2-2-2018

FacultySenate Minutes - February 2, 2018

USM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes

Recommended Citation

USM Faculty Senate, "FacultySenate Minutes - February 2, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 195.
https://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/195

The University of Southern Mississippi
Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
Friday, February 2, 2018
Union B; Hardy Hall 316 (IVN); MEC Conference Room (IVN)

Present: Marcus Coleman, Jennifer Courts, Miles Doleac, Cheryl Jenkins, Nicolle Jordan, Ann Marie Kinnell, Bob Press, Stacy Reischman-Fletcher, Amanda Schlegel, Amber Cole, Will Johnson, Catharine Bomhold, Bradley Green, Lilian Hill, David Lee, Sharon Rouse Charkarra Anderson-Lewis, Cynthia Handley, Susan Hrostowski, Tim Rehner (Proxy), Bonnie Harbaugh (Proxy), Elizabeth Tinnon, Mac Alford, Sherry Herron, Joshua Hill, Susan Howell, Jeremy Scott, Adrienne McPhaul, Kenneth Zantow, Tom Rishel, Scott Milroy, David Holt, Donald Redalje, Westley Follett, Heidi Lyn, Melinda McLelland, Eric Saillant
Absent: Daniel Capper, Kevin Greene, Anne Sylvest, Deborah Booth, Charles McCormick

1.0 Organizational Items

    1.1 Call to Order **2:02**

    1.2 Roll Call

    1.3 Recognition of Quorum

    1.4 Recognition of ⅔ membership for voting on Bylaws and Resolutions

2.0 Adoption of Agenda

3.0 Program

    3.1 Provost Steven Moser (President Bennett attended as well) – **Comments follow agenda items**

    3.2 Brent Holifield, Lake Sehoy opportunities (**Not in attendance**)

4.0 Approval of Minutes

    4.1 December 2017 – **Approved with corrections**

5.0 Officer Reports

    5.1 President – Raised about $5,700 for the staff relief fund. Two listening sessions (here and Gulf Coast) were held concerning reorganization. Notes from both sent to Senate members and Provost. Comments from sessions were not an endorsement from us (Faculty Senate) or the AAUP. Executive committee members will meet with President and Provost next week and will bring up issues of gender/race equity in pay, compression/conversion pay, and summer rate pay. Reminder: In Administrative Evaluations, don't forget that Faculty Handbook requires an annual evaluation of chairs that is outside of our Faculty Senate survey evaluation.

    5.2 President-Elect – **No Report**

    5.3 Secretary –**No Report**

    5.4 Secretary-Elect – **No Report**

6.0 Decision / Action Items

6.1 Brian LaPierre (History) to fill open Senate seat – Approved by the Senate. LaPierre will serve for the remainder of this year with position opening during next election.

7.0 Standing Committee Reports

7.1 **Academics** – Last November, the Academics committee was charged with developing a list of concerns and recommendations relevant to online learning. To that end, Academics Committee members (Follett, Handley) met with Catharine Bomhold, Chair-elect of the Online Learning Steering Committee, on December 7, 2017. The Academics Committee Chair (Follett) met with Vice-Provost Amy Miller, to whom the OLSC reports, on January 11, 2018. The following preliminary report reflects the conversation of those meetings, supplemented with information from the Bylaws of OLSC and notes of the October 6, 2017 meeting of the OLSC provided by Vice-Provost Amy Miller

- Despite its title, the Online Learning Steering Committee does not have actual authority to "steer" anything: it is primarily an advisory body charged with *recommending* policy to the Office of the Provost. Per the OLSC bylaws, the purpose of the OLSC is to "discuss critical topics, develop policies and procedures, and provide recommendations… as well as undertake other duties as assigned by the Provost related to online initiatives and needs"
    - The Office of the Provost has sought recommendations from OLSC around three specific issues:
        - 1. What guidance can we provide to faculty on effective strategies for online teaching?
        - 2. How will we ensure that regular and substantive interaction is happening in online classes and that teaching is generally at a high level?
        - 3. We want to ensure that our fully online students are supported and included as Southern Miss students – what recommendations do you have for how to improve support and inclusion for our online student body?
    - The effectiveness of the OLSC in addressing these is open to question; per its own bylaws, the OLSC is to meet once a month; to my knowledge, it met once last semester; another meeting is set for the first of next week. This infrequency may reflect the difficulty of coordinating meetings between the 22 members of the OLSC, and the lack of an executive committee within the OLSC. As one committee member is on record saying, "There is definitely a feeling that we are not steering the ship."
    [*Nota bene*: OLSC membership comprises 15 appointed, voting members, including (12) faculty representatives from the academic colleges, Academic council, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate, Council of Chairs, Gulf Coast campus, and (3) staff from the Office of Online Learning. There are 7 *ex-officio* members.]
- The general focus of the Office of the Provost, and extended to the OLSC, has been on *fully online* programs and students, with less regard for students in traditional degree programs who take online courses in addition to regular, face-to-face courses
- To a large degree, the actions of Office of Provost & OLSC have been more responsive than proactive, addressing college and program concerns (e.g. the need for online exam

proctoring solution: last fall Office of Online Learning piloted the Smarter Procter program, with the intent of general roll-out in Spring 2018; another example being the need for more opportunities & resources for faculty development in Online instruction: OLSC partnership with *Quality Matters*)

- Many fundamental questions remain: the Department of Education requires that online courses have "Substantive, Regular Interaction" between instructor and student; but what exactly does that mean, what does that look like? Who is responsible for the quality of online pedagogy? Who draws the line? The departments? Schools? Colleges? How does online teaching impact faculty course loads? How can we prevent faculty burnout from online teaching? How do we prevent campus students from filling seats intended for fully online students in fully online programs? What is the long-term university strategy in respect to the future of Online Learning at Southern Miss? How far down this path do we want to go?

- Amy Miller would welcome Faculty Senate input on Online learning issues, to include the development of a university long-term strategy for Online learning; she sees FacSen and OLSC as participants in the conversation about these issues (but I think not particularly as the *lead*, which will remain with Admin); she says that she would welcome an invitation to speak to FacSen about these matters.

Questions/Comments:

Bob Press: I think administration is driven by financial needs. I appreciate the substance you provided and I think we do need to pursue this. I think faculty burnout is real.

Jeremy Scott: May have issues with face-to-face students taking seats from online only students. If they are students on campus, they need to be in class (face-to-face). There is a (process) in SOAR that allows for instructor consent, but I have no power to let them in the class. The secretary goes in to see if student is fully online or an on campus student. Is there some way in SOAR so that students who are not fully online (on campus) won't be able to register for completely online courses?

Catharine Bomhold: All of our classes for advising purposes are permission only (that's how we control that issue). If students are from outside of department, there isn't really a way to regulate from a SOAR standpoint or a way to flag people in SOAR; (it's cumbersome) to see where students are.

Jeremy: Is there a way to automate if students are taking on campus classes that they not be allowed to take online classes?

Catharine: From my understanding, I don't think there is a way to automate that. May need to call Institutional Research.

Mac: Lee, please take this issue to Amy (online issues). How do you want to generate recommendation to send to the Provost's Office?

Lee: It would be best to take place with Academic Committee, but we can reach out to Senate through a survey. There is still a lack of clarity for where these biggest questions should be generated. Faculty Senate should forge ahead.

David: Generate list of questions that may relevant to this discussion and take them to the executive meeting. Other than that we would have to write up a formal recommendation.

Mac: We can bring it up at the meeting Tuesday.

David: How do we deal with proctoring students who are actually on campus? In relation to Student Success, do we need to restrict freshman from taking online classes until they learn how to be online students?

Ken: The committee doesn't seem to meet; that's a problem. Can we say something about that? You can't work on things if you can't get the committee together.

Catharine: There's a lack of dissatisfaction and lack of clarity coming from above. I would like to take a look at the set up of and make up of committee to see if there can be changes made. There is a certain tension and lack of definition of what we're supposed to be doing. I think what will help is to focus more on pedagogy instead of just policy and get more information out to faculty to do this well.

Elizabeth Tinnon: As far as pedagogy, is it the thought that only "online only" students could take courses? (No, that is not the case.)

Catharine: The concern is that there are students sitting in their dorms taking away seats from only online students when they could be sitting in a seat somewhere.

Sherry: That would be a department unit decision.

Ann Marie: Rather than send Jeremy to IR, that might be something that we want to take forward as a group. Maybe one person can look into it and explain how students are enrolled. Asking to put courses online, is that something that Academic Council would want to deal with?

Catharine: I have had this discussion with Luis Iglesias [chair, Academic Council]. It hasn't come from Academic Council. There is perception that online is not as good as face-to-face. This is what students want and where we need to be because eventually this is where we'll need to be. There's a lot of different voices here.

Sharon: There has to be an answer. We have precedence that students are flagged for other things in SOAR. Fully online students should get priority to register for online courses.

Bradley: Have people who do advising (Advisement Center) deal with this issue.

Jeremy: This is a large program. It's a very cumbersome process to get students registered.

Mac: Lee, at last meeting we brought up pros and cons on intercessions counting load, did you all discuss that?

Lee: No.

Karen Reidenbach (iTech liaison): I suggest you to talk to the Registrar's Office to see if the People Soft and SOAR systems can do what we need it to do. Start with Registrar's Office for some of these issues (Nicole Green).

Bob: As we look ahead we have some issues: Burn out, process issues, and need some kind of plan as to where we are heading (no plans there).

Mac: In cabinet meeting, I've brought up online education before and it seems to be an business issue from administration's perspective.

7.2 **Administrative Evaluations** –
   Committee Chair: Melinda McLelland

Committee Members: Amber Cole, Anne Sylvest
1. We finalized the survey on Qualtrics based on the input of the faculty senate.
    a. We added Vice-President – Gulf Park, Vice-Provost – Gulf Park
    b. We added an option to evaluate another chair/director
    c. We added a survey feedback option to fix glitches and get faculty insight
2. We distributed the survey via Qualtrics on January 22, 2018.
3. The deadline for completing the survey is February 9, 2018.
    a. A reminder will be sent by February 6, 2018.
    b. Senators should: Notify and remind their respective colleges about the deadline and remind them to check "clutter."
        i. Suggested: Copy and paste the link to send out a College email from the College senators.
4. The results will be analyzed and distributed to the administrators by the end of April.
    a. After faculty evaluations are complete (no sooner than April 1)

7.3 **Awards** – The Awards Committee received this week the University Excellence Award Nominations. The committee is in the process of carefully reviewing the submissions and selecting an award recipient, and then make a recommendation to the provost.

7.4 **Bylaws** – No report

7.5 **Elections** – Remains on hold at his time in response to multiple conversations and pending reorganization process.
Davis: Why don't we continue our current process until the reorg happens?
Tom: No problem with that recommendation.
Sharon: We're operating under our current bylaws, and until that changes we have to operate under those.

7.6 **Finance** – Met with CFO and discussed a number of things. Anticipating another cut, but we don't know for sure. Talked about the data issue and inflexibility of SOAR and I hope that there is a solution that we'll get some time in the future.
David: Do numbers look like they are leveled off right now?
Ken: No. We have fewer students; that's always going to be a threat to us.

7.7 **Governance** – No report

7.8 **Gulf Coast** – Ken: "Anxious" is operative word. We're looking forward to next process. Because of reorg, people are anxious. There wasn't much about the Coast in the document and we're awaiting the next step.

7.9 **Handbook** – Chair resigned (Max Grivno); David Holt (elected chair of the committee): Discussed progressive disciplinary action. In current Handbook there is language for "doing a good job" or "you're not doing a good job at all." Requested Provost Office move forward

to re-write language to move forward on progressive discipline policy. Waiting to see how reorg impacts Faculty Handbook. I've received an official "stand down and wait" to get further guidance. Is the Faculty Handbook as it stands, is it a folder that just references where all standards are? What it is? A lot of people have opinions about what it is. We have to decide what this is.

Questions/Comments:

Mac: Any questions abut changes that Dr. Beckett suggested?

David: Still trying to get guidance from Provost on how to proceed. Faculty Handbook committee should report to Provost, but handbook said that we report to President, so that needs clarification.

Alan Thompson (AAUP President): Would like clarification where it originated that Faculty Handbook reports to Provost instead of President.

David: What's on the website is different than what's in the Handbook.

David Beckett (audience): Faculty Handbook committee reports to the President, not the Provost. There is a lot of interaction with the Provost, but changes have to be approved by the President. The President generally asks the Provost his suggestions, but the Faculty Handbook committee reports to the President. Also, there is no reason to wait on reorg to make recommendations/changes to the Handbook.

Beckett comments/questions submitted to Senate via e-mail:

1) The first modification alters Section 9.7.1 and amends the qualifications for serving on departmental tenure committees. This modification "excludes from departmental tenure committees those who are of lower rank than the applicant for tenure and under review for promotion." This phrase is somewhat unclear but I am interpreting this modification as stating that in order to be excluded a tenured faculty member would have to be BOTH of a lower rank AND an applicant for promotion. Frankly I think the intended target/targets of this modification would be extremely rare, and, if this modification were ever carried out, it would be detrimental to the process of tenure review.

Application for promotion generally occurs in either the 5th year of service (or one year earlier for those who seek early promotion) or the 6th year of service at the university, and tenure applications occur during the 6th year of service. Also, promotion results in an increase in salary (a rarity at USM these days!). The point, therefore, is that faculty are almost always "up" for promotion either a year before their tenure application or during the same year as their tenure application. So, tenured faculty members are almost universally either Associate Professors or Full Professors. A tenured Assistant Professor would be a real rarity.

To be a member of a Departmental Tenure Committee a faculty member MUST be tenured. So this means that they would be a tenured Associate Professor or a tenured Full Professor. And under what circumstance would such a person be "excluded from departmental tenure committees" and their deliberations according to the modification of Section 9.7.1? The person being considered for tenure would have to be a Full Professor and the person being excluded would therefore be an Associate Professor in that department who would, simultaneously, be up for promotion to Full Professor. The next question would be as follows: how could we have an untenured, but up for tenure, Full Professor? Such an

occurrence would certainly be unusual but it does happen. The University could (and has) hired in a faculty member from another institution, provided them with Full Professor status, and allowed them to "come up" for tenure during their first year on the USM campus (usually this happens with the hiring of "new" chairs from "outside.""). So previous to this year's Handbook all the tenured professors in that department (both Associate and Full) would participate in the discussion and vote as to whether the candidate merited tenure. This seems to me to be a sound practice. However, due to the peculiarity of this year's modification it appears that the change would only operate in very unlikely circumstances as illustrated in the example below. Dr. Smith has been hired as the new chair of the Dept. of Dragonology at USM; he has been hired as a Full Professor but will come up for tenure in the spring of his first year at USM. Dr. H and Dr. D are both in their 8th years as tenured Associate Professors in USM's Dept. of Dragonology. Dr. H has submitted his dossier for promotion to Full Professor; Dr. D has not.   So according to this year's modification of Section 9.7.1 of the Handbook Dr. D could participate in the discussion and vote in regard to Dr. Smith's candidacy for tenure but Dr. H could not (because Dr. H has applied for promotion).   This makes no sense to me.

A possible rationale for this modification is that it is supposed to avoid possible retribution from: 1) an "up for tenure" Full Professor who is also chair, targeting an "up for promotion" Associate Professor in the chair's department, or conversely, 2) retribution from an "up for promotion" Associate Professor who receives a negative promotion vote from the new chair. So this scenario would begin identically to the example presented in the previous paragraph (and again would be very uncommon). In the first case (1) the new department chair would supposedly receive the tenure vote from his departmental tenure committee in which there might be a negative vote or votes. The chair then might decide to abrogate his/her responsibility to provide a sound assessment of his colleague's candidacy for promotion. However, what invalidates this possible scenario is the fact the chairs provide letters of evaluation (for promotion of Associate Professors) during the <u>fall</u> <u>semester</u> and chairs would not come up for tenure until the <u>spring</u> <u>semester</u> of that academic year (several months <u>after</u> the chairs had written letters of evaluation).   The second situation presupposes that if the chair has written a negative letter of evaluation (for promotion) of an Associate Professor) and the Associate Professor later takes "revenge" by voting negatively on the chair's tenure. For this to happen it would be necessary to begin with a uncommon situation (a new untenured Full Professor who is also chair and an Associate Professor in the department up for promotion in the same academic year) compounded by a negative vote (by the chair) regarding promotion (of the Associate Professor) followed by a vengeful vote by an Associate Professor. Is this very likely?

It also seems to me that this modification in the Handbook's Section 9.7.1 unnecessarily clutters up the Handbook by envisioning situations that would rarely occur and then resolving them by denying tenured Associate Professors the long-established privilege of having input and voting regarding the tenure of a colleague (in this case the chair). If I have "missed the boat" regarding the intent of this modification I would greatly appreciate knowing what was intended and how the existing modification accomplishes that purpose.

2) Modification #2 proposes three changes in Section 9.5.2, but does not provide a rationale for any of them. The first two modifications are good ones in my opinion, the third is not. The first modification adds the modifier "tenure-stream" as a qualification for

personnel serving on a Departmental Promotion Committee. I am guessing that this modification is a response to the information recently added to the Handbook regarding Research, Clinical, and Teaching Professors. Research, Clinical, and Teaching Professors have already been precluded from acting on the Departmental Promotion Committees which consider the promotions of Research, Clinical, or Teaching Professors (those promotion committees consists of a department's tenured Associate and Full Professors (see Section 3.4 NON –TENURE TRACK FACULTY, Section 3.4.1; POLICY/PROCEDURES, A. Research and Clinical Position Titles and B. Instructors, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Teaching Professor Positions). Research, Clinical, or Teaching Professors are not tenured and therefore could not serve on those committees. However, the addition of "tenure-stream" as a modifier makes it clear that "regular" Departmental Promotion Committees (non-Research, non-Clinical, and non-Teaching Professor promotion committees) are made up of only tenure-stream professors. It was not the intention of the committee which established the university's parameters for qualifications and promotions of Research, Teaching, and Clinical Professors to allow non-tenure-stream faculty to be members of "regular" Departmental Promotion Committees. Thus, this is a needed clarification.

The second modification (within Modification #2) is also a good one. It clearly states that Departmental Promotion Committees will consist of ALL eligible faculty members. This modification was made necessary during this last academic year. During that period two Promotion Committees were deliberately constituted with only about one- half of the eligible faculty.

The third modification (within Modification #2) could be stated more clearly (it states that those who are currently under review for tenure are not eligible to serve on Departmental Promotion Committees). Actually, this modification is aimed at Associate Professors who have received early promotion (from Assistant to Associate) but are not yet tenured. In other words, they are now Associate Professors, but this modification makes them ineligible to discuss and vote concerning the promotion of Assistant Professors (to the Associate Professor level) within their own departments. This modification was passed by the Handbook Committee via a split vote and against the wishes (as expressed in a vote) of the Faculty Senate. In my opinion this is an unfortunate change in the Handbook for the following reasons: 1) the modification was based on one vague circumstance where some faculty members didn't like the vote of a person who had earned early promotion; 2) only faculty members who have extraordinary qualifications can earn early promotion and (in my view) as Associate Professors they deserve to vote on the promotion of Assistant Professors who are members of their home departments, and 3) this modification alters the long-standing University precedent that Associate (and Full) Professors discuss and vote concerning the promotion of Assistant Professors to the Associate Professor level.

3) Modification #3 mandates that a link to the University's Academic Integrity Policy be included in Section 4.5.5. This was a straightforward modification and I have no questions or comments concerning it.

4) Modification #4 deals with a faculty member filing a grievance in which he/she stipulates that a university rule, policy, or procedure has been violated (Section 12.2.3). Basically two changes were made from the previous version in the Faculty Handbook: 1) a

stipulation is included that the grievance must be filed "within 10 days" of the "incident" and 2) that this 10-day countdown begins "when the facts pertaining therefore become known or should have been known to the faculty member." Dr. Davis states that these modifications were made so that the Faculty Handbook would "be in an alignment with the USM *Employee Handbook*." The previous version of the Faculty Handbook did not provide a deadline for filing a grievance and the 10-day "countdown" is indeed stated in the USM *Employee Handbook*.

I have two objections to this modification. First, the USM *Employee Handbook* states that "days within the [Grievance] policy statement shall refer to working days of the Grievance or complainant" (see *Employee Handbook*, Section 4: Grievance Policies, Time Frame). So to be consistent with the *Employee Handbook* the Faculty Handbook should state 10 <u>working</u> days as a "countdown" rather than just "within ten days." Second, there is no statement within the *Employee Handbook* that the time frame (countdown) can begin when the facts "should have been known to the faculty member" or employee. Doesn't this infer that faculty members should somehow be clairvoyant whereas non-faculty personnel are not similarly required/gifted? Example: Dr. Jones does something that irks the college dean, and the Chair of Dr. Jones department tells Dr. Jones that the dean isn't happy with him. Three weeks later Dr. Jones finds out that the dean has taken disciplinary action against him. Dr. Jones wants to file a grievance but cannot because Section 12.2.3 of the Faculty Handbook states that he is past the 10-day deadline and he (Dr. Jones) "should have known" that the dean was unhappy with him and that some consequences might result. Did the Faculty Handbook Committee really think some vague reference to what the faculty member "should have known" was suitable for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook? Was this discussed with the Faculty Senate? I strongly urge the Faculty Handbook Committee to consider the removal of this phrase ("should have been known to the faculty member") from the Faculty Handbook.

Mac: If you want to consider details about information provided in e-mail (Beckett), please forward to Sharon or David.

Alan Thompson: As part of reorg, we're not talking about modifying finer points of language. I'm curious if meetings of Faculty Handbook committee will be open to faculty?

David: Yes, any meeting we have should be publicized and will be. We have way too many questions that are very conceptual at this point. We have been asked to stand down on Handbook as of now (by Provost). It seems the overall goal is to try and streamline Handbook and Employee Handbook.

Bob: Do we still have a Senate Faculty Handbook Committee? (Mac: Yes. Max resigned from chairing that committee.)

Mac: There is the standing university Faculty Handbook committee and then there is a Faculty Senate Handbook Committee through which to funnel information to and from the standing university committee. The third committee is a sub-committee from reorganization committee that looks at the Handbook.

7.10 **University Relations and Communication** – No Report

7.11 **Welfare and Environment** – Pushing for more attention from the administration to meet pay disparities between male/female employees (hope for a line item); administration push for plan to increase minority hiring and also push for conversion/impression (administration has not moved on any of these things, but we will continue to push). We need another committee member. David Holt has stepped down with his role on so many other committees.

8.0 Outside Committee Reports

8.1 **Academic Reorganization Steering Committee** (Mac Alford, Ken Zantow) – Submitted report to Provost; awaiting decisions on implementation from the Provost.

8.2 **Online Learning Steering Committee** (Catharine Bomhold) – Meets next week

8.3 **University Assessment** (Mandi Schlegel) – No report

8.4 **Search Committee, Vice President for Student Affairs** (Mac Alford) – Two candidates have been here, one more on next week.

9.0 Consent Items

9.1 None

10.0 Unfinished Business

10.1 Reorganization Feedback

11.0 New Business

11.1 **Shared Governance Statement** – No clarity about what "shared governance" means at USM. Mac distributed Jackson State University's agreed upon shared governance document for reference and for consideration as we think about creating something similar at Southern Miss

12.0 Good of the Order

12.1 Report on University Staff Relief Fund

12.2 Next Staff Council meeting: March 1, 9:30–11:00 a.m., MGCCC

Sherry: Was able to work with NR Burger Engaged Hattiesburg for Community Wellness and Education program

Bob: In regards to juvenile recidivism, NAACP is in the process of forming a community and faculty steering committee that looks at this issue (please send e-mail if you are interested)

13.0 Announcements

13.1 Next Senate Executive Meeting: February 6, 2:30 p.m., College Hall 104

13.2 Next Senate Administration Meeting: February 6, 3:00 p.m., President's Office

13.3 Next Senate Meeting: March 2, 2:00 p.m., Cook Library 123 and IVN

14.0 Adjourn

Remarks from President Bennett:
Wanted to come by and check in with everyone and opened floor for questions from Senators. Earlier today we had a wonderful ceremony for Kennard where the Freedom Trail marker was unveiled.

I had the opportunity to present to the IHL Commissioner and both House and Senate appropriation committees letting them know about the work that USM has done. We won't know the outcome of session until deep into the spring.

Thanks to those who presented during academic reorganization session. I look forward to continuing work in that area.

Questions/Comments:
Bob Press: Please confirm open office hours, Feb. 26 or 28 (It's Feb. 26).

Mac: Any updates on fundraising from private donors?

President: We're doing well and preparing for quiet phase of donations.

President: Thank you for what you do. It's a tough time to be in higher education. I really appreciate the hard work. We're making significant progress to make this a stronger and more intentional institution.

Remarks from Provost Moser
Most interested with where we are with listening phase and recommendation of reorganization plan.

I have been collecting feedback through faculty leadership groups over the last week or so and will spend time looking at it.

Feedback will be included with my recommendation to the President. I hope to have it on President's desk next week.

With help of ALC, I hope to get some recommendations on how to get through the process and how we meet implementation goals by July 1.

I'm very proud of the amount of work done by faculty groups this fall.

Through implementation phase we'll look for ways to have broad reach (some details not quite where they need to be at this point).

The proposals give us a starting place. They are not set; they just give an idea of what we're supposed to do. The detailed work is now ahead of us

Questions/Comments:
Mac: Two issues that you both could address… The Coast couldn't provide us much feedback because they don't know the structure on the Coast yet. Waiting to see if there will be assistant directors or assistant deans there.

Provost: There is not an intention to push down a decision about structure yet. We would like to further vet and to have a liaison between us and the Coast. I asked Dr. Maugh Funderburk to establish committees to help establish guidelines.

I don't think we're there yet. We'll get feedback from committees.

Mac: Second question comes from broader vision… the Vision doesn't have our mark on it. It's not the thing that makes us unique compared to other institutions.

Provost: I disagree. I think the work we're doing makes us unique. We've reframed the issue, [sent back to the faculty to help us define the solutions].

Alan: From listening sessions, our staff colleagues are experiencing anxiety about their employment. Can you give them any idea when university will begin plugging people into positions? Should program directors start plugging people in to their needed staff requirements?

Provost: This is not an employment reduction effort. We're not looking to remove staff from the university. Some staff will be moved. We want a process that's fair, equitable, and transparent. We still have a July 1 goal. Waiting on one College to finish their selection of director and then I will meet with the new group of directors and see what pieces need to be handled so that we know how to move forward.

Questions for Provost and President:
President: Will it be helpful if Provost and I met with staff (for conversation about issues)?
Kelly James-Penot (Chair, Staff Council): I think it's an excellent idea if you met with staff.
Bob: Online education and where are going in that direction?
Provost: There is an opportunity for growth in online education. We have an interest in online education; it helps with our brand. We don't want to force all programs online, only where it pedagogically makes sense.
Lee: In respect to July 1 goal for reorganization, is it possible to comment on timeline for formation of Coast committees and liaison and when you expect to hear from these groups?
Provost: The July 1 date is important. It is the date IHL approved for structure to be implemented. Pieces tied to implementation must be completed by then. Not all components will be done by then. What I will ask implementation committee is that they propose and a realistic timeline for some of the other work that has to occur. This will take time.
Susan: There are classrooms that are being assigned that are not fit to be taught in. It's frustrating to teach in these types of classrooms.
Provost: We are scraping together dollars where we can to renovate classrooms. We don't have the dollars to do everything. I've committed to walking the campus to do an assessment to know the shape of our facilities and to talk to people and create a priority list for how we're going to renovate across campus. We're balancing lots of issues around our finances.
Nicolle: With construction across Hardy Street, will there be a bridge or is that a city issue?
President: There will not be a bridge, but there will be improvements at crosswalks and median along US 49 and other areas.
Elizabeth Tinnon: Did the city of Hattiesburg say it was our responsibility to have a bridge?
President: There are no resources for that level of construction project that are available right now.
David: Is it safe to presume that pieces from proposals (reorganization) will be used in restructuring, or is it safe to safe that other components will be at play?

Provost: I think the proposals are extraordinarily philosophical; they do move the institution in right direction.

David: Could you and the President get that message out to faculty and staff. A reorganization should be exciting and so far people are just scared.

Provost: We've tried to provide opportunities for people to be a part of the conversation. It's as if no one has read the document. If we can get that information out for people to review, please get that to me.

Bob: How do you see this issue of finances?

Provost: We are faced with great challenges with financial structure. Our expenses exceed our revenue. That's driving some of this. We have to take a look at what we're doing and why we're doing it. In our first review of degree programs, we're going to look at graduation rate. If we're not where we need to be there, then maybe we need to make better decisions. Maybe we need to look at our programs and see if they're effective. The bean counting is discouraging, but at the end of the day, we have to pay our bills. We've got to redirect some of our resources. We have an unusual number of degree programs for a university this size. This is not an attempt to change the quality of what we do.