

3-2-2018

## Faculty Senate Minutes - March 2, 2018

USM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes](https://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes)

---

### Recommended Citation

USM Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes - March 2, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 193.  
[https://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes/193](https://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/193)

This 2017/18 Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Archive at The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact [Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu](mailto:Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu).

**The University of Southern Mississippi  
Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda**

Friday, March 2, 2018

Cook Library 123; Hardy Hall 316 (IVN); MEC Conference Room (IVN)

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

### 1.0 Organizational Items

1.1 Call to Order **2:06**

1.2 Roll Call

1.3 Recognition of Quorum

1.4 Recognition of  $\frac{2}{3}$  membership for voting on Bylaws and Resolutions

### 2.0 Adoption of Agenda

### 3.0 Program

3.1 President Rodney Bennett – **Notes following agenda items**

3.2 Provost Steven Moser – **Notes following agenda items**

3.3 McKenna Stone, Vice President, Student Government Association (Matthew Dunning will speak on her behalf)

SGA Senator had an idea to create a syllabus bank that would be put on Student Success website and that would be voluntary for faculty to include their syllabi. It would allow students the ability to look at course work before signing up for classes. At meeting to get feedback from Faculty Senate.

**Feedback:**

Lilian: I think it would be useful insofar as it could be kept up to date.

Ann Marie: Students would also have to realize that for classes that are taught a lot it may be easy to keep up to day, but when we have new instructors/faculty coming on board or new classes, that we might not be able to do that. (Matthew: We could have a disclaimer saying that this will not represent your future classes, also professors change how they do things semester to semester)

Matthew: There are 17 peer institutions that do the same thing, so we'll be using them as a model. Not sure how the syllabi will be listed/organized right now.

Bonnie: I would like for the syllabi to be available on our system and not available on a public one.

Sharon: Do you know what the percentage of the demand for these syllabi are?

Matthew: Did a poll recently and over 90 percent of the students (USM) surveyed said they wanted this.

Bob: What we can start doing is that when we start advising week we should have a couple paragraphs of what the course is about. Maybe that would help.

Tim: I don't have a problem with the idea. But, there may be some problems with the timeline and what's coming out as a result of the reorganization, what's rolling into departments and Schools. That's going to make some of that difficult to do, the maintenance. (Matthew: We don't expect this to happen in the next year or so).

Bradley: My concern would students would be use it to decide if classes are easier I get five to 10 students who request syllabi

Comment: Maybe students could also reach out to the instructor about the syllabus before classes start.

Ann Marie: I think there is a benefit for students knowing what the class is about; we have a new service learning designation classes. If students do not know they have to serve 15 nonprofit hours, that may be beneficial to have on record There is a certain expense to knowing how to schedule classes. This might be a tool for professor as well\*

Adrienne: It would be useful for student support centers. A repository like that would be easier to look up.

3.4 Brent Holifield, Aquatics and Outdoor Adventures Coordinator, Rec Sports: Lake Sehoj opportunities–Finished building Challenge Course at Lake Sehoj.

Brent: Please let students and other faculty know about facilities.

There is a faculty/student enrichment fund available that can pay for classes on things like Team Building or Leadership. There is also trained staff in place to help with any of your needs.

#### 4.0 Approval of Minutes

4.1 February 2018–**Approved** (with correction)

#### 5.0 Officer Reports

5.1 President (Mac) – Dee Dee Anderson did accept offer to be Vice President of Student Affairs and will begin April 16 (Provost: Official announcement will be on Monday). We will have to undergo active shooter training, mandated by the governor, that is going to be due, I believe in May (President Bennett: May 1). If you think we need to invite Rusty Keys back for “hostage situation” training, please let me know. It will be an online training module (active shooter training).

President Bennett: The campus community will receive communication from me with instructions. We are seeking clarity from governor's office on the definition of “employee” (we have several types of “employees”) and they are checking with the legal

people in Jackson about how best to determine that. We hope his office will answer that question in a day or so.

David Holt: Is there an effort to get options for students that may be interested, to go through an active shooter training as well?

President Bennett: I'm not aware that we've had any conversations about that, but I think it's a great idea.

Tim: That might be a good recommendation by SGA. In this day, it makes sense to do.

Mac: Recommendations are being made about commencement. Sent an e-mail out last month about commencement, having special service for Ph.D. students on Thursday and several other things. So the committee made a recommendation based on your feedback. Requests for new positions for next year should have gone out March 1 and will be due on April 1. All of those requests will go to the Provost's Office and he will have a team of deans and other representatives making decisions.

Provost: "New positions" is something I want to clarify. We're not in a position to create a lot of new positions. This is in response to retirement and some critical areas that may not be fully staffed.

Bob Press: How many advisors for freshman are we hiring?

Provost: I don't think we're there yet. We have to identify funding first.

Alan Thompson: How many tenure track hires are we targeting this year?

Provost: We approved 74 searches in October. Whether those result in successful appointments, we're waiting to see. In the budget reductions, we lost 52 lines, so there was a potential for 120-130 lines to be searched and that had all been approved, but the reduction reduced that down to about 70, I believe. Those searches in some stage are moving forward. The April review will be much smaller because of that.

Mac: A list of appointed School Directors will be sent out soon and orientations will begin this summer, as well as a retreat for them.

Several on Staff Council along with myself (Mac) and Stacey met with VP for Finance and Administration to go through spreadsheet of cuts and eliminated lines. I will condense as a summary and provide at a later date. Some may have thought that their departments might have been targeted (cuts), but based on what we saw in the data, that doesn't seem to be the case. It will be good for everyone to see where cuts have occurred across campus in last two and half years. Dr. Bennett will ask VP for Finance and Administration's office to help with heavy lifting of organizing that data for Senate. Will have Allyson and Lyn go through it with the Senate at a meeting.

Doug Masterson asked me to remind you to sign up for Digital Measures workshops (keeps up with individual work data); some programs piloting using it for annual evaluations.

Provost wants groups to know that he is available to talk if they need him to come to their meetings.

5.2 President-Elect– We met with President Bennett, Provost Moser, and VP for Finance and Administration Allyson Easterwood on Feb. 6.

He shared a draft of House Bill 1083 and explained that he had been in Jackson sharing how this would negatively impact institutions of higher ed.

In light of impending review and possible revision of bylaws for governing bodies, I asked the President what his view is of the charge of the Faculty Senate. He said he would need time to think about that before responding.

We discussed online learning and I shared how a large portion of all our senate meeting centers on discussions about this topic. I shared that the role of the Online Learning Steering Committee was not clear and that it seems that the OLSC could be either a policy decision-making body or a committee concerned with best practices in online learning. I shared that most people are not against online learning, but that we have heard (in Senate) one too many stories about how it isn't working. Faculty want to know who to go to for answers. The Provost asked if the senate would recommend to him a possible charge for the OLSR. I asked why the comprehensive reorganization plan does not address salary compression and inversion, and gender and race equity in compensation. The Provost answered that addressing those issues required revenue streams and that these measures are underway, but that we are not yet in a place to address the issues with dollars. So in some respects, the reorg seems limited to Academic Affairs, and this issue requires partnership with the VP for Finance and Administration.

**Comments/Questions:**

Mac: What Stacy is referring to (in “charge to the Faculty Senate” reference) is that when we’ve had our Executive Committee meetings, the president and provost have alluded to or seem to feel like we’re their “ambassadors” to the faculty, and of course we don’t see ourselves as that, but as the “voice” of the faculty.

Stacy: This meeting is what used to be the meeting with the president. We have so many questions, that the president suggested we invite others (provost, VP of Finance).

Tim: That limits your freedom to talk about the impressions you might have about where faculty are coming from with the president (with the provost there).

Bob: I do appreciate your meetings and they open up the channel of communication. Think there is a need on an educational level for both the President and Provost to let us know (if there is any doubt) that we represent the faculty and that we in funnel up... that we are faculty voice.

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 – (Westley Follett) The Academics Committee is currently focused upon two issues. The first of these concerns the matter of intersession courses as part of faculty teaching loads. The specific question set before the Committee was whether or not courses taught during the August, December, and May intersessions may be counted toward fulfillment of a faculty member's contractually obligated teaching load. On the pro side of this issue, allowing intersession courses to count would offer faculty greater flexibility with the potential to reduce one's teaching load in a semester that might otherwise be taken up with intensive research or heavy service obligations. On the con side of the issue, some faculty have observed that allowing intersession courses to count as part of the teaching load might mean that a Department Chair, or School Director could mandate the teaching of an intersession course. The Committee suggests that surely it would be possible to devise policy that allows intersession courses to count but specifies that the teaching of intersession courses will remain the option of the faculty, and cannot be required by administrators. This is perhaps a question to be raised with senior administration. The Committee intends to create a survey on the matter of intersessions to be put to the faculty at large.

The second issue before the Committee continues previously raised concerns relating to online learning at the university. Much of our attention has been upon the work of the Online Learning Steering Committee. The Committee's report last month highlighted three specific matters that the Office of the Provost has asked the OLSC to address. To recap, they are 1) to provide guidance to faculty on effective strategy for online teaching, 2) how to ensure "regular and substantive interaction" is taking place in online classes, and also how to ensure online teaching generally is at a high level, and 3) make recommendations to ensure fully online students are supported and included as Southern Miss Students. The work of the OLSC has thus, in large measure, been taken up with pedagogical concerns, and ensuring online student success; it has been less occupied with development of strategic policy recommendations to the OP. This being so, the Academics Committee proposes to draft a Senate Resolution expressing support for the restructuring of the OLSC; given the impending reorganization of the university, the OLSC would have to be restructured anyways since faculty representation on it is essentially collegiate. The Restructured OLSC could then be specifically charged with the development of recommendations toward a long-term strategy for online learning—a strategy, we would advise, that is not shaped solely by market demands or the university's budgetary needs. Further considerations for this retooled OLSC would include determining exactly what "substantive, regular interaction" between online instructors and students looks like, and determining if and how partially online students are to be treated differently than fully online students, in matters such as enrollment windows and caps. The Committee invites input from the Senate on this proposal.

**Comments/Questions:**

Mac: If committee puts together a recommendation for online learning, are there additional things (other than what was reported) that should be added?

Bob: One concern is the number of students in online course; there are faculty burning out. At some point we may start to sacrifice our quality.

David: The matter of class size; it's coming out of committee, so the committee can actually draft a resolution.

Stacey: You're using the language/word "restructuring" and I'm wondering do we want to think about "disbanding" and "restarting" something? It might yield the same thing. If it's such a large revision, then maybe we're just starting something new. It might yield the same thing. Maybe severing ties with online learning steering committee so we can start anew and say we do propose a committee that does these things and these are the people who should be on it. And clearly dissolving the old one.

## 7.2 Administrative Evaluations –

**Committee Chair:** Melinda McLelland

**Committee Members:** Amber Cole, Anne Sylvest

### **Report:**

1. The data are cleaned with a final sample size of 315; 20 more than last year.
2. We are analyzing the data from the survey.
3. The results will be analyzed and distributed to the administrators by the end of April.
  - a. After faculty evaluations are complete

**Resolutions or Recommendations:** None at the moment

### **Comments/ Questions:**

Mac: Provost said he was interested in the results in evaluations of deans (he normally gets them after; I see no reason that he cannot get them). Melinda will pass them along in next couple of weeks

7.3 Awards – (Sharon Rouse) -The Awards Committee are reviewing the nominees for Junior Faculty Teaching Award and the Junior Faculty Research Award. The committee is in the process of carefully reviewing the submissions and selecting an award recipient, and then will make a recommendation to the Provost. The committee just received the Faculty Memorial Scholarship Endowment student applicants and will processing them March 4, 2018.

## 7.4 Bylaws – No Report

### **Comments/Questions:**

David: Are we as a Senate going to say anything about us shrinking from 45 to 31 (members)? Right now I'm against that. Will we be able to see it (recommendations) again before they say that this is the new stuff?

Stacy: That feedback coming from Senate and from governing bodies is being looked at (by one of the reorganization committees). If it doesn't work out there, it should be addressed in bylaws.

Mac: We have to bring recommendations back here (Faculty Senate) and vote on those (bylaws).

David: I just think it's weird that we have a reorg committee deciding how many senators there should be as opposed to the Senators deciding.

Alan: Personally, I as a member (Faculty Governance and Representation Committee) did not agree with shrinking size of Faculty Senate. There is a meeting today to meet with representative bodies; no real discussion about counter recommendation that Senate size be reduced. Within that committee is a smaller sub committee that is working on that particular issue. I would encourage Senate leadership to push back on that issue.

Mac: When we had listening sessions, people consistently commented that that Senate should remain at the same size; one senator per school, plus four from Coast is the proposed composition.

Tim Rehner: There needs to be a consistency for how the Senate is going to represent the university, especially with the size of Arts and Sciences.

Bob: I don't think voices should be diminished. You have a certain number of senators representing a certain number of faculty. We should fight it now and stop to the extent that we can.

Scott: I also serve on that committee working on this (but not on subcommittee). The thinking was that in the previous space, with the creation of this behemoth College, there was a concern that they wanted to distribute faculty voices fairly. In the past elections were problematic getting people to run/serve on Senate. The math comes from that idea. I would suggest to go on provost's website where proposals were submitted and contact the persons who are running those committees to let them know you want them added as a business item; if there is a lot feedback from folks, those will be added as action items.

Melinda: Being from a College with only three reps, it's kind of scary to go down to one. I would hope that there is not a change.

Tim: What matters more is who we elect, those willing to serve and those vocal. I don't know if the number matters. The value should be placed on service.

Alan: It's important to have knowledge about eligibility to serve. Untenured professors are excluded (marginalizes a significant portion of faculty). It is my suggestion to let those who have done third-year review serve.

Tim: We should send resolution to the committee and send copy to provost.

Stacey: We grow by 6 or 7 at-large members who are outside of our School/College; that would be one way to grow.

Ken: There are other issues to the bylaws that the Senate needs to address. We no longer have department chairs; we now have directors. That needs to be resolved in our bylaws; in current bylaws, directors can serve.

David: We as a Senate have given up a lot of things that we would normally be a part of. Can we as a Senate try to address questions like that? Can we get reports from those committees?

We have a couple senate meetings left, are we going to have a bunch of decisions made before then? We need communication coming out of those committees.

Tim: Are you recommending that in addition to standing committee reports, we should have sub committee reports?

Ann Marie: The reason there is no communication is that there is nothing going on.

Everybody on campus should be responding to these changes and processes

Mac: Reorganization committees have been added to agenda since the beginning of the year.

\*Merek Steedman is the liaison between the faculty and the reorganization committee.

Comment: The reorganization is changing the structure of the university and not the structure of the Senate; when the structure of the university has been decided at that point we can move forward.

Stacy: I will draft up a proposal that encompasses what we as Faculty Senate agree on and then will send right to the committee (e-mailed to the Senate).

Ken: I'll write Merek and ask him to be in contact with the Senate.

Stacey: I will need clarification on what we agree on in this matter (for the proposal that will be sent to committee).

Bob: Preferably that no decisions be made while the Senate is not in session (summer).

Tom Rishel: This committee does not get to decide the Faculty Senate representation.

David: We could say here are our recommendations, what do you say to us? Then we decide if we agree.

Stacey: We could extend procedural abeyance past July 1.

Tom: we would need to get the agreement from the current senators to serve through the extension.

**Motion that we (the Senate) remain in procedural abeyance with current Senate members' terms extended for a period of one year, with the agreement of those serving in those positions (passed).**

7.5 Elections–Tom: we are in procedural abeyance and postponing elections until we have a better sense of what that structure would look like as opposed to having elections now and bringing in people who are not as aware of what's going on.

7.6 Finance – Met with Allyson; no impending cuts from state. We are improving our debt ratio and that's encouraging.

7.7Governance–Committee will meet. The shared governance statement that was distributed at the last meeting (JSU) will be discussed and used so that the committee can come up with a description of what we do (here at USM). Ann Marie will send an e-mail to convene and will have a report by next meeting.

Mac: Our shared governance statement is limited to about two paragraphs in the Faculty Handbook and is very broad.

Tim: We should expand it.

7.8 Gulf Coast–Faculty Council voted to postpone elections until the dust settles. Dr. Casey Maugh-Funderburk has created a Gulf Park Reorganization Committee for which Ken is chair. It begins with campus level in order to define an academic leadership structure. Provides protocol to develop faculty and governance committees. The charges do a lot to add to the reorganization process which largely had no focus on the Gulf Coast at all. It's made up of faculty and staff from Gulf Park.

7.9 Handbook – (Sharon Rouse) - The committee met on February 14, 2018, to discuss its timeline, function, and process, as it pertains to the university's reorganization plan. A review of the current membership terms was presented, reviewed, and duly noted.

7.10 University Relations and Communication– Nicolle reached out to different groups to improve Wikipedia page and no feedback yet.

Tim: University Communications and up coming branding of university is making it difficult to get things approved. There is still business as usual as reorganization moves along. We can't just stop.

7.11 Welfare and Environment – Bob Press (Chair), Charkarra Anderson-Lewis, Miles Doleac, Susan Howell

This is more of a restatement of action requested earlier since no response has been forthcoming from the Administration:

1. Equal pay for equal work. Despite President Bennett's earlier support of the concept, there has been no action on this Senate's request during the current academic year to come up with a plan to address the gaps. The Welfare Committee through the Senate President respectfully re-requests that the Administration address this issue as soon as possible. Obvious budget challenges are acknowledged but it is the feeling that this should not preclude development of a sound plan to close the gaps of equal pay for equal work.
2. Faculty salaries: compression and inversion. Again, acknowledging current financial constraints, the Committee through the President respectfully requests again that the Administration develop a line item in the budget to address the serious issue of under-payment for long time faculty. The current challenges should not preclude development of a plan to implement when possible. Lack of implementation can lead to departure of some faculty and the costly re-hiring of replacement faculty.
3. Online learning. The Committee appreciates the candid acknowledgement at the February 2018 by both Provost Moser and President Bennett that there is no current plan regarding the balance between online and in-person teaching, and that expansion of online courses is important because it brings in needed revenue. But it is the expression of this

committee and others on the Senate that a plan for balance is needed. For one thing, faculty burn-out on very large online courses is an issue. Other issues come under another Senate Committees.

4. Diversity. The Committee has a focus to be supportive of the University Diversity Committee. But as of March 1, that Committee has yet to receive it's charge from President Bennett. The hiring and welcoming of ethnic minorities to the faculty is a critically important issue and this Senate Committee urges the Administration to present a plan for increasing minority faculty representation.

**Comments/Questions:**

Tim: Could the committee push forward a formal apology to Clyde Kennard family about what this university did to this person?

Bob: President expressed apology at marker unveiling.

Bob: There are also some other concerns, like the names of the some of the streets on campus (Forrest).

Bradley: Can we ask university to subsidize body armor for faculty or staff? In light of what's going on, may be necessary.

Rehner: The only building on campus with security is the Dome.

## 8.0 Outside Committee Reports

8.1 Academic Reorganization Implementation Committee(s) (Ken Zantow) – Contacted Marek and he has suggested that he come to next Senate meeting in his role as liaison with Governance Body Committee.

Scott: In September AAUP advanced an idea about how faculty would be involved in selecting leaders for the university. The faculty should be more explicitly involved in selecting leadership. That was one of the proposals vacated by the Reorganization Implementation Committee.

Ken: There was little support for that proposal. The provost chose to take that out of the process and recommendation for workload measures.

Scott: The chair of the implementation committee sent a memo, but I wasn't aware that the decisions were made by the provost.

Ann Marie: The memo was from Provost to Jeff Wiggins.

Ken: The proposal may not be going forward, but the idea behind it is supported by members and can be addressed in future .

Alan: In January, Jeff Wiggins sent a memo to Provost suggesting that those recommendations not be considered now; in response, I sent an e-mail to Wiggins seeking clarification and received a straight-forward explanation of his decision-making process. (Alan then read some exchange with Jeff Wiggins about the process).

Ken: I find it to be awkward.

Alan: What's the harm in continuing the dialogue?

Ken: It doesn't mean that we can't continue this discussion.

Alan: For him to say that this is “his decision” is problematic.

Mac: I was included on those e-mails and was bothered by the language. I met with the Provost and believe that he will create an *ad hoc* committee that will continue these discussions past the July 1 deadline.

Tim: Not sure that an *ad hoc* committee is the best way to do this. I’m troubled with the response that our folks in the reorganization committee are responding in that the communication must stop; that’s troubling.

Ann Marie: Anything perceived as a directive or policy right now, is not going to fly.

Alan: The provost was supportive of the idea; and wants to see faculty input of leaders.

8.2 Online Learning Steering Committee (Catharine Bomhold) – No Report

8.3 University Assessment (Mandi Schlegel) – No Report

8.4 Search Committee, Vice President for Student Affairs (Mac Alford)

8.5 Search Committee, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences (Doug Masterson\*) – screening 10 candidates today

9.0 Consent Items

9.1 None

10.0 Unfinished Business

10.1 None

11.0 New Business

11.1 None

12.0 Good of the Order

12.1 Next Staff Council meeting: April 5, 9:30–11:00 a.m., Trent Lott Center 207

13.0 Announcements

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

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

13.3 Next Senate Meeting: April 6, 2:00 p.m., Trent Lott Center 101/102 (Stacy Reischman Fletcher presiding)

14.0 Adjourn

**President Comments:**

President – Not as much to report on this meeting, but there will be more to share at April meeting (more in-depth reporting). Happy to take questions or comments at this time.

**Comments/Questions:**

Anne Sylvest: Any update on search for Arts and Letters dean?

President: I'm sure the Provost will have an update on the Academic Affairs matters.

Tim Rehner: Report from legislature and what funding looks like?

Pres: We are cautiously optimistic about it.

Tim: What about the issue of guns on campus?

President: There will be some modifications to the gun legislation bill, but I don't think it will die. I think there will be guns allowed somewhere on campus, but maybe not everywhere on campus. But, we're still working our way through that.

Alan Thompson: Your comment does raise an interesting point, that under state law citizens, students, etc. might be allowed or already are allowed to do this, but employees of the university, we are not allowed to carry weapons. To an extent the constitutional rights of employees are limited a little more. So we're not in a position, even if we wanted to, to protect ourselves

President: I've raised that point with the leadership and the concerns about it. I think that if something gets passed, that's a good follow up for us.

Alan: Is that an IHL policy?

President: Well, IHL and the law.

Bob Press: This will be in a report that I'm giving later (in the meeting), but it's a reiteration of points that we've raised through Senate previously; and, it's probably very understanding that you haven't had a chance to respond because you've busy with everything going on. So it's in that context (that questions/comments are posed). Equal pay for equal work, faculty salaries online learning (we need some kind of plan) and diversity (are the concerns listed in report).

President: The Provost and I have had very good conversations about those things mentioned. I'm supportive of all of the things mentioned. So, I'll look forward to whatever recommendations come forward or that move us forward on those things.

Bob: In some sense, we've already made the recommendations and just waiting on action on them from you, when you have time.

President: Who have you sent those recommendations to?

Bob: Well, in the past semester we've sent them to Mac (our president), but they were raised at the cabinet meetings and they were raised at the time that we were in financial crisis. These are issues agreed to earlier and basically we are just re-requesting action from your part to move forward.

President: And those recommendations were submitted this academic year?

Mac: No, some were from previous years. For example, having a line item for inversion/compression or salary discrepancy across race and gender.

President: So maybe just for clarity, is it possible for the Senate to send those to me again?

Bob: (Handed recommendations to President during meeting)

### **Provost Comments:**

Bob sent me a couple of questions as a follow up to his questions at the last meeting about some of the things we're doing to work on our financial strengths across the academy. One of the initiatives is to take a look at under enrolled classes and try to get an understanding of what we

can afford to do and what we need to look at as an institution. As an example, this past fall we had 895 sections of lectures/lab classes that were under enrolled (didn't meet minimum of 15 undergrad, 10 grad). That's 895 out of 4225 sections offered. We understand that there is a need to provide services to under enrolled classes. What we're concerned about is the balance of those classes across the institution. As we look at this from a financial perspective, given the stress we have financially in Academic Affairs and we are going to invest in some salary compaction/compression and address equity issues, so we need to look towards repositioning the faculty lines to support growth, and, the fact that we're challenged to do those things. We also look at this piece as a part of becoming more efficient. If you were to use very crude analytics and you took 25 percent of those sections during the fall, that would be 223 sections. Multiply that by very nominal \$3000 adjunct costs, that expense (just 25 percent of that) is about 671,000 for one semester. These things really do have impact. It's not going to be one or the other. We have a lot of qualitative decision making around enrollments that we have to manage and there are reasons why some classes need to be set at a lower than minimum enrollment, but as a matter of practice perhaps we are not as conscientious as we should be about that type of scheduling. Sometimes we are just out of sync in our curriculums, in our program rotations. That kind of analysis is really important as we try to figure out how we're going to reset and how we're going to support what we're doing and invest in opportunities and how we're going to address issues only money can solve. Hopefully this gives frame around questions that were asked earlier. If we're doing in the spring what we did in the fall, that would be about \$1.2 million just for 25 percent of under enrolled classes (again, nominal crude calculation).

**Comments/Questions:**

Bradley Green: One of things we were doing is that we have a lot of grad students, who are advanced, teaching some of the undergraduate courses since they're going to be on stipends anyway. We're piloting, got an exception that one of our students in clinical psychology can teach abnormal psychology once they've taken their advanced psychology course as a graduate student. Is that something that is maybe going to be back on the table? It serves a lot of purposes for us. They get teaching training and experience and mentorship from us so they have that on their resumes. It also takes a load off. That way we only have to think about how many graduate faculty do we have to have to make our programs viable. So we're hoping that will come back in a very reasonable way.

Provost: It's good to hear the work that you all are doing. I'm a big fan of guidelines versus policy. We are going to look at developing clearer guidelines around us. Every time we have to enforce a minimum enrollment requirement under the guidelines, there will probably be two or three exceptions. The exceptions are going to be supported by a good and reasonable plan. So, if you're trying to achieve something, that's part of a good plan. There are going to be a lot of exceptions to the decisions we make. If it's not for some strategic reason, then we have to take a look at it. We have a lot of bad practices on this campus that contribute to our financial stresses. But, don't fear if there is a good plan attached to what you are trying to do.

Bradley: I agree. I think we need to reduce redundancies in some areas. On students teachings, we don't want anyone out there who is not representing well, so we're very invested in quality control.

Provost: And that's absolutely critical. But what you have described is reasonable and a benefit to the students. We often get new Ph.D.s that have really never performed well in the classroom. So that's a liability to us. A new faculty member that we get to campus and it takes awhile to get them successful in the classroom. What you're doing is absolutely the right thing to do. Getting them ready for the life they're going to live.

Bob: I believe I understand better now, from your e-mail and from your explanation, that in fact you have some small classes that help students get through programs well, those types of situations will be considered and courses can still remain.

Provost: We've got to be realistic about what we can afford as an institution. Our program inventory is extraordinary for the number of students we have at this institution. While you may have a niche, boutique program, if it cannot support robust enrollment, we have to take a look at why we're doing that.

Ann Marie: The new School of Social Science and Global Studies and the School of Communication Studies met this morning to start talking about setting up social science methods classes so that that we teach them in common so we can rotate. We're trying to share faculty, share students if we're all teaching the same class. That's one of the benefits of the reorganization, from our perspective, is that now we can actually move forward and create these kinds of classes, whereas before we felt like we couldn't.

Provost: It was all territorial; everyone wanted to protect what they had, so we may have had five different colors of a research methods course when it's all social science. I'm glad you're already having those conversations

Provost: The other item I wanted to touch on briefly is contract dates and what we hope to accomplish under new academic calendar. Contract date (for this year) is set at Aug. 20. Classes start Aug. 27. We are focused on not wasting time during contract period. We'll take that time to do new faculty orientation work and work shopping. Want to take that time to work with leadership all the way down to school directors. We also want to have structured school meetings, college meetings and division meetings. We want that to be an expectation as part of the contract. I think we move this ship forward better if we hear the conversation together. We're looking for ways to be more efficient and ways to be more useful and helpful and to provide the division with opportunities for interaction in ways that we've not had before. I think this could be a benefit and I'm asking the Faculty Senate to support this. This is something we expect (or maybe require) as part of your contract. We don't really want to do that (require), but we do want to move forward as an institution together. Our ability to communicate well very often is enhanced when we have these rare opportunities to come together as a faculty.

Alan Thompson: Are you indirectly trying to address here the notion that faculty don't have to show up until the day that classes start? Is that what we're trying to dispel? That week prior (to classes) is when we'll have the opportunity to meet?

Provost: Suggesting that we start the year well and that we're addressing issues before they overwhelm us.

Stephen Judd: The nomenclature of things like departments and units and all of that and titles like coordinators, chairs, and the language that we're using, can you talk about how those shifts in nomenclature, how do those connect to the idea of what we now call departments (a department as a coherent body of knowledge, with its own specific knowledge and specific application of disciplines), how do you see that relationship?

Provost: I refute that. I think that a department is an administrative structure that can house what you described. And what we want to focus on and really hold on to are the disciplines in the Schools. We call them departments now, but they are disciplinary faculty groupings. It's important that we hold on to those pieces to ensure that the discipline isn't lost in our attempt to become more collaborative. It's about terminology and the reason I want to move away from department, is to try and get us out of silos. Words matter. We may end up having chairs, but I want us to decide what that means, because words matter. Right now we define chairs very specifically on this campus and the roles of the faculty leaders will shift during reorganization. Let's make sure we're defining what we're doing well so that it's clear for all. Whether we move back to departments or talk about this in terms of disciplines, under a School structure, we are not at the end of the conversation. I can't tell you where we'll end up at the end with some of the details surrounding those terms, but what I do know is that it matters what we call all of these pieces.

Judd: So, you're in agreement that cross disciplinary collaboration really can best be achieved from maintaining the integrity of the individual discipline?

Provost: Yes. It depends also on the mission/goal of that particular division. The scope. All of that matters. One of our weaknesses as an institution has been that we try to do the same for all and it's much too complex. We have all have different roles. And we have to acknowledge and support that.

Judd: So, one of the corollaries to that is that works when there is enough support on top of support that's provided to the units to enable that process to work. Support has been so diminished over the years that we're taking up the slack by our own individual time (faculty sweat equity) and it's taking the place of the equity that would normally come from other places.

Provost: We were headed down the road to continuing that practice, making the lives of all faculty harder because we weren't making strategic decisions about who we are. Not all things can be equal if we are going to move in this direction. There are going to be winners and there are going to be losers in this conversation and that's going to be hard. Not speaking of staff or faculty reductions, but where our priorities are going to fall. We can't address issues if we are still financially at the margins. Then we have those conversations as well. It's interconnected. We haven't gotten the opportunity to get to our Strategic Plan/Academic Master Plan because that's going to take resources as well.

Alan Thompson: Would you care to provide a synopsis of what you discussed with the AAUP leadership earlier this week in regard to implementation and degree program inventory review?

Provost: We're in first phase of a multiyear process where we look at graduation rates because that's what IHL is using to give us our score card. The metric is also tied to viability in the institution, so even if you're meeting the minimum graduation rates for your program based on the IHL metric what we want to come out of this is, Are there opportunities for growth? Where can we collapse and consolidate some emphasis areas under programs? How can we become more efficient if that is appropriate for what we're trying to accomplish? First step is hardest, taking a look at those that do not meet the IHL requirement. Those programs are going to have a fairly compelling plan to continue. We will continue to do the process over the next several years because we do have to reduce our inventory. What's been happening is that we continue to expand our programming, programming that has become outdated that should have been subset years ago. The numbers aren't there to support those programs or curriculum has not been updated. We're starting with emphasis areas.

Thompson: What will be the process for that? We've heard that there will be a committee within Graduate Council to look at graduate programs and one in Academic Council for undergraduates.

Provost: Yes, that's the appropriate group to advise me. I'm using Doug Masterson and his shop to manage this process, so that when recommendations come back to me I can look at them fresh without being biased by the process. Both Councils have program committees, so it seemed logical to go to them, but also asked both chairs to choose how they wanted to do this. and his That's how we will approach this.

Rehner: Will these subgroups send recommendations to their councils who will in turn send their recommendations to you? What are you expecting from those committees?

Provost: I'm expecting advice on whether these programs need further review, whether they find programs problematic, whether they are happy with them, or whether programs should continue to do what they are doing.

Rehner: In those subgroups there will probably be three or four people who make decisions and then what happens after that?

Provost: My impression is that it's going to run up to Doug's office and he'll send it to me.

Thompson: Second point was implementation of reorganization process?

Provost: Sent message about the process for the implementation stages via e-mail last week.

We're still building processes and meeting regularly with groups to make sure we are focusing on the work that needs to be done. Big questions now: Who owns the process? What is the process for implementation? Who needs to provide advice on finalizing proposals? All of those questions have not been answered yet. We're working on that piece now. The assumption is that all that will be done by July 1, and that's not the case. It's going to take about 18 months to get through all of this. There are some components that have to be done quickly and that has to do with the structure of the schools, appointments and staff assignments. We will announce directors early next week. I feel like we are moving the way that we should be. We will communicate broadly (update every 2 to 3 weeks from committee). We're developing the structures right now.

Bob: Where does Senate take part in the review of course programs?

Provost: It has not been proposed to pull Senate into that conversation, but I can do so if necessary. It just seemed more appropriate that the Academic Councils manage this. If we need to have a broader conversation, I'm happy to have that.

Tim: I like the idea to let the academic committees make those decisions.

Beckett: What's going to happen with Faculty Handbook, especially in terms of tenure/promotion? Processes need to be in place before next academic year because if they aren't followed and coincide with the Handbook, then the university leaves itself open to lawsuits. It's March and the last word I got from Handbook committee was that it was in "procedural abeyance."

Provost: Procedural Abeyance means that we take a look at how we typically review and we allow for exceptions to that timeline (that may be changed). Some of the processes would have to be adjusted to get to a specific goal and it needs to be reasonable and fair. I feel very good about my conversations with David and the role of Faculty Handbook Committee and how they will move forward. We will have the appropriate checks along the way and we're not going to rush a Faculty Handbook through that creates greater risks for the university. So the July 1 deadline may be for pieces of the Handbook that we have to get to, but not all chapters. I'm relying also on General Counsel to help guide the decisions around what's critical for the institution. David (Beckett) has been a champion of the Handbook for a decade and a half. The work that we're doing now is not to change policy, it is to align policy.

Beckett: I understand. I'm just concerned about things like tenure/promotion (Do chairs still write letters? Are School directors involved? Or not?). When those decisions are made, they are certainly going to have to be in the Handbook by the fall. I agree other chapters don't need to be there by fall, but the tenure/promotion needs to be there. In the past the Senate has heard about modifications along the way, but with this body I don't see how modifications that will be in Handbook would be able to come to Senate then added to the Handbook.

Provost: We'll be able to do that. I understand that we may not meet July 1 deadline, but we'll need to figure out a way to handle that and do it right. We may get to a point in a year and discover that it's not working and we'll take a look at that and adjust. That's critical for all of us to remember. I have confidence in the Faculty Handbook Committee. I think they can get this done.

Holt: Everything the provost has said up to this point is my understanding of what we're doing and I agree with him. The procedural abeyance we moved into has to do with how often we meet as a Faculty Handbook Committee, how language will be coming to us, how those changes will be made. Quite frankly, the Faculty Handbook is the president's and he decides what goes into it, so we'll follow those rules. As it stands right now, my understanding is that the part of the AFEC is to help restructure that Handbook and give that language back to the Faculty Handbook Committee (the key parts) and we're going to try to get that evaluated. We still have a two vote system right now and hopefully that will hold up. We're going to have to meet more often than monthly once we get language and how it's been rearranged and then we'll move forward like

we normally would. The exception is that it will be quick. At the end of the day, the recommendation will go to the president.

Provost: I don't think the president will disagree that matters of the Handbook belong to the faculty.

Beckett: It's not the president's Handbook. It's the faculty's Handbook.

Holt: My understanding is that the president can write whatever he wants. We give him recommendations and hopefully he decides to agree with us.

Judd: We need to clarify this. That is not philosophy of the Handbook.

Provost: I think what David is trying to say is that these things have to be approved up through the appropriate channel and that's all. The president is not doing this work, nor am I. That is not the way it is set up. This is a faculty process.

Beckett: How it works, the Faculty Handbook makes those modifications and they can come from anywhere (president, staff, etc.) and then once they are approved, you run them by the Senate, and then it goes to the president (provost normally looks at it first). It's up to the president to approve or not approve modifications. The ones the president approves goes in the Faculty Handbook, the ones the president doesn't approve, doesn't go in the Handbook. It's a good system because things originate from the faculty, but the president does have a say in whether it goes in the Handbook

Provost: It's a system that works.

Bonnie: How does the end of the contract work? After classes we have a week of so after to work (May 17).

Provost: My office will not be planning formal events for the end of the contract.

Anne Sylvest: Dean of Arts & Sciences search?

Provost: The screening committee has narrowed pool of 50 to 10. We're doing Skype interviews this afternoon and next week. The pool will be narrowed to finalists for campus visits. That schedule will go out to faculty when that decision is made. We are willing to bring in the best of the pool and excited about quality of candidate pool.

Sharon: Will there be searches in other Colleges soon?

Provost: There will be other searches (Nursing next year).