

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

9-13-2022

September 13, 2022

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate, "September 13, 2022" (2022). *Meeting Minutes*. 231.
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/231

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.



The University of Mississippi
Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes

This meeting was held on September 13, 2022, via Zoom. Details appear at the end of the document.

Senators Present: Melissa Cinelli, Joe Sweeney, George McClellan, Heather Allen, Joseph Carlisle, Jon-Michael Wimberly, James Cizdziel, Andre Liebenberg, Brian Boutwell, Elisa Modolo, Zenebe Beyene, Sasan Nouranian, Bob Barnard, Melissa Bass, Carolyn Higdon, Matteo D'Alessio, Chad Russell, Lance Yarbrough, Brad Jones, John Lobur, John Berns, Burhanettin Keskin, Sujith Ramachandran, Scott MacKenzie, Simone Delerme, Christy Nielson, Shari Holt, Carrie Veronica Smith, Cole Stevens, Louise Arizzoli, Hans Sinha, Nadeeja Wijayatunga, Alex Watson, Gabriel Garrido, Angela Green, Annalise V. Caudle, Joshua First, Jamie Wagner, Brian Reithel, Joel Mobley, Enrique Cotelo, Randy Dale, KoFan Lee, Mandy Perryman, Kerry Bowers

- **Meeting called to order**
 - **Minutes approved from the May 3, 2022, meeting**
 - Motion
 - Second
 - Vote

Faculty Senate Chair: Welcome

- Dr. Durkin welcomed the Senators and expressed his hopes for the coming academic year. He commented that the Senate had been extremely productive last year, and he thanked everyone for their hard work, saying he expected the Senate to have much to do in the coming year.

Lila Osman, ASB Student President

60 years of Integration; submissions of letters to James Meredith

- She discussed the upcoming Celebration of 60 Years of Integration and indicated that they had extended the deadline for submitting letters to Mr. James Meredith in relation to this event from Monday the 12th until Friday, the 16th of September 2022 for the first volume.
- She indicated that there would be a second volume, and that letter submissions to Mr. Meredith will be accepted on a rolling basis going forward for inclusion in the second volume. She mentioned that the 60th Anniversary Celebration had been organized in partnership with BSU and the Graduate Student Council. She further expressed her continued willingness to work with the Faculty Senate on resolutions and any other matters that may present themselves. Ms. Osman went on to say she enjoyed working with Dr. Durkin and [ASB] Vice President Richard Springer during the past year and invited anyone on the Senate to reach out to her and/or her cabinet, the other members of the ASB.

Provost's Welcome:

- Noel Wilkin welcomed the Faculty Senate. He provided an update on this year's incoming Freshman class, which, while well over a thousand students lower than our all-time high (in Fall 2016), was still considerably higher than it has been in several years; He credited this to the University's recruitment efforts, and indicated that these are ongoing. He further commented on the University's present and future recruitment and enrollment initiatives.
- In addition, he discussed the development of new programs, which he attributed at least in part to the Strategic Planning Council and its efforts to refresh Flagship Forward and launch Empower Now, Accelerating Discovery and Growth for Success represents our key institutional priorities and provides a unifying framework that gives shape to the University's Pathways to Equity Plan that was developed by the Vice Chancellor for Diversity Community Engagement. The goal was

to use this framework to structure departmental and organizational strategic plans in those departments that haven't revised their strategic plan in the last five years. SACs accreditation require the University's strategic priorities and strategic plans to align in the University's budget. This involves asking deans and directors to structure their requests so that they align with strategic priorities. This enables the University to show alignment of the strategic plan and key priorities with the budget and operational allocations that are being made.

- He mentioned that the University has lost its strategic planning manager, and that a replacement is being sought. Katie Busby is serving in the interim.
- He indicated that he would return to the Senate to give his presentation on current enrollment data at the University, which data will be finalized by November 1st, 2022.
- Returning to the discussion of this year's freshman class, he said that the high enrollment numbers puts our housing at 97%. Not all of these numbers represent Freshmen, who must live on campus. He refuted a rumor that the University was putting students in hotels; all students, he stressed, are housed on campus in our facilities. However, he indicated that these large numbers mean that more housing must be developed in the near future, since applications are up compared to this time last year.
- He went on to discuss the search for The Dean of the School of Law; the search committee is chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School, Annette Cluck. The search for the Dean of the School of Engineering is also underway, chaired by Donna Strum, Dean of the School of Pharmacy.
- He discussed the Strategic Plan, mentioning Dr. Josh Gladden, who is putting together a task force to help the Office of Research create infrastructure to support faculty research and creative achievement.
- He reported that the main reason students come to the University of Mississippi is for good academic programs in their major. He mentioned that the University continues to receive financial support from various sources and remains at the forefront of innovative research initiatives.

Q & A

- Alex Watson asked about plans to improve and expand on housing to meet increased demand.
- Provost Wilkin responded that the University was examining necessary improvements. He mentioned the predicted enrollment cliff, a precipitous drop in enrollments at all universities from 2025-2037. From a high of 20%, more recent estimates by WHICHI indicate a 10% drop, but our institution is predicted to experience just a 6.4% drop. Many in higher education are ramping up their efforts to recruit students in the South. This drop will somewhat balance the need for large additions to housing. The freshman class this year will be over 4000 and the University is at 97% capacity.
- Jim Chase asked about Josh Gladden's efforts to add research infrastructure.
- Provost Wilkin discussed the efforts to increase research support for faculty by adding people who can help submit grants on the pre-award side and personnel to support contracts and to help manage the grants. He said that a task force would guide what other infrastructure support is needed. He suggested having Josh come and give a presentation on the resources that are being considered.

Rich Forgette: IHL Board Changes to Bylaws and Provisional Statement

- Discussed the University's efforts to address the last-minute bylaw changes the IHL made to University policies about promotion and tenure in April of 2022. He noted that all the chief academic officers found out about the changes to the bylaws the day after the session; the IHL had not discussed them in advance with the state institutions. Forgette thanked everyone who helped work on this issue over the summer and shared the statement that this task force produced.
- Pointed out the specific changes to sections 402 and 403 from the bylaws. The first changes that the IHL made removed them from the tenure approval process. In the past, the IHL had to approve the tenure list. The IHL have amended their rules so that now the Institutional Executive Officer, the Chancellor, is the final stage of our tenure review process. The next set of changes are changes to two different sections of the IHL bylaws, notably the tenure criteria, the promotion criteria, and the post-

tenure review criteria. These changes are to 402 and 404 and relate to the minimum standards for tenure.

- The IHL board added some additional minimum standards that would have to be reviewed or considered by each institution. They added the words “effectiveness, accuracy, integrity, communications,” and inserted the word “collegiality” to the next bulleted item. The third item, the “absence of malfeasance,” “inefficiency” and “contumacious conduct” were also added. They established some rules for each institution to demonstrate compliance with those minimum standards, notably that prior to recommending tenure to a faculty member, the university's faculty members, department chair, the dean and the provost must demonstrate that they have reviewed those criteria through a written certification statement. They will have to sign a written certification listing the various bulleted criteria laid out in the changes. The IHL wanted a written statement indicating that University officials reviewed the criteria, and that the candidate, if affirmed, met those criteria. Forgette indicated that over summer (2022) the Faculty Senate Working Group members came up with a provisional statement that will see us through this year, and be included on the Dean’s recommendation form for that candidate that is part of the E-dossier for tenure or promotion.
- Alex Watson’s data was very useful in constructing this statement, as it showed the language of other institutions faced with this requirement. Forgette indicated that some institutions, such as Jackson State, addressed the term collegiality in their statements. If the IHL enforces this new provision, Forgette went on, this written certification will show compliance.
- The Chair interjected that those who submitted their e-dossiers this summer did not know about or include the statement, and upon seeing it missing, the IHL indicated that the University needed to rectify the omission, indicating the IHL changes will be enforced.
- The same statement would also become part of the annual faculty review, in which a question will address whether the faculty member is meeting the standards stated in the new bylaws. This language is forthcoming.
- The Working Group tried to create a statement that complies with the IHL bylaws changes while remaining focused on professional competency, so that the criteria are to be applied to research, teaching, and service activities and not to faculty’s private activities. The benefit of having this embedded within the faculty annual review is that the faculty member will be able to get annual feedback and evaluation on these criteria prior to completing their e-dossier for tenure and promotion. If there is a problem and the chair does not click the box, there will be a dialog box that will open and the chair will have to provide documentation, a clear statement of exactly what is in violation of those standards. Forgette said he hopes to have this professional competency language approved and in place in time for this year's annual reviews.

Q & A

- John Lorber asked who would determine whether or not a violation is valid. He questioned the use of the term “collegiality,” defined as the sharing of authority among colleagues.
- Rick Forgette agreed to reflect on the comment and emphasized the effectiveness of the Working Group, those who came up with the stopgap statement. He said the most important thing was to make sure that we do right by faculty who are standing for tenure and promotion.
- The Chair added that this statement is provisional; we still need to define these terms in ways that make sense to us. The AAUP uses the term ‘professional fitness’. The working group preferred “professional competency.” We should use AAUP language because the IHL likes to rely on it. So we will work on it, because it is very important and it affects our future colleges.
- Carolyn Higdon asked whether departments were expected to review their guidelines for compliance with the statement.

- Rich Forgette indicated that that was not the intent at this time; however, some departments may need to tweak their TNP documents to reflect these minimum standards.
- George McClellan asked whether the definitions for collegiality and fitness being reviewed by the Working Group
- Rich Forgette indicated that they were.
- Chair Durkin added that other institutions were eager to borrow or use this language themselves, as uniformity across state institutions ensures compliance for all. He added that our institution is working with other state institutions so that all can have the same or similar language in their statements.
- Hans Sinha asked about the use of the term “accuracy” and asked if this was new, a product of changes to the bylaws. Forgette agreed that yes, it was a new word; he didn’t know where they got this term.
- Chair Durkin agreed that the language was problematic, but that at present we were stuck with it. He reiterated that the Faculty Senate will look at all of this language, using the information from other institutions provided by Alex Watson.
- Carrie Smith, who was a member of the working group who created the provisional statement, acknowledged the Senate’s fears and the statement’s imperfections. That is why the Faculty Activity Report will require some evidence of misconduct to invoke this language. It allows the faculty member the opportunity to respond to their chair’s charge. At least it is not a unilateral statement without evidence or an opportunity to question the accusation. She further stated that the Working Group has been very sensitive to these issues. She indicated that the language would continue to take shape with these concerns in mind.
- John Lober seconded Smith’s statement and asked how this would be adjudicated.
- Chair Durkin called attention to Robert Barnard’s comment in chat:
 - <John, and all: One key point we discussed was the need to not have these determinations made by single individuals. Since its a T&P matter, the natural thing to do would be to require collective evaluation of the criteria when the departments vote. This is not settled, but it’s on the working group’s radar....>
- Chair Durkin assured everyone that there would be multiple fail-safes in place.
- Rich Forgette mentioned that there will be a review of Tenure and Promotion cases this year. The plan is to proceed with inserting the revised recommendation forms with the certification statements into the current E- dossiers for tenure and promotion candidates, making sure that it’s done properly and consistently across all candidates, by inserting these new documents into the appropriate subfolders and extracting the old forms. For transparency, they will contact all the candidates for tenure and promotion to alert them that this form has been changed and modified so that they’re aware of the IHL bylaws changes.
- George McClellan asked whether current candidates were made aware of this change, indicating he was not. Chair Durkin and Forgette said that even though there is no paper trail, this certification complying with the bylaws can still be reasonably asserted without input from the candidate. Chair Durkin said the issue would be on the agenda for the foreseeable future, and provided an image of the form. The IHL had no issues with the form once it was inserted.
- John Lober suggested implementing an appeals process to contest the negative impact of the form.
- Provost Wilkin said in chat: <We already have one. It would be appealed in the existing process.> He indicated that this statement would be considered part of the tenure and promotion process and would therefore be under the tenure and promotion appeals guidelines that are already in place. He elaborated on the appeals process, saying that the chair of a given department doesn’t make recommendations in isolation. Rather the recommendation is based on evidence that’s been documented over time, as part of the Faculty Activity Report and the performance evaluation. From there, the bundle goes first to the dean of that school and then to the graduate dean, and finally to the provost. Each assessment would have complete visibility of the evidence that was presented and they would be able to cast their votes and then certify based on that information. If someone were denied because of this new certification, that would be part of the appeals process. It would be heard by the Tenure Promotion Appeals Committee, which is a faculty committee.
- John Lobur asked if this would apply to tenure and promotion too.

- Provost Wilkin indicated that the provost lets the candidate know before the recommendation is filed with the chancellor what the recommendation will be based on the entirety of the packet. If there are any flipped votes or contradictory votes, the provost must call a meeting and hear each side before finalizing his or her recommendation to the chancellor. The candidate has the opportunity to appeal. And then the recommendation that goes to the chancellor is the provost's recommendation, the candidate's appeal, and the vote of the faculty. So the chancellor has all of that before he ever puts his recommendation in place. He doesn't see the provost's recommendation prior to the appeal.

NTT Award Eligibility Update

- Josh Elyer gave an update on the work of the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track faculty eligibility for teaching awards. He said that two themes have emerged: One was that many schools already have eligibility for non-tenure track faculty in their awards. The other was that many colleges have developed or are developing awards for which all faculty, regardless of rank, would be eligible. They are also changing some of the eligibility for awards so that all faculty would be eligible. There was just one award that they would retain as only being eligible to tenured and tenure track faculty. For the Elsie Hood Award, the chancellor's office decided that they would not change the eligibility requirements for the current year's award. They did recommend that an additional university wide teaching award be created for non-tenure track faculty.

QEP update/ CETL 2.0

- He gave an update on the progress of the CETL (Center for Teaching and Learning) quality enhancement plan on critical thinking. It has resulted in 138 grants. The QEP, in year four of five, has provided funds to redesign 91 courses. This, in turn, has had a positive impact on thousands of students. Those faculty who redesigned their courses gave a presentation at the Fact Institute this past August (2022). Dr. Durkin asked about the next five years of the QEP. At the end of five years, Elyer continued, there will be a second incarnation of the QEP via the re-accreditation by the SEC, which happens every ten years. The QEP is the first five years of the re-accreditation cycle. So when we enter the next cycle, he said he believes that SACs will still require a QEP. So there will be more opportunities for grants, etc., then. Further, he indicated that CETL has been trying to align more closely with teaching centers and other research one universities by creating more opportunities for faculty and graduate students to utilize our programs and services. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning has been around since 2007. Since then, many of its support services have moved to other offices. So CETL crafting new ways to promote its services to faculty and graduate students. There are currently an ongoing series of workshops this academic year that faculty can engage with, most of which are run by CETL staff. CETL offers consultations to any faculty member who wants to talk about anything related to teaching and learning. It is confidential, completely outside the evaluative structures of the university. As an extension of that, they can also do classroom observations, also confidential, also non evaluative only for formative purposes. Or they can come into the classroom and watch what's happening and then meet with you and talk about it afterwards. Some people call this small group instructional diagnosis. They will come in, talk to students, ask them a set of questions, get feedback from them and can ask follow up questions. And they can also offer an analysis of student evaluations. He encouraged faculty members to use CETL to improve teaching based on evidence-based teaching practices.

Q & A

- John Lobur asked whether both awards would be given at graduation.
- Josh Elyer said the decision was made by the Chancellor's office in consultation with that committee is not correct.
- Provost Wilkin said that the Hood Award is given out at University Honors and awards night. The committee and the chancellor concurred that that there should not be a second award for non-tenure track faculty and that the Hood award would be just for tenure track faculty. He indicated his willingness to lead that effort and to develop an award with the involvement of non-tenure track faculty to make sure that the new award is commensurate with the Hood Award.
- Chair Durkin suggested that the matter be discussed again at the next meeting.

SETL 2.0 - Bob Cummings

Bob Cummings gave an update on student evaluation changes, saying the committee has arrived at a set of questions to pretest at the end of fall semester with a small group of students. They are changing the questions to move away from teaching behaviors and more directly to assess teaching and learning itself.

He shared nine Likert-style statements:

- “I learned a lot in this course.”
- “I put a lot of effort in completing this course and its assessment this semester.”
- “The learning activities, discussions, lectures, etc. in this class helped me to learn the course content.”
- “This course helped me appreciate the value of the subject matter.”
- “The assessments, papers, exams, problems, sets, etc. did a good job of measuring my learning of the course content.”
- “The feedback I received on my assessments was helpful for learning the course content.”
- “I thought feedback from the instructor was helpful.”
- “When I sought additional assistance outside of class, the instructor was available.”

There were two capstone questions:

- "Compared to other classes you've taken at this level, how challenging was this course?"
- This question has the greatest community investment. They kept superior, excellent, good, marginal. They did change the word “performance.” The previous questions were asking students to rate an instructor’s effectiveness rather than their performance.
- The first narrative question is, “What do you want your instructor to know about your experience in this class?”
- “What do you want other students to know about your experience in this class?”
- These new questions will be tested using Qualtrics in a very small pilot, next Thursday (9/22). Students will go through the regular student evaluation of teaching as well. So people who participate in this testing will be asked to surrender a few minutes or so in their final week or near the end of class time to take the Qualtrics survey. In the March meeting, they will turn it over to the Faculty Senate for a vote.

Q & A

- John Lober mentioned a useful policy at the University of Oregon that assessed whether comments were appropriate.
- Bob Cummings indicated that this was a good idea. The changes are intended to improve the entire system .
- Scott Mackenzie suggested changing the name to student evaluation of learning instead of student evaluation of teaching. Bob Cummings mentioned a discussion about switching to “course evaluations” as opposed to “student evaluations of teaching.”
- There are a lot of nuances and the aim is to balance the role of the teaching environment, so if a T.A. failed to provide feedback, it wouldn't be thrown onto the instructor. But we are managing the different formats. Managing the TAs and the roles that they might play is complex. This is an issue represented on the task force. So we're going to try to get a product that balances that.
- Joshua First asked if the new system would have stars. Bob indicated that it did not.
- Gabriel Garrido asked about the timing of evaluations. Before they do the evaluation, they already know the grade. So a student who gets a bad grade will be very negative on the evaluation. In languages, we have a separate platform that finishes early, so it's no incentive to complete an eval to get their grade early. Bob said there have been a lot of opinions about the timing and the research investigates evaluations of teaching, correlating with student expectations of grade. We are stuck with the timing because there hasn't been, a clear consensus.

- Chad Russell asked about the logic of comparing the difficulty of courses in the question "How would you rate the difficulty level of this course compared to other courses you've taken so far at Ole Miss?" Bob Cummings indicated there was a change from "difficulty" to "challenging" and the phrase, "Other courses taken so far at the university" was added. There is an implicit comparison between an introductory class versus a capstone class. The task force also changed the question about textbooks to one about course materials. There is also a set of five rotating questions. We need to develop policy about how we will rotate them every semester to focus on different issues. Those five questions will remain for the foreseeable future until we're able to clarify our reporting needs with IHL. We get a lot of data through the student evaluation of teaching.

The Chair reminded everyone that this is just a pilot. They will learn from the pilot and tweak the questions accordingly. He suggested that the research on evaluations was bleak. Bob Cummings acknowledged that faculty will never be happy with student evaluations, but best practices can make them better than they are now.

"Where We Are Lean" Survey

- The Chair mentioned that the survey was for the benefit of the Chancellor who asked us to identify areas in need of significant investment. Kerry Bowers indicated that it was very simple and open-ended on purpose. It is also anonymous. It consists of two, open-ended questions. One identifies departmental needs and the other asks for input on more global, University-wide services.
 1. "What services do you see as being most in need of funding at the University of Mississippi?" and
 2. "What specific schools and departments do you see as being in need of funding at the University?"
- Ample space below each question gives respondents room to share whatever information they would like to. All data will come back to a single account for sorting. We will align the responses in some ways with the categories that the Executive Committee previously came up with.

The Chair discussed some examples:

- The university should invest in qualitative research software.
- There should be an office within the research office that is devoted specifically to finding grants for faculty based on their interests. Dr. Boyce mentioned this initiative for research infrastructure at the faculty meeting.

Q & A

Carrie Smith suggested that many departments should accept more graduate students and generate more revenue with two faculty lines. She suggested more detail was needed in the survey.

Housekeeping

Anniversary of Integration - Shabana was not able to join the Faculty Senate for the meeting to talk about the Anniversary of Integration. She sent information that includes links to all events.

Committees - We will begin the process of committee assignments in the next couple of weeks. Committee work is part of a senator's duty. While we'd like to keep it voluntary, some senators may be assigned if they don't volunteer.

Updates

UFSAM Update

Met last week. Main topic was the IHL bylaw changes.

- Other institutions are waiting to see what we do before they follow suit
- We still do not have participation from Mississippi State.

Joint Governing Body Update

The joint governing body is the ASB, the Graduate Student Council, the Faculty Senate, and the Staff Council.

Monthly meetings will renew this year. Everybody on it is new. we're looking to really be a little more intentional. The relationship with the ASB is positive. For instance, with the non-tenure track awards, they were frustrated that they couldn't nominate their favorite teacher for some of the awards. They are the only student body that supported us in our critical race theory resolution.

COIA Update

At most institutions, Faculty Senates are members of COIA (The Council on Intercollegiate Athletics). COIA provides an opportunity for us to our athletics policies.

Grievance Policy Update

The Senate will vote on it at the next meeting, and it will be sent out ahead of time. There will be specific instructions about getting feedback from your colleagues on it. We're going to be evaluating how it works and will revisit it as necessary.

SEC Group

The President of the Faculty Senate at the University of Florida reached out to the faculty, senate, presidents and chairs in the SEC and is looking to form an SEC group. He will be meeting with the President Tuesday and will share updates at the next meeting.

Reorganizing Subcommittees

- We will be reorganizing the subcommittees and adding a parliamentarian (possibly), which will require changes to the bylaws. We will bring it to a vote. We have some idle committees we may get rid of. We may want to add some new committees. Alex has looked at what other universities are doing, not just the SEC, but across the nation to identify best practices at other institutions.

The IHL in the next year

- The governor is going to be assigning new people to the IHL.
- The legislature may try and legislate some major changes to tenure as other states have.

New Items

AAUP Summer Workshop report

- they gave advice on the language of the provisional statement addressing the IHL changes, as far as putting it under the umbrella of professional fitness or professional competence. We're also going to use their language regarding intramural and extramural utterances.
- Most of the people that attend this workshop are there because things are really bad where they are. Our administration is very supportive. A couple of our policies don't quite align with theirs, but some minor tweaks would fix this. This year we should align to AAUP standards to help protect faculty.

SEC Faculty Senate

- Chair said the president of the Faculty Senate at the University of Florida reached out to the faculty, senate, presidents and chairs in the SEC and is looking to form an SEC group. He said he was meeting with the President Tuesday and will provide updates.

The Year Ahead

- The Chair discussed the year ahead, and the plan to reorganize the subcommittees and possibly add a parliamentarian. This would involve some bylaws changes. He reassured the Faculty Senate that any changes would be put to a vote.

Committee Updates

- Dr. Durkin indicated that anyone who is interested in serving on a committee should do so. Once the committees are lined up, I'll ask them to meet and to vote on a chair. He further Indicated that there is a need for a chair for Research & Creative Achievement, as that Chair is vacant. Last year Donna as chair developed an ongoing relationship with Josh Gladden and the Research Office.
- As for the other committees:
 - *Academic Conduct (Interim Chair: John Lobur) Nothing to Report
 - *Academic Instructional Affairs (Chair: Alex Watson) Nothing to report
 - *Development & Planning (Chair: Vacant)
 - *Finance & Benefits (Chair: Joseph Carlisle) Nothing to report
 - *Governance (Chair: Carrie Smith) Nothing to Report
 - *Research & Creative Achievement (Chair: Vacant)
 - *University Services (Chair: Heather Allen) Nothing to report.

- Old Business -none
- New Business -none

The Chair made a motion to adjourn.

- Motion:
 - Second
 - Adjourned at 8:06PM

NEXT MEETING: October 11, 2022 @ 6:00 via ZOOM

Daniel Durkin is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Faculty Senate Meeting

Time: May 3, 2022 06:00 PM Central Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://olemiss.zoom.us/j/93907482236?pwd=eTh0M3lQeUNrek0zRm9SbjJVU0k2UT09>

Meeting ID: 939 0748 2236

Passcode: 778558

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,93907482236# US (Chicago)

+19292056099,,93907482236# US (New York)

Dial by your location

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

Meeting ID: 939 0748 2236

Find your local number: <https://olemiss.zoom.us/j/93907482236>