

ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

October 15, 2021

1. Call to Order
2. [Adoption of Minutes, September 10, 2021](#)..... (p. 2)
3. Introduction of Guests
 - Dr. Thomas Bourgeois, Interim Associate Vice President for Student Success & Dean of Students
 - Dr. David Shaw, Executive Vice President and Provost
4. [Report of the Faculty Senate President](#)..... (p. 20)
5. [Report of the Faculty Senate Vice President](#)..... (p. 24)
6. Reports from Faculty Senate Designates on University Committees
7. Business to be sent to Committee:
 - 7.1. [AOP 12.08 Requirements for Degrees, Minors, and Certificates](#) (Academic Affairs)(p. 38)
 - 7.2. [AOP 13.15 Evaluation of Teaching Performance](#) (Faculty Affairs) (p. 44)
 - 7.3. [Faculty Performance Evaluation Task Force Report](#) (Faculty Affairs) (online/use link)
8. Standing Committee Reports:
 - 8.1. Academic Affairs
 - 8.1.1. [AOP 13.02 Selection of William L. Giles Distinguished Professors](#)..... (p. 26)
 - 8.2. Ancillary Affairs
 - 8.3. Charter & Bylaws
 - 8.4. Faculty Affairs
 - 8.5. Student Affairs
 - 8.5.1. [Student Survey of Teaching](#) (p. 33)
 - 8.6. University Resources
9. Special Committee Reports
10. Pending Business
11. New Business
12. Adjourn



ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE

Uncorrected Minutes of September 10, 2021

The Robert Holland Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University held its regular monthly meeting in the Bettersworth Auditorium at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, September 10, 2021.

Members absent and excused were Robert Banik, Mark Fincher, Robin Fontenot, Ganeswar Gude, Andy Perkins, and Andrea Varela-Stokes.

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Rebecca Robichaux-Davis.

President Robichaux-Davis asked for any corrections to the minutes of the August 20, 2021, meeting. Hearing no corrections, President Robichaux-Davis accepted the minutes as presented.

GUESTS

Dr. David Shaw, Provost and Executive Vice President

Dr. Shaw said the survey to determine the vaccination status of students and employees, conducted at the beginning of the semester, has been deployed again. The results of the second survey show that vaccination rates on campus have improved. Dr. Shaw said as of today, 56% of the student body and 77% of employees have indicated they are vaccinated. He said this, to him, is very good news. It indicates that the efforts by everyone to encourage people to take advantage of the opportunity to be vaccinated and protect themselves and those around them have been paying off. Dr. Shaw said at this time last year we had 174 students in the previous two weeks who had tested positive for the virus. Today we have 88. This time last year we activated our third quarantine and isolation hotel because the first two were filled. Today we have 12 rooms occupied. Dr. Shaw said he would like this to be thought of in the context that last year we were dealing with a virus strain which was 3 to 4 times less virulent than the Delta variant we are dealing with today. Dr. Shaw said that the administration is taking this seriously, and he is proud of the work all of us are doing collectively to ensure the health and safety of students and employees. The administration continually monitors the numbers and Covid remains the top priority. Dr. Shaw said there are regular ongoing conversations with our state health officers, sister institutions, and other SEC schools. The status of local hospitals is also carefully monitored. Dr. Shaw said he is extremely proud of the

job our faculty, staff, and students are doing overall. He said, from a personal perspective, he thought we would be dealing with more issues at this point than we are. He said he is not downplaying the number of cases we have, but he thinks this is a testament to the hard work being done to provide our students the quality education they deserve in a face-to-face setting, which has proven to be as safe as we can reasonably do.

Dr. Shaw said he fully understands the stressful situation this semester has brought. In July we were expecting this semester to be a more normal semester than what we are experiencing. He said we are all dealing with the non-stop demands on our time. Dr. Shaw said Dr. Keenum, himself, and everyone understand and sympathize with all the stress faculty are dealing with. He said he appreciates the commitment faculty have for our students and the educational status of our state.

Dr. Shaw said Dr. Thomas Dobbs is cautiously optimistic that we might be seeing a trend downward. We are not out of the woods by any stretch, but the modeling data seem to indicate we have passed the peak.

Dr. Shaw said the Cowbell Well weekly updates have been resumed. He said he approved of the latest release right before this meeting and faculty should see the update in their mailboxes this afternoon. The intention is for the updates to remain worthwhile and relevant. If anyone has questions, he asked that they send them to himself or Dr. Hyatt and they will address them. He said they can certainly address them on a one-on-one basis, but many of the questions received are the basis for the content of the next Cowbell Well update.

Dr. Shaw said the University continues to actively promote vaccination. There are pop-up clinics being hosted along with different incentive programs for faculty, staff, and students. He said we have seen some really good participation. So far, 479 students have taken advantage of the pop-up clinics. This does not include the vaccinations given out of the Longest Student Health Center.

Dr. Shaw said, to further address a question asked of Dr. Keenum at the last Faculty Senate meeting, requiring documentation of vaccination status, mandatory vaccinations, and mandatory testing runs counter to the guidance that has been given to all Mississippi public institutions by the recent vote of the State College Board. He said we do not possess the legal authority to issue a vaccine mandate. He said these mandate requests carry with them the possible unintended consequences of significant erosion of privacy rights and may encourage new and more restrictive policies regarding how public entities are allowed to handle the pandemic. This has already happened in a number of our sister states. We have been working to ensure that we do not have overly restrictive regulations placed on our University. We have been successful in this regard to this point. Dr. Shaw said the administration is very much aware of the potential federal executive orders in discussion, as well as the ramifications they would have on our policies. Our chief legal counsel has been in conversations with IHL legal counsel and the State Attorney General's Office.

Dr. Shaw said the administration will continue to work with and listen to the campus community as we move forward together. He said he cannot stress the “together” enough.

Senator Kelley asked if there was a place where the buildings which have received updates to the HVAC systems are listed and if there is a plan to update the remaining buildings on campus. Dr. Shaw replied that last week’s Cowbell Well update contained a link to the list of buildings that have received HVAC updates, those scheduled for October, and those scheduled after October. He said UV filters have already been added to most of our most common teaching buildings. In addition, all buildings have been updated to bring in more outside air circulation. He said it is more expensive to heat and cool outside air, but we have increased the amount of outside air to improve circulation. He said the University is following all CDC and Civil Engineering Society’s recommendations for operating in the pandemic.

Senator Kelley said it was brought to her attention that the University of Southern Mississippi and Jackson State University have adopted a hybrid/in-person mix for classes where, for example, half of the class attends on Tuesday in-person and the other half attends in-person on Thursday. She asked why MSU did not pursue this model. Dr. Shaw said he will have to look into this because his last conversations with the Provosts of these institutions did not indicate they were using this model. He said beyond that, our situation is that the very clear message we received from our students and many of our faculty is that hybrid is the worst of both worlds. It requires both fully online and fully face-to-face delivery. The approach this semester, given the feedback received, including feedback from Dr. Dobbs, led us to move forward with our current model. Dr. Dobbs actually recommended that we use this model and noted that many students do much better in a face-to-face environment.

Secretary King said Mississippi Today reported on August 20th that the IHL Spokesperson said that IHL board policy does not prohibit institutions from mandating vaccinations in addition to the minimum vaccination requirements established by IHL. She said on August 27th the board held an emergency meeting and voted to not require Covid vaccines at IHL institutions at this time. She asked for clarification on why this prohibited individual institutions from mandating vaccines. Dr. Shaw replied that this is an ongoing question. He said Dr. Keenum read the memo he received from Commissioner Rankins at the last Senate meeting. He said this was taken as clarification on what was being reported in Mississippi Today. In consultation with our legal counsel and the legal counsel of IHL, it has been clarified through numerous conversations that we do not have authority without board action on this topic.

Senator Pelaez asked for Dr. Shaw’s reaction to the strong recommendation by the two doctors on the IHL Board to require vaccines. Dr. Shaw said he listened very carefully to what the doctors said at the meeting. He said he listened very carefully to all of the debate during the meeting. The doctors made a very strong case. Dr. Shaw said the 10-2 vote gave a very clear directive to us. He said, given his role as Provost, he has to keep his personal opinions out of the picture, but he believes they articulated their arguments and statements very well.

Senator Pelaez asked if there were an open legal option to mandate vaccines, would the administration entertain doing so. Dr. Shaw replied this is a situation where hypotheticals can get away from someone very quickly. He said he will hedge his response on the question due to the many factors which come into play. Dr. Shaw said he is strongly in favor of vaccination. He said he understands that even within this body, there is going to be a difference of opinion and there would need to be a robust debate. He said if such an opportunity should arise, it would give the administration an opportunity to engage the campus community to make the decision. He said it would not be a decision that would be made by Dr. Keenum or himself. He said it would be a decision based on the entire campus community working together.

Senator Pelaez said given the fact that we cannot require vaccines, she feels there are other things we could be doing beyond requiring masks and promoting vaccines. She said this past weekend during the sporting events, the University could have been publicizing that everyone should be safe. She asked why we are not doing more than we are. Dr. Shaw replied we are already doing more than the minimum. He said he is always open to new ideas. It has been months if not a year since he has not gotten at least one suggestion daily. Many of the things we are doing now are a result of the suggestions and comments that have been received. Any and all suggestions submitted are and will continue to be considered. He said the flip side of it is there is always a tension going on which is exacerbated by the political environment we are in. Dr. Shaw said earlier today he received a message from a faculty member which was talking about the toxicity of the vaccine. He said he also had a conversation with a parent earlier this week in which the parent said their student would be withdrawn if he could not promise them that we will never require the vaccine. He said this is the pull and tug we find ourselves in as we go through this debate. What seems reasonable to one person may seem unreasonable to another. Senator Pelaez said we are a research institution, and we should be following the science. She asked why we don't require proof of vaccination or a negative test to attend a game. She asked why we do not require proof of vaccination or mandatory random testing for students who live in dormitories. Dr. Shaw said the administration works with the state health officials to try to find the middle ground which is as safe as we can reasonably expect.

Dr. Shaw said the recommendation of Dr. Dobbs was to sanitize our classrooms once a day. We chose to sanitize the classrooms three times a day. This increases the workload for our custodial staff. He said this is an example of how the University is going beyond the minimum requirement and trying to find the middle ground on what we can do.

Senator Williams asked for clarification from either our legal counsel or the IHL legal counsel on why we do not have the authority to institute a mandate. He said the IHL policies on vaccines give no justification for the required vaccines and simply list the required vaccines. He said the IHL website, under the Covid-19 guidelines, states that institutions are expected to follow CDC and State Department of Health guidelines and expand upon what is said in the guidelines. He asked if the State Attorney General has been asked to render an opinion on the ability of an institution to mandate vaccines. Dr. Shaw replied he will request legal counsel to clarify our

legal authority on vaccine mandates. Senator Williams thanked Dr. Shaw and said that his understanding was that during a time of emergency operations, IHL not only grants, but charges, the Executive Officer to take action. He said he wants clarification of why we do not have the legal authority to institute a vaccine mandate.

Senator Freeman said as we are starting to be able to do some experiential learning experiences with our students such as field trips and internships, we are seeing that some of the companies we are partnered with are requiring proof of vaccination from our students. He asked if there is policy that could be included in the documentation the students receive to sign up for these activities about this. Dr. Shaw replied there is policy on the Covid-19 website which addresses this. He said if there is a situation that the policy does not cover, the Covid Taskforce can look at that specific situation.

Senator Kelley said mask wearing among the student population has declined quite a bit. She said, from her observation in Allen Hall, there are times that only two-thirds of students are wearing masks at all. She said the message about the importance of wearing a mask seems to be getting diluted. Senator Kelley said the IHL meeting to vote on a vaccine mandate was damaging and callous. She said it was only 20 minutes long and the two doctors gave excellent reasons why we should be pushing vaccinations, including speaking very specifically to the age group of our undergraduates. She said the commissioner was very cavalier and made up statistics. She said the meeting ended in 20 minutes with very little discussion while they met remotely for their safety. Senator Kelley said faculty walk into classrooms with 200 students but the board had to meet remotely for their safety. She said this sends a message that they are out of touch, cavalier, and not taking the perspectives of faculty seriously. She said it also did not inspire confidence that this body, as a whole, was qualified to make such a weighty decision. She said her comments are based on statements made by faculty who approached her.

Senator Pelaez asked what the plan is if the infection numbers start to grow again. Dr. Shaw replied if we get to the point where the State Medical Officer says it is time to take a pause, we can shift to hybrid or remote learning for a period of time. He said we have shown that we can do this. This can apply to individual classes based on the faculty or a large number of student infections, or it can happen at the university level. Dr. Shaw said all of the many factors of this decision have to be evaluated every day.

Senator Pelaez said yesterday a graduate student told her that she was scared because she had three students with Covid and she did not know how to do the assignments. Senator Pelaez said this shook her since the student felt like she was being put in a risky situation. Senator Pelaez said she has other testimonies, but she wanted to share this one in particular. She asked if the University is willing to enact more restrictive policies for those who are not vaccinated before we go to plan B. She said this could entail paying more for health insurance or prohibition from certain activities to put pressure on the unvaccinated. Dr. Shaw replied that the reason he compared this year and last year earlier was to illustrate the difference the

vaccine is making in terms of the infection rate on campus. He said there are many who are feeling more comfortable due to the fact that they are vaccinated and much less likely to be hospitalized or die from the virus. He said he understands that we are in a very charged, high-anxiety environment. Dr. Shaw said he is not criticizing the graduate student or anyone else for feeling anxious about the situation because we are living in a pandemic. He said he fully recognizes the emotional challenges that exist.

Senator Pelaez asked if Dr. Shaw was aware that a senator resigned due to the in-person meeting format of the Faculty Senate. She asked why an option was not given to this senator. She said there are individuals who, even though they are vaccinated, face a greater risk or are around others who face greater risks. Dr. Shaw said he was aware of the situation. He said we face a balancing act. He said due to the concerns raised during the first Senate meeting, he worked with the Senate President to identify a space where people could feel more comfortable. Many different spaces were examined to find one that senators would feel comfortable in for these meetings. Dr. Shaw said, as someone who previously served on Faculty Senate during a time when shared governance was being debated, there is a difference between participation in person and virtually. The space we are in today was chosen to address the concerns senators had in the Grisham Room. Dr. Shaw said we do not call this the Senate and you senators for no reason. He said if you look at deliberative bodies at the state and federal level, there is an expectation of face-to-face conversations and reasoned debate. He said, certainly in a pandemic situation, we need to find ways to accommodate the health and safety of the members, but we need to keep in mind the deliberative nature of the Senate when thinking about any long-term changes that may be made. Senator Pelaez said she appreciates the space, but this is a symptom of the strategy of the University. She said it was not until someone resigned and the body as a whole during the last meeting expressed that they wanted additional space that a larger space was sought. She said this illustrates the reactive plan that the University has enacted.

Senator Gregory asked if the quarantine and testing data provided included off-campus numbers. Dr. Shaw replied that it does not. He said the data provided are solely from the Longest Student Health Center. He said the administration knows that there is testing which is occurring off campus, but they do not have any way of collecting this data. Senator Gregory asked if there is a way that Dr. Dobbs can apply the modeling he is using to determine the peak to the public universities in Mississippi. Dr. Shaw said he is willing to ask if that is possible. Senator Gregory said that a poll of faculty asking how many of their students have reported being infected may be beneficial. She said many of the students who informed her they were quarantined or isolated did not have documentation. Dr. Shaw said he is certainly willing to explore conducting such a poll. He said he has been doing a much more informal version of this through his meetings with the deans. Senator Zuckerman said there are more than 80 positive students in anthropology courses alone. She said if the campus numbers are accurate, it would be something to celebrate, but she feels our numbers are just the tip of the iceberg.

Senator Popescu said she is teaching a class with roughly 90 students. Many of her students have either tested positive or have been identified as close contacts. As a result, she is delivering her course in a synchronous hybrid format. She said many of her students are only attending online even though it is a face-to-face class and only half of her class attends in person.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

Due to our last Senate meeting being held just a little over two weeks ago, I have not attended as many meetings of university standing committees as I will in a full month. I have continued to attend weekly COVID-19 meetings and have almost daily dialogue with MSU administrators. Since our last meeting, we co-hosted with the Office of the President the Fall General Faculty meeting, which was held on Tuesday, August 31, 2021, in Bettersworth Auditorium.

Besides attending university standing committee meetings, I have worked with the Office of the Provost to schedule meetings between the Executive Committee and the on-campus candidates for the Dean of University Libraries. The first of those meetings is scheduled for Thursday, September 9, 2021. We are also currently hosting the elections for faculty for seats that were not filled when we conducted elections at the end of the spring semester. You may have seen email correspondence from me concerning these elections.

Status of AOPs:

The following AOPs are not under review to the best of my knowledge, but are past the four-year review cycle:

AOP	Title	Date
10.05	Nepotism	12/5/2012
31.02	Legal Resident Status	2/5/2013
13.06	Sabbatical Leave for Faculty Members of State IHL	6/9/2014
10.08	Classroom Regulations	4/26/2016
11.11	Auditing a Class	11/3/2016
12.02	Withdrawal from the University	3/23/2017
12.20	Undergraduate Academic Forgiveness	8/30/2017

Reports from Committees on which I Serve:

Athletic Council – This committee has not met yet this year. Our first meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, September 8, 2021 but due to the passing of Mr. Wesley Reed that meeting has been postponed. Mr. Reed coached at Mississippi State and had a long tenure with Mississippi State Athletics. To honor Mississippi State Athletics and the family's request, the Athletic Council meeting will be rescheduled to accommodate Mr. Reed's memorial service to take place at the M-Club.

COVID-19 Future Planning Task Force – The COVID-19 Task Force meets weekly on Tuesday afternoons. Information from each of these meetings is provided primarily through

emails/announcements from the Office of the Provost, weekly updates from the Office of Student Affairs, and from MSU's Office of Public Affairs. The COVID-19 website has been updated with the most current guidance, information, and other resources, along with Vaccine Clinic information. COVID-19 Pop-Up Vaccine Clinics will continue to be made available until September 10th. Appointments can be made for these clinics, but walk-ups are welcomed too. We are trying to make it as easy as possible for anyone to get vaccinated. See www.msstate.edu/covid19 for more information.

Design Review Committee – This committee met on September 2nd with representatives of Sasaki, an architectural design firm. Representatives shared renderings of campus that incorporate the following big ideas of the design plan: Campus Core, Clusters/Nodes of Campus, Smart Growth, Westside Connections, Outdoor Environments (Social and Academic), a Green Corridor, and Ecological Stewardship. The frameworks that are guiding these plans are Campus Life, Academics & Research Sharing Space, Landscape, Mobility, Sustainability, and Infrastructure.

Inclusive Excellence Leadership Council – This council has not met since my last report.

Executive Council – This committee met on August 23rd. We approved OP 91.310 – Outdoor Amplified Sound – which included a clarification of who is on the committee that approves outdoor amplified sound on weekends. We also approved AOP 41.01 – Coordination of Solicitations for Private Donations – which now contains updated definitions of “sponsored project” and “gift.” All instances of “SPA” have been updated to “OSP” to reflect the new name of the Office of Sponsored Projects. We also approved AOP 11.01 – Shackouls Honor College, AOP 12.10 – Recognition of Undergraduate Academic Achievement, AOP 13.01 – Emeritus Appointments, and AOP 13.23 – Faculty Workload.

Executive Enrollment Management Committee – This committee has not met since my last report.

Fall Convocation Group – This committee has not met since my last report.

Game Day and Special Events – This committee met on August 25th and September 1st to discuss and approve various Game Day requests including expanding the Hail State tailgate and adding merchandise sales locations near the football stadium. We also discussed ADA Parking locations near Bell Island, Visiting Team Bus Parking and Game Day Building Hours of Operation. It was decided that the Welcome Center and the Student Union would be closed on Game Day Saturdays. Other aspects of the Game Day experience that we discussed included the requirement to wear masks while using the SMART Transit System buses, but masks will not be required anywhere else. The stadium concessions and other merchandise sales will all be cashless again this year. The “Fan Zone” area has been expanded to include food and beverage trucks. The Office of Public Affairs released details concerning football parking, road closures, and transit services. This release can be found on www.msstate.edu.

Information Technology Council –This committee has not met since my last report

Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee – This committee has not met since my last report.

Parking and Traffic Regulations Committee – This committee met on August 26th to discuss parking zone changes and reserved spaces east of the IED Building, TK Martin Center and Longest Student Health Center. The committee had received specific parking requests from faculty and staff in the IED Building, the Library and the Student Health Center. The IED Building and the Library have lost parking spaces due to construction. The request from the IED and Library faculty and staff were tabled until a study of parking during the first few weeks of classes can be completed, and a more accurate picture of parking patterns established. The request from the Student Health Center was approved allowing six parking spaces in the parking lot across from the Student Health Center to be reserved for COVID-19 Drive-thru Testing.

Sustainability Committee - This committee has not met since July 1st.

Senator Williams asked why the utility lines are marked on the Drill Field. President Robichaux-Davis replied she did not know why they are marked, but she will find out and report back.

Senator Tagert asked if the traffic study report will be published. She said students are reporting that they are able to find parking, but it is taking a long time to get out of the parking lots. President Robichaux-Davis said she was not sure if the report would be released, but she would request it.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE VICE PRESIDENT

Academic Deans Council

Deans Council will meet September 15th.

Committee on Campus Access

Committee on Campus Access will meet September 13.

Community Engagement Committee

Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee

Undergraduate Research and Creative Discovery Committee

No meetings were held since the last Vice President's report, and no meetings are scheduled to date.

Updated on September 7, 2021

Respectfully submitted, Missy Hopper

FACULTY DESIGNATES ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

BUSINESS TO BE SENT TO COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

<u>Academic Affairs</u>	<u>No Report</u>
Ancillary Affairs	No Report
Charter & Bylaws	No Report
Faculty Affairs	No Report
Student Affairs	No Report
University Resources	No Report

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

1. Resolution Submitted by Senator Gregory

President Robichaux-Davis noted that item #1 of the resolution is already occurring. She asked for discussion of the motion. Senator Follett raised a point of order that the motion is an improper motion. He said it conflicts with policy that is in place by the authority of the Mississippi Board of Trustees of the State Institutions of Higher Learning, as prescribed in the state Constitution Section 8 paragraph 203. Since the motion, even if adopted, would be null and void according to Robert's Rules of Order, the motion is improper. President Robichaux-Davis accepted Senator Follett's point of order.

Senator Gregory said, with all due respect, Senator Follett is not a lawyer and we have already asked Dr. Shaw to get clarification from the State Attorney General who is more qualified to interpret the Mississippi Constitution. She said she would like to continue this motion until such a time that the State Attorney General can clarify the question of legal authority, as was requested previously of Dr. Shaw. She said she would like to amend the resolution based on feedback received from faculty. President Robichaux-Davis said she can accept an amendment to the motion, but the motion is improper as stated for the reasons given by Senator Follett.

Senator Priddy made a motion to amend the resolution to state, "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University call on the administration of the aforementioned university in an emergency capacity to initiate a university-wide vaccine mandate for all faculty, students, and staff not to include those with legally acceptable and documented exceptions." Senator Pelaez seconded the motion.

Senator Follett called the same point of order he previously made, citing Dr. Shaw's previous comments stating the University has no authority to institute such a mandate. He said it is still an improper motion since we would be asking the administration to do something they are not

legally authorized to do. Vice President Hopper, as the Faculty Senate Parliamentarian, said Senator Follett is correct and it is clearly stated in Robert's Rules of Order. She said the motion cannot go forward if it is not a proper motion. Asking to do something that cannot be done is an improper motion under Robert's Rules.

Senator Chamberlain said he has never heard any information which provides a policy that would be violated by issuing a vaccine mandate. He said the IHL Board vote was whether or not to adopt a vaccine mandate, not prohibit mandates. The IHL spokesperson said it is up to universities in Mississippi to choose what to do. Senator Chamberlain said the University of Mississippi is also governed by IHL and follows Robert's Rules but have adopted a resolution almost identical to the one that is now on the floor. He said we cannot speak to their conformity to Robert's Rules, nor is it a matter for us to concern ourselves with. He said he does not want the Senate to get bogged down with the procedural issues. He said what really matters is that there is a proposal for a science-based public health measure that the Senate can either show their support for or show our disapproval of.

Senator Follett said the letter read by Dr. Keenum at the August Faculty Senate meeting stated that he did not have the authority to institute a vaccine mandate. He said Dr. Shaw has agreed to make this letter public. He said the IHL meeting was not totally clear about their results during the meeting. He said the clarification received by administration after the vote provides the clarity. Senator Follett said the paragraph delegating governing authority of public universities to the Board of Trustees is very clear. He said in Board policy, Article 201.0505 on Institutional Officers, it states that each institution of higher learning shall be under the management and control of the Institutional Executive Officer. In exercising this authority as delegated by the Board, the Institutional Executive Officer shall act in accordance with Board policy, institutional policy, the laws of the state of Mississippi and the federal government, and in accordance with the Commissioner. He said whether it is a formal written policy or a verbal policy, there still remains the fact that actions have to be taken in coordination with the Commissioner.

Senator Pelaez made a motion to amend the resolution to insert "and the IHL Board of Trustees of the State of Mississippi" after "the administration." Senator Zuckerman seconded the motion.

The motion to amend passed by majority vote.

Senator Follett said the amended resolution is still improper. He said the Charter of the Robert Holland Faculty Senate states that it is a conduit of information between the faculty and the President. The Board of Trustees is not included in the charter.

Senator Freeman said Robert's Rules did not seem to be followed as closely during the last meeting as it is today. He said people are clearly upset and want their voices heard with a resolution. He said no matter what anyone says, it will not change anyone's mind. Senator Freeman said he would like for there to be a vote. Whether the resolution passes or not, we

know it is not going to go anywhere. He said it has already been stated that there is no legal authority, so let's vote and move on.

Vice President Hopper said there are so many things we could move forward for protection of the faculty and the students. She said the motion is still improper due to the fact that it cannot be acted on. She said if we can get to an amendment that has a greater purpose, we will actually have a resolution.

Senator Pelaez said she agrees with Senator Freeman's comment about Robert's Rules not being so strictly enforced at the last Senate meeting. She said she finds this very disconcerting and hopes it is not in bad faith. Senator Pelaez said she does not know if this resolution is possible or not, and we may have a federal mandate on vaccines. She said things are changing and the situation of public health in the United States is not as static as is being said here. She said, as things change, this resolution would be setting us in a good direction. Senator Pelaez said the role of a university is to lead based on science. We have the ethical duty to show a path that is based on science and the common good of our community. She said the resolution would send this message to the authorities in the state, other universities, and the people of Mississippi.

Senator Williams said the way he understands this, the addition of IHL wouldn't be improper since it is asking them to rethink their position on this. President Robichaux-Davis replied that the Faculty Senate does not communicate directly with IHL. She said we can communicate with our administration, but we cannot ask our administration to do something they do not have the authority to do. President Robichaux-Davis said we can ask the administration to go to IHL on our behalf. Senator Williams said he believes there are several occasions since he has been a senator where the Senate has exceeded our charter by passing resolutions outside our advisory role to the President. Senator Williams said he does not fully understand that the administration cannot mandate a vaccine. He said Commissioner Rankins may have written the letter, but he believes it is still a legal question that has not been physically presented to the University. He said the letter may have said not to do this, but there are places on the IHL website which say universities are expected to go beyond the recommendations of the State Department of Health and the CDC.

Senator Wood said she is a new senator, and this is the first time she has been approached by numerous people ahead of a meeting to voice their perspective on a resolution on the floor and desperation to have their voices heard. She said she believes, regardless of the properness of the resolution, it behooves us to vote on it so they know their voices have been heard. She said if it needs further amendment so we can vote on it, she urges those to be made. She does not want to see it simply be set on the side because it is improper. That would be doing a disservice to those we are representing.

Senator Priddy said she sent a survey out this morning in the College of Engineering to approximately 150 people. The survey received a 60% response rate with 71% in favor of the

mandate. She said children under 12 cannot be vaccinated at this point. Of the children hospitalized, 50% did not have a known preexisting condition. She said the Delta variant is affecting children in a way that previous variants did not. Senator Priddy said Dr. Shaw stated President Keenum would expect Board approval to be necessary to mandate a vaccine, but it is an ongoing question. She said as other senators have mentioned, legal input is needed on this.

Vice President Hopper asked if the senators would like to table the resolution to get legal clarification. She said she believes some of the senators are requesting this.

Senator Gregory said that previously she said that Senator Follett does not have a legal background and is unable to make a legal determination. It was requested by Senator Williams that the State Attorney General give advice based on that. She said that this does not keep her from wanting to move this resolution forward and vote on it. She said she agrees with her colleagues who talk about representation. Senator Gregory said that Senator Varela-Stokes was unable to attend today, but she surveyed the College of Veterinary Medicine faculty and had a 94% positive response rate in support of the initial resolution.

Senator Kelley made a motion to amend the resolution to state, "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University call on the administration of the aforementioned university in an emergency capacity to formally petition the Institutions of Higher Learning Board of Trustees of the State of Mississippi to initiate a university-wide vaccine mandate for all faculty, students, and staff not to include those with legally acceptable and documented exceptions." Senator Pelaez seconded the motion.

Secretary King said she was contacted by several faculty in the College of Education who were opposed to a vaccine mandate. They felt that people should have a choice whether they get vaccinated or not. She said the faculty who contacted her felt very strong that it is a personal decision, and there are still questions about the safety and effectiveness of the vaccine.

Senator Zuckerman said she conducted an informal survey of the faculty in Anthropology and Middle Eastern Cultures and African American Studies. She said an overwhelming majority supported the vaccine mandate and there were no concerns about a vaccine mandate. There was far more urgency and concern about this. She said there was also a feeling that the IHL meeting was destructive to feelings that the faculty have their concerns understood and represented, including in governance at Mississippi State.

Senator Wood said she also performed an informal survey asking for responses and the level of detail, evidence provided, and antidotes shared were in favor of the mandate. In fact, 92% of the responses were in favor of the mandate. She said she had faculty outside of her department proactively reaching out to her to make sure that their voices were heard.

Senator Sebba said she represents the College of Education and she received feedback from faculty within her college and outside of her college. She said the feedback she received showed that half were for the vaccine mandate and half were against a mandate.

Senator Hall said she also reached out to faculty and received unsolicited emails. She said all of the feedback she received was in support of the vaccine mandate. Senator Hall said choosing not to mandate vaccines is not a neutral position. She said it is a decision in favor of allowing the risk to continue to be borne by those with children and those who are at higher risk or cannot be vaccinated. Senator Hall said we are not telling the University this is how it has to be, we are allowing for the choice to be vaccinated or undergo testing. She reiterated that choosing not to require a mandate is not just avoiding the issue, it is falling on the other side of the issue. The pro-science side of the issue is that the vaccine side effects are far safer than the risk of getting Covid. She said we are clearly not going to get anywhere near what is needed for herd immunity with our current vaccination rate. Senator Hall said to prevent further mutations that are even more harmful to those who are vaccinated but have weakened immune systems, she strongly encourages the senators to support this.

Senator Dinh said he represents the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and read a letter one of his constituents wrote. The letter stated:

Faculty Senate,

My name is Dr. Clay Cavinder and I am a Professor in Animal and Dairy Sciences. I am writing to you regarding my concern about potential vaccine mandates on campus. To make this direct and to the point, I am opposed to mandating that anyone put something into their body that they do not want to. Now, some are saying "you have a choice, you can work here or not. " Well, it's not quite that easy. I am, like many, a 44-year-old Full Professor who has been in the field of academia for 21 years now. This is my profession and something I have wanted to do since the age of 19. Changing careers at this juncture is not easy, especially when factoring in the responsibility of family. I am not an "anti-vaccine" person, as I have taken many vaccines in my lifetime including the annual flu vaccine. However, here are my primary concerns about mandating the Covid-19 vaccine:

1. It is brand new. Most vaccines take 5-7 years to prove efficacy and safety. None of us know the long-term effects of these vaccines. Many people are taking the vaccine out of fear of Covid, which I fully understand. I believe in free choice. The scientific facts are that greater than 99% of people do not die from Covid. I in fact have had Covid recently. I quarantined for the required 10 days and was fine. I do understand it affects people differently but I choose for my personal health to not test an experimental vaccine on myself at this time.

2. No vaccine should be so highly political. No matter what position you take in politics, this vaccine has had the opinions of our officials change drastically over time. To correspond with this, many of our politicians and health officials are personally tied to the NIH, FDA, and other government agencies charged with protecting the safety of American citizens. If I elect to do something, I want the facts and not the changing opinions of politicians and health officials tied to them. When the facts about the vaccine are established and all long-term effects known, I may choose to take it too.

3. The positive effects of all vaccines do not include assurance of not contracting the illness. People who take any vaccine are still susceptible to getting the disease to which they have been vaccinated and are also just as prone to spreading the disease. Vaccines help our bodies fight off infection and thus prevent us from getting more severe symptoms or illness. Because of this, I support anyone's choice to get the vaccine. If you choose to get it, then by all means, please do so. In this way, you protect yourself. Also, if you choose to wear a mask in hopes of keeping the virus from infecting you, then do that too. However, if I choose to not get an experimental vaccine for numerous reasons then I am the one who has to live with the consequences. Not you.

4. The argument that the vaccine is now FDA approved is a very poor argument. What choice did the FDA have but to approve? We have been injecting people with this vaccine for almost a year without approval. If the FDA said "we do not approve the vaccine" then what would be the next step? With all the political ties to this subject, the FDA had no choice in this matter but to approve. This all boils down to letting people make choices concerning the health of their own bodies. My choice to not take the vaccine at this time does not affect anyone but me. That is a risk I am willing to take. In the future, I may choose the vaccine, but I want to feel comfortable knowing I am making a good choice for me and my family, not succumbing to political pressure and the forced intent of our government and academic institutions. I appreciate your time in reading my concerns.

Senator Dinh said he is from Vietnam. He said right now in Vietnam Covid is widespread. His parents were quarantined for almost a month and a half. He said they were tested five times a day. They were dragged into the street by the army and tested. At this point they have been tested almost 150 times and all of the tests were negative. Senator Dinh said the point he is trying to make is that there is a limit to what we can do with respect for people's choices. He said we talk about leading by science. He asked what is the role of science in this. He asked what the vaccine will do to you. He said we can only do one thing and that is to protect ourselves. He said you cannot prevent yourself from getting viruses. He said you will not be able to stop yourself from spreading the virus. Senator Dinh asked that the senators and all faculty stop putting the intent on other people that do not want to get vaccinated. He said during the pandemic we have made a lot of decisions. He said none of these decisions were based on a control and treatment application. He said we do not have control data for not wearing masks or for those not vaccinated. Senator Dinh said he thinks we need to slow down and have a rigorous debate since this deals with people's freedom. He said he is fine with voting on the resolution so people can be heard, but he does not want to see the administration make a decision which forces people to make a choice between their job, their health, and their choice.

Senator Pelaez said she received an email from a concerned faculty member which read, "I write to ask you to vote yes in favor of the resolution submitted by Senator Gregory which calls for the reinstatement of the Covid Task Force and the university-wide vaccine requirement. If

we want to proclaim to the world that we are a Research I university, we should act like one. That means we should value scientific research over anti-intellectual political pressure. The data on the vaccine is clear. The FDA has issued an official approval and there should not really be a debate.” Senator Pelaez said that the University is not moving closer to where we should be and she feels after the addresses at the last meeting and this meeting, if we do not put pressure for mandates, nothing is going to happen. She said she thinks a resolution like this will give force to the people within IHL who are fighting to look for stronger measures for vaccines. She said it may not be a vaccine mandate, but it could be policies that force people to make the choice that is for the common good.

Vice President Hopper said for every email she received in favor of the vaccine mandate, she received one against it. She said the resolution includes exceptions for those with legally acceptable and documented exceptions. She said she hopes that the University and the powers that be would be reasonable about the documented exceptions.

Senator Kelley called the question. Senator Freeman seconded the call of the question.

The vote to call the question passed by majority hand vote.

The vote to accept the amended resolution passed 20 to 15 by majority hand vote.

2. Resolution Submitted by Senator Stokes

Senator Stokes said the College of Forest Resources senators were approached by their constituents to present their thoughts as a resolution. She said the resolution they were asked to bring forward was: “Whereas, members of the Robert Holland Faculty Senate and the faculty whom we represent recognize that the administration of Mississippi State University is working within legal and logistical constraints to keep faculty, students, and staff safe and healthy; and

Whereas, the administration continues to address the concerns and needs of our individual members to provide support and medical safety provisions regarding conditions surrounding the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic; therefore

The extraordinary additional effort this has required over the last 1.5 years is recognized and commended, and we wish to express our confidence in the administration of Mississippi State University that they will continue to make decisions and policies in the best interest of the faculty, students, and staff of this University aligning with immediate and long-term well-being of the MSU family.”

Senator Hall said the feedback she received on this resolution was mixed. She said she would caution that we have heard from senators that there is a concern that there is not enough happening, and they would like the University to do more. She said since this deals with a vote of confidence, if it passes unanimously, that is wonderful, but if it squeaks by with a majority, it doesn’t look great, and if it fails, it is something newsworthy. She said maybe this can be tabled until things settle down a little bit.

Senator Zuckerman said she wants to express her extreme frustration with the resolution before the Senate. This statement effectively forecloses all future debate within the Senate on public health measures during the pandemic. The statement expresses gratitude, support, and confidence in the administration and puts senators in an unnecessary bind. It creates a situation where senators cannot engage in basic faculty governance urging the administration to move toward additional public health measures. This includes mandating an FDA-approved vaccine. Vaccines are now required at approximately 500 US universities and are mandated by the US government for all federal employees and large private companies. Not approving this resolution is effectively voicing a vote of no confidence in our administration. This is an unfair and unnecessary conflict to have created for the senate, particularly the senators who are untenured or otherwise insecure in their employment environment. Ole Miss' Faculty Senate was recently able to adopt measures to support basic public health. Alternatively, we can stand in the way of doing so to fearfully support a measure that represents poorly hidden brown-nosing. She said administrators are not fools and are very good at identifying brown-nosing. She said she believes they would prefer honest communication. This is a coercive resolution designed to, as one of her colleagues put it, manufacture consent and intimidate senators. This means that it is antithetical to the ethos of faculty governance which is critical to the Faculty Senate, the University, and the purpose of the Faculty Senate to act as a channel of communication between the faculty and the University President. She said this resolution will make it impossible for a senator to communicate their support and the support of their constituents for basic public health measures while also communicating their support of the administration for everything they have and continue to do. Instead, we have been pushed into a state of false antagonism with the administration which will unnecessarily and counterproductively prevent the free communication integral to the function and purpose of the Senate and to put false sentiments into our mouths.

Senator Pelaez said she has great respect for Dr. Keenum and our administration. She said she supports many things that they do, but she has her critiques as well. She said she thinks that they could be doing more and as a result she feels constrained by this. She said she does not want to vote for this, but that does not mean that she does not have respect for decisions that have been made and future decisions in which she supports the administration. Senator Pelaez said she will vote no for this resolution, but she will be deeply unhappy because this could be seen as not having confidence in the administration. She said the message should be that we have trust in this administration, but we want more from this administration in terms of Covid. She said if she votes yes for this resolution, she will not be able to voice her criticism in the future.

Senator Carskadon said it sounds to him that we would be saying thank you and we have confidence in you if we vote yes, or we don't have confidence in you if we vote no. He said there is no way he would ever vote no to this, and he urged the other senators to vote yes. Senator Carskadon said he feels the administration has been candid, transparent, responsive, and have done a hell of a job.

Senator Stokes said this was in no way intended to hinder or hold back any future discussion. She said this is from faculty represented by the senators from the College of Forest Resources and Extension as a complementary statement to the first resolution showing that there are faculty who feel like their voice is not consistently heard and who wish to express their support and gratitude for what the administration has done so far.

Senator Pelaez said she feels there has been a misreading of what has been happening in the Senate. We had a 2-hour discussion last month with the President. Some people were asking about different potential things that could be implemented. She said this resolution really puts everyone in a bind. She said she will vote no for this resolution, but it will break her. Senator Pelaez said by no means is she trying to antagonize the administration, but she wants to be able to continue to say that there is more that can be done.

Senator Williams said he remembers the Senate passing a resolution very similar to this one last year. President Robichaux-Davis replied the resolution passed last year was by a different Senate. She said each year is a new Senate. Senator Williams said he would like to remind the senators that a resolution of support was previously passed, and we have already thanked them. He said he did not know how many more times we can thank them.

Senator Chamberlain said, looking at the resolution, he felt a sense of conflict like he was being torn. He said the majority of the faculty members he has spoken to have expressed incredulity about this rather than support. He said this resolution is not just about support, it also says that the administration is working within legal and logistical constraints to keep faculty, students, and staff safe and healthy which has been discussed at length that it is unclear what the legal constraints are. Secondly, it claims the administration continues to address the concerns and needs of our individual members. He said if this was the case, we would not have the dissatisfaction we are hearing from faculty. He said he would personally support a general statement praising the efforts, but only if the first two clauses were removed.

Senator Kelley said the colleagues she surveyed gave feedback similar to Senators Zuckerman and Chamberlain. She said the extraordinary effort that it has taken to keep the University running over the last year and a half has not solely been performed by the administration. She said faculty have had to convert classes abruptly to online, students have had to quarantine or were sick with Covid, and no one has been called on more than our custodial staff. Senator Kelley made a motion to amend the resolution to read: "Be it resolved, members of the Robert Holland Faculty Senate recognize the extraordinary additional effort required over the last 1.5 years by administration, staff, students, and faculty to preserve our university community." Senator Zuckerman seconded the motion.

The motion to amend passed by majority hand vote.

The motion to adopt the resolution as amended passed by unanimous hand vote.

President Robichaux-Davis said the reason Robert's Rules of Order was followed a little more closely this meeting was due to feedback received from several senators that they did not feel comfortable speaking because it felt to be a back and forth without order. She said she hopes that the senators who did not feel comfortable speaking at the August meeting felt comfortable to speak during this meeting. President Robichaux-Davis said the last thing that she wants is for a senator who was elected to represent their faculty to not feel comfortable enough to stand before their peers and speak.

Senator Follett made a motion to adjourn. Senator Williams seconded the motion.

The motion to adjourn passed by unanimous hand vote at 4:30 p.m.

Submitted for correction and approval.

Stephanie King, Secretary

Jason Cory, Administrative Assistant II

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Dr. Thomas Bourgeois, Interim Associate Vice President for Student Success & Dean of Students

Dr. David Shaw, Executive Vice President and Provost

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

Over the last month, I have attended meetings of most of the university standing committees on which I serve. Additionally, I have attended meetings of the Faculty Development Task Force and have continued to attend weekly COVID-19 meetings. I also have remained in contact with MSU administrators concerning various issues brought forward to me. In response to concerns regarding the street lighting in the area of the Music buildings, the Music Building design has been reviewed and the lighting plan is being revised to provide additional lighting along the new sidewalk that is under construction. Additionally, the Pedestrian/Bike Safety Task Force will meet on Friday, October 15th to specifically discuss skateboards and scooters on campus. Results of this meeting will be forthcoming.

I have worked with Dr. Brent Fountain, Faculty Athletics Representative, and members of the Athletics Department to plan and announce events throughout the month of October which has been designated as Faculty Athletics Month. Various events have been planned to show appreciation to the faculty and staff for their role as a part of winning the national championship. Specifically, on Monday, October 4, 2021, a photo-op for faculty/staff and their families with the National Championship Trophy was held at the home plate entrance to Dudy Noble Field. About sixty members of the faculty or staff and their families participated in this event. On Tuesday, October 19, 2021, faculty/staff and their families are invited to an open football practice which will include a tour of the Leo Seal Football Complex. Registration for this event is required. On Sunday, October 24, 2021, faculty and staff will be recognized at the MSU volleyball game against Texas A & M. On Thursday, October 28, 2021, faculty and staff will be recognized at the MSU soccer game against Ole Miss. Finally, faculty and staff can get discounted tickets for the Homecoming football game against the University of Kentucky on Saturday, October 30, 2021.

As in previous years, the Robert Holland Faculty Senate will host the nominations for the SEC Faculty Achievement Award. You should have received an email this past Tuesday asking for nominations. Please consider nominating colleagues who are Full Professors and have taught predominantly undergraduates. Details of the nomination requirements were included in the email and are posted on the Faculty Senate website, as well.

Status of AOPs:

The following AOPs are not under review to the best of my knowledge, but are past the four-year review cycle:

AOP	Title	Date
10.05	Nepotism	12/5/2012
10.08	Classroom Regulations	4/26/2016
11.11	Auditing a Class	11/3/2016
12.02	Withdrawal from the University	3/23/2017
13.06	Sabbatical Leave for Faculty Members of State IHL	6/9/2014
31.02	Legal Resident Status	2/5/2013

Reports from Committees on which I Serve:

Athletic Council – This committee met on September 15, 2021. Leah Beasley, Mike Richey and Eric George gave a presentation on the impacts of winning the NCAA Baseball National Championship in terms of branding and licensing and the unprecedented sales of merchandise that occurred within the days immediately following the national championship game. In the first 6 hours, MSU set the record for the highest amount of CWS Champs hot market sales in Fanatics’ history. Maroon shirts were sold out across the United States for a period of time. In one month, 2,100 of the CWS panoramas were sold which is three times more than the number sold within the first month of the most recent Super Bowl. Within two weeks of the National Championship win, \$115,000 was raised through the Bulldog Club which included 175 new

donors. Christine Jackson gave a report from Athletic Academics. She shared that the departmental grade point average for spring 2021 was 3.20. This was the eighth consecutive semester that the department grade point average was at least 3.0. Also in spring 2021, 66 student athletes earned a 4.0 grade point average and were awarded “top dawgs.” For the entire academic year, student athletes had a grade point average of 3.18. Currently, two student athletes are Stephen D. Lee Scholars. During the 2020-21 academic year, 126 current and former student athletes graduated. John Cohen reported that new policies allow transfer students to be immediately eligible to play.

COVID-19 Future Planning Task Force – The COVID-19 Task Force continues to meet weekly on Tuesday afternoons. Information from each of these meetings is provided primarily through weekly Cowbell Well updates that are provided on Fridays. COVID-19 Vaccine and Flu Shots continue to be available at the Health Center and at various pop-up clinics. MSU is trying to make it as easy as possible for anyone to get vaccinated and get the flu shot. See www.msstate.edu/covid19 for more information.

Design Review Committee – This committee has not met since my last report.

Inclusive Excellence Leadership Council – This council has not met since my last report.

Executive Council – This council has not met since my last report.

Executive Enrollment Management Committee – The Strategic Enrollment Planning Prioritization Summit was held on September 22-23, 2021. The EEMC spent two days attending this summit. The overall goal of the summit was to determine which enrollment strategies we would adopt as a university. We spent the first day listening to presentations of over 20 strategies. The second day we prioritized those strategies and their accompanying action plans based on specific criteria and then selected the strategies that we would adopt. We adopted the follow 11 recruitment and retention strategies: Comprehensive, university-wide marketing plan; University-wide undergraduate communications plan; Expand and increase market reach; Comprehensive, university-wide international recruitment and partnerships; Comprehensive and holistic review of undergraduate financial aid awarding; Graduate assistant funding; Graduate student pathways expansion including stackable coursework; Coordinated graduate student recruitment communications plan; Enhance and execute an incoming student onboarding experience; Develop broad academic support strategies; and Further develop student success strategies for Campuses 2 and 5.

Fall Convocation Group – This committee has not met since my last report.

Game Day and Special Events – This committee met on September 15th, September 29th, and October 6th to discuss and approve various Game Day requests. The committee approved a request to allow Step Shows in the Amphitheater and at the Coliseum on the Friday and Saturday of Homecoming Week. On Game Days at Davis Wade, we are very short-staffed. The Athletics Dept is continuing to look for volunteers and/or hourly workers to work on Game

Days. The committee approved a request from Southern Traditions Tailgating which asked if they could send their current customers a renewal letter for the 2022 season. The committee also approved a Golf Cart All Access Pass for the ROTC on Game Days. In the most recent meeting, the committee approved of requests to set up tents/tailgates/displays for the Alabama home game. These tailgates/tents/displays will be for National Chemistry Week, a Former Football Player Reunion, and the EcoCar Team, which will have its Camaro on display at the corner of Creelman and Hail State Blvd.

Information Technology Council –This committee met on October 5, 2021. ITS is working on a new procurement web form that goes into detail regarding the service/system/equipment that is being procured. The Network Refresh is 83% complete. Through the 2020 CARES Act Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund, 45 classrooms/teaching spaces have had technology upgrades which are now complete. These classrooms/teaching spaces are as follows: 1 in Agricultural Engineering, 3 in the Band and Choral Rehearsal Hall, 2 in Bowen Hall, 5 in Carpenter Engineering Building, 1 in Cobb Architecture Building, 3 in Dorman Hall, 2 in Etheredge Chemical Engineering Building, 3 in the Franklin Center, 1 in Giles Hall, 2 in Griffis Hall, 5 in Hilbun Hall, 6 in the IED Building, 1 in the Jackson Center, 2 in Lloyd Ricks Hall, 1 in Middleton ROTC Building, 1 in Mitchell Memorial Library, 1 in Moore Hall, 3 in Swalm Chemical Engineering Building, and 2 in Thompson Hall Annex. Faculty who are using Wireless Microphone Belt packs in ITS-Supported classrooms have been leaving their classrooms without turning off their microphones. The microphone stays connected long after the faculty member leaves the classroom and then it connects to other wireless receivers in other classrooms, interfering with the instruction taking place in that other classroom. To avoid this, faculty should turn off their microphones when class is over prior to leaving the classroom. An email explaining this will be sent out to all faculty. A new ID card design has been approved. It has a horizontal design with the person's photo on the left side and a bulldog graphic on the right side. On the back of the ID is a QR Code that can be used with Athletic Department scanners for ticketing and tracking attendance. These new IDs are much more secure and as such are more costly. The new IDs are approximately \$7 more expensive per ID. The new version of DUO Mobile App, Version 4.0, is now available and has a rolling update. An email will be sent out explaining this. For those using iOS, the update window will be Oct. 11 – 18th. For those using Androids, the update window will be Oct 11 – 15th. Changes to the app include improved accessibility, clearer guidance on restoring an account, and an easier way to find and manage accounts through a simpler interface.

Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee – This committee met on September 9, 2021. The committee approved the Design Review Committee's recommendations for the Engineering Student Center. Greg Havens from Sasaki was on campus with us and gave us a Master Plan update. The draft report reflected the framework of open space and the design principles being used embrace our sense of place through our historic buildings and architecture. Other frameworks reflected include campus life, academic and research sharing spaces, landscape, mobility, sustainability, and infrastructure. The big ideas of the design plan

include the Campus Heart/Core, Clusters/Nodes, Smart Growth, Westside Connection (Starkville), Outdoor Environments (Social and Academic), Green Corridor (Connecting people through beautification), and Ecological Stewardship.

Parking and Traffic Regulations Committee – This committee has not met since my last report.

Sustainability Committee - This committee met on September 22nd, but I was not able to attend because I was attending the Strategic Enrollment Planning Prioritization Summit. Vice-President Hopper attended in my place. The Office of Sustainability is sponsoring Green Week during the week of October 11th. This week will feature various events including Yoga on the Drill Field on October 11th; Tie Dye on the Drill Field and Student Leadership Panel on October 12th; a Faculty Climate Panel in Old Main on October 13th; an Environmental Justice Talk and a Sustainability Minor Q&A session on October 14th; and Bikes & Smoothies and Wall-E on the Drill Field on October 15th.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE VICE PRESIDENT

Academic Deans Council

The Academic Deans Council met at 1:00 on September 15, 2021. The following AOPs were approved:

12.12 Credit and Grades,

13.06 Sabbatical Leave for Faculty Members of State Institutes of Higher Learning,

10.08 Classroom Regulations,

13.15 Evaluation of Teaching Performance,

12.08 Requirements for Degrees, Academic Minors, Certificate Programs, and Academic Consortia/Contractual Agreements.

No action items.

Committee on Campus Access

The Committee on Campus Access met on September 13. Old business: the crosswalk on Stone Blvd. is moving forward and is now in design phase. New business: the Montgomery Building is a historical building so it can only have one accessible entrance. Other buildings discussed for accessibility were Patterson Engineering and Butler. Many of these buildings were built before ADA compliance was in place. No action items.

Community Engagement Committee

No meetings were held since the last Vice President’s report, and no meetings are scheduled to date.

Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee

The Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee met September 9, 2021. The meeting consisted of an overview of the new master plan for the campus. No action items.

Undergraduate Research and Creative Discovery Committee

No meetings were held since the last Vice President’s report, and no meetings are scheduled to date.

Sustainability Committee

The Sustainability Committee met on Wednesday, September 22, 2021. The Sustainability motto is “Maroon Goes Green.” Items discussed were:

- 1) Working to educate MSU—Sustainability Social, Newsletter, Cowbell Cleanup
- 2) Energy Update—MSU is always working to update efficiency with heaters, etc. that take less energy. Cleaning coils in air handlers on campus has been a priority to reduce energy consumption.
- 3) Solar and wind initiatives were discussed—both are place dependent
- 4) Water bottle filler stations, have 14 installed with 25 more to go
- 5) Enhance Program—MSU was first to enter voluntary program and was the 1st to receive this award
- 6) Green Week October 11-15 with events on campus

No action items.

Updated on October 11, 2021

Respectfully submitted, Missy Hopper

REPORTS FROM FACULTY DESIGNATES ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

BUSINESS TO BE SENT TO COMMITTEE

- 1. [AOP 12.08 Requirements for Degrees, Minors, and Certificates](#) (Academic Affairs). (p. 38)
- 2. [AOP 13.15 Evaluation of Teaching Performance](#) (Faculty Affairs) (p. 44)
- 3. [Faculty Performance Evaluation Task Force Report](#) (Faculty Affairs) (online/use link)

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. AOP 13.02 Selection of William L. Giles Distinguished Professors

Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate

Academic Affairs Committee

Report on AOP 13.02 Selection of William L. Giles Distinguished Professors

October 12, 2021

Background

AOP 13.02 was assigned to the Academic Affairs committee on April 9, 2021, with a directive to help clarify the materials to be included in nomination packets for the Giles Distinguished Professors.

Recommendation

We recommend that the changes be made indicated in the AOP included with this report. Specifically, this is to include a list of appropriate items of documentation (including a cover letter, a current vita, and letters from both internal and external sources providing support for the nominee) that is expected in the nomination packet, as well as having examples of successful nomination packets being made available on the Giles Distinguished Professors website. Several editorial changes were also made to clarify the description of the process. Although not strictly part of the AOP review process, we were also provided a copy of the evaluation form currently used by the University Giles Distinguished Professor Review Committee and have included some recommended improvements to that document as well.

Discussion

The Academic Affairs Committee discussed the AOP via e-mail, with a group edit of the document in Microsoft Teams. There were some consistency issues that were addressed, including the ordering of “teaching, research and service” in a couple of places, and simplification of the description of the process. Most changes were editorial in nature, with no substantive changes being recommended in the decision-making process. However, based on anecdotal evidence of lack of specificity in the description of the nomination packets, we decided to recommend two changes in that area. First, a list of the three main items to be expected in the nomination packet was given, including a cover letter, a current vita, and letters from both internal and external sources providing support for the nominee. Next, to allow

potential candidates to understand the typical scope of both quality and quantity of the documentation needed for a successful nominee, we have recommended that the W. L. Giles Distinguished Professors website be modified to contain a set of example nomination packets from previous years. With both of these changes, we hope that we have removed some of the ambiguity that previously existed with respect to the expected content of a nomination packet.

Also, as previously mentioned, we reviewed the Evaluation Form that was provided to us. This form is currently used by the review committee each year and should be based on a clear understanding of the requirements for nomination packets. Along those lines, we would suggest the following changes in that form:

- Group the “teaching, research and service” items in order for both demonstrated achievements/excellence in each area, and for the demonstration of continuing achievements or excellence in each area.
- Change item 6 to read “Demonstrated Leadership that motivates both students and colleagues.”
- Clarify the requirement of a minimum of ten years of service at MSU to also include the requirement that at least five of those years be at the rank of Professor.
- Add detail to checklist items to ensure that the letters of support address excellence in each of the required areas of excellence and that they come from both internal and external sources.

While these recommended checklist changes are not part of the AOP itself, it is our hope that they will help clarify to future selection committees the items that are most important in the nomination process, and help them to make good decisions for their recommendations to the Provost.

Committee Members: Randy Follett (Chair), Mike Breazeale, Brian Davis, Erdogan Memili, Andy Perkins, James Sobaskie, Andrea Varela-Stokes, Kimberly Wood



AOP 13.02: SELECTION OF WILLIAM L. GILES DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to define the policy on the selection of William L. Giles Distinguished Professors.

REVIEW

This AOP will be reviewed every four years (or whenever circumstances require an earlier review) by the Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs with recommendations for revision presented to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

One of the highest honors the University can bestow upon a faculty member is that of Giles Distinguished Professor. It is not a faculty rank but an honorary distinction. This recognition is based on distinguished scholarship as evidenced by a record of outstanding teaching, research, ~~teaching~~, and service, and is conferred only on a faculty member at Mississippi State University who has attained national or international status. This distinction is designed to recognize a continuing commitment to establishing career recognition and faculty excellence at Mississippi State University. -In that context, a minimum of ten years of service at MSU with a minimum of five years at the rank of Professor with tenure is necessary for consideration.

It is expected that the successful candidate will have an exemplary record in all three areas of the university's mission: teaching, research, and service. The criteria for selection, which are available in the Office of Academic Affairs, will be rigorously applied. They-Criteria include a distinguished record as a scholar, demonstrated research achievements, and national or international prominence as verified by external reviewers from the candidate's specific field. Outstanding performance in teaching and service, and motivating colleagues and students toward their best professional career goals and objectives are also to be considered in the appraisal of a nominee. Appropriate documentation must be provided to support the case for excellence in all three of the areas of ~~research~~, teaching, research, and service, as well as in the area of motivating others. Such documentation will include a cover letter, a current vita, and letters from both internal and external sources providing support for the nominee. Additionally, examples of nomination packets from previous successful nominees will be made available on the W.L. Giles Distinguished Professors website, to provide clear guidance on the quantity and quality of documentation that should be contained in the nomination packet. No administrator at the level of dean or above is eligible for consideration as a Giles Distinguished Professor.

Nomination of a professor for designation as a "William L. Giles Distinguished Professor" will be submitted with appropriate documentation by the originate with the department or the college/school in which the nominee holds the rank of professor. If the nomination originates with the nominee's department or school, it must be forwarded to approved by the dean for review prior to submission. ~~The nomination, along with appropriate documentation, will then be forwarded~~ to the Provost for review

and further consideration. A University Giles Distinguished Professor Review Committee, all of which shall hold the rank of professor, will ~~play a major advisory role~~ serve as advisors to the Provost in the considering consideration of the nominations for Giles Distinguished Professor. ~~The committee~~ will consist of seven members: Vice President for Research and Economic Development (Chair), two current Giles Distinguished Professors designated by the Provost, two members designated by the President, and the President and Vice President of the Faculty Senate or designees. The committee members designated by the President will serve staggered two-year terms. The two Giles Distinguished Professors will be appointed on an *ad-hoc* basis ~~in order~~ to avoid any potential conflict of interest with faculty applicants, and they should not hold an administrative appointment.

The committee will consider all nominations and advise the Provost accordingly. The Provost will, ~~in turn, then~~ make recommendations to the President, ~~who will grant Final-final~~ approval and announcement ~~of the new~~ Giles Distinguished Professors ~~will be made by the President~~. The Chair of the University Giles Distinguished Professor Review Committee will write a letter to each nominator informing them of the overall recommendation of the Review Committee for that nominee.

The total number of Giles Distinguished Professors will constitute a relatively small percent of the faculty. No stipulation is made concerning the number of Giles Distinguished Professors that may be named in any one year. There may be years in which no Giles Distinguished Professors will be designated.

~~The appointment of~~ Giles Distinguished Professors will be appointed ~~occur~~ during the Spring Semester of each academic year. ~~A call for nominations will be issued by~~ The Office of Academic Affairs will issue a call for nominations each year in September ~~of each year~~. The deadline for submission of nominations to the Provost is January 31.

REVIEWED

Executive Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate School

Date

Provost and Executive Vice President

Date

President, Robert Holland Faculty Senate Date

Director, Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Date

General Counsel

Date

APPROVED:

President

Date

Proposed Version



MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY™

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

William L. Giles Distinguished Professor Evaluation Form

Nominee _____

	Yes	No
1. Established record as a scholar	_____	_____
2. Demonstrated excellence in teaching	_____	_____
3. Demonstrated research achievements	_____	_____
4. Demonstrated excellence in service	_____	_____
5. National or international prominence	_____	_____
6. Demonstrated leadership that motivates both students and colleagues	_____	_____
7. Continuing commitment to excellence in teaching	_____	_____
8. Continuing achievement in research	_____	_____
9. Continuing commitment to excellence in service	_____	_____
10. Minimum of ten years of service at MSU with at least five years at the rank of Professor	_____	_____

Comments: _____

Reviewer _____

Current Version



MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY™

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

William L. Giles Distinguished Professor Evaluation Form

Nominee _____

	Yes	No
1. Established record as a scholar	_____	_____
2. Demonstrated research achievements	_____	_____
3. National or international prominence	_____	_____
4. Excellence in teaching	_____	_____
5. Excellence in service	_____	_____
6. Established concern for others that motivates students and colleagues	_____	_____
7. Continuing achievement in research	_____	_____
8. Continuing commitment to excellence in teaching	_____	_____
9. Continuing commitment to excellence in service	_____	_____
10. Minimum of ten years of service at MSU	_____	_____

Comments: _____

Reviewer _____

ANCILLARY AFFAIRS
CHARTER & BYLAWS
FACULTY AFFAIRS
STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. **Student Survey of Teaching**

Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate

Student Affairs Committee

Report on Evaluation of Teaching (Proposed Student Course Survey)

October 15, 2021

Background

The RHFS Student Affairs Committee was asked to review the newly proposed Student Course Survey. The Task Force on Evaluation of Teaching Performance recommended that the survey instrument be revised. In addition, it was recommended that the results of the student surveys be a single measure of teaching performance, coupled with other measures as outlined in AOP 13.15. A separate Faculty and Administrator group was formed to develop the proposed Student Course Survey. The resulting product has now been sent to Senate for review, possible modification, and possible approval.

Recommendation

All recommendations below were unanimously endorsed by the members of the Student Affairs Committee.

Recommendations on Proposed Student Survey Questions

Q1. "I knew what was expected of me in this class." Worded well – no change

Q2. "I understood how the assignments and/or exams connected with the learning objectives of the class." Worded well – no change

Q3. "Instructional activities in the class helped me to learn."

Suggested modification and reasoning: After "instructional activities", add examples of activities in parentheses, such as: tests and exams, papers, projects, experiments, readings, homework, etc. The question as it stands may indicate active participation in the class and may not be understood as the assignments and all content for the course.

Suggested question: "Instructional activities and assignments (such as lectures, discussions, demonstrations, tests and exams, papers, field studies, homework, projects, etc.) accomplished inside and outside of class helped me to learn."

Q4. “My participation in class was welcomed and respected by the instructor.” Worded well - no change

Q5. “If I had questions or needed help, the instructor was available and responsive inside or outside of class.”

Suggested modification and reasoning: Include “teaching assistant” and “during office hours and/or normal University operating hours.” The changes would offer clarity for courses that employ teaching assistants as potential points of contact. In addition, there was discussion about students’ expectations that faculty respond at all hours of the day or night. This modification would provide defined boundaries on what is expected of faculty members.

Suggested question: “If I had questions or needed help, the instructor or teaching assistant was available and responsive inside of class or during posted office hours and/or normal University operating hours.”

Q6. “The feedback I received on my performance in the class helped me to improve.”

Suggested modification reasoning: The discussion about the original wording brought up a concern that some courses, depending on the types of assignments, may not include “feedback” beyond just marking questions correct or incorrect on a test or a simple “good job”. For courses such as English, feedback may be a natural component based on the nature of the coursework. However, in a general education course with large student numbers, the “feedback” may simply be the grading of a test with single numerical or alphabetic feedback. The suggested rewording would clarify simply graded responses as well as more extensive feedback in other forms.

Suggested question: “Feedback and grades on tests and assignments helped me to improve.”

Q7. “In this class, I have gained knowledge and skills that I can use in future classes or other contexts.”

Suggested question: “In this class, I have gained knowledge and skills that I can use in future classes, a prospective career, or other contexts in my life.”

Q8. Outside of class time, approximately how much time each week did you spend engaging with the course content (reading, studying, completing assignments, etc.)? Worded well – no change

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS TO ADD:

As a committee, we recommend adding the following questions which will provide necessary feedback to a faculty member/instructor on student perceptions of the instructor’s performance in a course. These questions are also a partial conceptual carry-over from the previous course evaluation. Based on a small pilot study, we estimate that adding these three questions will add less than 30 seconds total to the time it will take students to complete the survey.

ADDITIONAL Q9. “I felt that the instructor presented and explained the course material clearly.”

ADDITIONAL Q10. “I felt that the instructor wanted all of us to succeed.”

ADDITIONAL Q11. Inclusion of a summary question such as, “Overall, I would recommend this instructor to other students if they wanted to learn this subject.”

Q12-14. Written responses: “What worked well in this class?”; “What changes could improve this class? (Specific suggestions will be the most useful.)”; “Please feel free to say more about your response to any items above or provide any additional feedback.” - **Worded well – no change**

Additional Recommendations:

1. As a committee, we recommend changing the order in which the responses are listed so that “**Strongly Disagree**” appears on the left and “**Strongly Agree**” appears on the right, like the former student evaluations. This would reflect similar formatting to other rating systems. The gradient-colored scale is helpful and should still be included.

Mississippi State University welcomes student feedback that can be used to help improve teaching and learning in this course. Meaningful self-reflection on your experience in the course and a focus on your own learning (rather than general critiques or things you have heard) will provide the most useful and constructive feedback. Thank you for your participation.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Abstain
I knew what was expected of me in this class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I understood how the assignments and/or exams connected with the learning objectives of the class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instructional activities in the class helped me to learn.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My participation in class was welcomed and respected by the instructor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I had questions or needed help, the instructor was available and responsive inside or outside of class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The feedback I received on my performance in the class helped me to improve.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In this class, I have gained knowledge and skills that I can use in future classes or other contexts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Outside of class time, approximately how much time each week did you spend engaging with the course content (reading, studying, completing assignments, etc.)? (Hours)	Please select. ▾				
What worked well in this class?					

2. As a committee, we recommend that there be an opportunity for faculty to add their own course specific questions, up to 3 additional questions, that could contribute to better evaluation of specific course content, approaches, assignments, etc. Ideally, this would be incorporated into the Fall 2021 survey, but if not, it would be incorporated beginning in the Spring 2022 semester.

3. As a committee, we recommend changing the word “abstain” to either “NOT APPLICABLE” or “ABSTAIN/N.A.”. Alternatively, we recommend there be a statement at the top of the survey that indicates, “Choose ‘Abstain’ if you do not wish to express an opinion or if the question does not apply to this course.”

Final Overall Recommendations:

We recommend that this evaluation be used on an experimental basis for two years, after which it will be revisited for its efficacy by all pertinent parties, including administration, Faculty Senate, and the University's Standing Committee "Teaching Evaluation Committee" to evaluate the survey and consider modifications to it before adopting it on a more permanent basis.

Discussion

The committee had lengthy discussion about considerations related to course surveys. Collectively, we agree that a more "student-centered" approach in the questions is a valuable way to evaluate a course. However, we believe that it is necessary for faculty and instructors to receive performance feedback to improve teaching effectiveness in the classroom. Based on these conversations, we have several thoughts that should be considered in the launch of this instrument.

1. It is important to clarify that Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) are only one part of the overall methods for evaluating teaching. The primary purpose of the student course surveys should be to provide feedback to instructors that may help them improve their instruction. Other measures of teaching effectiveness should be used and considered with greater weight than the results of student surveys. The revision of AOP 13.15 Evaluation of Teaching Performance is helpful in promoting a more thorough evaluation of teaching but universally, department heads need to respect the shift in the value of student surveys as just one component of the overall evaluation of teaching for annual faculty reviews.
2. It may be valuable to ask students to rate their attendance record in a course.
3. It would be valuable to use the results of the survey to create intradepartmental data that could be used in assessing the faculty as a whole within a single department.
4. It still is valuable to have a Global Mean in some form. This value is often used by faculty and instructors to compare their own performance from year to year and semester to semester.
5. For proposed question 8, we recommend the numerical values be between 0-20 hours.

Committee Members: Lyndsey Miller (chair), Iva Ballard, Tom Carskadon, Mark Fincher, Gnaneswar Gude, Ted Wallace, Kelley Wamsley

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURN



AOP 12.08: REQUIREMENTS FOR DEGREES, ACADEMIC MINORS, CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS, AND ACADEMIC CONSORTIAL/CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy (AOP) is to establish requirements for different degrees and to provide the basis for establishing and maintaining academic minors and certificate programs which both recognize successful completion of course work area(s) other than a student's academic major.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

1. **Degree Programs.** A degree program is defined by the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning as a course of study with a prescribed set of requirements which a student must complete. It is identified by a specific degree title and a specific major subject matter area. Mississippi State University (MSU) offers baccalaureate, master's, educational specialist, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education, and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degrees. All courses and curricula are subject to the review and approval of the University Committee on Courses and Curricula; additionally, the Graduate Council will review and approve courses and curricula at the graduate level. Faculty members representing all of the MSU colleges serve on these committees. All courses and curricula are also subject to review and approval by the Academic Deans Council.

Undergraduate degrees. All baccalaureate degrees offered by MSU must comply with the guidelines established by the Board of Trustees of the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning. All undergraduate degree programs must have a minimum of 120 semester hours and typically no more than 124 hours. Exceptions for exceeding the 124 can be requested based on discipline-specific accreditation and licensing standards and other standards in certain disciplines. All baccalaureate programs must meet or exceed the university's general education requirements. [Students enrolled in undergraduate degrees who have not completed bachelor's requirements should not enroll in academic programs at higher levels \(including postbaccalaureate certificates\) unless through formal accelerated or early admission programs.](#)^[RP1]

Graduate Degrees. The five graduate degrees have length requirements as follows:

- All master's degrees at MSU must have a minimum of 30 semester hours. The master's degree with a thesis option requires 24 hours of graduate course work and 6 hours of earned research/thesis hours. Any non-thesis master's option must contain a minimum of 30 hours of graduate course work.
- The educational specialist degree requires 30 semester hours of graduate credit above the master's degree. The educational specialist degree with a thesis

option requires 24 hours of graduate course work and 6 hours of earned research/thesis hours. Any non-thesis educational specialist option must contain a minimum of 30 hours of graduate course work.

- The Doctor of Philosophy degree requires at least three academic years beyond the bachelor's degree to meet the course requirements. Also required for the Doctor of Philosophy are a dissertation and a minimum of 20 semester hours of research for the dissertation. Each academic unit which administers a degree program leading to the Doctor of Philosophy will determine, if any, the research and special skill requirements for the degree. The academic unit will notify the Dean of the Graduate School of any new skill requirements or any changes in current requirements.
- The Doctor of Education degree requires at least three academic years beyond the bachelor's degree or a minimum of 90 semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree to meet the course requirements. Also required for the doctorate of education are a dissertation and a minimum of 20 semester hours of research for the dissertation.
- The Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degree is a professional degree, and it requires a minimum of the equivalent four academic years, including two academic years of hands-on clinical education.

2. Post-Master's Certificate. A post-master's certificate is a stand-alone academic program with courses beyond the master's degree, but does not meet the requirements of academic degrees at the doctor's level. To enroll in a post-master's certificate program, a student must have earned a master's degree or equivalent. The establishment of post-master's certificate programs must be approved by the University Committee on Courses and Curricula, the Provost and Executive Vice President, and the Assistant Commissioner of the Institutions of Higher Learning for Academics and Student Affairs.

3. Postbaccalaureate Certificate. A postbaccalaureate certificate is a stand-alone academic program with an organized program of study beyond the bachelor's degree, but does not meet the requirements of a master's degree. Students in postbaccalaureate programs must have completed a bachelor's degree. The establishment of postbaccalaureate certificate programs must be approved by the University Committee on Courses and Curricula, the Provost and Executive Vice President, and the Assistant Commissioner of the Institutions of Higher Learning for Academics and Student Affairs.

2.4. Minors. An academic minor is a designation of a group of courses in an approved academic area in which a student can gain recognition for the completion of a required number of credit hours. Minors are optional at the undergraduate level but may be required in certain graduate degree programs. Minors can only be granted concurrently and in conjunction with the granting of a degree from Mississippi State University.

The following conditions apply to minors:

- A minimum of 15 credit hours is required for an undergraduate minor and a minimum of 9 credit hours is required for a minor at the master's level and 12 credit hours at the doctoral level.
- At least one-half of the hours in the undergraduate minor and two-thirds of the hours in a graduate minor must be taken at MSU.
- A minimum grade point average of 2.0 is required in all courses taken as part of an undergraduate minor, while a minimum 3.0 is required in all courses taken as part of a graduate minor.
- A department or academic unit granting a minor may specify majors for which students cannot earn that minor. Otherwise, students are free to pursue any approved minor.
- Academic units can establish additional requirements that go beyond those specified in this policy.
- The establishment of all undergraduate minors must be approved by the University Committee on Courses and Curricula and by the Provost and Executive Vice President.
- A student must declare intent to complete requirements for a minor prior to the declaration to graduate.
- Completion of a minor will be noted on a student's academic transcript.

3.5. Certificate Programs
Course Recognition Certificate. A course recognition certificate can only (Dr. T. Baham suggested “can only” over Dr. R. Travis use of “must”) be granted in conjunction with a degree program. ~~RP2] academic course recognition certificate program is a thematic grouping of courses in which students can attain recognition for the completion of a required number of credit hours. It is distinct from a minor in that it is not necessary for the granting of a certificate to be tied to the granting of a degree although individual certificate programs may make that requirement. These course recognition certificates are not formally recognized at the university as an academic program.~~

Unlike minors, which tend to be in areas where there are majors, course recognition certificate programs can be interdisciplinary and are often in areas in which the university offers no major.

The following conditions apply to course recognition certificates^{BT3}:

- A minimum of 12 credit hours in a program are required for a course recognition certificate.

- At least 50% of the hours earned in a certificate program must be taken at MSU.
- A minimum grade point average of 2.0 is required in all courses taken as part of an undergraduate [course recognition](#) certificate program, while a minimum 3.0 is required in all courses taken as part of a graduate [course recognition](#) certificate program.
- [Course recognition](#) certificate programs can be established with additional requirements that go beyond those specified in this policy.
- A committee or oversight body must be established that administers the [course recognition](#) certificate program.
- ~~The establishment of all certificate programs must be approved by the University Committee on Courses and Curricula, the Provost and Executive Vice President, and the Assistant Commissioner of the Institutions of Higher Learning for Academics and Student Affairs.~~
- A [course recognition](#) certificate ~~may~~ **must** be granted ~~independent of a degree or~~ in conjunction with a degree ~~if so specified by the certificate~~ program.
- Completion of a [course recognition](#) certificate program will be noted on a student's academic transcript [at the request of the department](#).

4.6. Review and Approval of Courses and Curricula. Any addition, modification, or deletion of a course, or a degree program, or any formal and coherent grouping of courses (to include concentrations, minors, and certificate programs) is subject to the review and approval of the University Committee on Courses and Curricula and the Academic Deans Council. These changes are subject to the review of the Graduate Council when offered at the graduate level.

The following definitions shall be used to determine if review is required:

- **Degree:** The most general designation assigned to a graduate or undergraduate program of study. The degree is usually awarded by a College or School.
- **Major:** A subdivision of a degree. The major usually resides within a Department.
- **Degree Program:** The combination of degree and major.
- **Concentration:** A subdivision of a major. It is a formal and coherent grouping of courses beyond the core of the major that allows a student to focus on a specialty area.
- **Emphasis:** An informal grouping of courses within a concentration that provides a direction for advisors and students wishing to pursue a particular aspect of their

chosen concentration. Emphases are not tracked or indicated on the student's transcript.

- **Minor:** A formal and coherent grouping of courses primarily outside the major designed to provide the student with specialized training. Minors are offered, and administered, by a department in an already-established area of study (recognized by the existence of a major, or course prefix), and are not generally available to students pursuing a major within the same department.
- **Certificate:** A formal and coherent grouping of courses taken outside the context of a degree program. If completed within a degree program it is usually considered a minor.

5.7. Academic Consortial/Contractual Agreements. Agreements which allow students to obtain academic credit which broadens their educational experience, while aligning with the mission of Mississippi State University.

- A. Consortial relationship—formal arrangement between Mississippi State University and one or more institutions of higher learning to share the responsibility for delivery of courses/programs meeting mutually agreed upon academic quality standards.
- B. Contractual agreement/formal arrangement between Mississippi State University and another institution(s) of higher learning for receipt of courses, programs, or other academic credit delivered by the other institution(s).
- C. All academic consortial/contractual agreements must be approved by the Provost and Executive Vice President. The agreements will be on file in the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President.
- D. The [Associate Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs](#) will be responsible for a periodic review of the academic consortial/contractual agreements to ensure compliance and alignment with the university's mission.
 - Agreements which specify an evaluation date will be reviewed accordingly.
 - Agreements which do not specify a review cycle will be evaluated biannually.

REVIEW

This AOP will be reviewed every four years or whenever circumstances require an earlier review by the Executive Vice Provost with recommendations for revision to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

REVIEWED:

Executive Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate School

Date

Provost and Executive Vice President

Date

President, Robert Holland Faculty Senate

Date

Director, Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Date

General Counsel

Date

APPROVED:

President

Date



AOP 13.15: EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

PURPOSE

The following policy guidelines have been adopted by the University to provide the faculty with a greater certainty of the procedure that will be used in the evaluation of teaching performance at Mississippi State University.

POLICY/PROCEDURE

Numerous measures of teaching performance can be used to assist in the process of faculty improvement and for personnel decisions. The results of the evaluation should be combined with other measures of teaching performance and be used for both personnel decisions and to assist in the process of faculty improvement.

Personnel decisions in this case will include annual raises, annual evaluations, and promotion and/or tenure decisions. ~~Students will be informed that the student evaluation results should be used.~~

Faculty members are expected to provide the department head and dean with information to support the evaluation of their teaching performance. A faculty member can choose among the following criteria to provide information to support evaluation of his or her teaching performance:

- a) Peer evaluations (internal or external)
- b) Self-evaluation or report
- c) Classroom observation report
- d) Student learning outcomes
- e) Student course surveys
- f) Faculty response to student course surveys
- g) Faculty response to mid-term student course surveys
- h) Scholarly research/publications/presentations related to teaching
- i) Examples and/or analysis of course materials including course syllabi, assignments and exams
- j) Teaching grants and awards

- k) Additional student input in the form of letters, emails, faculty nominations, etc.
- l) Curriculum development and innovation
- m) Evidence of significant professional development in teaching
- n) Additional evaluation materials.

Student course surveys will be administered uniformly across all courses each semester, but they shall not be the only criterion used to review teaching performance. Used alone, survey results may or may not provide accurate and appropriate information upon which to base judgments about teaching effectiveness. By themselves, student surveys of teaching may indicate trends and provide faculty members with useful information about methods of instruction and practices. Used in combination with other types of information about teaching performance, student course surveys can yield useful information about teaching effectiveness. Students^[GT4] will be informed of how the student course survey results will be used.

1.—

- a) Student course surveys may be conducted using any mode(s) (e.g., electronic, paper) provided by and supported by the university.

1.— Student Evaluations

~~Student evaluations will be conducted as either a web-based instrument or as a paper instrument at the discretion of the instructor.~~

2.— Development of the Survey

3.— b) The survey will investigate aspects of each of the following categories: (i) the course and (ii) the instructor. The Teaching Evaluation Committee generally will be responsible for updating and changing the student course survey. The survey will measure aspects of each of the following categories: (i) the course, (ii) the instructor, and (iii) the method of delivery.

- c) All procedures and processes for statistical reporting shall be developed and reviewed by the Teaching Evaluation Committee. The Teaching Evaluation Committee will consult with the Student Association.

- a.— The Teaching Evaluation Committee generally will be responsible for updating and changing the student evaluation form.

4.— Reporting the Results

~~All procedures and processes for statistical reporting shall be developed and reviewed by the~~

~~Teaching Evaluation Committee. The Teaching Evaluation Committee will consult with the Student Association.~~

The faculty member, along with their department head and dean or director, shall receive a copy of the statistical report and all comments for every evaluated class and section the individual teaches.

~~2. Additional Evaluation of Teaching~~

~~Student evaluations shall not be the only criterion used to review teaching performance. Used alone, evaluation results may or may not provide accurate and appropriate information upon which to base judgments about teaching effectiveness. By themselves, student evaluations of teaching may indicate trends and provide faculty members with useful information about methods of instruction and practices. Used in combination with other types of information about teaching performance, student evaluations can yield useful information about teaching effectiveness.~~

~~Faculty members are expected to provide the department head and dean with additional information to support the evaluation of their teaching performance. A faculty member can choose one or more of the following criteria to provide the additional information to support evaluation of his or her teaching performance:~~

- ~~a. Department Head evaluation on teaching~~
- ~~b. Dean evaluation~~
- ~~c. Peer evaluations (internal or external)~~
- ~~d. Self-evaluation or report~~
- ~~e. Scholarly research/publications related to teaching~~
- ~~f. Course syllabi and exams~~
- ~~g. Teaching grants and awards~~
- ~~h. Additional student input in the form of letters, emails, faculty nominations, etc.~~
- ~~i. Curriculum development and innovation~~
- ~~j. Additional evaluation materials.~~

REVIEW

This AOP will be reviewed every four years (or whenever circumstances require an earlier review) by the Executive Vice Provost with recommendations for revision presented to the Provost and Executive Vice President.

REVIEWED

Executive Vice Provost & Dean, Graduate School

Date

Provost and Executive Vice President

Date

President, Robert Holland Faculty Senate

Date

Director, Institutional Research & Effectiveness

Date

General Counsel

Date

APPROVED

President

Date