

Faculty Senate Minutes – April 10, 2018

Attendance:

Present:

Staley Lantagne, Stephen Monroe, Aileen Ajootian, Zachary Kagan Guthrie, Mary Roseman, Younghee Lim, Gary Theilman, Sara Wellman, Ana Velitchkova, Brad Jones, Thomas Peattie, Rory Ledbetter, Mantrel Langle, Joan Wylie Hall, Lei Cao, Dennis Bunch, Jeffrey Pickerd, Byung Jang, Deborah Mower, Marcos Mendoza, Antonia Eliason, Chalet Tan, Jessica Essary, Patrick Alexander, Robert Hunt, Sumali Conlon, Enrique Coteló, Tossi Ikuta, Adam Gussow, Tejas Pandya, April Holm, Cecelia Parks, Andrew Lynch, KoFan Lee, Jennifer Gifford, Tim Nordstrom, Kyle Fritz, Marilyn Mendolia, Mark Ortwein, Amy Gibson, Randy Watkins, Breese Quinn, Nancy L. Wicker, Kimberly Kaiser, Chris Mullen, Meagen Rosenthal, Brice Noonan, Stacey Lantagne

Excused:

Brenda Prager, Vivian Ibrahim,

Absent:

Roy Thurston, Cesar Rego, Zia Shariat-Madar, Byung Jang, Ethel Scurlock, Alysia Steele, John Berns, Martial Longla, Stephen Fafulas, Robert Cummings

- **Call Meeting to Order**
 - Called to order 6:00
- **Head count**

A quorum is present
- **Approval of March 6 2018 Minutes**
 - Motion for approval: Michael Barnett
 - Second: Amy Gibson
 - Passed by acclimation
- **Committee Reports**
 - Academic Instructional Affairs
 - Nothing to report
 - Academic Conduct
 - Nothing to report
 - Finance & Benefits

- Nothing to report
 - Development & Planning
 - Nothing to report
 - Governance
 - Nothing to report
 - Research & Creative Achievement
 - Nothing to report
 - University Services
 - Nothing
 - Executive Committee
 - Faculty Senate structure developed to assist with reporting within various University sitting committees
 - Communication from executive committee members to senators sitting on various committees periodically (1 – 2 times/year unless reports are otherwise made)
- **Old Business**
 - None
- **New Business**
 - Senate Election update
 - 6/36 seats filled; 4 pending scheduled meetings
 - Senate representatives to Chancellor's Standing Committees
 - 3/19 seats filled
 - Internal search for Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA)
 - Please spread the word within the CLA for qualified applicants
 - Syllabus bank resolution passed by ASB
 - Encourage everyone to let faculty in your department know this is going on. Please let Brice know if you have any feedback (bnoonan@olemiss.edu)
 - Q: Do we know whether the syllabus bank would be closed or open?
 - A: I don't think this has been decided yet. The ASB has requested a university wide syllabus bank. How that will be implemented has

not yet been decided. If there is an interest to keep it internal to the university the provost would be willing to hear more about it.

- Comment: I would advocate for it being closed. I think someone outside of the university may misinterpret the content of the course based on titles.
- Comment: There are also personal issues, like being away for conferences that we would not want to be made public.
 - R: It is possible that the syllabi will not be current to the specific semester.
- Comment: Many of our courses are already closed to anyone who is not a major. Maybe they are less applicable.
- Comment: In our area we have accreditation syllabi that are available that would work.
- Comment: I was just trying to line this up with current state law, wherein we already have to provide this material
 - R: That may be only current materials, not everything ever offered is there.
- Revision of Bylaws
 - Motion (Brice Noonan): I move that the Faculty Senate approve the proposed revisions to the Faculty Senate bylaws distributed to the senate on 4/4/2018 with adoption of said changes pending approval of a revision of the constitution with consistent language in a meeting of the faculty.
 - Second: Antonia Eliason
 - Discussion:
 - Initial comment: The intention is to work through the proposed changes to the bylaws. Note that there are a number of things that popped up as we started to look more closely at the document. We have tried to address all of these inconsistencies as part of this process.
 - Q: Why do the bylaws specify the “Oxford” campus (Article II)?
 - A: Traditionally faculty senate has not represented the regional campuses nor the Jackson campus.
 - Tony Ammeter: I don’t know about the Jackson campus, but I do support the representation of the regional campus faculty on the faculty senate. They are technically part of the department from which they come on the main campus.

- Q: What is the justification for not representing regional campus faculty?
 - A: We don't actually know, our history of these decisions does not go back that far.
- Q: Could the first edit to the University of Mississippi cause a problem with the UMMC?
 - Motion to strike the amended language (Michael Barnett)
 - Seconded: Unknown
 - Discussion:
 - Comment: I think we leave it as it is now. So I proposed we leave the deletion of the Oxford campus.
 - To clarify – We are discussing the first edit for now
 - Question: I think the first deletion is about where we meet, while the second is about who has standing to be represented on the senate.
 - Comment: The way that I am reading this right now it is a sentence fragment.
 - Vote:
 - Undelete edit 1:
 - 6 in favor
 - 23 opposed – deletion remains
- Breese Quinn Motion: I propose that we delete from the comma after “MS” through to the end of the current sentence. And including the verb “is” after the word organization (Article II).
- Second: Chris Mullen
- Q: Why would we like to take that out?
 - A: Because that phrase only applies to the faculty senate
 - R: I though it references us back to the name of the constitution
 - F/U: If that is the case I withdraw the motion but leaving the second.
 - F/U: Friendly amendment to keep formally deleted language, but keep the “is”

- Q: Will there be an opportunity to correct grammatical error?
 - R: Yes
 - Vote:
 - In favor: 38
 - Opposed: 0
 - Article III:
 - Here we have amended the eligible faculty. We have referenced the Faculty Titles and Ranks Policy 2015 to assist with the legacy tracking of the document.
 - Q: The term “budget listed” is not comfortable. Why not just use the term FTE?
 - A: These are referring to people who represent a line item within the overall institutional budget.
 - F/U: If we got rid of that I am afraid that it has consequences that I may not understand.
 - Comment: With this inclusion of non-tenure FTE in the senate, the body of people that are part-time are smaller.
 - F/U: They will be represented as part of the faculty senate, but can not serve.
 - F/U: They are also not counted as part of the department.
 - F/U: Was there any discussion about whether or not people on temporary funding would be able to serve?
 - R: If they are full time, they would be able to serve if they met the other time requirements.
 - F/U: I am not talking about soft money, but positions for which we have to request funding each year.
 - Q: I wondered why visiting faculty member can not be counted for eligible faculty? I understand the serving capacity, but they are not counted as part of the census.
 - A: This has to do with the situation of the person not the actual line within the budget.

- *Secretary's note: Multiple commenters asking questions about the definitions of faculty within the Titles and Ranks Document*
- F/U: I feel like the visiting faculty implies that there is an end date and they are coming here from another institution. This is not there home.
 - F/U: There is nothing in the language of the policy that prevents them from holding a tenure track position. But I don't think that's what we are trying to do here.
 - Motion Rory Ledbetter: to strike visiting faculty from this list
 - Second: Michael Barnett
 - Comment: They may not be well-defined within the titles document, but I do not like counting them in the census for the faculty senate. The way it is currently defined in way that suggests that they have not invested themselves within the institution. If the definition is not clear, that should be adjusted, or a new title be created.
 - Comment: I think striking the term goes along with what we are trying to do with making this document more inclusive.
 - Comment: There have been individuals within the Theatre Arts Department who have been very invested in the Department regardless of title. Saying that we should not have visiting faculty listed goes against that idea.
 - F/U: To clarify I was not talking about individual people, but rather the spirit of the visiting faculty position.

- Comment: Maybe we should move away from the individual discussion. Separate our mental states, but rather focus on the intention of the program.
 - Comment: If we want to focus on the definitions in the Titles document there is no time limit listed. Nor is there a time for Writers or Artists in Residence.
 - Comment: If departments want to decide that visiting faculty member should represent them on senate, they should be allowed to do that.
- Striking visiting faculty
 - In favor: 15
 - Opposed: 20
 - Visiting faculty stays
- Motion Rory Ledbetter: To strike Writers and Artists in Residence
- Second: Marcos Mendoza
- Comment: If we leave this comment in and there is a tenure track faculty member who is an Artist in Residence we will create a conflict within our document.
- Comment: can we just remove items 1-5 and just let the department decide?
- Q: Can we get some clarity on the spirit of these job titles?

- Donna Strum: They are considered faculty, but the intention was that they move on at some point.
- Q: The senator represents all eligible faculty within their department?
 - A: They represent all faculty
 - F/U: I have a clarifying question, if we represent all faculty, even though they can't serve, why don't they all count in the census?
 - F/U: The intention comes from the responses from departments that was circulated earlier. There was no support for counting them as part of the census.
 - Comment: For clarification someone cannot serve unless they have been employed for one year. So, I am unsure how this could fit for people who are visiting here for two years.
 - To be clear we are talking now about who can serve.
 - Vote:
In favor: 13
Opposed: 21

- Motion Ana Velitchkova: To strike faculty that are not full-time faculty
- Second Marcos Mendoza
- Comment: I think this goes back to departmental freedom to choose who they want to represent them.
- Comment: Since this is the metric that defines the census, I think it would be fairer and more just to include part-time faculty.

- Comment: When the Taskforce for Non-tenure Track Faculty met with us in Jan I made the comment we are not impeding their ability to participate in shared governance. If we vote on anything that doesn't match with their initial proposal we will be preempting their participation in the shared governance process. I think we should give their initial motion a vote and then potentially move forward with an alternative.
- Q: Is there a mechanism for getting sense of the feelings of the wider faculty?
 - A: We have tried to do that with polling of faculty and reporting to this body.
 - F/U: Whether or not we follow what was proposed by the task-force, if this body sees a need for something to be addressed, I don't feel like it is appropriate for this body to do nothing.
 - Comment: So, when you examined the responses that departments fed back to you there was not support for inclusion of non-full-time faculty.
 - Comment: I don't mean to pick apart your language, but I do not think it is "welcoming" all members of the faculty to start to stating who does not count for representation.
 - *Secretary's note: multiple conversations unable to distinguish*
 - Comment: In the numbers you sent out it was 15 that responded. How many departments are there?
 - F/U: I believe there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 35.
 - Non-senator member: In this hypothetical discussion, why not leave it to the wisdom of units to make the decision. In reality how often would it be that a part-time person be elected to the senate. I don't see why in a representative democracy why the unit can't make those decisions for themselves.
 - F/U: I think that a lot of units rely on this body to guide decisions. I wish

we could have a discussion just specifically about part-time faculty.

Q: We make these decisions and then we will take this to the full faculty.

- R: My guess is that this would generate more discussion
- F/U: My department was unanimously against this idea. The reason is that my department is affected by the decisions made by this body. We want people making decisions that are completely invested in this University.
- Comment: I think a lot of us have to bring our departments' thoughts to this discussion. I think we need to move forward, without discussing why we voted one way or the other.
- Comment: There are folks that teach just a partial load by choice but are fully invested.
- Comment: We also have not voted on 1A.
- Comment: I am not sure how we can provide evidence for people's commitment. Maybe the Senate should consider why we care about full-time faculty. I think there is already a tendency to shuffle senate responsibilities off to the newest members of the department. Maybe we should think about other

metrics for we should care about full-time faculty.

- Comment: I think that departments are capable about making determinations about the level of commitment of their members.
- Article III, Section 1:b:1:
 - Vote:
 - In favor: 13
 - Oppose: 25
- Motion (*Secretary's note: didn't catch original motioner*): To change the language to "exclude UMMC". So that branch campuses to serve and count.
- Second: Breese Quinn
- Discussion:
 - Friendly amendment: to spell out UMMC and then use the acronym
 - Accepted
 - Vote:
 - Favor: 35
 - Opposed: 3
- Military personnel is not included because they are not paid by the University
- Assistant and associate vice chancellors have not previously been listed, but are now
- Assistant and Associate deans – has come up a couple times this year (within the School of Law and the Library) wherein they teach a full load, but ½ of their time is spent outside of that traditional faculty position.
- Article III, Section 1:c: Tightening up language that we changed last year
- Section 2:

- Motion Rory Ledbetter section 2 b: “senate representative will consist two representatives from each unit”
 - Clarification: This has come up in discussions with the task-force. To have two members from each unit this would take us to 70-80 representatives within this body.
- Second: Antonia Eliason
- Discussion:
 - Comment: I think the US senate is a terribly un-representative body and I don’t think we should emulate it.
 - Comment: For smaller departments this may be a real concern.
 - Comment: Along those lines I think departments have a hard time finding one representatives:
 - F/U: My thinking around this comes from discussions within my department wherein non-tenure track persons may not be able represent tenure-track people and vice-versa. So, my thinking is one seat for each group.
 - Comment: This pushes the problem down to the level of the departments, but doesn’t address it.
 - Comment: This suggests that there should be separate bodies.
 - Comment: I think there is a way to adjust the language to make this better. But I am not getting a sense that this is getting a lot of support.
 - Vote:
 - In favor: 2
 - Oppose: 33
- Motion Zachary Guthrie: Section 2:b - rather than a census of eligible faculty. I propose to amend the language to say census for representation is based on FTEs.
 - Comment: This is what the NNT task force proposed.

- Second: Antonia Eliason
- Discussion:
 - Comment: I am going to be a lawyer for a second and point out that that “Faculty” is capitalized. We need to discuss whether that definition of that term is what we mean it to be.
 - F/U: Brice asked Stacey to check up on this
 - Friendly amendment: Does the list refer to “the full faculty”?
 - Yes - amendment made
 - Clarification: This also includes branch campus faculty, yes?
 - F/U: Yes this will, but the numbers presented by NNT may not be completely representative.
 - Comment: One consequence of this, in a faculty meeting are we going to have people voting by their FTE status? This matters for the future.
 - Comment: Would military personnel, or the Chancellor get counted in the census?
 - F/U: It seems like the eligible faculty has been defined in Section 3.
 - Comment: the constitution states that only “eligible faculty” are allowed to vote. So that seems to address that particular issue.
 - Comment: To me this issue of counting. FTE is based on how many courses you could potentially teach, if the Chancellor is not teaching, how big of any issue will this be to the census? I don’t think it will be.
 - F/U: Can you remind us what the implications of this be in terms of Senate numbers?
 - R: This would not affect the total numbers of senate seats per say. 1-3 departments will gain or lose numbers. The Department of Writing and

Rhetoric will gain because they will get three additional members.

- F/U: There is currently no provision for a department to have four senators.
- Question: Somewhere along the way I have lost the idea of how proportionality has been calculated?
 - A: An average faculty size is calculated and then standard deviations from the mean are used to calculate representation
- Comment: I think this is a really important amendment, because it ensures everyone is counted.
- Comment: Second
- Vote:
 - In favor: 38
 - Oppose: 2
- Michael Barnett: Motion to postpone discussion until the next meeting of the senate
- Second Brice Noonan
- Vote: All in favor
- Revision of Constitution
 - Motion (Brice Noonan): I move that the Faculty Senate approve the proposed revisions to the Faculty Senate Constitution distributed to the senate on 4/4/2018.
 - Second: Michael Barnett
 - Discussion
 - Article 2:
 - Move to replace Oxford campus to make it in line with bylaws (Brice Noonan)
 - Second Rory Ledbetter
 - Discussion:
 - Vote:
 - In favor: 39

- Oppose: 0
 - Clarification: In the first statement are we precluding people who are “represented” from starting their own body?
 - A: I don’t think so.
 - F/U: I feel like in the hypothetical scenario if the group wanted to remove themselves from representation I don’t see that this body would prevent that from happening.
 - Question (Antonia Eliason): Is it important that titles and ranks reference 2015 and that “policy” be capitalized? If yes, I move to do that
 - Second: Stacey Lantagne
 - Discussion:
 - Vote:
 - All in favor
 - Question: No where on the titles and ranks document is there a date?
 - A: There is one on the policy directory
- Article 3:
 - Motion Zachary Guthrie: Make the language to section referring to census align with bylaws?
 - Second: Chris Mullen
 - Discussion:
 - Comment: Can we remove the phrase?
 - Friendly amendment: Yes
 - Comment: That is another capitalized “Faculty”, do we want that?
 - R: Yes I think so.
 - Vote:
 - In favor: All in favor
 - Opposed: none
- Motion Brice Noonan: to add above to standard deviation discussion (just before section 3)
 - Second: Unknown
 - Vote: All in favor

- Motion Michael Barnett: Language suggestion: Departments will receive additional senate seats equal to their SDs above the mean.
 - Second: Unknown
 - Motion Brice Noonan to extend the meeting ten minutes
 - Second: Michael Barnett
 - Vote all in favor
 - Comment: To be Rhode Island for a minute...this will preclude small departments from any degree of representation.
 - Comment: I think that we can add language that caps the total number of seats.
 - Comment: I will not accept an amendment that also adds a cap to my amendment.
 - Vote:
 - Favor: 31
 - Oppose: 2
 -
- Motion Michael Barnett: To strike language that would allow the senator to remain on senate for the entirety of their term even if their department loses a representative.
- Second: Deborah Mower
- Discussion
 - Comment: If that is the case I think we need to include some language that would allow for how to decide who to remove in this situation.
 - Comment: Aren't the senate seats numbered?
 - R: Yes
 - F/U: So, can't we just remove the highest numbered seat.
 - Comment: this is a situation wherein I think we should leave it to the department.
 - Comment: I agree
 - Comment: If we leave it to the department how do we know when that seat is to go up for election?
 - R: We can just shift the seats down accordingly
 - F/U: If we are going to make this department decision, I think we should specify that this is done by a vote.

- F/U: That is not necessarily how this decision is made now
 - F/U: It shouldn't be that way.
 - Comment: Is there anything within the bylaws that state that departments have to vote in senators?
 - Vote:
 - All in favor
 - Opposed: none
 - Motion Rory Ledbetter: section 3: "the choice of which senator is to step down will be left to the discretion of the unit"
 - Second Brad Jones
 - Discussion:
 - Point: Can we add the word "scheduled" between is and to in the first part of the clause?
 - Point: the choice of which senator steps down "will" be left...
 - Vote:
 - All in favor
 - None opposed
 - Immediate past chair:
 - Question: Why does the immediate past chair have to be a voting member of the senate?
 - R: I don't feel strongly about this one way or the other. I think that having past-chairs within the senate as advisors is important.
 - Motion Breese Quinn: Change past chairs to non-voting members
 - Second: Antonia Eliason
 - Discussion:
 - Comment: There may be a future problem of loyalties to past leadership to keep them as non-voting members.
 - Question: Do you see merit Michael in your position as past-chair how do you feel about voting?
 - R: I have no issue being a non-voting member. The only trepidation I have is with incentivizing future past-chairs to continue to participate in the senate.
 - Question: Is the idea behind this making it a rule that past-chairs continue to participate in the senate?

- R: It is an expectation, but this is not a responsibility of the position.
 - Vote
 - Favor: 47
 - Opposed: 1
 - Abstain: 1
 - Section 7:
 - Question: Is there an opportunity for us to “at least” to this language?
 - R: That is a good point?
 - How much time do we want to be the minimum?
 - Motion Randy Watkins: No earlier than 24 hours after the notice
 - Second: Michael Barnett
 - Discussion:
 - Comment: I think one of the reasons for this time frame is that extraordinary meetings should only be called in extraordinary circumstances. So, I think it should also have a 30-day window.
 - F/U: there are times that the faculty exec would know that there would be a meeting in 7-days, but this language precluded us from telling people about it.
 - F/U: Since we have to have a majority of the senate executive or five members of the senate. I am not sure this would be an issue.
 - Non-senate member: without this limit the chair could be against discussion and not hold a meeting within a timely fashion.
 - Comment: it seems like the reason for getting rid of this language was to give notice to the senators. It seems that we could solve this by allowing the chair to announce anticipated dates of meetings.
 - Comment: One of things that you could say is that the meeting has to held within a “timely fashion”.
 - Michael and Randy withdraw motion
 - Motion Breese Quinn: I move that re-instate deleted text. And add language stating that the chair is not precluding from giving informal/earlier notice of an anticipated meeting.

- Second: Cecelia Parks
 - Vote:
 - All in favor
- Article IV – Who gets to vote
 - Question: Is Eligible Faculty defined within the bylaws?
 - R: Yes
 - Non-senate member: I am concerned that who votes to change the constitution is defined by the bylaws. And that the bylaws can be changed by the senate.
 - F/U: That is an important point and at some point, I want to discuss whether or not changes to the bylaws and constitution would require a full faculty vote.
- Motion section at the end of the document
 - Comment: Because it is historical my feeling is that the title should be changed. But the text of the motion has obviously been changed.
 - Question: Does this section suggest that it needs to be brought to the whole faculty?
 - R: It is not clear to me what this is saying
 - F/U: It seems to me that these recommendations are not problematic in that we are just bringing this to all of the faculty. It does not seem problematic to me.
- Motion to postpone discussion of this document until the next meeting.
 - Vote
 - Favor: All in favor
- **Adjournment**
 - Motion to adjourn Amy Gibson
 - Second Antonia Eliason
 - Adjourned at 9:09

Brice Noonan
Chair

Michael Barnett
Past Chair

Stacey Lantagne
Vice Chair

Meagen Rosenthal
Secretary

Antonia Eliason
Academic Instructional Affairs

Vivian Ibrahim
Academic Conduct

Andrew Lynch
Finance & Benefits

Aileen Ajootian
Development & Planning

April Holm
Governance

Brad Jones
University Services

Christian Sellar
Research & Creative Achievement

Patrick Curtis
Strategic Planning Council 1

Nancy Wicker
Strategic Planning Council 2

Noel Wilson
Strategic Planning Council 3

Michael Barnett
Strategic Planning Council 4

Christian Sellar
Strategic Planning Council 5

Sandra Spiroff
Strategic Planning Council 6

Toshi Ikuta
Instructional Technology

Martial Longla
Recruit, Admissions, Orient., Advising

Name
Athletics Compliance

Antonia Eliason
Academic Discipline

Marilyn Mendolia
Academic Dismissal

Sara Wellman
Student Affairs

Andrew Lynch
Retirement & Insurance

Michael Barnett
Intercollegiate Athletics 1

Brice Noonan
Intercollegiate Athletics 2

William Sumrall
Intercollegiate Athletics 3

Dennis Bunch
Buildings, Grounds, Renovations

Marcos Mendoza
Recreational Facilities

Lei Cao
Faculty & Staff Appeals

Vivian Ibrahim
Sensitivity & Respect

Amy Gibson
LGBTQ Affairs

Stacey Lantagne
Traffic & Parking

Aileen Ajootian
Accessibility

Meagen Rosenthal
Lecture Series

Rory Ledbetter
Artist Series

Chalet Tan
Musuems