

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

5-5-2015

May 5, 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, "May 5, 2015" (2015). *Meeting Minutes*. 147.
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/147

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

May 5, 2015

The meeting of the University of Mississippi Faculty Senate was called together at 7:00 PM on May 5, 2015.

Senators in attendance: Philip Jackson; Patrick Curtis; Robert Doerksen; Brad Cook; Tossi Ikuta; Tom Garrett; Adetayo Alabi; Annette Trefzer; Yang-Chieh Fu; Oliver Dinius; Joshua Howard; Stacey Lantagne; Dennis Bunch; Susan Ivey; Jing Jing Wu; Christopher Newman; Sasha Kocic; Heather Allen; Adam Estes; Jos Milton; Laurel Lambert; Erin Holmes; Allison Bell; Breese Quinn; Ben Jones; Greg Love; David Rutherford; Desiree Stepteau-Watson; Marcos Mendoza; Minjoo Oh; Rory Ledbetter

Senators excused: Allan Bellman

Senators absent: Rachna Prakash; Charles Ross; Brice Noonan; Randy Wadkins; Feng Wang; Elliott Hutchcraft; Ben McClelland; Robert Van Ness; Darren Grem; Vanessa Gregory; Antonia Eliason; Lorri Williamson; Jessica Leming; Dwight Frink; Milam Aiken; Tejas Pandya; Valentina Iepuri; Michael Gardiner; Mary Thurlkill; Marilyn Mendolia; Mark Ortwein; Joe Sumrall

The following departments' seats were unfilled as of this date: Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Pharmaceutics

- **Call Meeting to Order**
7:00PM
- **Approval of February 10, 2015 Minutes**
Approved
- **Senate Committee Reports**
 - **Executive Committee**
 - **Update on Chancellor Search Process**

Barnett: The Executive Committee met with Dr. Borsig a few weeks ago. During that meeting, he laid out the process of the chancellor search, and I want to walk you through the steps.

1. Hiring of search firm via RFP.

2. Once the search firm is hired, they will put out a call for a Campus Search Committee (25-30 people). You can nominate as many people as you like, and I hope you will take the opportunity to nominate people. Please also let your colleagues know to keep their eyes open for the call. It extends beyond the university and out to the community, as well. I was hoping the call would have gone out before this meeting and before the semester ended, but since it hasn't, hopefully it will come soon.

3. Following that committee being named, they will meet once over the summer to establish the traits that they would like in a chancellor. That information will be shared with the search firm. Two listening sessions will then happen in August. The first will be at the Medical Center, and the following session will be held the next week in Oxford (Dr. Borsig thought it would be the week before classes begin).

I should also mention that the Board Search Committee itself is made of IHL Board members. Anyone on the IHL Board can serve. Traditionally, according to Borsig, it is made up of members from this part of the state. This is the official search committee, not the Campus Advisory Committee that I described earlier.

4. Following the listening sessions, the nominations for the next chancellor will start coming in to the search firm (the search firm will also reach out to qualified people, I imagine). Dr. Borsig thought that would begin in September, though I'm not sure if we're still on that timeline. One important thing in the bylaws that I want to emphasize is that at any point in the search process, the Board may add people without starting the search process over. This could be an area of concern. It was explained to the Executive Committee that this is a way to make sure no one that should be considered is missed. Once the candidate screening process begins, the Campus Advisory Committee will vote by secret ballot for a minimum of 5 candidates. The result of the ballot is given to the Board Search Committee, and that committee decides who will be interviewed. This is another point that we noticed- nowhere in this policy does it say that the result of the secret ballot are shared with anyone besides the Board. This could mean that the Board may interview people not picked by the campus committee, and no one outside of the Board would know this. I'm not suggesting that will happen, and we did share this concern with Borsig, who said he would share our thoughts with the Board. I also shared with him that if there was a lack of transparency, it had the potential to create an ugly situation on this campus. That's the big concern I've been hearing- lack of transparency- and we want to make sure there is more transparency moving forward.

5. After they choose who to interview, the Campus Advisory Committee will be notified who will be interviewed. Again, they will not necessarily be told who was voted via blind ballot, but who they are choosing to interview. These two could possibly differ as the current policy is written. The campus committee will then break into a smaller committee called the Interview Search Committee. This committee may participate in the remainder of the search process with the board committee, except when the board committee excuses them from session. We were told they will be there for the physical interviews, and may be asked to ask some questions. It is not clear whether their questions and the answers will be considered by the Board.

6. The Board will discuss who to have for the next round of interviews. The Board may conduct as many interviews as they wish. Again, they could enter a new candidate at any time. The Board Search Committee will decide which candidate will come to the Oxford campus and the Medical campus for a two day in-person interview. The Board will meet after the last on-campus interview, and will vote to elect or to continue the search. We asked if someone had ever not been offered the job after an on-campus interview, and Dr. Borisg was not aware that it had ever

occurred.

Brosig told me that this is typically a 9-12 month process, and he suggested that it probably meant we would have an interim chancellor. Please note that whoever acts as interim cannot be considered as the chancellor. It could be that whoever we think should be considered as the next chancellor may be asked to be interim, in which case they could not be considered in the current search. We were assured that the board wants to hire good academic credentials, and will not choose a political appointee.

The points of concern about the process that I raise here are not because I expect them to cause problems, but I share these concerns because I want us to keep a close eye on these points. Please share this with your colleagues.

C: I want to point out that though Borisg said it is not going to happen, it is possible for them to appoint a new chancellor without a search with a super majority vote.

C: Which is what they did with the most recent commissioner.

C: I expect that would not comply with SACS accreditation, which has been brought to their attention.

C: He did say on TV that they would not go through that process for the chancellor, which may carry some weight.

C: Historically speaking, the IHL has not necessary been that transparent, so I think that they will follow policy, but I wouldn't expect anything more.

Barnett: Borsig did say that the Board understands the concern about the lack of transparency, though I don't know how that will manifest itself.

Provost: Perry said the same thing to me at the April Board meeting about being transparent and conducting a search, assuring that it would not be a political appointee.

Q: How soon will the interim chancellor come aboard?

Barnett: The current chancellor's contract runs through September 14.

Provost: I'm speculating, but he may address that point at the faculty meeting this Friday.

- **Academic Affairs**

- **Update on the GradeBuddy Online Note Distribution System**
GradeBuddy.com, according to their website, "provides a platform for students to access the best study materials to help accelerate learning and increase academic success." It is a system that allows student to sell their in-class notes via an online portal to other

students. The question has been raised whether this should be considered academic misconduct and whether this represents an inappropriate use of the intellectual property of the professor.

Breese Quinn reporting: Here is the action plan that we came up with after our last meeting [document on screen]

Proposed Action Plan Regarding Student Use of GradeBuddy.com and Similar Websites

GradeBuddy.com, according to their website, “provides a platform for students to access the best study materials to help accelerate learning and increase academic success.” It is a system that allows student to sell their class notes and study guides via an online portal to other students. The question has been raised whether this should be considered academic misconduct and whether this represents an inappropriate use of the intellectual property of the professor.

The “proper” use of GradeBuddy.com consists of students creating their own original material such as course notes and study guides derived from their own in-class and out-of-class study. When the service is used in this manner, the Faculty Senate does not agree that such use constitutes academic misconduct, nor does it violate intellectual property rights of the professor since the submissions would be original material produced by the student. Therefore the Faculty Senate does not suggest adopting a University policy prohibiting the use of such services.

Uploading any course material not originally produced by the student would constitute improper use of GradeBuddy.com. This would include posting any materials produced and distributed by the course professor, even if the distribution is open and public. It would also include posting in-class notes that are essentially transcriptions of the lecture. This type of use could potentially represent illegal violations of intellectual property rights.

The Faculty Senate disapproves of using these services for three reasons.

1. Use of the service promotes detrimental academic habits such as inattention to instruction, lazy note taking, and skipping class.
2. Improper use of the service could violate the intellectual property rights of course professors.
3. It is not clear how improper use of the service could be monitored. GradeBuddy.com is a login subscription site, so there is no way to externally review uploaded material.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate asks the Office of the Provost to address the issue of student use of web services such as GradeBuddy.com with three

action items.

1. Conduct a review of legal issues surrounding use of Gradedbuddy.com and similar sites.

2. Create a webpage containing descriptions of such sites, the legal issues involved, and Faculty Senate disapproval of student use. A model for the webpage can be found at Colorado State University (<http://tilt.colostate.edu/integrity/faqs/gradebuddy.cfm>).

3. Encourage course professors to issue the following warning against improper distribution of course material in their course syllabi:

"All materials distributed electronically and in hard copy in this class are protected under intellectual copyright. Any attempt to upload these documents onto the Internet (or to distribute them by some other means) or to profit from the distribution (by Internet or other means) of these documents constitutes theft and will be in violation of intellectual property law and the UM Academic Conduct Code unless expressly permitted for by the instructor. Accessing such materials for your own use is also in violation of the UM Academic Conduct Code. Additionally, the distribution of your own class notes via the Internet or other means, or access of such materials, encourages absence from class and is highly discouraged."

Rory [Ledbetter] has tried to contact GradeBuddy in two different ways to find out how they monitor improper use, but he has received no answer. He is also working with the campus legal advisory to discuss any possible misuse.

In favor: All. 0 opposed. 0 abstentions.

○ **Academic Support**
Nothing to report.

○ **Finance**
Nothing to report.

○ **Governance**
Nothing to report.

○ **University Services**
Nothing to report.

● **Old Business**

Barnett: I would like to give some updates on resolutions that have been passed in the last year. I spoke with the Provost to ask about these this week.

The resolution calling for on-campus childcare: The Provost has asked Lee Tyner to take the lead on this. Tyner will put together a task force to review the efforts put together, and provide necessary suggestions for current policies. Tyner will be asking for people to serve on this task force, so if you are interested, please let me know.

The resolution regarding insurance benefits to same sex partners: Chancellor Jones had a conversation with Hank Bounds (then IHL commissioner, who was also on the Insurance Board), and if I recall correctly, it was a non-starter of an issue.

Provost: I talked with Jones about it today, and he thought there would be judicial actions soon and the state may be forced to take action.

The resolution regarding Fair Family Leave: This was forwarded to Clay Jones in HR. Jones said that we already follow the law as we should. He is open to any questions we may have. I would suggest we invite him here to discuss this next year.

The resolution regarding a transparent leave policy: Jones forwarded this to HR, who reported that the university does have policies. However, if the faculty wants to appoint a subcommittee with them to rewrite this, they are happy to do so. If you have interest in this, please let me know. If I don't hear from you, I suggest that the senate take up this action in the fall.

The resolution regarding a revision to the smoke-free campus policy, banning smokeless tobacco and e-cig in all in-door facilities: Jones was very enthusiastic about this resolution, and he asked that Student Affairs get support from ASB and the Staff Council. The ASB did not take the resolution forward to the ASB senate, feeling that the issue had been fully vetted in 2011. The Staff council chose not to do that without ASB support, as well. My recommendation is that since there is new administration at ASB, and we should approach them again.

Two years ago, we passed a resolution for the creation of an Office of the Ombuds. Last week, I met with three candidates for that position. There was much discussion about whether this would be a part-time staff position, a full-time staff position, or a faculty position. It is a full time staff position. I was impressed with the candidates that I met. It was definitely a national search, and my sense is that we had three exceptional candidates, and I'm excited that it's moving in this direction.

C: I would also like to include an additional update on the KPIs. There were 53 suggestions for indicators, and that feedback is being reviewed, and is being pushed to the next academic year. The first round will go to the Strategic Planning Counsel, and then we will take it from there.

- **New Business**

Barnett: The chancellor has asked that I express his appreciation to you all for the support he has had from us. He looks forward to speaking at the meeting on Friday.

Provost: I offered that he speak to the faculty on Friday, and I think he looks forward to that because of the feeling of support that he has felt from them.

Barnett: Please encourage your chairs and deans to send me the names of the new senators soon, so that we can move forward. A reminder— you are the senate until the first fall meeting. It is possible that there could be an extraordinary meeting called over the summer. We have no intention of doing that, but just be aware, until the senate convenes, you are the senate. Thanks for your work this year.

- **Adjournment:** 7:40 PM