

The University of Southern Mississippi
The Aquila Digital Community

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Archive

6-8-2018

Faculty Senate Minutes - June 8, 2018

USM Faculty Senate

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

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

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, Eric Saillant, Dan Capper (Proxy), Susan Mullican

Absent: Marcus Coleman, Jennifer Courts, Kevin Greene, Brian LaPierre, Amanda Schlegel, Will Johnson, Lilian Hill, Ann Sylvest, Bonnie Harbaugh, Joshua Hill, Susan Howell

1.0 Organizational Items (June Meeting, following adjournment of May meeting)

1.1 Call to Order **2:24**

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 None

4.0 Approval of Minutes

4.1 [Approval of May 2018 Minutes postponed until September]

5.0 Officer Reports

5.1 President – The enrollment numbers are in, and there are some positives; things are looking good in that area. Things are not looking so good with new schedule, though. Some students don't have classes to go into (Biology, for example, has had to restrict some students to register for certain labs/classes).

5.2 Secretary – No Report

6.0 Decision / Action Items

6.1 None

7.0 Standing Committee Reports

7.1 Academics – No Report

7.2 Administrative Evaluations – Completed as of last week

7.3 Awards – Awards Day was May 4, 2018. Results will be listed on website later (complete list of award recipients at the end of Minutes).

7.4 Bylaws

7.4.1 Straw poll on reorganization changes – (Catharine Bomhold) Should directors be able to serve on the Senate? **Poll results: Yes - 8 votes, No – 11 votes, No Opinion – 2 votes**

Size of the Senate (34/reorg recommendation or 42–45 current bylaws)? **Poll results: 34 – 11 votes, 42–45 – 11 votes, Recusal – 1 vote**

7.5 Elections – **No Report**

7.6 Finance – **No Report**

7.7 Governance – (submitted by Governance committee: Donald Redalje, Jennifer Courts, Ann Marie Kinnell, Charles McCormick, Scott Milroy, Timothy Rehner, Jeremy Scott)

It should be noted first that the Senate Governance Committee members have all contributed to the content of this report, but that there may not be unanimous support for the report. However, the consensus of the committee members who contributed and responded to the suggestions in this report is in support of the 3 recommendations.

The Senate Governance Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate consider the following recommendations:

1. The Senate should write a Resolution in support of all aspects of Proposal 6 (Proposal 6: Enhancing Faculty Involvement in the Selection of Academic Leadership) submitted during the university reorganization with a special emphasis on the following statement made by the reorganization Steering Committee:

“We suggest that the University develop, through a conversation involving all relevant stakeholders, consistent and clear procedures for faculty involvement in the selection of academic leadership.”

The significant involvement of faculty in the selection of university leadership is a cornerstone principle of shared governance and must be supported and protected by the Faculty Senate for the benefit of all university faculty.

2. The Governance Committee has suggested the following revisions be made to the *Faculty Handbook* for sections 2.12 and 8.4.7:

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 for Deans, school Directors and Chair/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.

¹This 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.

The committee proposes that these suggested revisions be forwarded to the Faculty Handbook Committee for their review. In addition it is important to have a process to assure that all Deans follow the process designated in section 8.4.7 with a clear and official record that the process was followed and completed as written provided to the Faculty Senate as well as to the Provost and university President.

3. The Committee recommends that the Progressive Disciplinary Policy be revised as suggested in the following document provided by AAUP President, Alan Thompson, attached to this report.

The committee has all seen these suggestions and comments, but we have not yet had a meeting to discuss them.

Comments/Questions

Mac: Everyone should look this over and talk about it with colleagues/faculty. Could come back as a resolution in the fall.

Don: Will forward to Senate Handbook Committee first and then the University Committee.

Mac: This is an iteration of what we discussed at the Senate meeting last September.

David Holt: I have no problem supporting the proposal; just remind powers that be that faculty should be involved.

Sharon: Previous concerns were based on directors—some were appointed, some were hired (needs to be consistent).

Mac: The Provost said that if we want to take it somewhere further, we should develop a committee or look at some other institutions. The Governance Committee could take this on and look at other institutions. [Mac will meet with president and provost a week from Tuesday and will bring this up.]

7.8 Gulf Coast – (Tom Rishel) No Report

7.9 Handbook – David Holt: Met May 18 to discuss the Progressive Discipline Policy and sent it to Senate. Next meeting not yet scheduled. Comments need to be in writing and sent to the committee.

David is compiling the full list

7.9.1 Progressive Discipline Policy – E-mailed to Senate May 23 (first vote passed)

7.9.2 Unification Policy (“Bridge Document”) – E-mailed to Senate May 23 (first vote passed)

Comments/Questions:

David Cochran – Subcommittee will meet as soon as possible.

Miles Doleac: Faculty members concerned about tenure/promotion policy; note from concerned faculty in response to the suggestion in the policy that says that we would be evaluated on the T&P documents that were in use when we were hired. They suggest: “The

pre-tenured faculty member may choose to be evaluated using either the most current (most recently adopted) departmental Tenure and Promotion document in effect prior to the reorganization or the Tenure and Promotion document that was in effect at the time of his/her hire. In anticipation of the reorganization, our department has made important revisions to our Tenure and Promotion document, in order to make it clearer, less ambiguous, and easier to interpret for the evaluators.”

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

7.11 Welfare and Environment – **No Report**

8.0 Outside Committee Reports

8.1 None

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 Staff Council Election Results

13.0 Announcements

13.1 Faculty Senate Retreat: August (TBD)

14.0 Adjourn (June Meeting)

FACULTY AWARDS

FACULTY EXCELLENCE AWARDS

University Excellence in Service Award
Alan Thompson

University Excellence in Teaching Award
Matt Donahue

Higher Education Appreciation Day Working for Academic Excellence
(HEADWAE)
Kelly Lester

Nina Bell Suggs Endowed Professorship 2017–2018 Professors

Joye Anestis
Daniel Capron
Andrew Ross
Emily Stanback

IHL Diversity Award for Excellence

Chin-Nu Lin

National Endowment for the Humanities Award (NEH)

Brian LaPierre
Courtney Luckhardt

Aubrey Keith Lucas and Ella Ginn Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence Awards

Fengwei Bai	Matthew Donahue	Catherine Rand
Douglas Bristol	Alan Hajnal	Donald Sacco
Samuel Bruton	Brian LaPierre	Emily Stanback
Nora Charles	Courtney Luckhardt	Alexandra Valint
Dave Davies	Stephanie McCoy	Donald Yee

ACUE AWARDS

USM Certificate in Active Learning

ACUE Distinguished Teaching Scholars

30 recipients

Innovation in Online Teaching Award

SherRhonda Gibbs

Graduate Mentor of the Year Award

Sarah Morgan

Outstanding Service-Learning Faculty Award

Delories Williams

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INNOVATION AWARDS

Basic Research Award

Shahid Karim, Department of Biological Sciences

Creative Activities Award

Dr. John Wooton, School of Music

Academic Partnership Awards

Dr. Kyle Zelner, Department of History

Graduate Student Award

Torie Fowler, Department of Mass Communications

Lifetime Achievement:

Dr. Homer Edwin Jackson, Department of Anthropology and Sociology

Dr. Angela Ball, Department of English

UNIVERSITY EXCELLENCE AWARDS

Faculty Senate Jr. Faculty Awards

Teaching – Chris Foley

Research – Davin Wallace

Staff Excellence Awards

Justin Martin

Robin Johnson

Petra Lamb

Joyce Garrigan

Jimmy Draughn – Jessie H. Morrison Award