

University of Mississippi

eGrove

---

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

2-13-2018

**February 13, 2018**

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen\\_minutes](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes)

---

#### **Recommended Citation**

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate, "February 13, 2018" (2018). *Meeting Minutes*. 174.  
[https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen\\_minutes/174](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/174)

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](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

## Faculty Senate Minutes – February 13, 2018

### *Present:*

Jeff Pickerd, Patrick Alexander, Nancy Wicker, Brice Noonan, Brad Jones, Brenda Prager, Randy Watkins, Chris Mullen, Aileen Ajootian, Tossi Ikuta, Byung Jang, Lei Cao, Adam Gussow, Ethel Scurlock, Andrew Lynch, Jennifer Gifford, KoFan Lee, Zachary Kagan Guthrie, Vivian Ibrahim, Evangeline Robinson, Alysia Steele, Stacey Lantagne, Dennis Bunch, Kimberly Kaiser, Amy Gibson, Sumali Conlon, Cesar Rego, Tejas Pandya, Sarah Wellman, Stephen Fafulas, Thomas Peattie, Mary Roseman, Chalet Tan, Meagen Rosenthal, Gary Theilman, Deborah Mower, Breese Quinn, Marilyn Mendolia, Christian Sellar, Younghee Lim, Ana Velitchkova, Marcos Mendoza, Roy Thurston, Jessica Essary, Rory Ledbetter, Michael Barnett

### *Absent:*

Zia Shariat-Madar, Beth Ann Fennelly, April Holm, Antonia Eliason, Cecelia Parks, John Berns, Martial Longla, Tim Nordstrom, Mark Ortwein

- **Call Meeting to Order**
  - Called to order 6:01
- **Approval of January 23 2018 Minutes**
  - Motion made and seconded
  - All approved
- **Dr. Rich Forgette, Associate Provost & Dr. Katie Busby, Director IREP – QEP**
  - Discuss new QEP – quality enhancement plan (Critical Thinking)
  - Reaffirmation process
    - SACSCOC our accrediting body
      - Reaffirmation happens every 10 yrs. with a check in at 5 yrs.
    - Review components
      - Compliance certification report – due Sept 2018
        - Completed through a set of narratives to reviewers demonstrating compliance
      - Off-site review committee – Nov 2019

- Review certification reports and determine compliance
- Focused report
  - These are the results of the off-site review committee
  - It is normal to receive a report back with at least some non-compliance
  - We are able to prepare a response to this report
- Quality enhancement plan
  - Focus on student learning and success
- On-site review team – March 2019
  - Opportunity to interact re: off-site review
- Follow-up report
- In the midst of completing compliance certification due in September 2018
- In addition to syllabi and CVs there may be other information that is sought by this group from faculty
- On-site review will include 7 members from similar institutions outside of MS
  - Most time spent on QEP review
  - May visit off campus sites
  - 3 days (t-r)
- QEP opportunity for institution to engage in an initiative to improve student learning and success
  - This is an university wide initiative for us as an institution to get better
  - Topic: critical thinking
  - Will be implemented in lower-division courses and enhancing curricular and co-curricular experiences
  - Definition of critical thinking built around our assessment model from the University (with the intention of being able to assess it concretely in the future)
  - Two goals:
    - Faculty development – examine the best practices from other institutions and apply the successful approaches here (ex. Clemson University – summer institute)

- Modify the learning environment to promote critical thinking – will mean both physical changes to classrooms (ex. TEAL classrooms) and supplemental instruction, cohort programming and allowing students to enroll in both large and small classroom settings at the same time.
- None of the actions have been set in stone, the committee has been thoughtful about building on past successes.
- All plans will be implemented over a 5yr period
- Questions:
  - Q: How are we going assess critical thinking? And not overburden faculty with more paperwork?
    - A: What we would like to do with the assessment...is that we will need to do course specific assessment. This could be extra questions on the final exam, or a rubric. We will have to look at the classes where this makes the most sense. Will also examine what has been done in other institutions so there is the opportunity to compare across our peer intuitions. Evaluations will evolve over time.
      - F/U: This could also be part of the faculty development programming, which would allow you to have a hand in figuring out what this would best look like.
  - Q: Will this be for all faculty across the board, or just those in the lower-division classes?
    - A: It will be a little of both. Critical thinking is part of our general education and we will continue to do that. This will become more specific as assessment plans are developed.
  - Q: For those of us in physical sciences critical thinking is “baked in”, are there disciplines where this isn’t necessarily the case?
    - A: It really is in the eye of the beholder. Of course most faculty will say that they are teaching critical thinking. But as class sizes have gotten larger in the lower level classes, this has necessitated more lecturing and fewer opportunities to engage actively with the material.
  - Q: In terms of the reaffirmation of accreditation have we identified any deficiencies, if so what are they?

- A: We have noticed some, but nothing that we feel is of great concern. Ex. policy needs to be updated or to codify a procedure that needs to be a policy. We will also ask faculty representatives to review the final version of the report to get a critical review before it gets handed on for official review.
- Q: How much of an emphasis has been placed on administrative support to decrease class sizes or addressing this issue?
  - A: That's a good question. We are not quite there yet. There may be courses and programs wherein we come to that conclusion. There may be other options we need to explore moving forward.
- Q: Have you considered bringing in more critical thinking in to EDHD courses wherein students from across disciplines are brought together?
  - A: Yes we are considering that as an option
- **Committee Reports**
  - Academic Instructional Affairs
    - Nothing to report
  - Academic Conduct
    - Nothing to report
  - Finance & Benefits
    - Nothing to report
  - Development & Planning
    - Nothing to report
  - Governance
    - Nothing to report
  - Research & Creative Achievement
    - Nothing to report
  - University Services
    - Nothing to report
  - Executive Committee
    - Chancellors position on faculty raises
      - The Chancellor is planning on coming to next meeting to discuss this issue

- FAQ for Family Leave Policy section on HR page is coming –
  - Working on every Friday
  - Anticipated to be completed at the end of March
- NTT Task Force Proposal
  - Met and discussed options sent out to senate members
    - Need faculty feedback from departments before we move this discussion forward
    - 15 departments have returned comments, a further five are meeting this week
    - Brice will synthesize comments and distribute to senate members
  - Comment – I went through this exercise with faculty, and felt that it was most useful to have a definite yes or no for options. I think that will be most helpful to our next steps.
  - Question: Tenured faculty will have vote on this, yes?
    - A: Yes
      - F/U: As it is right now in my department this won't pass. Do we have alternatives?
        - F/U: We have majority support for representation right now, but the specific details have yet to be determined.
          - F/U: Is your sense of this that we need to do it this semester?
            - F/U: Yes because 66% of the senate will new in the fall
  - Question: Do you want a vote from the department?
    - A: Consensus of the majority is the goal. So that if we bring this before the whole faculty that we give the best chance of resolution.
  - Comment: Make sure to follow-up with department members. Ask chairs to get breakdowns of faculty.
  - Q: Do you want feedback from NTT and TT?
    - A: It would be good to know both of course, but the resolution is just for TT faculty.

- Comment: Based on the fact we represent our department, as long as there is memory from senator to senator, I caution against rushing this process.
  - A: I agree you are correct. But we will have time this semester.
    - F/U: I also believe that senators should use their own judgement and the benefit of the experiences of the NTT faculty presentation that other faculty do not have.
- Q: You mentioned that you could get us numbers of the kinds of faculty, does that include research faculty?
  - A: It currently includes only instructional faculty.
    - F/U: That has to be done before this discussion moves forward. We need to know where these faculty members are assigned before we can move this forward.
- Comment: One of the reasons I choose to get feedback from NTT was to bolster the task force numbers about NTT desire to be represented on faculty senate.
  - F/U: The final response from task force group on survey response was 26% and more than half sought representation.
- Q: When is the final deadline for submitting numbers?
  - A: The next executive meeting is Feb 21, please have it to Brice before that date.
- House bill 1083 – Conceal and carry legislation
  - Executive committee has been working on this issue
  - Legislation has passed the House
  - Has until Feb 26, 2018 to move to the Senate
  - We are currently waiting to see if it comes out of committee before move forward with any action

- **Old Business**
- **New Business**
- **Adjournment**

- 6:53