

**ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE  
UNCORRECTED MINUTES OF MEETING ON NOVEMBER 11, 2005**

The Robert Holland Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University held its regular meeting in the Grisham Room of the Mitchell Memorial Library at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, November 11, 2005.

**Excused**

Carolyn Adams-Price, Paul Allen, Michael Berk, Kent Coffey, Allen Greenwood, James Martin, PC McLaurin, Al Myles, Peter Ryan, Juan Silva, Paul Thaxton, and Chien Yu

**Unexcused**

Bill Hardin and Jon David Cole

The meeting was broadcast real-time over the World Wide Web. The file will be left active for a few weeks and can be reviewed by clicking on the Senate homepage at <http://www.facultysenate.msstate.edu>.

President Mark Goodman called the meeting to order.

President Goodman referred to the minutes of the October 14, 2005, Regular Meeting as distributed. Senator Wolverton moved, Senator Chamblee seconded, that the Robert Holland Faculty Senate approve the minutes of October 14, 2005 with corrections. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

**GUESTS**

President Goodman introduced guests: Dr. Peter Rabideau, Provost; Dr. Colin Scanes, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies; and Dr. Kirk Schultz, Dean of the College of Engineering.

**PETER RABIDEAU, PROVOST**

Provost Rabideau provided the following information:

- *Teaching and Learning.* He presented a PowerPoint presentation to discuss his commitment to learning, service, and research through the Center for Teaching and Learning which will be a joint support effort between his office, ITS and the MSU library. Rabideau outlined a number of activities that have lead to growth in the University's commitment to teaching and learning.
  - He provided an organizational chart for the Center to provide support and advise faculty. Potential activities include:
    - Provide teaching incentive grants and awards to faculty for innovative practices; advise him and his office on related activities; seek external funds for improvement of teaching and learning activities; coordinate the learning communities; provide new faculty orientation, and technical training

- (coordinated by ITS and the library); sponsor lectures, seminars, colloquia, and other activities (e.g., annual teaching retreat); provide a resource room for faculty access; launch a website teaching “toolkit” with links to websites (similar to that developed by North Carolina State University); provide faculty consultation (i.e., P&T progress, improvement of teaching); and video taping to facilitate pod casting and other tools for teaching.
- He has appointed Dr. Matt Raven to direct the Center, plus a part time associate director and others. He stated that he is using a number of rooms across campus for activities.
- He hopes to raise a significant amount of money (\$1 million) for an endowment for this endeavor.
- *Departmental Performance Evaluation.* Rabideau stated he has met with the department heads about the development of performance objectives by each department head and stated that they, in turn, will be talking with the faculty about these plans.
- Rabideau reiterated his desire to talk with any department at its invitation.
- Questions posed to Dr. Rabideau:
  - Senator Millea asked about department performance standards evaluation in rating departments. Specifically, will comparison be within department or across colleges/university. Rabideau responded that he recognizes differences between and within colleges and he expects departments to craft their own standards with intent to assist departments in identification of problems and strengths.
  - Senator Wood asked about a timeline to implement the evaluations. Rabideau responded that he did not have a pat answer. He indicated that the University operates on an annual calendar and that grants are based on a fiscal calendar. When asked when the first performance review would begin, Rabideau responded that in the spring he will meet with the Deans and a timeline will be developed.
  - President Goodman requested that Rabideau return and present details when developed. Rabideau agreed.
  - Senator Wood asked if there would be some corrective action taken to address inadequate performance. Rabideau stated that there would be some corrective actions taken but issues such as the centrality of a unit might be a beginning place.
  - Senator Byrd asked about the involvement of ITS in the new proposed Center. Rabideau responded that Matt Raven’s CV and credentials were appropriate and that there will be a focus on teaching support.
  - Senator Millea asked about external reviews of programs who have recently received accreditation from their professional associations. Rabideau responded that there have been many reviews completed. He responded to a question about the cost of the reviews, stating that he believed the cost for a review was around \$5000.

## **COLIN SCANES, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES**

Dr. Scanes provided the following information:

- *Role at the University.* Scanes stated he perceived his office and his role within the University, to be to improve research through academic integrity, economic development, and improved quality of life for Mississippians. As such, he provided the following information:
  - Increase productivity (e.g., number of Ph.D.s students, competitive grants, publications, awards, intellectual property, and spin off companies). He stated that for every \$1 million brought to the University there is a corresponding 30 jobs created in the community.
  - With regard to legislative funding, Washington has been very helpful; but we will not always be in that fortunate position. He stated that post-Katrina, things continue to be unsure, but that the atmosphere is one of support and positive expectations. He briefly discussed the prioritization and allocation of available funding and expressed concern regarding the University's future energy costs.
- He outlined the following progress:
  - Increases in number of doctoral students and the number of graduates.
  - Progress in research expenditures and reputation in research.
  - Growth in economic development including six partner companies, four spin off companies, and the need for more space in the Research Park.
- The following questions were posed to Dr. Scanes:
  - President Goodman asked about a research incentive program discussed in a recent Dean's Council. Scanes indicated that at other universities reward programs had created legal difficulties, but if the award was tied to other activities (e.g., publications, books, grants, patents, finished doctoral degrees, professional awards) with a scoring procedure, it might be successful. He stated that he has received a letter of support from the distinguished professors, but they also expressed concerns that will require future meetings. He proposed that a percent of overhead (e.g., \$5,000 – \$20, 000) as a one-time incentive. He indicated a good place to start is a list of faculty who might have received an award (~9) in the past. Goodman asked that Scanes provide future updates during his regular Senate visits. Scanes cautioned that there is much to work out with such a program.
  - Senator Diehl asked about the budget cuts and the expectations for greater productivity. She stated that not only new, but also mid-level (i.e., those who have worked for 10 years at MSU), faculty are leaving. This has created a spiral such that faculty are increasingly required to do more with less. She expressed concern about the call for greater accomplishment and scrutiny of departments, individuals, and post tenure review given these events. Department heads are placing the expectation for more at the faculty level and that the reward program would not provide incentives for mid-level faculty. Scanes acknowledged the importance of faculty morale and referred to letters sent by other faculty. He stated that faculty compensation is a priority of the administration. Scanes also acknowledged significant problems within some departments, but encouraged

- faculty to be positive and to work together. He stated that this is a serious issue and “is a cautionary note for the administration”.
- Senator D’Abramo stated that Senator Diehl described a “state of emergency” that needs to be communicated to IHL and the legislature. Scanes responded that a recent study revealed that an approximate 50% funding increase was needed to bring the University up to the SEC average. Scanes stated the approach that all the universities in the state are equal is not appropriate given that the University is aspiring to compete regionally and nationally, whereas others were competing at the state level. He also stated that following the recent hurricanes, there is greater potential for faculty to look elsewhere. To address this, he stated that the University has taken great steps to assist employees living in the effected areas.
  - Senator Travis asked about the “disconnect” with the middle 60% of the faculty and the expectation for behavior consistent with higher ranked schools while faculty are paid at the level of lesser schools. Scanes responded with a call for optimism and the need to “set the bar high”.
  - Senator Deeds referred to the impact of the recent departmental productivity evaluation on faculty moral and stated this might be an appropriate topic for a future retreat. She indicated that he may not be the appropriate one to hear the concerns of the Senators on the issues. Scanes stated concerns also include compensation of staff and graduate students. Scanes encouraged the departments to use the evaluations to monitor performance and to determine deficiencies and strengths.
  - Senator Smyer asked about similar evaluations of administrators and asked about external review in this process. Scanes stated that administrators are evaluated by Dr. Lee using clear, measurable, and rigorous criteria with input from across campus and other stakeholders (state, business, labor).

## **DR. KIRK SCHULTZ, DEAN OF THE JAMES WORTH BAGLEY COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

Dr. Schultz, appointed from Chemical Engineering as Dean of the College in January 2005, provided the following information concerning the College of Engineering:

- General College demographics:
  - 1800 undergraduate students (50<sup>th</sup> largest in U.S.), 183 doctoral and 216 masters’ students, and 108 tenure-track faculty members.
  - Funding is predominately soft money. College ranks in the top 10% in research expenditures (24<sup>th</sup> in nation) and ranked 77<sup>th</sup> of the top 150 programs according to *U.S. World and News*.
- He outlined four key aspects to his college’s agenda:
  - *Faculty Recruitment/Retention* – the College provides \$150,000 to \$200,000 as a new faculty start-up package. College has an Academy of Fellows and also has a number of Endowed Professorships with \$150,000 to \$250,000 supplemental and discretionary funds. They offer a variety of activities to applaud work (e.g., reception for new textbook authors).

- *Doctoral student recruitment* – change in focus from a masters to doctoral level environment. For those students who are funded by faculty grants, if the grant lapses for faculty with an active track record of external funding, the college attempts to offer support to those students.
- *African-American student recruitment* – obligation to provide opportunity to our state and the individuals within the state.
- *Increase national recognition* – they bring professionals and other faculty to campus to showcase their programs and the University. Have engineering professionals guest speak at functions.
- Schultz indicated the point is to be creative in finding activities to offer incentives to deserving internal faculty such as support and supplementary funding to offset the lack of pay increases.
- The following question was posed to Dr. Schultz:
  - Senator D’Abramo requested that Dean Schultz make the same presentation to the other deans at the University.

### **DR. JOHN FORD, COMMUNICATION DEPARTMENT HEAD**

Dr. Ford requested to present on the proposed Instructional Faculty Policy. He provided the following information:

- Dr. Ford indicated that he continues to receive support from department heads and faculty across campus. He indicated that several people have also come to answer questions if needed.
- He outlined the letters in the Senators’ packet.
- He indicated that the issues addressed in his previous statements about the policy, are inline with the previous speakers of the day.
- He stated that he thought an AOP would be necessary following acceptance of the policy.
- The following questions were posed to Dr. Ford:
  - A question was posed from the floor regarding the honoring of academia and Ph.D.s. Ford responded that his department is akin to a professional school with a need to find doctoral-level individuals with practioner experience, adding that it is important for his newly hired faculty to focus on teaching and research activities. He described recent growth in his department as mainly service to other programs.
  - Senator Nagel asked about the service requirements of the large number of university instructors (20%) and the fact that the policy would address this issue. Dr. Ford responded that there needs to be flexibility for others to serve the department and the university. He stated that the policy is demeaning to the effected individuals. Senator Nagel clarified the call for clear distinction between tenured and non-tenured faculty came from IHL via the Provost, not from Senate leaders.
  - Senator Deeds asked a Point of Information: Had there been a decision to take the motion off the table and is there a reason to continue to hear from individuals about this issue? Goodman responded that Dr. Ford had requested to speak

and he was here to speak. Ford responded that there were issues and statements to which he wanted to respond.

### **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

President Goodman gave the following report:

- Goodman stated that he would let the packet provided in the agenda speak for itself and added nothing to his report.

### **REPORT OF THE VICE PRESIDENT**

Vice President Wood gave the following report:

- With regard to Winter Intersession, it appeared to be less successful than hoped, but that the administration would likely look into a May Intersession.
- The new Faculty Performance Awards program mentioned by Dr. Scanes would be geared solely toward faculty who are generating significant funds and overheads. The cash awards will include two-thirds donated from the individual's own department. This would not work for faculty who are not generating significant funds. Wood stated he does not know if an individual would be able to earn enough points to obtain one of these awards in the absence of the generation of external funds.
- With regard to departmental performance evaluations, he reiterated the areas that will be evaluated within departments. He stated that there would be three levels: exceptional, as expected, and under performing.
- With regard to post tenure review clarification, Wood stated Dr. Rabideau expressed interest in assisting with the process.

### **REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE DESIGNATES ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES**

**Benefits Committee** – Senator Myles, although not able to attend, provided a handout of the September 21, 2005 committee meeting minutes. President Goodman referred to the handout and stated that the Faculty Senate still has not been successful in obtaining someone to talk about employee benefits at a future senate meeting.

### **BUSINESS SENT TO COMMITTEES**

None.

## **BUSINESS TO BE SENT TO COMMITTEES**

**Letter from Dr. Meghan Millea, re: Trailing Spouse Incentive** - Senator Wolverton moved, Senator Deeds seconded, to refer this issue to committee. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote. President Goodman assigned this issue to University Resources.

**Letter from Dr. Walter Diehl, re: University Mission Statement** – Goodman referred to the letter. No motion was provided.

## **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Senator Bridges, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, referred to this Committee's report on AOP 12.01 – Academic Add/Drop Policy. He stated that this was an AOP that was sent to both his and another committee and that he wished to withdraw his report on this topic at this time.

Senator Bridges, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, referred to this Committee's report on AOP 12.23 – Cooperative Education Program. Senator Bridges moved, Senator Wolverton seconded, that the Robert Holland Faculty Senate approve AOP 12.23 as revised by the Deans Council, Associate Deans Council, and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of the Senate.

### **ANCILLARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

No report.

### **CHARTER AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE**

No report.

### **FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Senator Jacquin, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, referred to this Committee's report on the Post Tenure Review Policy. Senator Jacquin moved, Senator Woods seconded, that the Robert Holland Faculty Senate send this to an Ad Hoc Committee to be chaired by Peter Wood. Goodman provided an update on this issue, stating that some faculty in Arts and Sciences had been requested by their dean to create a Post Tenure Review document.

The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of the Senate to send the issue to an Ad Hoc Committee. Dr. Wood agreed to chair the committee.

## **STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Senator Hogue, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, referred to this Committee's report on International Faculty that the issue has been addressed and the faculty involved are satisfied with the actions taken and a response was provided by the Office of Human Resources. This issue arose due to changes in federal policy addressing Homeland Security. The issue has been closed.

Senator Hogue then referred to this Committee's report on AOP 13.04 – Attendance at Classes. Senator Hogue moved, Senator D'Abramo seconded, that the Robert Holland Faculty Senate accept AOP 13.04 as modified by the Student Affairs Committee.

The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of the Senate.

## **UNIVERSITY RESOURCES**

No report.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Non-Tenure Track Research and Extension Faculty Policies Recommendation**

Goodman yielded the chair to Vice President Wood, who called on Goodman to report on behalf of the Ad Hoc committee regarding the status of the of the Research/Clinic/Extension Faculty Promotion Policy. Goodman reminded the Senate that this policy had been moved on and seconded at the previous meeting. Goodman provided a background on the policy and the foundation for the need for the policy. He stated that changes focus on the issue of those who are turned down for promotion can ultimately appeal to University Promotion and Tenure Committee. He stated that new language reflects input from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Senator Bridges moved and Senator Chamblee seconded to approve the changes formulated by the Committee.

The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of the Senate.

Senator Dunaway moved, seconded by Senator Montgomery, to accept the entire resolution.

Senator D'Abramo moved, Senator Wolverton seconded, to allow 10 minutes for Dr. Laurie Grace, College of Forest Resources, to address the Senate on this issue.

- Dr. Grace stated she was speaking on behalf of DAFVM Senate:
  - Speaking from experience with working for multiple bosses and recently going through the promotion process, Grace indicated this proposed policy would



create difficulty for those with split appointments. The policy would create college-level committee difficulties, most notably for those with a second assignment to extension. The difficulty is not at the department level, but at the “next level up”.

- Grace identified the creation of a second timeline for promotion material submission: November 15<sup>th</sup> and November 1<sup>st</sup>.
  - She stated it is uncertain to which vice president the letter of recommendation would go.
  - She also stated that the appeal process potentially involves a governance issue: the appointment versus election of the representatives on the committee.
- Senator Montgomery provided a Point of Information: he stated the dates were intended to stagger the load on the committees. With regard to which vice president would receive the recommendation, he asked for clarification about Dr. Grace’s statements. Goodman indicated that there is provision for multiple vice presidents to review the recommendations. Additional discussion involved the need for clarification for this aspect of the document. Goodman indicated that equivalency of this document is the Promotion and Tenure Policy and, therefore, this document would go through revisions from several bodies.
  - Senator D’Abramo expressed a desire to table and send the document to the Ag Senate for review before a vote is taken. Senator Montgomery stated he supported this and wished to include other interested individuals in the review. Discussion involved the desire for input for the faculty in the agriculture faculty and possible avenue to obtain their and center directors’ input on the policy. Clarification was provided that input had been sought and work had been extensive to obtain perspectives from those impacted by the policy.
  - Senator Deeds moved, seconded by Senator Vaughn, to postpone the decision until January to allow input from those mentioned as having investment in the policy.
  - Following further discussion regarding the thorough work of the committee and the need to respect the work of committees, Senator Wolverton Called the Question, seconded by Senator Deeds. The motion passed 29-1-3.

The motion to postpone the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations for the Non-Tenure Track Research and Extension Faculty Policies until January Senate meeting was passed 25-6-2. The document will be circulated for review.

### **Instructional Faculty Policy Recommendation**

Goodman referred to the Non-Tenured Track Faculty resolution and reviewed it as it was presented at the last Senate meeting. Goodman moved, seconded by Henington, to withdraw the previous motion to accept the resolution, send it back to the Provost with accompanying materials developed by the committee and faculty responses to the document and a letter explaining the reason for the Senate’s decisions. He stated the withdrawal was based on the fact that the issue was divisive with regard to issues of money allocation, power, and job security. He stated that the resolution is at the core of issues currently before the University (e.g., trends of faculty use and belief that there is a strong relationship between quality teaching and the research and service activities

of the faculty) and that it addressed fundamental questions that must be first addressed. He stated the issue of reducing the number of research faculty and replacing them with instructors is related to the focus of much of the discussion during today's Senate meeting. Goodman also stated that it is unacceptable to ask instructors to complete duties of an assistant professor. He stated that the direction and future of the University in these areas must be determined by the administrators at the University: "What is the mission of the University?". He linked these fundamental issues to the financial well-being of the University and encouraged the administration to determine the answers to the fundamental question of the "economics of the issue" and the devotion to research as the future of the University. Goodman apologized for not being able to bring the issue to a consensus. Senator Wolverton clarified that the motion is that the previous motion must be removed from the floor. Following discussion, it was determined that the appropriate action is to remove the motion from the floor. Discussion involved the issue of the direction of the University (i.e., a business or an institution of higher learning) and of the continuing trend of asking more from faculty with fewer resources. Senator Diehl commended Dr. Ford for coming before the Senate and stated that an open dialog is important. Senate Nagel stated that there is no consensus about this issue of instructor service, citing diverse demographics of other universities in the region.

The motion to withdraw the Instructional Faculty Policy resolution passed 31-1-1.

Goodman personally thanked the committee for their work on this issue.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Senator D'Abramo moved, Senator Montgomery seconded, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote of the Senate.

Submitted for correction and approval.

---

Carlen Henington, Secretary