

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

1-27-2015

January 27, 2015

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes

Recommended Citation

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate, "January 27, 2015" (2015). *Meeting Minutes*. 141.
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/141

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

University Faculty Senate Minutes
January 27, 2015

The meeting of the University of Mississippi Faculty Senate was called together at 7:00 PM on January 27, 2015.

Senators in attendance: Rachna Prakash; Philip Jackson; Patrick Curtis; Brice Noonan; Randy Wadkins; Brad Cook; Tossi Ikuta; Feng Wang; Tom Garrett; Elliott Hutchcraft; Adetayo Alabi; Ben McClelland; Chris Offutt; Andre Liebenberg; Robert Holt; Yang-Chieh Fu; Oliver Dinius; Joshua Howard; Vanessa Gregory; Antonia Eliason; Dennis Bunch; Lorri Williamson; Susan Ivey; Jessica Leming; Jing Jing Wu; Dwight Frink; Milam Aiken; Christopher Newman; Sasha Kocic; Tejas Pandya; Heather Allen; Valentina Iepuri; Adam Estes; Michael Gardiner; Jos Milton; Laurel Lambert; Erin Holmes; Allison Bell; Breese Quinn; Ben Jones; Greg Love; Marilyn Mendolia; David Rutherford; Marcos Mendaoza; Allan Bellman; Mark Ortwein; Joe Sumrall; Rory Ledbetter

Senators excused: Charles Ross; Mary Thurlkill

Senators absent: Darren Grem; Desiree Stepteau-Watson; Minjoo Oh

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

Guests: Linda Chitwood; Derek Cowherd; Donna Gurley; Noel Wilkin

• Call Meeting to Order

- 7:00PM

• Approval of December 9, 2014 Minutes

- Approved

Barnett: Tim Walsh has resigned as Executive Director of Alumni Affairs to accept a position at the University of Florida. I have been asked to provide a Faculty Senate representative to the search committee which will be comprised of university employees and alumni. Is there anyone here who has an interest in alumni affairs and relations who would like to serve on this committee? Randy Wadkins volunteered.

• Presentation by Dr. Linda Chitwood, Associate Provost for Outreach and Continuing Education, on Online Education at the University

I'm happy to be here to talk about how outreach supports the university's initiatives. Online falls under the umbrella of what I oversee, and I'm here to talk about the future of online education at Ole Miss and a bit about intellectual property. [slide presentation]

I'll discuss the numbers, effectiveness, the future, and a little about intellectual property.

Fall Semester Data: Fall enrollment is higher, so comparing data each fall ensures consistency. In fall of 2014, we had 95 online courses, and 82 faculty teaching online. This is up from 82 courses and 72 faculty in 2013. In fall 2009, 6% of the total student body took an online class. In fall 2014, 14% of the total student body did. That translates to about 17370 students that did not take an online class, and 2742 that did.

Question: This graph is if a student took at least one class?

Chitwood: Yes.

Of those 2742 students, 86% were undergraduates, and 14% were graduates. This graph shows that the number of students who took at least one online class is 2395. 347 (about 13%) took only online classes. I cannot explain this growth necessarily, though we did change the way we were counting regional students, and we changed the support that we were giving to online classes, which could have something to do with this increase.

Who are the students? If they're taking an online class and an in-person class, they are more female than male (69%), about 23 years old, 81% undergraduates, 29% full time, and 68% Mississippi residents. Fully online are 66% female, 28.8 years old, 29% undergraduates, 15% full time, and 69% Mississippi residents.

Highest degree programs with students are Higher Ed (54), Curriculum and Instruction (35), Counselor Education (31), and Masters of Business Administration (91).

How broad is our reach? For full online classes, 69% are from Mississippi, clustered in Oxford, Jackson, Desoto, and Tupelo. We have not yet secured authorization of all states, so we know we are not reaching far and wide like a lot of universities are.

Comment: I don't understand the math on this screen? The numbers don't make sense.

Chitwood: Yes, you're right. I apologize, and will correct the numbers.

OK, now I'll talk about effectiveness. Let me emphasize that this is extremely preliminary data. Also please note that we're interested in trying to figure out about student performance, not teacher performance. We found 7 courses offered in fall 2013 and/or spring 2014 that had online and live sections offered at the same time, and taught by the same faculty member. It ended up with 7 online and 8 live. First, I'll discuss grade distribution. Do online students make grades similar to students in live classes? Overall, the grades were similar. In the live group, 90% of the grades were C or higher, and online 87% grades were C or higher.

In terms of student evaluation, how did they rate the course compared to others in terms of difficulty? 44% in the live class rated the class difficult or higher, and in the online, 42% rated it difficult or higher.

The next question asked was “Did the lectures or online materials help you in learning the material?” We received pretty much the same answer, which was “always.”

Now on to the percent of non-completers. I’ve heard there are too many dropouts in online classes, so I wanted to see the numbers. After the first day of class until the 10th day (census date), 18% students dropped out of live classes, and 29% dropped out of online classes. That doesn’t bother us too much because students are changing schedules. After the 10th day, 20% dropped out of online classes, and 11% out of live classes. Why is this happening?

Comment: The penalty is lacking. Live classes penalize dropping in regards to scholarship. This has to do probably with the term of “good standing.”

Comment: I signed up for an online accounting class, which I didn’t enjoy, and I dropped the class after the tenth day. I’m wondering how many people do what I did, which is to try an online class, and to drop it and never come back.

Chitwood: There are a lot of things that could impact this, I think, and we’re going to try to do follow up and figure out if this is happening in all of our classes. Anne Klingen has a tutorial asking students if they’re ready to take an online class, seeing if they have self-discipline to stay in sync with these classes. I think that the maturity of students choosing online classes could be a factor. We are going to see if there are resources or counseling that can help with this.

Comment: Do you have a sense of how this compares to other universities?

Chitwood: No, not necessarily, but I do know that the drop out rate is an issue nationwide.

OK, now I’ll talk about the future. Right now, online courses are housed in Outreach and Continuing Education, and reports to the Provost. When I talk about outreach, it comes through office of Online Design and eLearning and the Office of Summer, Winter, and Online Sessions.

The mission is to support the online endeavors of the academic units. We are developing a fund to help faculty have the technology that they need to teach. What we do not do is determining the strategic goals, which belongs to the Provost, the Deans, Chairs, and faculty. So if a faculty member or department chooses to add an online class, it’s their decision. Our job is only to help make it happen.

Recently, I had an online task force that gave us recommendations. Here are four recommendations from them: create a one-stop shop for faculty technology and online learning support; create a qualified pool of faculty willing to expand the use of technology in their teaching (online and live classes); empower deans and chairs to create online courses and programs to further their strategic goals; and maintain a predictable, transparent, and stable financial model that gives resources back to the deans and schools.

The first recommendation would include a lot of people, so it may not be easy. The Provost is considering it, and I hope it happens.

I think we already doing the third recommendation, and if we aren't, please tell us.

I think we already have the fourth recommendation in place, as well. We have a model giving back to the deans on a per credit hour basis. For undergraduate courses, they get \$55 per credit hour. At the graduate level, it's \$165/hour. Those funds are discretionary to the deans.

Now, let's talk about intellectual property. I'm going to ask Donna Gurley, Associate University Attorney, to speak about this.

Gurley: We try to comply with the University of Mississippi Copyright Policy. We know that's not as simple as it sounds, and the online environment makes it even more complicated.

My goal is find out what your concerns are. I have passed out the copyright policy and the policy does govern ownership of works created here at the university. This will apply to materials created for an online course as well. It traditionally has not been a complicated issue when we talk about old-fashioned methods of delivering classes, but once we added the online, it got a little less clear.

The most important part of this policy for our discussion is on page 4, which talks about ownership of copyright. The university traditionally has taken a liberal approach to faculty members and ownerships of works created. Most businesses are much stricter. Businesses own the works that their employees create. The universities have been broader—we want you to be productive and to write, and therefore the majority of what you create is yours. Royalties are yours. If you want to assign property rights, they're yours. Patent is different. But in terms of written product, ownership is usually with you, with exception of what is on page 4. "Supervised works" refer to when the university owns copyright, such as if student employees create it, or works created by faculty, staff, or associates as part of an assigned task. Usually, the decision to write an article or publish a book is made individually as a faculty member. On the other hand, there are times when the university might ask you to create a particular work, and there may be a negotiation as a part of that. You could be in a position where the department wants more online courses, so the department asks a faculty member to produce a class on a certain subject. The department may want these elements in it, and will give you time off from teaching to do that, and then will use that for a broad number of students online. During the course of that conversation, the department makes it clear how the course will be used, and that you are not creating this as part of your regular load, and it becomes clear that that work is being created for the university. If you're not sure, you need to have a conversation at the start of the process and ask. But if the university selects and directs you, and somehow you are being compensated for creating, it could be that the university wants ownership of that work.

Another time that the university may have ownership is in terms of supported work, where a substantial use of university resources were used to create the work. 'Substantial use' is defined in this document.

So what happens in online courses? It can require a lot of assistance from university personnel- equipment, uploading, instructional designers—because a great online class is not where you simply see a talking head. There is more that goes into a good online class, and there are people that can help you. The more of those resources that you use, the more likely it is that the university may want ownership.

Let's talk about externally sponsored works. If you are creating something in the course of a grant, you'd have to look at the grant to see where ownership lies.

Those things being said, the main thing I want to say is that the university overwhelmingly wants faculty to own copyright in the works they create, except in very few instances. Any questions should be asked at the front end. My final question is "What are the things that you or your department are worried about when it comes to creating online classes?" We've had these conversations and I may be able to answer some questions or else bring back your concerns to the Provost.

Comment: I entered a meeting about the development of an online course with several faculty members, and the hope would be that the faculty could walk away, the TA could take over, and it would help with instructional cost. I am worried that we may be phasing out faculty. I'm 98% confident that this isn't the objective of the university, but it could happen.

Gurley: Well, you have to look at the overall goal—how much effort are you putting in and how much is the university putting in for resources? And always ask questions. I see this as two questions—to what extent is it university resources and continuing to have ownership in your course? The other issue is a policy issue of at what point would the university use online courses as a way to increase student load or as a sub for a faculty member?

Chitwood: The policy of Anne's group in the past is that it's your course, and you can take it when you want. In our discussions, we've talked about courses versus material. It could be that the university sinks a lot of money into a video, and then the university wants that video and thinks they have the right. But our policy is that the course is yours, and we'd like to share it, but we've never taken it and used it. We have no intentions of doing that.

Question: Is there anything in writing that says you can't?

Chitwood: No, but we're in the information gathering mode so we'll know what the concerns are, and what we should do about this.

Comment: The University of Nevada Las Vegas has a policy about this, which may be quite liberal, but they have one out there.

Comment: I teach online, and it seems to me that a good dividing line would be original works. Certainly, the university supports the uploading of materials. As far

as instructional designed, I've designed all of my own online courses and they're my content, and therefore they are original works. The dividing point should be how much is original work attributable to the faculty member versus attributed to someone else? If we start to bring in original work, regardless of the university, the best you can hope for is that it would be the supported work category. Even if the university pays to record me, it's still my original work, so that moves into the supported work category.

Gurley: When you look at a course, you look at all the elements—video lecture, charts and graphs, where are they from, who wrote the textbook, etc. So you might have to look at the ownership of each element. Again, I am not saying the university wants to take your ownership of your course away from you. Just have conversations. I do think the degree to what you have created is an important factor, but I'll also say that there are people all across the US that are creating works that they do not own. That is not the case here, but you cannot think that will be the controlling factor.

Comment: Related to intellectual property- if the university provided a sabbatical to create an online course, I think they are getting paid to do the work.

Gurley: I agree.

Comment: What is "supported works?" I think you need to redefine the online work and customary usage.

Gurley: Yes, I agree that we should define that differently.

Comment: I'm confused about supported work. What about people hired only to teach online?

Comment: That has already happened. There was a certificate program from a program for people hired only to teach online. I don't know the current status of that program, but that has already happened.

Comment: Are they faculty ranked?

Answer: No, they had another status.

Gurley: Yes, that's a whole other issue. They are not tenure track faculty. I do want to say if you have particular scenarios, please let us know. Send me an email.

Comment: Most of these questions is about IP. Another question is are we going to start doing things like Courseara. That's probably not a question for the lawyers, though, right? The Outreach Division is thinking about these issues and knows that there needs to be a broader conversation about this.

Chitwood: No discussions are happening about accepting Courseara courses as transfers. Those are made at the faculty and department level.

• Presentation by Derek Cowherd, Senior Associate Athletics Director for Academics and Student-Athlete Development, on Efforts to Support Student Athletes with the Utmost Integrity

I want to speak with you about the measures we're taking to ensure integrity with the athletes by giving you a quick report on how we're doing. I had a meeting recently with the Provost and the Athletic Administration, and it was a good meeting, and all seem pleased with our work.

We train our tutors 4-5 times per semester. We make sure they all earn a 3.0 or better, we conduct a background check, and we require recommendation letters. We have to make sure that we're not giving athletes any "extra benefits" that other students aren't getting.

Let me discuss a few cases out there, including FSU, UNC, and Dartmouth. FSU started it off 10-12 years ago, and people still reference the case. It refers to a music history course when the academic athletic staff kept a test bank of all answers to quizzes and gave it to the student athletes. UNC is most recent, and it took 18 years to find it. A "paper class" was given to over 3,100 students, 1,500 of which were student-athletes. They would take the class, not attend, often have someone write a paper, and receive a favorable grade. Clustering problems were also an issue (lots of student athletes together in a class). In this case, they broke almost every rule. At Dartmouth, a math instructor gave the student athletes extra coursework and did the work for them online while they were not present.

I'm saying all of this to show how many cases are out there. We do not want that here. It's not just about the tutors, it's not just about the faculty—it's everyone on this campus' responsibility. We make sure we train everyone that ever works with us to ensure that we don't do these things.

Here are some of our best practices: limit the number of independent study courses and online courses allowable; commission a committee to review the GPAs of student athletes versus non-student athletes in course with heavy concentrations of student athletes; review instances of class clustering and major concentrations periodically. The Drake Group Recommendations includes 11 metrics to ensure the university is doing due diligence, and we are or have implemented a variety of these measures. We are doing these reports for protection, peer group certification (N4A certification in 2013); and freshmen eligibility (their rule is that anyone under a 2.0 cannot compete). These policies will be voted on, and I don't know how successful they'll be.

Drake Group Recommendations

- Reporting Process and Protection
- Peer Group Certification
- Academic Counseling and Support Services
- Athletics Eligibility Measures: no student-athletes competing < 2.00gpa.
- Freshmen Eligibility
- Academic Disability and Ability Testing
- Academic Conflict Policy

- Athletics 'Only' Facilities
- Transfer Policy
- Academic Oversight Committee
- Annual Public Report

What else are we doing? We have a banner program for workshops and trainings. We have tightened the training regimen for tutorial support. We work closely with writing center to provide quality tutorial support. We have about 150 tutors, and tend to have about 1500 sessions per week. Our reports are done within 24 hours, and tutor sessions must take place in the FedEx Center. On the road, a counselor monitors. A test is never proctored on the road, unless it's at university host site. We've installed cameras in our Center, and we report under the Provost.

In regards to continued compliance: In the past, a professor may have gotten a call from a coach. That should never happen. Only a select number of people in our office are allowed to contact professors, and that's really only me. We have created a coaches control manual, as well.

How has all of this helped us? In 2012, we were at 2.82 GPA overall, which is still a good number. We know we have a lot of support, and we're proud of that number. This year, we got to the 2.96 GPA.

Now, we have one pending case here, which is in regards to women's basketball. I can't speak on the particulars, but I can tell you that the coaches are no longer here, it did not happen on this campus or to anyone on this campus, and the case specifics will be coming down soon. Other than that, we have no other cases pending.

I want you all to know that if at any time you hear anything, or feel any pressure, or know of any classes where professors are easier on student-athletes, we need to know that. We simply want everything to be fair and consistent across the board.

Question: You guys monitor grades on Blackboard, right?

Cowherd: Yes, we have read-only Gradebook access on Blackboard. We cannot see assignments, and we can't read emails, no can we open attachments or even syllabi. Other departments have some of this too. We do not have passwords at all.

• **Senate Committee Reports**

- **Executive Committee**
No formal report.
- **Academic Affairs**
 - Update on Best Practices related to Academic Discipline
 - This list would suggest the appropriate disciplinary measure to take for a set of common infractions.

This report is not complete, and will be presented at the meeting in February.

- **Academic Support**

- Update on Campus-Wide Testing Center
 - Exploring the need for a campus-wide testing center open to every Student Disability Services registered student in all academic disciplines.

Stacey Reycraft (Director of Disability Services) and Dr. Brandi Hephner-Labanc (Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs) will be speaking in February about this issue.

- **Finance**
No formal report.
- **Governance**
No formal report.
- **University Services**
 - 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.

Senator Greg Love presenting: I am going to present the survey results tonight. I also met with Human Resources about the leave policy. I'll come back in February with resolutions to propose after you hear the information.

A little over 1000 people took the survey. More women than men took this, and by far professional services and secretarial. Everyone at the university was asked to take the survey, and a little more than half of the respondents did not have children. Only 20% of respondents said they were planning on having kids in the next 5 years. Most only have 1 or 2 children.

How much time do people spend each day taking kids to daycare? By far, 20-45 minutes. Type of problems? Affordability and length of waiting list for care were the top listed. If you have children under the age of 6, or if you are planning on having kids, most are very interested in having on campus childcare. How much are people paying for childcare? Most people are saying a really high number, so I don't think people were reading this question correctly. Most people indicated that they want to pay \$300-500 for on-campus care. How much of a priority should on-campus childcare be? This was asked to everyone, and by far, "a very high priority." How often does childcare affect the department's performance? Almost 50% answered "sometimes." How is your work-life balance? The answer "high" was chosen by about 40%. The executive/administrative category respondents ranked the importance of on-campus childcare significantly lower than others. Also, the executive category respondents think they do a better job at work-life balance. The stress level between the groups is about the same. After controlling out age and gender, the executive category still ranks priority of childcare lower.

FMLA/Compensation: Paid leave is limited to 6 weeks for standard birth. There are more complications with those on a 12-month employment. 9-month employees may not get paid if they have a baby in summer. Under University policy, spouses cannot both take leave (though an unmarried couple can).

Comment: I would ask that people on other campuses have the same benefit of some kind as well. I'm in Jackson on the medical campus.

Comment: I'd like to bring up that here, we don't have a good policy about if you have a child halfway through the semester.

Comment: I would like to bring up that administrative would probably have at home care, so childcare would be less of an issue.

Comment: Going on that, I wish we had salary information for respondents.

Comment: I probably initiated this because I have a 3 year old that is in childcare, and I found that everyone (in the SEC) had better benefits. I took this to the Provost, and he said that we needed faculty senate support for this.

Comment: We have brought up benefits compared to other universities in the past, and there are some things that we can't change, like health care benefits apparently. But if there are things that we can change to make things better for the overall, I'm on board. So I'm on board for this.

Love: Our intent is to bring forward a resolution that clearly expresses what the senate thinks on this issue.

Comment: I recommend trying to put something with a university policy on it. Within departments and schools, there are differing things happening, so a university policy may be more helpful.

Question (Barnett): Is it going to be a joint resolution between these groups?

Love: I will think about it.

Comment (Barnett): I got several email responses that expressing disappointment that this only spoke to childcare and not elderly care. We may want to consider how to move forward for total care, increasing the scope.

Love: We obviously limited this to childcare because it's what was asked of us, and to limit the amount of time it took to complete the survey.

Comment: I would suggest that what you submit is strongly worded, since people have been complaining about this for a while. We seem to have a lot of support from the senators, so I encourage you to take the liberty to be strong.

- **Old Business**

- None

- **New Business**

- **Key Performance Indicators** (See Attached)

- The Faculty Senate has been asked to make recommendations of Key Performance Indicators, metrics that the university will use to measure its own success in the future.

•
Senator Oliver Dinius presenting: These were two issues that came up in December. Faculty excellence has been discussed before, but I think the Key Performance Indicators are new. They want a fairly short list of KPI to measure. There is a fairly short timeframe to move forward with this. Other bodies have been asked to do this, as well. I sent this out the project background and description and a memo that went out to the bodies asking for feedback on the KPIs proposed. The Executive Committee thought it would be good to suggest the number of indicators that we feel should be included. We came up with four categories, which are listed on page two of this document. These track faculty research productivity; track student success after graduation; track UM faculty salaries compared to the SEC and/or SUG averages; and track ratio of tenure-track to non tenure-track faculty.

The goal is to assess the operation and performance of the university. The reason I brought this up is because I didn't feel like the short list of KPIs really measured the faculty, so I felt that the faculty senate should be proactive by bringing this up. We only have two weeks to submit this, and we would like to see what you all think.

Question: How feasible is to measure the success of students after they leave here. Derek [Cowherd], you all try to measure student-athlete success after graduation, right?

Derek: Yes, and it is pretty hard.

Comment: We don't even allow them to keep their email address from Ole Miss. How would we do this?

Dinius: Well, it would be a good thing to have, and even if we don't have a way now, it could be included here and developed in the future. We hoped this document would help make this important to the administration.

Comment: Why not make the KPI a numeric value where the faculty can define student success, since they know the success of their number?

Barnett: That is a suggestion already in this document, actually.

Comment: Is there any way to tap in to the alumni connection for finding people after graduation?

Noel Wilkin (Chair, Strategic Planning Council): Yes, this is a notoriously difficult measure. Even if we track them down, they may not tell us what they're doing. It's a priority of a lot of our units to do this, but it's hard to get usable information back and to trust it enough to report. I don't think that means we should give up, but it would be up to the strategic counsel to figure out how to do that and to calculate it in a meaningful way.

Comment: This sounds like how we have to give a value on our PhD students. Once we meet that goal, we have to reset the bar even higher, and it sounds like we could get there with this. I'm concerned that we're setting ourselves up for this kind of cycle.

Dinius: Noel, can you talk about the “external audiences” we need to consider when designing the KPIs?

Wilkin: Internally, first of all, from the strategic plan, it was recommended that we develop KPIs that track progress in meaningful ways. In those numbers, there are lots of external audiences, such as other institutions. If we are going to compare salaries, we have to identify ways that we are comparing appropriately. Secondly, IHL is using a funding formula to appropriate state dollars. That formula uses metrics and numbers (grad rates, research expenditures, for example), so that’s another important external entity, so that we know how to track and make progress in those areas. The state of Mississippi has a strategic plan, as well, and they are asking for identification of KPIs, too. The good news is that we have the flexibility to define the metrics. Finally, SACS accreditation. We have to be able to document at the university level that what we do makes a difference. Again, we have the flexibility to define the metrics for this.

Comment: RPI is a metric the athletic department uses. Is RPI a metric we could use? Derek [Cowherd], can you explain that?

Cowherd: Yes, it could be.

Wilkin: If you think that’s a metric we should use, send it to us so we can see it.

Cowherd: We have APR that measures retention and graduation.

Comment: We could immediately use that metric for our entire student body.

Comment: I suggest if you’re thinking about metrics and rubrics—we’ve had to do that in Engineering for accreditation. There may be a model there that may help, too.

Comment: I would say this is very important. If it gets measured, it becomes important. I am concerned that A and B do not fulfill all of the criteria. I’m just concerned that these crucial measures will not be selected, and as a result, the attention that should be directed will not. My question is what is the process? We have two weeks. Then what? Who is making these decisions? We don’t have another faculty senate meeting.

Barnett: We actually do have another meeting the day before they’re due. Send me all comments, and I’ll send them to Executive Committee.

Motion to go ten minutes long: Yes.

Seconded: Majority.

Wilkin: You should know that the Strategic Planning Committee has a strong faculty member, which is over half. The committee will assess and vote, informed by input from the members. So if you don’t hit the February 12 deadline, it’s not as if you won’t have a chance to add to it. We are hoping it will be a working document by the end of this year.

- **Individual Parking Spaces on Campus.**

- Exploration of the ongoing viability of individual parking spaces on campus

Senator Sasha Kocic stated that faculty in the Department of Mathematics are upset about the high number of individual parking spots not being used. The department supports the idea that we get rid of these spots. In addition, the need for these spaces is diminished with the new parking deck.

This has been passed to the University Services Committee.

- **Adjournment**

- 9:05 PM. Next meeting is February 10, 2015.

Presentation to Faculty Senate on Strategic Planning Council Initiatives that affect Faculty

In the spring semester of 2015, the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) will take up two (arguably related) issues directly relevant to Faculty.

1. **Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**
2. **(Definition of) Faculty Excellence**

1) The SPC has been asked to establish so-called "**Key Performance Indicators**" (short KPI), a relatively short list of metrics that the university will use to measure its own success in the future. See the following passage from the charter for the project rationale.

1. *Project Background and Description*

UM 2020 includes a call for establishing the means for assessing the university's progress toward its strategic goals.

Assessing Progress

In addition to monitoring the implementation of initiatives and objectives, the Strategic Planning Council will track a set of performance metrics and qualitative indicators to measure the impact of these efforts. Key performance indicators will serve as a tool for gauging the strategic plan's overall impact and success but will not impede the ability of academic units to manage their own internal processes. (p. 28)

In addition, the University of Mississippi is expected to demonstrate its performance on a variety of metrics for a variety of external audiences. The IHL funding formula contains performance metrics, as does the recently developed State of Mississippi Strategic Plan. In total, over 150 metrics have been identified as potential KPIs.

Developing a set of KPIs that include indicators of student achievement will also aid the university in meeting Federal Standard 4.1 as part of the SACSCOC accreditation process.

The goal of this project is to develop a set of metrics that measure the most important aspects of the university's performance. The Council will engage the relevant stakeholders to ensure that the final set of KPIs is meaningful, feasible to collect and monitor, and has the support of the university community. Upon completing this project, the Strategic Planning Council can then request that the relevant divisions set targets for performance.

The attached memo (attachment 1) on "Nomination of Key Performance Indicators" lays out the basic expectations for such Key Performance Indicators.

The attached preliminary short-list (attachment 2) of promising KPIs -- drawn up by Strategic Planning Council staff -- provides a sense of the kinds of metrics that are early favorites to end up on this list.

Faculty representatives in the SPC have made the point that this short list does not include metrics adequately measuring faculty performance -- and thus the university's success as an academic institution in the fullest sense. The one exception is the metric on grants, which works for many but not all fields.

What the preliminary short list does not include are metrics that would measure success in areas where a university generally and its faculty specifically are expected to excel: (a) producing new

knowledge and (b) teaching students that use their education to live successful and fulfilled lives after receiving their degrees.

The Faculty Senate has been asked to suggest KPIs. The Senate's Executive Committee believes that the Senate should be pro-active on this discussion, but the time frame for suggesting KPIs is tight (deadline February 11).

Thus, the Executive Committee suggests that the Faculty Senate propose four KPIs aimed at a fair evaluation of the university's academic strength, the faculty's contribution to fulfilling the academic mission, and the conditions of work for faculty to be able to make that contribution.

- a) Track faculty research productivity, possibly using field- and department-specific tenure and promotion guidelines as a benchmark before aggregating the numbers for the whole university.
- b) Track student success after graduation, according to criteria that make sense for each field (or department) and then aggregate those numbers for the whole university.
- c) Track UM faculty salaries compared to the SEC and/or SUG averages. Goal: To close the salary gap between UM and peer institutions.
- d) Track ratio of tenure-track to non-tenure track faculty. Goal: To maintain or increase the share of tenure-track faculty.

Especially (a) and (b) do not necessarily fulfill all of the desired criteria of the rather rigid evaluation scheme for KPIs (see attachment 3), but they constitute meaningful measures of faculty success and should be included.

2) The second item is the **definition of "Faculty Excellence"** as a follow-up to the task force report the Faculty Senate submitted to the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) in April 2014 (attachment 4). The leadership of the SPC would like to get a clearer sense of the meaning of "faculty excellence".

In writing the task force report, we did not offer a concise definition of faculty excellence. Whether the term "faculty" is understood to refer primarily to the individual teacher/researcher or the collective of all faculty members at the university, it seemed impossible to define "faculty excellence" concisely.

The task force report implicitly established "producing new knowledge" as a key element of faculty excellence, both in the sense of ongoing research productivity and developing new lines of research – and made suggestions on how to enhance "faculty excellence" understood on that way.

Suggesting suitable KPIs that measure the contribution the faculty makes to the university may be one way to address the request for a more concise definition of "faculty excellence".

Attachments:

1. Interoffice Memo - "Nomination of Key Performance Indicators"
2. SPC Preliminary Short List of Key Performance Indicators (KPI)
3. Excerpts from UM Strategic Plan referencing academic mission and faculty excellence
4. KPI Valuation Template
5. Faculty Excellence Task Force Report



THE UNIVERSITY OF
MISSISSIPPI


Interoffice Memorandum

PROVOST AND VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

University, MS 38677

Phone: (662) 915-5974 Fax: (662) 915-5280

TO: Deans, Faculty Senate, ORSP, IREP, VC Student Affairs, Information Technology, Global Engagement, Graduate School, Diversity & Multicultural Affairs, Facilities Planning, Physical Plant, VC Finance and Administration

FROM: Noel Wilkin 

DATE: January 13, 2015

SUBJECT: Nomination of Key Performance Indicators

You are being asked to nominate potential Key Performance Indicators that will be evaluated by the Strategic Planning Council for inclusion in a university-wide set of performance metrics.

Defining KPIs

A Key Performance Indicator (KPI) is a quantifiable and comparable piece of information that will allow the University, as well as individual departments and administrative units, to measure and improve operations. The SPC has already nominated first year student retention and 4 and 6 year graduation rates as KPIs, as both represent important, quantifiable, and comparable metrics.

The KPIs that are selected should meet the following criteria:

- **Significance:** The metric should be important and have the potential to influence decision making.
- **Scope:** The metric should measure the performance of the whole institution or a key priority area.
- **Control:** The university's personnel should have control over the factors that drive performance on the metric.
- **Link to Mission:** The metric should help the university advance its mission.
- **External Audiences:** The metric should align with how external audiences evaluate the university.
- **Data Collection Strategy:** The metric should be well defined and feasible to collect, track over time, and report.

Process

Please use the Key Performance Indicator resources found on the website <http://um2020.olemiss.edu> under the link "[Strategic Planning Internal Resources](#)." The Box folder includes information about several of the accountability systems in which the University of Mississippi participates, including the IHL Performance Funding Formula, the State of Mississippi Strategic Benchmarks, the Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and the US News and World Report rankings.

You are asked to nominate specific metrics from your area of responsibility that you believe should be included in the final set of official KPIs. To do this, please fill out the attached evaluation form, and provide as much information as possible about the significance, scope, control, link to mission, external audiences, and data collection strategies of the metric. This information will be used by the Strategic Planning Council to evaluate each metric and arrive at a final list.

Please send your evaluation forms to Annie Davis Weber, Manager of Strategic Planning, by email (adweber@olemiss.edu) before **Wednesday, February 11, 2015**. You may also contact Annie Weber (x. 1751) if you would like assistance in defining metrics or filling out the evaluation form.

Project Background

UM 2020 includes a call for establishing the means for assessing the university's progress toward its strategic goals.

Assessing Progress

In addition to monitoring the implementation of initiatives and objectives, the Strategic Planning Council will track a set of performance metrics and qualitative indicators to measure the impact of these efforts. Key performance indicators will serve as a tool for gauging the strategic plan's overall impact and success but will not impede the ability of academic units to manage their own internal processes. (UM 2020, p.28)

In addition, the University of Mississippi is expected to demonstrate its performance on a variety of metrics for a variety of external audiences. The IHL funding formula contains performance metrics, as does the recently developed State of Mississippi Strategic Plan. In total, over 150 metrics have been identified as potential KPIs.

Developing a set of KPIs that includes indicators of student achievement will also aid the university in meeting Federal Standard 4.1 as part of the SACSCOC accreditation process. The goal of this project is to develop a set of metrics that measures **the most important aspects** of the university's performance. As an important stakeholder, the Strategic Planning Council is asking for your input to ensure that the final set of KPIs is meaningful, feasible to collect and monitor, and has the support of the university community.

Draft Short List of Key Performance Indicators

Student Success

- 1) Average ACT score of entering freshman
- 2) Enrollment of all students by ethnicity and gender
- 3) Student/faculty ratio
- 4) Student graduation rates
- 5) Student retention rates

Transforming the World

- 6) Percent of total FTE employees who are faculty
- 7) Dollar value of research grants and contracts awarded

Financial

- 8) Average net price of attendance
- 9) Ratio of weighted student credit hours to student credit hours
- 10) Average alumni giving rate



UM / 2020

STRATEGIC PLAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

PLANNING FRAMEWORK /

IN SIMPLE TERMS, A STRATEGIC plan is a road map that helps guide an organization from where it is now to where it would like to be in five or ten years. For a complex university organization, a planning framework can be used to ensure that university and unit-level strategic planning efforts are in alignment and that goal congruency is achieved throughout the campus.

The UM 2020 Planning Framework is comprised of the Mission, Vision, Core Values, Flagship 2020 Goals, Priorities of Excellence, Planning Principles, and Enabling Infrastructure. Additional details on each component are provided in subsequent sections of the plan.

UM 2020 PLANNING FRAMEWORK

ENDURING COMMITMENTS			
Mission Statement	Vision Statement		Institutional Core Values
FLAGSHIP 2020 GOALS			
Establish a bold vision with great expectations	Expand our impact locally, Extend our reach globally		Provide an unrivaled collegiate experience
PRIORITIES OF EXCELLENCE			
Undergraduate Education & Student Success	Graduate & Professional Education	Research, Scholarship, Innovation & Creativity	Faculty
The College Experience	Transformation through Service		Staff
PLANNING PRINCIPLES			
Quality & Focus	Diversity & Inclusion	Beyond Borders	Organizational Stewardship & Sustainability
Creativity Arts & Innovation	Blue Sky		Hospitality & Community
ENABLING INFRASTRUCTURE			
Facilities & Infrastructure	Capital Campaign & Development		Technology Innovation & Improvement
Marketing & Communications	Organizational Structure & Staffing		Budgeting & Financial Sustainability

ENDURING COMMITMENTS /

Our Vision

As a great American public university, the University of Mississippi will lead and excel by engaging minds, transforming lives, and serving others.

Our Mission

The University of Mississippi's mission is to create, evaluate, share, and apply knowledge in a free, open, and inclusive environment of intellectual inquiry.

Building upon a distinguished foundation in the liberal arts, the state's oldest university serves the people of Mississippi and the world through a breadth of academic, research, and professional programs.

The University of Mississippi provides an academic experience that emphasizes critical thinking; encourages intellectual depth and creativity; challenges and inspires a diverse community of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students; provides enriching opportunities outside the classroom; supports life-long learning; and develops a sense of global responsibility.

Statement of Institutional Core Values

In pursuing its mission, the University of Mississippi:

- Reaffirms its identity and purpose as fundamentally academic.
- Nurtures excellence in teaching, learning, creativity, and research.
- Provides the best and most accessible undergraduate education in the state of Mississippi.
- Offers high quality graduate and professional programs.

- Protects academic freedom and cultivates individual integrity and academic honesty.
- Promotes inclusiveness in its student body, faculty, and staff.
- Requires respect for all individuals and groups.
- Fosters a civil community of shared governance and collaborative endeavors.
- Practices good stewardship of its resources.
- Devotes its knowledge and abilities to serve the state and the world.
- Honors the dignity of all employees and compensates them fairly.

The University of Mississippi Creed

The University of Mississippi is a community of learning dedicated to nurturing excellence in intellectual inquiry and personal character in an open and diverse environment. As a voluntary member of this community:

- I believe in respect for the dignity of each person.
- I believe in fairness and civility.
- I believe in personal and professional integrity.
- I believe in academic honesty.
- I believe in academic freedom.
- I believe in good stewardship of our resources.

I pledge to uphold these values and encourage others to follow my example.

FLAGSHIP 2020 GOALS /

OUR FACULTY, STAFF, STUDENTS, ALUMNI, and friends offered over 10,000 inspiring ideas for the future of the University of Mississippi. Across all of these ideas, three common themes emerged including: a desire to “dream big” and to set great expectations for the state’s flagship university; to expand our impact in the state and to extend our reach globally; and to foster one of our greatest attributes – an unrivaled collegiate experience.

To encourage an unwavering pursuit towards these interests, the Strategic Planning Council identified the following Flagship 2020 Goals:

Flagship Goal: Establish a bold vision with great expectations

- Become a top 50 public research university
- Achieve one billion dollar endowment to support the university’s strategic priorities & bold vision for 2020
- Award 50,000 baccalaureate, graduate, and professional degrees between 2010 and 2020
- Recruit, develop and retain an inclusive faculty of the highest quality through a program of enhanced compensation, research support, and professional services that rivals our peers
- Advance to the Carnegie Very High Research University classification

Flagship Goal: Expand our impact locally, Extend our reach globally

- Lead the state and region in preparing STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) professionals and leaders, especially from underrepresented groups, and improve science literacy of the general public
- Lead state efforts to combat illiteracy, alleviate poverty, and support tolerance through academics, research, and service
- Enhance our leadership role as the flagship institution in the state for health, wellness, and sustainability
- Promote service learning and civic engagement by faculty, staff, and students through an innovative on-campus center or office
- Embrace and support globally engaged students by bringing the world to Mississippi and Mississippi to the world

Flagship Goal: Provide an unrivaled collegiate experience

- Deliver an accessible and affordable education of the highest quality to a diverse student body
- Foster our finest traditions: an inclusive, student-centered, and welcoming campus environment
- Enhance the involvement of our alumni, friends, and the community in campus athletic, academic, social, and cultural events
- Nurture and strengthen the collaborations between the University and the Oxford-Lafayette community
- Support nationally competitive athletic programs by providing student-athletes with the opportunity to compete at the highest level academically and athletically

INTRODUCTION/RATIONALE

AS A COMPREHENSIVE FLAGSHIP INSTITUTION, the University of Mississippi engages in the discovery, creation, and dissemination of knowledge for the benefit of society. New knowledge informs further inquiry, enhances educational experiences, improves the economic status of citizens in Mississippi, and enhances the quality of life for individuals throughout the world. Research, scholarship, and innovation in the humanities, arts, and sciences are accomplished at the University through the individual and collaborative efforts of its faculty, staff, and students, and are undertaken with a commitment to the institution's core values, especially academic freedom, stewardship of resources, service to Mississippi, and advantage to all people. These endeavors will succeed and have maximum benefit when aligned with a focused strategic vision and clear priorities.

OBJECTIVES

IN ITS PURSUIT OF DISTINCTION in this priority of excellence, the University will:

- Increase individual and collaborative research, scholarship, and innovation.
- Increase the role of graduate students in research and innovation activities.
- Enhance its capacity for research and scholarship.
- Engage in a disciplined investment strategy supporting research and scholarship.
- Capitalize on the University's small and diverse scholarly community.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE STRATEGIES/ TACTICS FOR SUCCESS

Immediate (Current–2-Year) Strategies/Tactics:

Increase individual and collaborative research, scholarship, and innovation

- Develop a comprehensive inventory of research resources (e.g., libraries, cyber infrastructure, facilities, and shared equipment and expertise) and areas of current interdisciplinary research, and recommend specific policies, programs, and key investments to strengthen these resources and interactions.

- Develop new policies, guidelines, programs, and spaces that support collaborations within the University and with other universities, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector.

Increase the role of graduate students in research and innovation activities

- Improve graduate assistantships and benefits for students enrolled in Ph.D. programs.

Enhance the university's capacity for research and scholarship

- Devise strategies to increase success in garnering competitive grants and honors of distinction.

Engage in a disciplined investment strategy supporting research/scholarship

- Make the process for awarding and reviewing sabbaticals stronger and more rigorous.
- Identify and make immediate and long-term investments in existing areas of excellent scholarly research, and identify nascent areas for similar support.
- Acquire and allocate the resources needed to increase the recruitment and retention of scholars in identified strategic areas and Ph.D. degree programs.
- Develop and implement a long-term action plan to advance the recommendations outlined in the 2011 STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) task force report, including but not limited to the following:
 - ▶ Increase the number of graduates in STEM fields, especially among first-generation college students and underrepresented groups
 - ▶ Provide our state, region, and nation with graduates who are technically knowledgeable, effective problem-solvers capable of working equally well individually or as part of a team, adaptable to different environments and situations, and comfortable with change
 - ▶ Provide all students, regardless of major, with a greater understanding of science- and technology-related issues
 - ▶ Improve K-12 science teaching preparation and effectiveness
 - ▶ Improve science literacy of the general public

INTRODUCTION/RATIONALE

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI'S EXCELLENCE is founded upon the excellence of its faculty. Further, as the constant in the university experience, faculty has the greatest positive impact upon the institution. To promote and protect the quality of our institution, we must strive not only to be a university that supports and is known for a pervasive culture of excellence and achievement, but also one that attracts, develops, and retains a superior and inclusive faculty. We must foster an environment that supports faculty members in their work and provides them with a high quality of life.

The University of Mississippi exists to create, share, evaluate, and apply human knowledge. The faculty members of this university create, share, and evaluate knowledge through their teaching, scholarship, and creative activities, and apply their expertise through leadership and service. When these activities are marked by achievement and excellence, and are guided by the principles of respect, integrity, and fairness, the University is better able to respond to the needs of students, the state, and the region.

OBJECTIVES

TO PROMOTE FACULTY EXCELLENCE, THE University of Mississippi will:

- **Recruit, develop, and retain a diverse faculty of the highest quality**
Educate our students, and prepare them for life in an increasingly diverse society, promote the free exchange of ideas, produce nationally recognized research and scholarship, and better serve the social, economic, and cultural development needs of the state, region, and nation.
- **Provide a system of equitable compensation for all faculty**
Equitable compensation is key to successfully attracting, retaining, rewarding, and recognizing the best and brightest scholars and teachers.

- **Foster an academic and professional environment for faculty that encourages and respects intellectual growth and exchange, professional collaboration and cooperation, and work/life balance**

Create such an environment, which is key to promoting faculty creativity, success, development, and achievement.

- **Adopt policies, systems, and procedures to create an efficient administrative environment**

Support the core academic, educational, and service functions of faculty with high-quality administrative services to enable faculty members to focus their time on these essential educational and research activities.

- **Encourage and support a culture of community engagement through academic programs and community partnerships**

Support such a culture, which is key to enabling faculty members to apply their expertise through services and to respond to the needs of students and the state and region.

- **Ensure an environment that meets the educational and research needs of the faculty**

Provide adequate and properly equipped classroom, laboratory, library, and research facilities.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE STRATEGIES/ TACTICS FOR SUCCESS

Immediate (Current–2-Year) Strategies/Tactics:

Recruit, develop, and retain a diverse faculty of the highest quality

- Create a task force on faculty excellence, and charge it with systematically compiling an overview of current programs and consulting best practices at comparable institutions to:

- ▶ **Define faculty excellence**
- ▶ Define faculty workload, examine practices at peer universities
- ▶ Determine competitive peer groups to better assess faculty excellence, particularly in areas such as compensation, benefits, and start-up packages
- ▶ Identify 5- and 10- year goals for competitive salary levels for faculty by rank and discipline vis-à-vis UM's peer groups

- ▶ Develop proposals to increase equity in teaching loads, including the identification of optimum faculty/student ratios, by unit
- ▶ Develop a university-wide policy on the status and employment of non-tenure-track faculty
- ▶ Develop proposals to provide supplemental salary opportunities for productive faculty (e.g., examine extending UM School of Pharmacy policy, compare to peer institutions)
- ▶ Develop incentive programs to encourage faculty productivity and reward success
- ▶ Develop plans to define and adopt post-professorial titles
- ▶ Develop a proactive policy on counteroffers and dual career hiring
- ▶ Develop proposals to enhance diversity and the intellectual environment for faculty (e.g., identify benchmarks or successful practices at peer institutions)
- ▶ Develop proposals to enhance the intellectual environment for faculty (e.g., reward collaborative work; develop a faculty dining facility, etc.)
- ▶ Develop proposals to meet the nonprofessional needs of employees related to work/life balance (e.g., areas including child care and elder care, dual career support programs, newcomer transitions, and employee benefits)
- Adopt policies and procedures for collecting exit interview information on faculty and staff leaving the University to identify factors negatively impacting retention of high-quality employees.

Ensure an environment that meets the educational and research needs of the faculty

- Initiate a systematic audit of the size and capabilities of available classroom, office, laboratory, and other space while developing a space-utilization plan reflecting the best available data on “worst-case” predicted needs and availability for 2020. Prioritize core academic and research functions when assessing these needs.

2+ Years/As Funding Permits Strategies/Tactics:

Provide a system of equitable compensation for all faculty

- Based on long-term goals from the faculty excellence task force, raise and maintain faculty base salaries to a competitive level vis-à-vis UM’s peer groups, and:
 - ▶ Initiate and direct development efforts to support a faculty excellence endowment with a stretch goal of \$250 million
 - ▶ Examine best practices and develop an institutional policy to address minimum salary levels for new hires
 - ▶ Examine best practices and develop a policy to address salary inversion that results from new hires
 - ▶ Examine best practices and develop a policy addressing new titles to recognize continued achievement by post-professorial faculty with accompanying salary enhancements

Foster an academic and professional environment for faculty that encourages and respects intellectual growth and exchange, professional collaboration and cooperation, and work/life balance

- Create and fund an Office of Faculty Development and Diversity within the Office of the Provost to address faculty development, retention, recruitment, and diversity issues. This office should be modeled after similar units at Harvard, UCLA, and the University of Florida.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR EVALUATION

KPI:	
Priority of Excellence:	
UM 2020 Objective:	

SIGNIFICANCE OF KPI
Why is this metric important and what decisions can the institution make based on changes in this number?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
SCOPE OF KPI
Does this metric measure the performance of the whole institution? A large portion of the institution?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
CONTROL OF KPI
Who at the university has the ability to control factors that influence the metric and achieve goals related to this metric?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
LINK TO MISSION
How does improving on this metric advance the mission of the university?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
EXTERNAL AUDIENCES
Do our external audiences (IHL, SACSCOC, IPEDS, LBO, etc.) use this metric to evaluate the university?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
DATA COLLECTION STRATEGY
How are the data elements of this metric defined, collected, and reported?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •
INTERNAL RESPONSIBILITY
Who is responsible for setting goals related to this metric and who is responsible for achieving them?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •

RECOMMENDED FOR SHORT LIST BY:
<i>Date</i>

Report on “Faculty Excellence” by the Faculty Senate, serving as Task Force as charged by the Strategic Planning Council

April 8, 2014

PREAMBLE

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University of Mississippi define Faculty Excellence in ways congruent with peer research universities to ensure that we remain competitive.

Faculty productivity is central to the University’s declared goal to move from the current RU/H in the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Learning to RU/VH status. Therefore, the focus of this document is on the encouragement of research and creative activity among all tenure-track and tenured faculty.

Fundamentally, this requires creating conditions that will allow faculty to spend a share of their work time on research and creative activity that reflects and exceeds the obligations as outlined in the tenure and promotion documents. This needs to include support for interdisciplinary and international research in line with goals outlined in UM 2020.

The protections offered by tenure-track and tenure are essential for faculty to develop a research agenda that is designed to gain the University national and international recognition. Thus, the University should limit the percentage of contingent faculty.

The order of Sections and within Sections in this document indicates a priority.

Section 1

DEVELOP INCENTIVE PROGRAMS TO ENCOURAGE FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY AND REWARD SUCCESS

1. Increase Productivity in Research/Creative Activity by Helping Faculty to have Teaching-free Semesters

a) Matching Grants

Match substantial outside grants to generate extended time (at least a full semester) for research and publication or creative activity. This encourages application for outside grants, raising the university's profile. Helps junior faculty to get a pre-tenure leave to generate time to meet tenure requirements.

b) Flexible Teaching Arrangements

Allow professors to arrange teaching loads flexibly in order to accomplish research and writing goals and meet promotion requirements. Professors with a 2-2 load (as example) should be able to arrange a 3-1 load, or even a 3-3-0.

c) Leave

Establish a system of internally funded, competitive sabbatical leave in addition to the current system of eligibility for sabbatical after 12 teaching semesters.

2. Create Financial Incentives with Transparent Rules to Encourage Faculty Productivity.

a) Annual Merit Raises

Adopt a system of merit-based salary increases based on published departmental salary policies. These need to include faculty participation in the process, state clear merit criteria, and establish transparent procedures for communicating the allocated raises. Place the emphasis for publications and creative work on quality rather than quantity and develop fair means to reward long-term projects with the potential for great scholarly recognition (and thus potential for long-term outside funding).

b) Greater Promotion Raises

Increase promotion raises to create an incentive for faculty to invest in research or creative activity as a long-term strategy with financial rewards.

Current promotion raises are too modest compared to other short- or medium-term financial incentives (additional teaching; administrative career), with a detrimental effect on the University's profile in research and creative activity.

c) Accelerated Tenure/Promotion

Develop a University policy regarding the offer of early tenure and/or promotion for outstanding faculty as a low-cost tool for retention. This would help increase the share of senior faculty at a time when some large departments have a majority (or close to) of junior faculty.

d) Special Professorships based on Productivity

Create special positions such as Distinguished Professor, College Professor or University Professor to recognize academic excellence. These would carry a salary supplement and a special research fund. Appointments may be temporary (three- to five-year) or permanent to form a fourth tier (above Professor) in the promotion ladder.

Note on Funding: The University, independent of state politics and IHL priorities, needs to make a serious commitment to crafting a stronger identity as a research institution. The Development Office should cultivate alumni support for faculty research and the intellectual mission of the University in the form of "named" grants, "named" research leave, and "named" special professorships.

Section 2

DEVELOP A PROACTIVE POLICY ON COUNTEROFFERS, DUAL CAREER HIRING, AND FAMILY-FRIENDLY PROGRAMS

1. Matching Counteroffers

Develop transparent and proactive policies that clarify expectations and conditions under which matching counteroffers will be extended.

2. Spousal Hires

Develop transparent and proactive policies to facilitate spousal hires. The policy should cover partners of current faculty members as well as new hires, regardless of marriage status or gender.

3. Child Birth/Adoption Leave

Align university policies with the goal of a family-friendly work environment. The university child-birth/adoption leave policy should not discriminate against parents that are both employed by the university. Each parent should be able to take the full amount of leave available to employees who do not have a spouse/partner employed by the university.

4. Tuition Waivers for Family

Offer full tuition waivers for children and spouses of faculty, ideally as a policy inclusive of all schools under the umbrella of IHL.

Section 3

APPLY STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS INTO THE RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY TO PROVIDE INCREASED AVAILABILITY OF SUPPORT SERVICES

1. Graduate Student Support

Increase institutional support for graduate student stipends, which should always include full tuition waivers. Attracting strong graduate students is essential for faculty research productivity.

2. Staff Support

- a) Improve the conditions that promote staff retention at the departmental level. Good staff at the departmental level will ensure that faculty do not spend unnecessary time dealing with basic administrative tasks.
- b) Establish an award for staff excellence in organizational stewardship for creating, and sustaining, resource conditions (e.g. financial, IT, physical and capital) for faculty academic excellence.

3. Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP)

Make ORSP more responsive to the needs of the faculty by taking a more proactive role in promoting faculty research. In particular, ORSP should facilitate the creation of interdisciplinary collaboration on campus and related grant writing, which may require a realignment of the Program Development Specialists' unit assignments into clusters likely to generate collaborative interdisciplinary research.

4. Information Technology

Information about and availability of informational technology should respond better to the needs of faculty research. Especially for faculty whose departments do not offer their own tech support, it is difficult to incorporate new technologies into their research without such support.

Convene a faculty committee to provide suggestions and oversight to the informational technology needs on campus. This committee would work in tandem with the current Instructional Technology committee and endeavor to schedule annual meetings with each unit on campus to better assess the needs of the faculty.

Section 4

DEVELOP PROPOSALS TO MEET THE NONPROFESSIONAL NEEDS OF EMPLOYEES RELATED TO WORK/LIFE BALANCE (E.G., AREAS INCLUDING CHILD CARE AND ELDER CARE, DUAL CAREER SUPPORT PROGRAMS, NEWCOMER TRANSITIONS, AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS)

1. Improve Health Care and Health Insurance for Faculty and their Families

a) Subsidize the existing family insurance options to provide much needed relief on benefit payments for faculty. As established in a 2011 Faculty Senate report, family insurance options available through UM are more expensive than any other SUG institution and more than double the SUG average.

This is a major factor in faculty decisions to leave for other positions or never accept an offer.

b) Develop a partnership with UMMC to provide services to employees and their families in Oxford.

2. Expand On-campus Child Care Offerings

Provide child-care facilities above and beyond what is currently made available at the School of Education's Willie Price Lab School.

3. Improve On-campus Recreational Facilities and Wellness Programs

- a) Accelerate the renovation and expansion of the Turner Center and potential additional recreational athletic facilities (Whirlpool).
- b) Provide venues for healthy eating on campus.
- c) Improve walking trails and green spaces available to the University community.

Section 5

DEVELOP PROPOSALS TO ENHANCE DIVERSITY IN THE INTELLECTUAL ENVIRONMENT FOR FACULTY AND PROMOTE INTERDISCIPLINARITY

1. Institutional Innovation

- a) Establish additional interdisciplinary programs (e.g. nanotechnology) that have both a research and teaching identity and create additional joint professorships (joint lines) to lead these programs.
- b) Make it a central mission of ORSP to promote interdisciplinary projects while establishing joint funding to incentivize exploratory projects or research between departments.
- c) Encourage units to allow interdisciplinary courses to count toward their degree programs.

2. Faculty Crossing Disciplinary Boundaries

- a) Encourage specialists on sabbatical to develop research projects and courses that focus on interdisciplinary subjects through specific grants that would provide additional funding during the sabbatical for the generation of these projects.
- b) Develop a grant for interdisciplinary conference participation/attendance that would encourage faculty to explore how their work can contribute to the work of their peers in other disciplines.
- c) Set aside funding at the departmental level to assist faculty who wish to co-teach courses. This should be part of the regular load, not an overload.

3. Intellectual Community

- a) Develop means to disseminate information about research/creative activities of faculty throughout campus. Examples would include a university-wide poster day or online publications by ORSP such as weekly research & creativity briefs (include author, title, abstract) or semi-annual reports.
- b) Create a centrally-located faculty-only space on campus (faculty lounge), where faculty from all disciplines are encouraged to exchange ideas and develop interdisciplinary plans. The Chronicle of Higher Education suggests that informal but structurally-encouraged (i.e., through lounges, office space configurations, etc.) interactions among professional cohorts are breeding grounds for innovation.

Section 6

DEVELOP A UNIVERSITY-WIDE POLICY ON THE STATUS AND EMPLOYMENT OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The Faculty Senate recognizes that the contingent faculty on this campus play an important role in supporting the university's mission and should be provided with a clear path toward promotion. A task force should be convened to develop university and college level policies to determine the appropriate level of contribution and promote the inclusion of contingent faculty in the University.

- 1. All permanent contingent faculty should have a clear promotion ladder available within their support faculty category, as defined in the 2006 Definition of Faculty Ranks Policy.**

The university should provide clear promotion guidelines, similar to those for promotion of tenure-track faculty and support funding for these promotion lines. Contingent faculty should be rewarded with a consistent promotion ladder, leading to increased job security.

- 2. Make visiting assistant professorships more attractive by providing funding for moving expenses and conference travel.**

These visitors serve an important function in the educational mission of our University. One of the primary difficulties in attracting quality individuals, who are frequently early in their career track, is the lack of funding available for moving expenses and conference travel.