

University Faculty Senate Minutes

October 14, 2014

The third meeting of the University of Mississippi Faculty Senate was called together at 7:00 PM on October 14, 2014.

Senators in attendance: Rachna Prakash; Chuck Ross; Philip Jackson; Brice Noonan; Randy Wadkins; Brad Cook; Tossi Ikuta; Feng Wang; Tom Garrett; Adetayo Alabi; Ben McClelland; Chris Offutt; Andre Liebenberg; Robert Holt; Yang-Chieh Fu; Oliver Dinius; Darren Grem; Joshua Howard; Vanessa Gregory; Dennis Bunch; Lorri Williamson ; Susan Ivey; Jessica Leming; Jing Jing Wu; Dwight Frink; Milam Aiken; Sasha Kocic; Heather Allen; Valentina Iepuri; Adam Estes; Michael Gardiner; Jos Milton; Laurel Lambert; Erin Holmes; Allison Bell; Breese Quinn; Ben Jones; Greg Love; Marilyn Mendolia; Desiree Stepteau-Watson; Minjoo Oh; Allan Bellman; Joe Sumrall; Rory Ledbetter.

Senators excused: Patrick Curtis, Antonia Eliason, David Rutherford (represented by an alternate).

Senators absent: Brice Noonan, Elliott Hutchcraft, Christopher Newman, Tejas Pandya, Mary Thurlkill, Marcos Mendoza, Mark Ortwein.

The following departments' seats were unfilled as of this date: Biomolecular Sciences, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Law (2), and Pharmaceuticals.

Guest: Provost Morris Stocks

- **Call meeting to order by current Senate Chair, Michael Barnett**
 - 7:00PM
- **Approval of September 16, 2014 minutes**
 - Approved
- **Introduction of Derek Cowherd, Senior Associate AD/Academic Support, and Drew Clinton, Assistant Director of Academic Support**
 - Regularly attend meetings to observe.
- **Presentation by Provost Morris Stocks**
 - I have been at the University for 24 years, and I continue to be thankful to be a part of it and I appreciate your work.

I have some news items to share. First, Dr. Nosa Egiebor was hired about two months ago as the Senior International Officer and Executive Director for the newly created Office of Global Engagement. Two ongoing searches include the Vice Chancellor of Diversity and Inclusion and Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

Another news item is that we now have some titles on campus that are not covered by procedures or policies according to Dr. Mourice Eftink's report. It is also time again for SACS (The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) five year report, due by March 2015.

The IHL Funding Formula is continuing to be reviewed, and I am attending a meeting tomorrow in Hattiesburg to review a performance based funding formula.

Additionally, it is the first time in UM history that all historically white fraternities and sororities extended a bid for membership to at least one minority student, which is great news.

In line with the UM 2020 Strategic Progress, we are making great progress.

In terms of enrollment trends, I do not have new information, but it is still incredibly amazing information. We were the thirteenth fastest growing university in 2012 in the country, and we continue to grow. Of course we have a great interest in this. The Oxford campus has grown the most (34%). Congressman Thompson talked about how pleased he is with this growth. The growth is at the undergraduate level [showed slide]. Liberal arts, business, and applied sciences are the top three programs. It is important to note that about a third of the freshman class is in general studies, which means undeclared. Also interesting is that journalism grew almost 18% in one year, and engineering, business, and accountancy continue to grow, as well.

Compared to our sister institutions, we are on a linear path of growth in terms of enrollment. Jackson State has begun to increase, and Mississippi State University and University of Southern Mississippi have begun to decline. This is important because this is where the funding formula comes in to play.

We are still relatively small in the SEC though. In 2013 (the most recent information), we were third smallest. I do not think we will ever get in the middle of that, because our community cannot handle that size. It is great to be small in some ways, but not in all (for example, faculty and student recruitment).

In terms of graduate enrollment, our education program is the largest, followed closely by liberal arts, applied science, engineering, and accounting. We saw a slight decline in graduate programs overall this year. In terms of professional program enrollment, pharmacy is up 15%. Law, however, is down 11.3% (nationwide, law has dropped).

I am constantly told if I give more money, graduate enrollment would increase. I have increased funds, and enrollment has stayed flat. Therefore, we have to figure out what to do here to increase graduate enrollment, and I've asked Grad School (John Kiss) to help me with that over the next 6 months.

To be an SREB1 institution, you must average granting 100 doctoral degrees each year over three years. That is the only requirement that we do not meet. MSU and SMU meet it, but we do not. This hurts our funding, because we are compared to SRB2 levels (and we are at the top of that). It is imperative that we are consistently granting 100 doctorate degrees a year. Last year, we granted 96 PhD, and almost 200 first professional doctorates, but those do not count because they are not research. I am trying to convince them to include these, and maybe I will be successful and maybe I will not.

We have had a lot of freshman applying (this year over 16,000). In fall 2010, it was almost 11,000.

Interestingly, enrollment at community colleges has declined across the country, and in Mississippi, it was significant.

Another piece of good news is that we have a lot of good students who want to come here (special academic programs). Lott, Honors, and Provost Scholar, to name a few.

For new applicants, ACT scores and GPA scores are increasing. Historically, if non-resident student met resident student requirements, they were automatically admitted. This is the same for IHL. However, we have become stricter by requiring higher ACTs and GPAs. If we ask for

supplemental materials, about 60% do it, and then it goes to the committee. 28% of those that went to committee were admitted last year.

My goal is to have 50% of our freshman class with a score of 26 or higher on ACT. Right now, we are at 38%. Most of the other schools are sitting at about 25 at 26.

We give a survey to applicants to learn why they chose UM. Over half of our applicants responded to our survey. Only 27% of new freshman reported a family connection with Ole Miss. So why do they come? 82% say UM is their first choice. Other reasons include a good major; academic rep; cost and financial aid; and reputation of faculty. 45% say athletic success.

Retention and grad rates- last year we were at 86% for retention rate. If we had been 87%, we'd be in the middle. We did drop some, but it was a larger class. I can tell you where it occurred but not why- nonresident males. Graduation rate improved this year from 58-60%, but we have a way to go to get to the SUG average. It will be a while because it is directly related to retention rate.

In terms of African American undergraduate enrollment, the SEC average is 9.3%. We are second below Mississippi State. In overall undergraduate minority enrollment, we are right in the middle at 23.3%. I was concerned that overall minority enrollment would decline recently in light of some events on our campus in the last year, and while the percentage did, the actual number did not. There is a new category option that indicates that you identify with two or more races, so things may be changing when looking at race numbers.

In terms of diversity retention trends, we have a lot of initiatives designed to help a variety of groups to be successful. We are above our sister institutions in terms of African American retention rate. I firmly believe our retention rates are because of our supplemental instruction, centralized advising, strong athletic group, and lots of other reasons and initiatives.

Surveyed students in good standing who do not return say it is because of money. It is almost always money. So we try to help. For instance, we invested 2.4 million dollars in need based scholarships for Mississippi residents, and they do not pay that back if they remain in good standing. If the family income is under \$30,000 and the student stays in good standing, the university pays. Therefore, our good retention rate is due to our hard work, too.

In terms of faculty trends, our full time faculty increases each year (11.5%). It is important to note that this is significantly lower than the increase in students. We continue to try to improve faculty salaries. Full professors have increased, but associates have not as much. Assistants have increased about 15%. Comparing to other SUGs, SECs, and border states, we are the lowest. Faculty activity (which is self reported data) shows that almost 1000 articles were published for 543 tenure track faculty. Sponsored funding awards are a continued challenge, and other creative scholarship is increasing. I view this as a good start to providing good information.

15% of course sections have more than fifty students (larger sections than in the past). In 2010, that was 6.6%. However, most classes have fewer than 30. We have maintained a fairly solid student/faculty ration (19:1).

We have raised more money in the last 3 years than in the history of the university. A significant majority is academics, though athletics has increased because of construction. This mainly comes from tuition. Most of the money is spent on people, which includes salary wages, benefits, and contractual services (more than 2/3 scholarships).

We have \$560 million dollars in various stages of construction on our campus right now. Who is paying? State is 11%, fed 32 million; private 44 million, and internal or borrowing is the rest.

[Slide shown of plan of new student union]. The new student union will take about 4 years to complete. We also bought 68 acres at whirlpool, which will be recreation and parking. Arena construction will continue for a while. Housing is also a big portion of construction. Academic buildings as well, including the applied sciences bldg, the science building, honors college, Coulter Hall, and the Natural Products Center (opening in spring).

In terms of park and ride, we have a bus that runs every 5 minutes. Numbers for OUT show that 2014 will most likely double 2012 numbers.

- **Opportunity for Questions to Follow Presentation**

Q: Regarding student enrollment and faculty enrollment, do you have a structure in place?

A: First, let me say that I do not see us ever going back from being a tuition driven institution. If I could make the decisions for tuition dollars, things would be done differently. Tuition dollars are paying for everything. Our plan is to continue to escalating nonresident tuition until we get to a point where they stop paying. We hope to help build a faculty base. The compensation problem is a part of this as well—do we give raises versus paying new faculty?

Q: At 34% growth over 5 years, it seems like we can't keep up with influx of students. Are we going to target a certain population?

A: At this point we have no control over residents. We actively recruit, but the admission policy is set by a government board. What we hope is that increased ACT scores will manage growth some. I'd like to get to 25,000- a few thousand in Jackson, a few thousand at the others, and the rest here. We are currently above 19,000 this year.

Q: What about all the fraternity and sorority houses on campus taking space?

A: The easy answer is that they have long-term leases. I have tried to put my foot on base for not dedicating any more land on this part of campus for sorority and fraternity housing. It's always ranked at bottom in terms of how to allocate land space, but we can't do anything about this until we have an option. We have hired an architect to help us figure out where we can put 20 homes for Greek life.

Q: What plans do you have for PHD growth? Any ideas here?

A: Two authorizations to plan for new programs are happening right now from academic units. We get plenty of applications, but I don't know if those are good. In reality, we are only five PhDs away. We are so close. New money has gone to increasing assistantships rather than new people, which is not bad, but it does not help reach that goal. This is a problem because at the level we are at (SREB2), we will not get new raise money because we are already highest. We cannot allow a reason for our governing board to not support us—we have to reach that 100 PhDs. Some say maybe we should take from Masters and put into PHD. Maybe, but I need a group of people to advise me.

Q: We have to do 100 every year?

A: Average 100 for 3 years.

Q: Have you considered looking at student/faculty ratios and how they've changed in those academic areas that are granting the most PHDs? Are those ratios different than the others that aren't?

A: I have asked this group to find out if professors are working with student credit hour production and if it's taking away from PhDs.

Q: [same question asker] You have the data already, so it seems like you can check that ratio easily. It could be a guide.

A: Yes, I am hoping that I can put together this group, led by the Dean of the Grad School, to help me figure it out.

Q: I'm in the chemistry department, and we don't get the strongest graduate students, honestly. Our students take 6 or more years to complete their PhD. The problem is that we get in students that need a lot of work to graduate and be competitive. We could turn them, but then we would not be competitive because we can't place them.

A: Is that because we don't pay a high enough assistantship?

Q: [same question asker] Well, we're in Mississippi. We have a PR issue that keeps some students away. I have recruited grad students for many years, and I know this is a real issue.

A: I am assuming that after that extra year those students are ready, and maybe there's just value in that.

- **Senate Committee Reports**

- Executive Committee: No formal report
- Academic Affairs: Update on Best Practices related to Academic Discipline. Report submitted by Breese Quinn, Chair.

We plan on taking on the task in three stages: First, determine if a set of guidelines should be created. If yes, then figure out the process to produce it. We assume that it is probably best to not just include the senate in the production. Once this is determined, complete the report.

Tonight's report is for our stage 1 plans. We have talked to Lori Wolff, Chair of the Academic Discipline Committee. Their process is this: If a student is reported for discipline, the student can appeal to the committee. The committee will first use the preponderance of evidence standard to see if something happened. Next, they use an abuse of discretion standard to determine if the faculty recommended sanction is appropriate. The committee will vote to accept or replace that recommended sanction with an alternative sanction.

In 2013-2014: There were 172 academic cases; 58 appeals; and 11 overturned (5 at faculty member's request, 6 in opposition). Additionally, it does not appear that there is one particular type of infraction.

Plans for completing stage 1- We have plans to meet with Lori Wolff, and we will have a member from that committee here to present to faculty. We plan on having a final report at the Dec 9 meeting about whether guidelines should be created or not.

- Academic Support: No formal report
- Finance: No formal report
- Governance: No formal report
- University Service:
Update on University-Sponsored Childcare: This was an item presented to the Strategic Planning Council as part of the Senate's Faculty Excellence Task Force report in spring of 2014. Reported submitted by Greg Love.

This has been considered twice, and both times it was dropped. Last year, there was a STEM grant for this. It was an unfunded grant in the end, but they may resubmit. Today, I learned that the current administration had created a committee and the committee did not see a need,

basically because of a cost. Every SEC university has child care, excluding us and Auburn. We are the fifth most expensive in the SEC. Within the state, we are dramatically more expensive.

From 1994-1997 a committee charged by Chancellor Turner to examine the need for on campus childcare. This committee conducted a study, survey, and worked with an architectural firm assessing budget issue. The project was eventually shelved after a presentation by Kindercare, a provider group, indicated that the operating costs would be too high and non-competitive.

In 2008 Commission on the Status of Women conducted a survey with results arguing for the need for childcare facilities, this is where we are now

School	Ages	PPP Cost
Auburn University	3-5 years	425.00
Louisiana State University	6 weeks-5 years	730.00
Mississippi State University	6 weeks-5 years	485.00
Texas A&M University	1-5 years	650.00
University of Alabama	8 weeks-5 years	
University of Arkansas	8 weeks-5 years	850.00
University of Florida	6 weeks-5 years	750.00
University of Georgia	6 weeks-4 years	750.00
University of Kentucky	6 weeks-Preschool	857.14

<i>University of Mississippi</i>	<i>3-4 years</i>	<i>791.67</i>
University of Missouri	6 weeks- 5 years	835.00
University of South Carolina	6 weeks-8 years	728.57
University of Tennessee	Infant-Kindergarten	825.00
Vanderbilt University	6 weeks-5years	705.00
<i>Average SEC Schools</i>		<i>721.72</i>

University of Southern Mississippi	8 weeks to 5 years	525.00
<i>Average MS R/H Schools</i>		<i>600.56</i>

The committee plan is to conduct our own survey in November around interest and costs. Based on these results, we will decide if we should take it to the chancellor. We believe that if we ask the chancellor (as the senate), he will consider it.

- **Old Business**

None.

- **New Business**

- **Religion and the Pursuit of Tenure & Promotion (Chris Offutt):** A resolution will be presented regarding the use of campus facilities to link religious beliefs to the pursuit of tenure & promotion (attached).

Chair [Michael Barnett] begins by reviewing the process for new Senators to ensure that all are aware of how this will take place. He also emphasizes that we are discussing the second draft, not the original resolution that was emailed to the senators with the agenda.

Senator Chris Offutt reports:

Let me begin by apologizing that the first draft was given out. A number of junior faculty in the English Department approached me on this issue, so I tried to listen to them and to do what I thought was appropriate.

The English department has a high turnover rate. We had 14 new hires in last 4 years, and most of those are replacing retirees. As a result, we are very young, and naturally concerned with tenure. These members expressed a great concern about the email. 99% of email recipients were junior faculty. Junior faculty fear speaking up because of tenure, so they came to me.

The most common thing pointed out to me was that the sender called himself a Senior Staff Member, and that a Chair was named in the email. Many of my colleagues believed that the nature of this email had a direct connection between their personal religious faith and their tenure. "Is tenure in the bible belt different than elsewhere?" concerned them. They worried that it was, but I told them no. However the fact is, I can't convince them, because I'm just one person. So I looked into this.

First, I spoke to the Chair of English Department, the Dean, the Provost, and the Chancellor. And Michael [Barnett]. The immediate response was that it was not a sponsored or sanctioned event. The sender was asked to clarify to the recipients.

I realized the problem is not the content. I believe in freedom of speech as a writer. Anyone can write whatever he or she wants, even in an email. The problem is that it was presented as an official UM event, and a misrepresentation that it was sent by a senior staff member. It being held on campus also contributed this.

I was asked to draft a resolution to present to the faculty senate. It seemed to me the best way to do it was to have a very simple disclaimer on emails to let people know that it is not sponsored by UM. To me, a simple disclaimer protects the first amendment. It also reassures junior faculty that tenure is not related to anything other than what it is. A simple disclaimer also protects the university from the possibility of a lawsuit in the future.

Thank you.

Chair comment: Is there a motion to approve this resolution? 1. And a second? Yes. Floor opens to discussion:

Comment: I'd like to suggest an amendment to this. I certainly think that any non UM group should have to use a disclaimer. However, I think the way it is written could limit this disclaimer. I would like to see every organization have a disclaimer if it is not a university event. I would suggest "where there is... through University policies".

Chair comment: Any discussion about this?

Comment: I think this is wise because the original way it is written; it would create someone deciding who has to and who does not have to use a disclaimer.

Comment: Does the language in here about the specific email have to be there?

Chair comment: We have to vote on this before making other suggestions.

Motion: yes, and second.

In favor: 36. Opposed: 1. Abstentions: 2.

Comment: The “whereas” clauses about the specific event (“the UM approved an on-campus event and whereas the luncheon included...”) -- I wonder if that should be deleted?

Comment: I would like to include the next two as well... “an email” and “junior faculty”. They are all related.

Chair: Motion to amend. And a second.

Now this is open for discussion. The argument is that the “whereas” clauses are not related to the amended language now.

Comment: What would be the benefit? The resolution as a whole is clean and gets to the heart of the matter, and it doesn’t offend anyone. However, the event is what caused this amendment. What do we lose by cutting it?

Comment: That actually doesn’t matter in my mind. In four years, it won’t matter. That’s my opinion.

Comment: I think leaving the “whereas” clauses actually makes this seem like it should only be directed at this situation, and not an umbrella. Leaving it in would make it stronger.

Comment: We cut out the language about the tenure, which is why I voted against it. This was an external group talking to a group about tenure. Now we’re just saying a disclaimer should be on email, but there is not rational as to why we’re doing that now.

Chair comment: Kate did some research. There were 300 recipients. 100 recipients were instructors; 134 were Assistant Professors; 11 were Associate Professors; 11 were full Professors; 4 were support faculty; 40 were not listed in the directory. Based on this, they were certainly reaching out to tenure track employees. I just want everyone to know these numbers. Is there any further discussion on this particular amendment?

Comment: Is there a precedent for other resolutions that doesn’t include reasons for the resolution, or vice versa?

Chair response: Yes, we had a resolution in the last year or two about Colonel Reb, and that got changed significantly to a blanket statement in support of symbols in general, so yes. This was done to be more far-reaching.

Comment: And again, a reason for removing it. OK, this one event got things stirred up, but if we state we’re doing this because of one group, we are not communicating a good message. We should broadly say that any group not speaking on behalf of UM should have a disclaimer. We don’t want to seem like we’re saying Christians are the problem, or that this one group or this one person is the problem.

Chair:

Motion: Yes, and second.

In favor: 38. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 3.

Comment: I want to know how we define the section “by individuals or organizations not speaking for the university officially”.

Comment: Is this about facilities or communication or both? Which are we more focused on?

Comment: I received one email from a faculty member asking if faculty members have to have a disclaimer at the beginning of courses if he/she doesn't agree with the university. Moreover, does this include UM Daily, ads in the *DM*, when a speaker is brought by Honors College, etc.? Are we, the Faculty Senate, an official body?

Comment: Basically, you're answering the question, that there is no way to define it, and that is problematic. The University is a set of ideas, and that's the point—we have all kinds of ideas, so how do you define that?

Comment: There are semantics here that might straighten this out, though wording is difficult because there are always exceptions. Is this an affiliated organization?

Comment by Chair: Yes, it is one of many affiliated organizations.

Comment: OK, so is this sponsorship?

Comment by Chair: I had this conversation, and the university administrators did not agree that allowing building use meant sponsorship.

Comment: So maybe using "sponsorship" would fix this?

Comment: If the problem is with the use of the word "officially," my first thought is that the word sponsor might be better used, because it addresses that what we do in rooms is sponsored by the university.

Chair comment: So you recommend changing "not speaking for" to "not sponsored by"?

Comment: Yes.

Comment: So what about student groups? Are they sponsored?

Chair response: I don't know. That's the original problem- we haven't defined officially.

Comment: Instead of looking at language, why don't we get back to religion and tenure being linked? Why don't we look at a template related to tenure?

Chair comment: That is exactly what it said before we started.

Comment: Well, semantics are hard to talk about. Religion needs to be a part of this.

Chair comment: One thing to consider when drafting resolutions, A. We don't have to figure out how to make it work, and B: the Administration is going to deal with semantics. They will come back and ask us about it or dismiss it. But if we don't parse the language, it will either come back to us or get dismissed.

Comment: Can we make a motion to send this to committee?

Chair response: Yes, you can make motion to send it to committee; to vote; to table.

Motion to table made.

Chair comment: Just know that if we table, we have to have 2/3 to open it again.

Table motion seconded.

New motion to extend past 9pm. Yes, and seconded.

Comment: There is no reason to put this off and not protect our departments and faculty.

Comment: Making decisions on the fly is not well advised. I think we should take some time to think it through. We need to think about this instead of rushing it.

Chair comment: Would you be open to sending it to committee instead of tabling it?

Comment: Yes.

Chair comment: New motion is to send to committee. Any discussion?

Comment: Which committee? And if we send it to committee, what gets sent?

Chair response: This revised document and the originals, and a resolution that would represent the concerns addressed here.

Comment: Can we ask the committee to clarify the language that we don't understand?

Chair response: Yes, they could do research on this.

Chair:

Motion to send to committee: Yes, and second.

In favor: 40. Opposed: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Chair comment: This will be sent to the Governance Committee.

- **Online Courses, Instructional Costs and Intellectual Property:** With the increasing use of online instruction at the University the question of who owns the course once it is created has become paramount. Additionally, exploring the primary motivating factors behind the creation of online courses, and their effectiveness, takes on a greater relevance.

Michael Barnett, Faculty Chair: I put this on the agenda. I thought about this issue and considered that when an instructor stores materials on a university server, and it becomes university property. I would also like us to study the effectiveness of online learning. I would like to recommend this to the Executive Committee because that committee represents all committees, and can break this into smaller issues for the appropriate subcommittees.

- **Adjournment**

- 9:30PM. Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 11, at 7 PM.