are undecided. They live together, take classes together, and there are some faculty, who are working in a collaborative way, who are teaching those classes. They are not, however, living with the students. Mostly it’s an opportunity for students to get connected to each other. It’s a space where students can get together and work together, share classes, etc. It’s worked really well for the nursing students.

Susan: Do the students live in the Century Park dorms?

Amy: This semester, the pre-nursing students live in Vann Hall. In the fall, we will have 3 groups in Century Park and one group in Wilbur Hall.

Comment: Can you yet comment on co-requisite courses and how those are working?

Miller: We don’t have a lot of data yet, but we will. It’s too new, so we can’t yet comment.

Schrader: It would be difficult to interpret the data right now.

Bob: Where should students be sent immediately when there is a problem or need help? Do you have a sense if faculty are saying that things necessary during advisement in regards to student success?

Miller: We will have data that gives students’ perceptions about advisement. The data is complicated because not all departments have faculty doing the advising. What I have seen anecdotally is that faculty talk to students regularly about the discipline and basically things that are going wrong with students. What we see less are conversations about careers. It varies by discipline. I think the most important thing for student success perception is the students’ relationships with faculty. That’s the most important variable. The primary role of faculty, to me, is to serve in the role of mentor to students. Faculty do a great job of that. We do have CARES system if you are concerned about a student. It just depends on the concern. If I know the specific kind of concern, I can point you in the right direction. We’re also interested in finding out the type of services or training advisors want or need to help make advising process more productive.
Elizabeth Tinnon: We may need to investigate how many students we engage with who have mental health issues. I’m growing more concerned with our students’ mental health. It is interfering with their student success. Also, what is my legal liability when a student says they have that issue? Do we need to come up with a plan besides CARES? I don’t know how that impacts what I should do in my courses with these types issues (preferential treatment issue).

Miller: There is a big national discussion now about this (mental health concerns). We’ve written grants to deal with the issue and done other things to help with this issue on our campus. We’re hoping to implement a better system of self care and work with students upon their entry to develop some resiliency skills. Some universities train students as professional listeners to help students cope better; there could be something through Faculty Development that we could do. ODA should be contacted before accommodating students with these issues.

Ann Marie Kinnell: It may also be a policy issue that we may want to address (i.e. incomplete guideline). In some ways it isn’t always useful to follow our stated policies to deal with these issues.

Miller: There are policies, but students can go and register with ODA and make those issues known and that way that can addressed, even if there is a specific policy.