University of Mississippi

eGrove

Meeting Minutes — Faculty Senate

4-11-2017

April 11, 2017

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate

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

Faculty Senate Agenda – April 11, 2017 MINUTES

Senators Present: Patrick Alexander, Kris Belden-Adams, Patrick Curtis, Brice Noonan, Randy Wadkins, Chris Mullen, Aileen Ajootian, Tossi Ikuta, Feng Wang, Mark Van Boening, Alex Yakovlev, Mary Hayes, Katie McKee, Peter Reed, Mark Walker, Andrew O'Reilly, Vivian Ibrahim, Alysia Burton Steele, Debora Wenger, Stacey Lantagne, Dennis Bunch, Eric Lambert, Michelle Emanuel, Amy Gibson, Christina Torbert, Vishal Gupta, Sumali Conlon, Sandra Spiroff, Tejas Pandya, Stephen Fafulas, Sarah Wellman, Thomas Peattie, Mary Roseman, Meagen Rosenthal, Travis King, James Bos, Breese Quinn, Ben Jones, Marilyn Mendolia, Christian Sellar, Javier Boyas, Marcos Mendoza, Minjoo Oh, Roy Thurston, Rosemarry Oliphant-Ingham, William Sumrall.

- **Call Meeting to Order**
    - 6:00 pm
- **Approval of March 7, 2017 Minutes**
    - All in favor

- **The following departments need to submit names of senators for the 2017/18 year**

    Chemistry & Biochemistry, Civil Engineering, Communication Sciences & Disorders, Economics, Finance, History, Journalism, Library, Management, Marketing, Mathematics, Music, Pharmacy Administration, Public Policy Leadership, Teacher Education, Writing & Rhetoric.

- **Dr. Donald Cole –** Assistant Provost and Co-Chair of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on History and Context will provide an update of the ongoing contextualization process.
    - Refer to attached document
    - Article referring to the Yale renaming principles: http://news.yale.edu/2016/12/02/report-outlines-principles-renaming-campus-buildings
    - Questions:
        - Q: Can you speak to the rational behind renaming two sites and contextualizing the rest?
        - A: The Yale principles start off with the assumption that no building should be renamed, and then you move to whether or not the name contributed greatly to the university and through a number of other steps.

With respect to that particular person the committee felt that they crossed a line deeming it possible to rename the building.

- A: In particular, Vardaman was exceptional for his open virulence and racism even for his time. Johnson Commons (Jr) took an active role in resisting integration in 1962, hence the need to specify Johnson Commons "Sr".

- Q: The process of contextualization, will it be the same as it was previously?
- A: The initial timeframe was to have all of this completed by March 2017. The new timeline is May 31, 2017. The committee is currently in the process of writing the text for the contextualizations, they will first present it to the Chancellor. The committees' recommendation is that once he is happy with it, that it will be shared.

  - Q: Will there be an opportunity for people from the community to take part?
  - A: We have had a number of listening sessions inviting community members to take part in identifying buildings, with the wording, etc. We will recommend doing the same thing this time.
    - o A: The committee reports to the Chancellor first, and they will strongly recommend that the text be disseminated first before it is codified.

- Q: Is your committee making a recommendation around what the contextualization looks like?
- A: The committee has feelings about what the format of the contextualizations look like, but they haven't formally come to that part of the discussion yet.

  - A: The charge from the Chancellor includes making recommendations on the format of the contextualizations

- Q: Is there not already a plaque at the Hilgard cut to stating its background?
- A: Yes there is a plaque, but the proposed contextualization for that area would refer to three buildings in that area at the same time
- Comment: As we move through May I would appreciate for the Senate to think about the function of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on History and Context Committee. The Chancellor has made clear that the work of the committee is important, but it is unclear whether or not it will continue to exist after May 31. I would like the Senate to consider the

value of the work that this group has done, and consider passing a resolution for its continued existence if it is disbanded.

- **Dr. Will Berry (Law) – Chair of Academic Discipline Committee**
  - Proposed changes to M Book and guidance on sanctions for academic dishonesty
  - Overview:
    - If a student in your class cheats you should file a case
      - Why? Because we want to know if the student is doing it a lot
    - File your case on myolemiss and outline how they cheated
      - MUST attach all supporting documentation re: cheating (it's very important that you attach your syllabus outlining what happens if students cheat in class)
    - Meet with the student before you officially file the case
    - Once the case is filed the student has 14 days to file an appeal
      - If they don't appeal the case is over
      - If they do appeal the committee meets to decide whether or not the student cheated (based on preponderance of evidence)
      - If the committee decides that the student cheated then they review the sanction (faculty members and departments have final say over sanctions)
  - The committee has provided a clearer definition re: academic probation – it is warning that goes on the student's internal file
  - See pg. 8-11 of this document for some suggestions on various sanctions
    - It is intended as a framework to help faculty make decisions and offer some consistency across campus
  - Addition to M book
    - See pg. 12 of this document highlighted section
    - Stemmed from a circumstance of students not in the class taking exams for students in the class – happened 3 times in the fall
      - Solution – the Dean of the department of the student taking the test will submit a case and decide how to deal with the offending student
        - Faculty member can not sanction a student that is not in their class
      - Added a sentence to the M-book outlining the above solution, so that students can be made aware of the consequences of this choice

- - Would like the Senate to approve and vote on the language
  - o There have been about 125 cases of cheating/academic dishonesty reported this year; about 25% of cases are appealed. Many of the overturned cases are based on faculty not meeting with the student before the case was filed or not providing adequate evidence of cheating.
  - o Questions:
    - ▪ Q: I've had a few colleagues that have been discouraged by interactions with the committee in the past. Do you have any statistics on the number of cases that are overturned by the committee?
    - ▪ A: I only have knowledge since July 1 when I took over the committee – to my knowledge it is only 1-2% of cases. Most of the time overturns are based on lack of evidence – not the degree of the punishment.
    - ▪ Q: In a lot of these cases evidence of cheating is on the cellphone, what do you do?
    - ▪ A: That is a more complicated question. But you can make a policy in your class that if you take out a cell phone during the test it is considered cheating.
    - ▪ Q: Is it just the substantiating enough to say that you as the faculty member to say you saw a student taking out their phone?
    - ▪ A: The committee will believe you, if that's what happens.
    - ▪ Q: I was on the committee for a while, and an observation I had was that adjunct faculty and graduate instructors may not feel comfortable going before the committee with these issues. Can we provide extra support to them around this issue?
    - ▪ A: Yes, we are putting something together for the fall for those groups.
    - ▪ Q: What is the makeup of the committee?
    - ▪ A: 10 voting members: 1 UG, 1 GS, and 8 faculty members, and 1 member from student disability services
    - ▪ Q: Students in my class are scanning each other in using the new attendance scanning system. Has the committee thought about moving to finger-print scanning?
    - ▪ A: That's a question for the Lyceum. But you could not use the scanner, or take attendance by hand occasionally as extra incentive.
    - ▪ Comment: The Greek societies are a big part of the University. I have observed potentially more behavior problems with Greek students. Is there any way to take this back to them to self-police.

- One way to address some of these issues is to make the consequences more serious and consistent across the campus
  - Q: Would your committee be putting out any summary report re: the state of academic dishonesty on campus?
  - A: I don't think we have done that in the past, but we certainly could moving forward.
    - Response: I think that having a report would show faculty what they are doing and perhaps overcome some of the previous concerns
  - Q: In the cases with respect to the addition to the M-book, is it the faculty or the committee making the sanction?
  - A: It is not within out prevue as the committee to administer the sanction. But we can make recommendations. I will clarify the language within the additional sentence.
  - Q: Language – What are the responsibilities of the faculty member in the class where the student took the test?
  - A: The idea would be that the faculty member would either let the student's Dean know, or let me (Dr. Berry) know.
- **Dr. Patrick Curtis (Biology) – Chair of Research & Creative Achievement Committee**
  - Solicitation of recommendations for Senate resolution to recommend change/augmentation of ORSP assistance.
  - Disseminate list to faculty for feedback – changes or new ideas
    - Order is based on perceived importance and feasibility
  - See pg. 13-14 of this document for details
  - Email Patrick Curtis (pdcurtis@olemiss.edu)
  - Questions:
    - Q: Some of the problems we have are with big-ticket items. Is there any plan on engaging with the Foundation, and alumni, to plead with donors about infrastructure donations?
    - A: That is not something that we had considered, but we could make it a point.
    - Comment: The ORSP has a program called "faculty fellows", to provide mentorship for grant writing. I would like a reworking of the recommendation to account for the fact that the faculty fellows program currently exists.

- Q: Have you had any conversations with the office of research?
- A: Jason Hale was at the research momentum meeting
  - Comment: I would recommend that you get in touch with Office of Research to make sure that they are not blindsided
  - Response: They have been made aware, but before we showed them this document to them we wanted to get full faculty feedback

- **Committee Reports**
  - Academic Instructional Affairs
    - Nothing to report
  - Academic Conduct
    - Nothing to report
  - Finance & Benefits
    - Nothing to report
  - Development & Planning
    - Nothing to report
  - Governance
    - Just waiting on the consensual relationship policy document to be circulated and brought back as a final document
  - Research & Creative Achievement
    - Nothing to report
  - University Services
    - Nothing to report

- **Old Business**
  - **Tenure Dossier:** Discussion of possible modification of T&P policy.
    - See attached for details
    - Proposed adding language UM supports AUUPE language regarding who is qualified (and should be) making evaluations of a faculty members academic and scholarly work
    - Proposed adding language that all "relevant" information and documentation will be forwarded to the committee to ensure that they have all of the information need to assess whether or not procedures were appropriately followed in the tenure and promotion process

- ▪ Questions:
  - • Q: What is the context for these changes?
  - • A: We had an informal policy in place that moved dossiers up without content. However, that did not match with our own actual policies. Hence the discussion, and the clarifications added to the document.
  - • Comments: Some of this grew out of the fact that we had three different formats for dossiers depending on where they were coming from (one for each of the different faculty/research staff members). We opted to make one format for the dossier, and then create a checklist for each of the different kinds of faculty/staff.
  - • Q: Are these procedural changes, or are these just clarifying the document?
  - • A: These are just clarifications. We tried to fiddle with things re: procedures, but they were just too complicated and troublesome.
  - ▪ Email Peter Reed (preed@olemiss.edu) with ideas or suggestions
  - ▪ Will come forward for a vote in May meeting
- • **New Business**
  - o Provost search: submit nominations to Laurie Wilder (Lwilder@parkersearch.com)
  - o HERI Faculty Survey – Encourage participation (this is to provide the administration information about the faculty experience)
    - ▪ Available until April 15, 2017
    - ▪ All data goes to UCLA and no analysis is completed on campus

- • **Adjournment**
  - o 7:41

University of Mississippi Academic Discipline Committee

Guidelines for Sanctioning Academic Misconduct

Under the academic discipline system adopted by the University, the faculty member chooses the appropriate punishment for academic misconduct in the first instance. If the student appeals the imposition of that sanction to the Academic Discipline Committee, the Committee reviews the sanction imposed by the faculty member under an abuse of discretion standard. That standard means that the Committee shows some deference to the penalty imposed by the faculty member, increasing it or decreasing it only where it deems that the faculty member abused discretion in imposing the punishment.

In cases where a student has a prior offense, the Academic Dean of the student's department can elect to increase the sanction after the case becomes final (because the student did not appeal or because the Academic Discipline Committee made its decision).

The available sanctions include:

Reduced Grade on Assignment

Failure on Assignment

Repeat Assignment

Probation

Reduced Grade in course

Failure in course

Suspension

Expulsion

The sanction of probation has been the source of confusion for some faculty members. What probation does is simply warn the student against further acts of misconduct. The best way to think of probation, then, is just as a warning. With a probation sanction, there is an internal notation in the student's file available to the Dean (but not other faculty), which

can serve as a basis for aggravating the sanction in a future case involving the same student. There is no external notation that a student is on academic probation. Unless otherwise specified, students remain on academic probation until they graduate.

In determining a sanction for a particular offense of academic misconduct, faculty members generally have discretion, but should make sure to be aware of any applicable department policies with respect to certain kinds of academic misconduct. Some departments adopt policies with respect to the appropriate punishment for certain kinds of misconduct.

In light of the discretion that individual faculty members specifically and departments more generally have to fashion sanctions for academic misconduct, the Committee has determined that providing some guidance would be helpful, particularly in light of past cases. The below chart is non-binding and does not impair the discretion of faculty members or departments in any way. Instead, it offers a framework designed to promote a level of consistency in sanctions across departments. We hope that it will prove helpful to faculty and departments alike.

Suggested Sanctions for Academic Misconduct

Kind of Misconduct	Sanction
Cheating on Homework Assignment • Copying / sharing answers • Impermissible collaboration Falsifying Attendance (1st offense) Plagiarism • Inadvertent failure to cite sources	Failure on assignment / Repeat assignment / Reduced grade in course / Reduced grade on assignment
Cheating on an Examination • Copying answers • Using a cell phone • Providing answers to other students Falsifying Attendance (2nd offense) Plagiarism • All other forms of plagiarism	Failure in course
Any form of cheating where the student manifests a clear intent to commit academic misconduct	Probation (can be in addition to failure on assignment and/or failure in course)
Having another student take an examination on your behalf	Suspension

Taking an examination on behalf of another student	
Repeat offenders	
Repeat offenders or cases involving systemic cheating	Expulsion

Proposed addition to the M Book, page 6 (new language is in **bold**)

Initiation of Case and Notification to Student In the event that a) a sanction beyond probation (see the list of possible sanctions) has been appealed by a student, b) the appeal has not yet been resolved, and c) it is the period for course grade reporting, an instructor should submit an I (incomplete) course grade. The Registrar's Office will contact the instructor to finalize the course grade after the case has been finalized. If the student does not appeal a sanction or if an appeal has been resolved before the grade reporting period, the instructor should submit a course grade that includes the upheld or non-appealed sanction.

If the alleged violation occurred outside of the structure of a course, e.g., comprehensive exams, the appropriate faculty member, or program, department, or college/school official, shall initiate the case within the myOleMiss system by accessing Students > Academic Discipline > Initiate Academic Discipline Case.

A similar situation arises in cases where one student takes an examination on behalf of another student but is not a member of the class in question. In such a situation, the Dean or the appropriate college / school official of the department or academic unit of the student improperly taking the examination shall file an academic discipline case against the test-taking student.

Initiating an academic discipline case requires the person initiating the case to provide a written report of the alleged incident, including information regarding the communications with the student described above, as well as indicate the recommended sanction. The faculty member also is asked to indicate whether the student accepted the sanction. If there are documents related to the case, the system provides the faculty member with directions on how to upload those documents, and such uploaded documents become a part of the case that is accessible online through the myOleMiss portal.

Suggestions from the Faculty Senate Committee on Research and Creative Achievement to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to stimulate research productivity.

Faculty research is a fundamental part of higher education, ensuring that individual faculty members are on the cutting edge of their chosen fields while also providing an important framework for training students in critical thinking. The greatest impediments to research productivity for faculty have been time and money. Given the faculty's considerable teaching and service responsibilities there is often little time to initiate new research projects and seek new funding opportunities. This is further exacerbated by that fact that research is often a monetarily and labor intensive process. However, the faculty recognize that ORSP can neither control the teaching responsibilities of faculty nor provide significant financial support. Therefore, the Faculty Senate Committee on Research and Creative Achievement (with input from the Faculty Senate, as well as the faculty at large), have compiled a list of suggestions that the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs might consider in order to help support increased research productivity amongst University of Mississippi faculty.

Greater ORSP knowledge of research projects in the University. The faculty recognize that it is difficult for the ORSP to have an in-depth knowledge of all the ongoing research projects at the University. However, there are benefits to be had for a more knowledgeable office. An office with a more global understanding of University research may be able to provide connections between different researchers or programs, and suggest collaborations. This has the potential to make feasible a wider range of research projects and/or increase the effectiveness of Broader Impacts activities. An office with a more detailed knowledge of the research support needs of the University of Mississippi faculty, as well as a more comprehensive understanding of discipline-specific aspects of grants and granting agencies would also help streamline the grant submission process.

Greater ORSP involvement in finding alternative funding sources. As federal funding becomes increasingly difficult to obtain, researchers are forced to seek out smaller or more non-traditional funding sources. However, finding these sources often proves to be difficult. Faculty requesting help from ORSP to find new funding sources are frequently directed towards Pivot. Most faculty, however have found Pivot to be of limited help. A greater ORSP staff knowledge of University research projects may allow them to connect new funding opportunities to researchers in the faculty.

Restructure and increase the ORSP travel stipend. Many faculty members find the application process for the ORSP travel stipend to be cumbersome, and the amount of the award hardly substantial. As the ORSP well knows, travel is often an integral part of the research process, from presenting findings at conferences and meeting with collaborators to discussing research with granting agency officials. The difficulty of the application process combined with the small amount make applying for the travel grant very dissuasive. The faculty recommend ORSP streamline the application process and offer a modest increase in the stipends awarded.

Strengthen and increase the visibility for the Investment Grants Program. In 2015/16 ORSP developed a small grants program (Investment Grants Program) that provided several grants between $2500 and $10000 to University researchers. Most faculty agree that these small grants play an important role in supporting new research. Indeed, such funds can often be used to support the preliminary research necessary to develop larger successful grant proposals, or even support entire research projects. However, it was discovered that many faculty did not know this program existed. While the faculty recognized that the initial testing of this program was done quietly in order to keep the application pool

manageable, the faculty feel this program could be of considerable benefit and would like to see it both strengthened and more widely advertised.

Foster grant mentorship within the University. It is clearly not feasible for ORSP to offer one-on-one grant mentorship activities as research in the University is so diverse. However, there is currently no impetus for grant mentorship, at least not at the University level. ORSP may be able to institute a grant mentorship reward program to induce individual departments to improve grant mentorship. For example, departments might be encouraged to count such mentorship as a service activity.

Greater awareness of grant deadlines. Many departments have disciplines that share major deadlines, where multiple faculty are trying to submit grants at the same time. ORSP review and approval is a necessary step in the grant submission process. While the faculty recognize we do not have the right to dictate the lives of ORSP staff members, there are cases when ORSP staff will take vacations around the times of deadlines for granting agencies. In an already strained situation, a critical ORSP staff member leaving for vacation creates chaos, and can inhibit the grant submission process. Greater awareness of grant deadlines and more communication with impacted faculty would help.

Work with departments to provide greater flexibility in activities. While a total teaching load reduction is not a feasible request, allowing a professor to redistribute their course load to provide more free time during grant writing months would provide a substantial boon.

Seek potential funding sources from the private sector. Specific corporate sponsorship and branding provides a substantial amount of funds to athletics. Is it possible that corporations could sponsor research within the University?

Investigate the introduction of a Fall Break. While clearly beyond the purview of ORSP alone, the faculty recommend investigating the introduction of a small University holiday in October (a Fall Break). Aside from the usefulness in providing life balance and scheduling more in line with other local schools, this break could provide a benefit to research activities. Some grant deadlines and/or conferences occur around this time of year, so the extra days off would foster greater participation.

Provide greater recognition and promotion of Arts and Humanities research. All research within the University is important. However, research within Arts and Humanities disciplines is sometimes overlooked, or in extreme cases ignored. While Arts and Humanities grants may not necessarily provide the same level of financial benefit as Science grants, Arts and Humanities research provides several boons to the University. This includes increasing interest in University enrollment, productivity that impacts various aspects of society, and directly impacting Carnegie classification by training PhD students. The ORSP could help foster a more inclusive research environment by finding ways to recognize and promote research from Arts and Humanities disciplines.