

# ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

April 8, 2022

1. Call to Order
2. [Adoption of Minutes, March 11, 2022](#) ..... (p. 2)
3. Introduction of Guests
  - a. Dr. Mark Keenum, University President
  - b. Dr. Brent Fountain, Faculty Athletic Representative
  - c. Mr. Chris Dallager, Director of Disability Resource Center and ACCESS
  - d. Dr. David Shaw, Provost and Executive Vice President
4. [Report of the Faculty Senate President](#)..... (p. 15)
5. [Report of the Faculty Senate Vice President](#) ..... (p. 19)
6. Reports from Faculty Senate Designates on University Committees
7. Business to be sent to Committee:
  - 7.1. [AOP 13.02 Giles Distinguished Professors](#) (Faculty Affairs) ..... (p. 72)
8. Standing Committee Reports:
  - 8.1. Academic Affairs
    - 8.1.1. [AOP 11.11 Auditing a Class](#) ..... (p. 20)
  - 8.2. Ancillary Affairs
  - 8.3. Charter & Bylaws
  - 8.4. Executive Committee
    - 8.4.1. [AOP 13.08 Travel by Faculty and Staff](#) (Rescind)..... (p. 23)
  - 8.5. Faculty Affairs
  - 8.6. Student Affairs
  - 8.7. University Resources
    - 8.7.1. [AOP 13.20 Exit Interviews of Departing Faculty](#) ..... (p. 30)
    - 8.7.2. [AOP 13.21 Faculty Released Time for Specified Committee Chairs](#) ..... (p. 34)
    - 8.7.3. [Library Concerns Letter](#) ..... (p. 37)
    - 8.7.4. [Faculty Senate Meeting Space](#)..... (p. 38)
9. Special Committee Reports
  - 9.1. [Faculty Senate Onboarding Ad Hoc Committee](#) ..... (p. 39)
10. Pending Business
  - 10.1. [Faculty Handbook: Edits for Additional Faculty Ranks](#) ..... (p. 43)
11. [Election of Officers](#)..... (p. 71)
12. New Business
13. Adjourn



## ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE

### Uncorrected Minutes of March 11, 2022

The Robert Holland Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University held its regular monthly meeting in Bettersworth Auditorium at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, March 11, 2022.

Members absent and excused were Beth Baker, Jason Barrett, Mike Breazeale, Jeb Cade, James Chamberlain, Thu Dinh, Charles Freeman, Alicia Hall, Stacy Haynes, Kimberly Kelly, Santanu Kundu, Melissa Moore, Mark Welch, and Molly Zuckerman.

Members absent were Sorina Popescu and Amanda Stone.

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

Senator Stokes made a motion to suspend the bylaw requiring in-person attendance to allow the senators with health concerns due to Covid 19 to participate in the meeting. Vice President Hopper seconded the motion. The motion to suspend the in-person attendance bylaw passed by majority hand vote.

President Robichaux-Davis said the Faculty Senate Office received one correction to the minutes prior to this meeting. The requested correction was to change the College of Architecture, Art, and Design to the School of Architecture during the discussion of the addition of an Extension faculty member by Senator Gregory. President Robichaux-Davis asked for any additional corrections to the minutes of the February 11, 2022 meeting. Hearing no additional corrections, President Robichaux-Davis accepted the minutes as amended.

### GUESTS

#### **Dr. Julie Jordan, Vice President for Research and Economic Development**

Dr. Jordan said the inaugural Research Week will be held the week of April 11<sup>th</sup>. This initiative is to raise awareness and promote research across the campus. Information on the various activities during Research Week can be found on the Office of Research and Economic Development website. There will be banners placed around campus and the video boards throughout campus will have information on the event. Dr. Jordan said this event will be held

annually. She asked that faculty take Research Week into consideration when planning research activities. She said Research week can help faculty gain exposure for these activities.

Dr. Jordan said her office records and categorizes research activities. There are three categories that her office is currently focusing on with regard to planning. These categories are infrastructure and resources, becoming more efficient and effective with our efforts, and building and supporting talent development.

Dr. Jordan said when it comes to resources her office is looking at computational resources and research tools. She said in the past few years her office has supported university-wide licenses for Qualtrics and Stata. She said this is an example of a small activity that can have a big impact on individual researcher's work. New GPU clusters are being added for data analytics and once the new High Performance Computing Center is completed, additional CPU computational resources will be added. Research Security and Compliance regulations are continually pushing new things on us which makes us think about how we structure our research enterprise. She said an example of this is the additional security layer that is being added to Outlook for researchers who manage controlled unclassified information or personally identifiable information. Dr. Jordan said we are in our second type of external review related to research security and compliance. The first was completed in the fall and the second one is ongoing. One thing that is anticipated to come out of this process is the creation of a university data governance council charged with research security matters, understanding where our data is for compliance purposes, and handling open data resources.

Dr. Jordan said becoming more efficient and effective involves the internal processes of research administration. The idea is to make it easier for PIs to get their work done and manage their projects. Today was our last conversation with a consulting firm which looked at optimizing our post-award management. Dr. Jordan said the pre-award process was examined prior to her beginning in her current position. She said the final report has not been fully examined yet, but several things have already come out of the study. One of these items is to increase the technology to manage post-award work. This will reduce the manual paperwork in the current process. Dr. Jordan said she is constantly challenging her team to determine how we can do things better and faster. She said one of the questions posed to the consulting firm was how we can double our research expenditures without doubling the amount of research administration work.

Dr. Jordan said there are a number of things going on to improve talent development. This includes the collaboration between her office and the Office of the Provost on the establishment of a data science academic program. She said this initiative also includes improving talent in research administration. The business managers of the Office of Research and Economic Development and the business managers of the Division of Academic Affairs co-hosted an event for all business managers on campus which discussed business administration across campus. Dr. Jordan said another effort in this area is trying to create a career path for grants and contracts specialists. She said there are a variety of titles for grant and contract

specialists on campus. Her office has worked with Human Resources and have established a Grants and Contracts Specialist I, II, and III. The criteria for how to advance through the levels includes having to attain certain trainings and certifications. She said undergraduate involvement in the research enterprise is also being examined. A pilot program was initiated this semester which employs 10 sophomore students in our research centers. She said often the undergraduate research programs are working in departments and colleges and labs. We don't get the undergraduate exposure in our research centers. This would include students who are in business, finance, or communications who would learn about the roles that support research centers to allow PIs to get their work done efficiently. Dr. Jordan said we currently recruit students from the Mississippi School for Mathematics and Science (MSMS) for internships and research experiences. A new school just opened in Huntsville, Alabama called the Alabama School for Cyber Technology and Engineering. This school is for grades 9 through 12 and is a resident school like MSMS. We are working to partner with this school to provide internships and research experiences as we do with MSMS.

Dr. Jordan said there was an announcement of the new seed grants for advancing collaborative research. She said she just spoke with a National Science Foundation Program Officer. This Program Officer has been tasked for the last 15 months with standing up the new technology directorate that is part of the Congressional Omnibus bill that is now pushing through. Our federal sponsors are looking for solutions that are not only interdisciplinary but are use-inspired as well. They want us to look at how to think about use-inspired problems that we can work with the community to solve. Our work needs to not only be interdisciplinary on our campus, but needs to involve external business partners and the community.

Dr. Jordan said just before the pandemic began a seminar was held around the topic of virtual reality. Now that we are coming out of the pandemic, there will be more initiatives like this which bring together different groups across campus to discuss a common issue. Dr. Jordan said she meets monthly with her peers from the University of Southern Mississippi, Jackson State University, and Ole Miss. She said every month they talk about how collaboration between the institutions can be increased.

Dr. Jordan said the economic development opportunities for this region are phenomenal. The North Star Industrial Park has just been completed and opens up industrial development for the region and creates opportunities for Mississippi State University. Dr. Jordan said MSU is deepening collaboration with the Communiversity as well. The Communiversity just announced a new Director, Dr. David Campbell. We have already begun trying to make sure that we can connect with the Communiversity and East Mississippi Community College. We will be hosting several sessions with Dr. Campbell to introduce him to our people and capabilities and to look for ways to increase our collaboration. Dr. Jordan said if faculty have ideas for collaboration or would like to be introduced to Dr. Campbell they should contact her.

Dr. Jordan said we have a liaison with the Partnership School. The engagement and activities the Mississippi State community has with the school is phenomenal. She said stories about

these activities are continually shared on social media. Dr. Jordan said she is hoping to see concrete evidence of increased student success resulting from our engagement with the school.

Dr. Jordan said the Hub, in downtown Starkville, is now complete. She said the Research Technology Corporation purchased a building in the research park which will be used to consolidate the various units of Research and Economic Development. She said the division will consume roughly one third of the building space. The center portion of the building will have classrooms and meeting spaces which can be shared. The remaining space will be three lab spaces. The Institute for Imaging will be in one lab and the other two will be swing spaces.

Dr. Jordan said we are constantly looking for new funding opportunities. She said if the state Legislature and Congress complete the bills currently under consideration, the funding agencies will have way more funding than they ever have before. The federal government is looking to dramatically increase the support of research and development. Dr. Jordan said the increased funding will be directly targeted at the societal and economic challenges we face as a nation.

Senator Tagert asked Dr. Jordan what the mission of the Communiversity is and where they draw students from. Dr. Jordan replied that the mission of the Communiversity was inspired by the regional economic development agency, the LINK. It is a space where academic and specific workforce training education can take place. She said it is also designed to be a gathering place for the community. They have an event space that can facilitate a couple of hundred people. The building has two wings. One wing contains lab spaces which have glass walls to allow for observation. The other wing has large spaces in which equipment can be set up for training purposes. Dr. Jordan said we have some joint projects already funded and the intent is to increase this activity.

#### **Dr. Dana Franz, Director of Academic Quality**

Dr. Franz said she came to address the Senate to tell them about a new initiative called the University Syllabus. The University Syllabus will gather all of the mandatory syllabus statements into one central syllabus. Dr. Franz said the plan is to roll out the University Syllabus in time to be used for the fall semester. Faculty will then be able to have their course syllabus contain a reference to the University Syllabus allowing them to not have to insert the mandatory statements. Dr. Franz said she has been working with ITS to have the University Syllabus contained on the Canvas management page in the LTI on the left side of the page. She said this will be beneficial for our students by ensuring they are presented with the same words in the same order for all mandatory statements. Dr. Franz said faculty would no longer have to update their syllabi when federal regulations or MSU policy change. She said she thinks this will make everyone's lives easier and will help the students understand the basic policies that always apply.

Dr. Franz said there was a concern raised by the Associate Deans that the students need to be very familiar with the University Syllabus. She said ITS will force the students to acknowledge that they understand the policies in the University Syllabus through a pop-up window upon

login to Canvas. There will be a statement provided which faculty must have on their course syllabus referencing the University Syllabus. This will only have to be done once and will not have to be updated when there is policy change. Dr. Franz said the individual in her current position will be responsible for maintaining the University Syllabus.

Dr. Franz said there have been suggestions to include additional information to benefit students in the document. She said an example of this is including the location of the Learning Center and which student success resources are available to students.

Dr. Franz said she worked with UCCC to create this document. Most proposals to UCCC that need edits are due to the university policies not being included correctly, which this initiative should help.

Senator Gregory thanked Dr. Franz for her effort to create the University Syllabus. She asked if the initiative would be ready for the fall semester. Dr. Franz replied that it would be available for the fall semester, but it cannot be mandated until the Academic Operating Policy on syllabi is edited. She said the policy will need to have the current list of mandatory statements required removed and the new statement referencing the University Syllabus added. Senator Gregory asked if the University Syllabus will be mandatory in the spring semester. Dr. Franz replied that she hoped so, but it depends on how long it takes to update and approve the syllabi policy. Senator Gregory asked if there will be a hyperlink available for faculty to include in their syllabi for the fall semester. Dr. Franz replied there would be a hyperlink available if the senators have no objection to moving forward with the initiative. The document will be housed on the Office of the Provost website and will be embedded in other websites.

Senator Pelaez said she includes additional language for the required diversity statement on her syllabi. She asked if she would still be allowed to include the additional language. Dr. Franz replied that this does not preclude faculty from including additional language on their course syllabi.

**Dr. Regina Hyatt, Vice President for Student Affairs**

Dr. Hyatt said it was a pleasure to be with the senators. She introduced Cheryl Bowen, Executive Director of Budgets and Planning for the Division of Student Affairs. Dr. Hyatt said she came to the Senate to introduce First Day Complete. First Day Complete is a program Student Affairs has been working on for several years. She said she believes this initiative will address some portion of the student success question. First Day Complete is an equitable access program designed to ensure that undergraduate students have the opportunity to start the semester with all of the required textbooks and course materials at the most affordable price. The program does support OER and maintains academic freedom in choosing course materials. With this program the cost of textbooks and electronic materials will be charged at \$20 per credit hour each semester. The charges will be applied to the student accounts at the same time tuition and fees are assessed. Students will see the comparable prices for purchasing the course materials outright. In most cases the per credit hour charges will provide

significant cost savings for students. In the cases where the program does not provide savings or costs more, the student is allowed to opt-out. Dr. Hyatt said the students will not be able to opt out on a course by course level but will have to choose to opt in or out for all classes for the semester. The program will also allow students to use financial aid to cover these costs since they will be billed to the student account. The current system does not allow for students to purchase materials through the bookstore and apply the charges to their student account. The program will be available to all undergraduate students including the Starkville campus, Meridian campus, Engineering on the Coast, and online students. The students can choose to pick their course materials up in the bookstore or have them mailed to them. All electronic course materials will be automatically populated into student's Canvas courses on the first day of class.

Dr. Hyatt said one of the most frequent questions about the program is what happens as students add and drop classes. She said students will still be able to add and drop courses and corresponding course materials throughout the usual add/drop period. Dr. Hyatt said the requirement of faculty is to adhere to the same schedule that they are already being asked to adhere to.

Dr. Hyatt said textbook affordability has been a topic of concern for a number of years. There has been a steady decline in students purchasing textbooks and course materials. Generally speaking, students are purchasing course materials at a rate which is impeding their academic success. Dr. Hyatt said sometimes students do not have access to the course materials which require access codes and are used as a mechanism for submitting assignments and quizzes at the start of the semester. She said even if a student has a one-week delay on having access to these resources it can leave them significantly behind. Dr. Hyatt said this is seen as a tool for student success and an equitable solution by allowing the charges to be applied to the student account and avoiding the question at the beginning of the semester of can the student afford the materials.

#### REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

President Robichaux-Davis said she would like for the senators to think back to where we were two years ago as a university. She said on this exact date, March 11<sup>th</sup> 2020, at 4:30 p.m., MSU released a statement cancelling all international travel including summer study abroad programs and employees and students were encouraged to avoid any unnecessary out-of-state travel. On March 12, 2020, the SEC basketball tournament was cancelled, and a separate announcement was made extending spring break so faculty could transition to online instruction. President Robichaux-Davis said little did we know in 2020 that in 2022 we would still not be completely back to normal. She said study abroad and travel seem to be returning to some sense of normalcy. The past two years have been filled with challenges and it seems nothing has been easy. President Robichaux-Davis said she commends and thanks the senators and the faculty they represent for all of the work they have done and the challenges they have endured over the past two years to keep us moving forward in accomplishing our university's

mission. President Robichaux-Davis said she understands how exhausting and draining this has been.

President Robichaux-Davis presented her written report as follows:

Happy Maroon Friday, Senators and Guests! I hope you are continuing to have a productive and rewarding Spring semester. We have nearly made it to Spring Break! As these last two years have been quite challenging and exhausting, I hope you will truly be able to “take a break” next week! Thank you for your hard work this semester and your dedication to Mississippi State University. Your commitment to teaching, research and service does not go unnoticed.

You may recall that last April we approved additional faculty ranks to include three levels of Professor of Practice, three levels of Teaching Professor, and three levels of Instructor. Since April our findings have been reviewed by the Associate Deans Committee. The Executive Committee of the Senate has been working closely with Dr. Shaw in preparation for hosting three town hall discussions to share and explain the new faculty ranks and answer any questions faculty may have. Senator Miller has prepared a beautiful graphical representation of the ten faculty tracks that will soon be shared with all faculty. The faculty ranks are categorized into tenure-track and professional-track. My goal is to call a special meeting of the General Faculty with the cooperation of Dr. Keenum to vote on the adoption of the new ranks. The Faculty Handbook is being examined to determine the changes necessary for the new ranks. If the general faculty adopt the new faculty ranks, I intend to call a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on May 6<sup>th</sup> to address the edits to the Faculty Handbook so implementation of the new ranks can occur as soon as possible.

Since my last report, some of the university standing committees on which I serve had meetings. Additionally, the COVID-19 Task Force met and after discussing the trends in the data concerning COVID\_19 case on campus made the recommendation to drop the mask mandate in classrooms. Faculty may continue to require that masks be worn in their offices.

The Committee for Inclusive Excellence Statements met last week. The result of that meeting was an agreed upon draft statement that you should have seen in my March update email that I sent on Monday of this week. Please send me your thoughts and comments on that statement by Friday, March 25<sup>th</sup>.

I met with the director of the Disability Resource Center, Chris Dallager, Jeremy Baham and Brent Fountain on February 22<sup>nd</sup> to discuss new procedures in place at the DRC. Chris shared that students needing accommodations are to submit a request along with all necessary documentation to his office. Then according to the accommodations requested, the next step is either for the student to meet with the faculty member OR the needed accommodations are added to the student’s info in Banner so that faculty can see those on their rosters. If the student is in need of extended time for assignments or for more absences than typically allowed, the student is given a form to complete with the faculty member. We also spoke about the procedures for having tests administered at the DRC. The student must make the request at



least three business days prior to the day of the test. The faculty member will then be contacted by the DRC and the faculty member just needs to get the test to the DRC prior to the actual time of the test. If students need to take the test at a different time than the rest of the class, they are now being asked why. The DRC will communicate this request to the faculty member. If a student fails to request to take a test at the DRC three business days ahead of time, then they either take it with the rest of the class and not receive their accommodation or they can work with the faculty member to take the test at a different time but with the faculty member. The DRC is soon to release a “Guidelines for Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” to all faculty. Eventually, there will also be a guidebook for student responsibilities. Both of these documents will eventually be available on the DRC website. Chris would like to explain these procedures and other information about the DRC with as many faculty as he can and has spoken to faculty at a few departmental faculty meetings. He will be on the agenda for our April meeting.

To celebrate Mississippi State’s 144<sup>th</sup> birthday and our 1<sup>st</sup> Twitter Birthday which were on February 28, 2022, we changed up our weekly Twitter programming. Mondays will continue to be a motivational quote and Fridays will continue to be Faculty Senator Fridays, but Tuesdays will now be “Where Are We Tuesday”, Wednesdays will feature a “Word of the Week” and Thursdays will be an MSU Trivia question. Answers to the Where Are We Tuesday tweet and the Trivia Question on Thursdays will go out on Mondays of the following week. If you are on Twitter, please follow us. Our Twitter handle is @msstateRHFacSen and our tweets go out at either 8:00 am or at noon, Monday through Friday.

Although I had been working with Tracey Baham to figure out a way to have faculty add their own three questions to the student surveys of teaching, it will not be possible to do that. The sheer volume of the course surveys that could potentially be “personalized” is just too large. To get a sense of scope, last spring, OIRE deployed 35,197 course surveys. These surveys have to be built between March 8<sup>th</sup> and April 11<sup>th</sup> which is very tight turn around time. Although there is a system in place for building the surveys in a timely fashion, the added layer of vetting additional questions at the individual faculty member level is not possible. Thus, we have agreed to a compromise through which faculty will still be able to add up to three questions of their choosing, but those questions will come from a question bank of 53 questions that Jim Dunne and Tracey Baham put together using previously published, vetted questions. These questions are grouped into specific categories to facilitate selection of questions. In the future, faculty will be able to submit specific questions that they wish to be considered for inclusion in the question bank and once those questions are vetted, they will be added to the question bank in the appropriate category. In terms of this semester’s timeline, March 21<sup>st</sup> is the deadline for department heads to make corrections to the instructor of record associated with each section. On or around April 11<sup>th</sup>, faculty will receive an email from Class Climate prompting them to select up to three additional questions from the question bank per section that they teach. The deadline for selecting additional questions is April 18<sup>th</sup>. On April 25<sup>th</sup>, the student surveys will be deployed to students. Surveys will close on May 6<sup>th</sup>.

At our next Faculty Senate meeting we will elect new officers whose terms will begin on July 1<sup>st</sup>. The nomination period will open on Friday, March 18<sup>th</sup> and will close on Friday, April 1<sup>st</sup>. Nominations (including self-nominations) should be sent to [faculty senate@senate.msstate.edu](mailto:faculty senate@senate.msstate.edu) or [rrr102@msstate.edu](mailto:rrr102@msstate.edu) in order to comply with the instructions in the handbook. All nominations must be submitted in written format. Note that you will need to provide a nomination packet which includes a statement consisting of qualifications and reasons for seeking election, as well as a vita, to the senate office by no later than 5:00 p.m. on April 1<sup>st</sup>. If there are not two or more candidates for an office, additional candidates will be allowed to run “from the floor” on April 8. If nominated from the floor, a written statement and vita need to be available for distribution in time for us to be able to distribute it at the meeting when we conduct the vote. Absentee ballots will be permitted on the first ballot only, and must be requested no later than noon on the Tuesday before the meeting (April 5) and submitted back to me, the elections officer, no later than 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 6. If you have questions regarding any of this process, feel free to contact Jason Cory or myself to get clarification.

#### **Reports from Committees on which I Serve:**

*Athletic Council* – This committee met on February 9<sup>th</sup> and March 2<sup>nd</sup>. The Office of Student Athlete Development held an NIL Program with the compliance office for all student athletes. A company called Captivate facilitated this program and discussed tracking on all social media and opportunities provided through social media. Networking nights were held in the suites of Davis-Wade stadium on February 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>. SAAC held a Book Drive which ended on February 28<sup>th</sup>. The books were given to local Starkville schools and student athletes read books at Sudduth Elementary on National Read Across America Day on March 1<sup>st</sup>. Student athletes were able to be part of “The Loyola Project” which includes watching “The Game of Change” and then participating in follow-up facilitated discussions. To celebrate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Title IX, all teams will be wearing a Title IX Warm-up Shirt prior to upcoming games. At the recent NCAA Convention a new NCAA constitution was adopted. The new constitution pushes control to the individual divisions. Eric George presented financial information about football bowl games. Basically, we break even financially, but the excitement of going to a bowl game and giving the fans an opportunity to go to a bowl game generates interest and ticket sales for the following season. John Cohen shared that the football team is currently engaged in “Midnight Maneuvers” – four nights a week for two weeks they compete in various football drills. He also spoke about 8:00 pm basketball games and that there are pros and cons with such a late tip-off time. On average, MSU fans drive 70 miles one way to get to a game. The last games allow locals to have dinner before going to the game and allows those traveling enough time to get to Starkville. However, the return home is quite late. An earlier game time would allow them to get home at a reasonable time, but they might have to take off of work to get to Starkville in time of the game. I am still working with Brent Fountain on a spring Faculty Athletics month or a few faculty-focused spring athletic events.

*COVID-19 Task Force* – Information from these meetings has been provided through emailed updates as well as through the updated COVID-19 website. Masks are no longer required inside of classrooms and other teaching spaces. Individual employees can require that masks be worn in their own office spaces. The COVID-19 Vaccine remains available at the Health Center. See [www.msstate.edu/covid19](http://www.msstate.edu/covid19) for more information.

*Design Review Committee* – This committee met on March 3<sup>rd</sup>. Dale Partners Architects presented the plans for MSU’s new High Performance Computing Center. The new space will be twice as large as our current HPCC building and the plans were drawn up with “ease of future expansions” in mind. It will be located in the Thad Cochran Research Park between the current HPCC building and the MSU Enology Lab. The facility will include a large viewing gallery which will provide ample space for tours. The committee approved the plans. Dale Partners Architects and Ches Fedric from MSU Athletics presented plans for a new Softball Fieldhouse along with some remodeling of the outdoor plaza area that is at the entrance to the softball field and tennis courts. It will be much more fan-friendly with picnic tables and more sitting areas. The committee approved the plans for this new facility.

*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* – 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 has not met since my last report.

*Information Technology Council* – This committee met on March 1<sup>st</sup>. Mississippi State University is implementing additional cybersecurity measures to allow us to remain compliant with federal information security policies. The cybersecurity requirements for government information are continually evolving. DOD contracts are the major driver for MSU to update cybersecurity measures at the moment, but other federal agencies are expected to be implementing similar standards in the near future. MSU’s DOD contracts totaled roughly \$40 million in 2021. The newest cybersecurity standards for government information are Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification 1.0 and Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) 2.0. Currently the High Performance Computing Collaboratory is the only entity at MSU that meets the criteria for CMMC 1.0 or 2.0 information. As we come into compliance with the standards, university policies will be updated. It is anticipated that we will spend \$6 million over the next 5 years to achieve the standards. As indicated in an email sent out to all MSU users, Google Drive is being decommissioned due to it becoming a paid service. Anyone with files contained on Google Drive must have them moved by May 15<sup>th</sup> or they will no longer be able to access them. The University community will continue to receive notifications of this change prior to the deadline. Microsoft OneDrive (5TB) or Teams (25TB) can be used in place of Google Drive. To meet new

requirements and maintain best practices, ITS will be working to remove administrative rights from all university computers unless there is a unique need. Before this takes effect there will be a software repository (or something similar) to allow users to download popular software to systems without admin rights. The security training initiative has entered its second round. There were 1,331 individuals who did not take the required training during the first round. The individuals who need to complete the training have been notified. If an individual does not complete the required training during this round they will be reported to their Vice President. If you are one of the individuals who have not yet completed the training, please do so as soon as possible. Please share this with the faculty you represent.

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

*Parking and Traffic Regulations Committee* – This committee met on February 24<sup>th</sup>. There were two items on the agenda. One was for the committee to consider allowing motorcycles to park in a manner where the license plate is not facing outwards since it is not the safest way to park for a motorcycles. The committee agreed to suspend issuing citations to motorcyclists who park in a manner where the license plate isn't visible from the drive lane. The second item on the agenda was a presentation and demonstration by the Bird scooter company. Bird scooters are programmable to allow for strict geo-fencing so that the scooters can't be ridden in places that are pedestrian-heavy. The committee is still in discussion about whether or not we want to propose that MSU get into a contract with Bird. We are also discussing if personal scooters should be allowed on campus at all or on certain areas of campus.

*Sustainability Committee* – This committee has not met since my last report.

## REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE VICE PRESIDENT

### **Academic Deans Council**

The Academic Deans Council met on February 16, 2022. The focus of the meeting was a progress report on the new Mississippi State University Bachelor of Science of Data scheduled to launch fall of 2022. The new major will include 10 concentrations. The degree proposal and new courses will be submitted March 10th.

Three AOPs were presented early in the cycle to address/clarify recent situations:

AOP 11.11: Auditing A Class added a sentence to clarify audit hours for graduate students.

AOP 12.32: Refund and Course Credit for Student Members of the Military Called to Active Duty or Deployed clarifies language for refund and course credit information for military.

AOP 13.12: Intersession Teaching (formerly Summer School Teaching) adds during intersession to include the winter session.

### **Committee on Campus Access**

The Committee on Campus Access meetings scheduled for February 7 and March 7 were cancelled.

### **Community Engagement Committee**

No meetings were held since the last Vice President's report, and no meetings are scheduled to date. Dr. Shaw is looking into why this committee is not meeting.

### **Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee**

The Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee was cancelled due to no agenda 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. It is possible that this committee is working to reestablish its mission and purpose.

### **Sustainability Committee**

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

Updated on March 7, 2022

Respectfully submitted, Missy Hopper

## FACULTY DESIGNATES ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

### BUSINESS TO BE SENT TO COMMITTEE

1. **AOP 11.11 Auditing a Class** (Academic Affairs)
2. **AOP 12.32 Refund and Course Credit for Student Members of the Military Called to Active Duty or Deployed** (Student Affairs)
3. **AOP 13.12 Intersession Teaching** (Faculty Affairs)

President Robichaux-Davis asked for any discussion on sending the policies to their respective committees. The motion to send the policies to their indicated committee passed by unanimous hand vote.

## STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

### **Academic Affairs**

1. **AOP 12.12 Credit & Grades**

Senator Follett, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, presented the committee report on AOP 12.12 Credit & Grades. He said Senator Carskadon pointed out a typo in the next to the last line of the first paragraph in the discussion section which reads “must allow for at least two changes”. Senator Follett said this should read “must allow for at least two chances”.

Senator Pelaez asked if catalog descriptions would need to be changed if her department decides to add minimum competencies. Senator Follett replied the course syllabus must clearly document the conditions for satisfying the minimum competencies and the catalog description has to include appropriate language that the minimum competencies must be met. Senator Pelaez asked if the program has to change. Senator Follett replied it did not. He said it is a course-by-course thing.

The motion of the Academic Affairs Committee to adopt AOP 12.12 as presented with the one noted correction passed by unanimous hand vote.

## **2. AOP 12.30 Developmental Studies**

Senator Follett, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, presented the committee report on rescinding AOP 12.30 Developmental Studies.

The motion of the Academic Affairs Committee to rescind AOP 12.30 passed by unanimous hand vote.

### **Ancillary Affairs**

#### **1. AOP 12.39 Policy on Undergraduate University Scholarship**

Senator Follett, on behalf of the Ancillary Affairs Committee, presented the committee report on AOP 12.39.

The motion of the Ancillary Affairs Committee to adopt AOP 12.39 Policy on Undergraduate University Scholarship passed by unanimous hand vote.

**Charter & Bylaws**                      **No Report**

**Faculty Affairs**                        **No Report**

**Student Affairs**                       **No Report**

**University Resources**               **No Report**

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

#### PENDING BUSINESS

#### NEW BUSINESS

President Robichaux-Davis said the Faculty Senate Office received a policy for review after the three-day deadline to be included in the agenda. She said the policy was previously sent to the Senate for rescission due to Extension senators, on behalf of Extension faculty, not being in

favor of rescinding it. President Robichaux-Davis said the operating policy on travel is currently being edited to accommodate the Senate's concerns and AOP 13.08 Travel by Faculty and Staff has been sent back to Senate to be rescinded. President Robichaux-Davis said she would like to assign AOP 13.08 to the Executive Committee for consideration to be rescinded. She said a copy of the policy will be sent to all senators and she asked the senators to send any concerns they have to the chair of the Senate committee they serve on.

Senator Follett made a motion to send the policy to the Executive Committee. Senator Banik seconded the motion.

The motion to send AOP 13.08 Travel by Faculty and Staff to the Executive Committee passed by unanimous hand vote.

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

The motion to adjourn passed by unanimous hand vote at 3:24 p.m.

Submitted for correction and approval.

---

Stephanie King, Secretary

Jason Cory, Administrative Assistant II

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Dr. Mark Keenum, University President

Dr. Brent Fountain, Faculty Athletic Representative

Mr. Chris Dallager, Director of Disability Resource Center and ACCESS

Dr. David Shaw, Provost and Executive Vice President

## REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

Happy April, Senators! As we near the end of another academic year, I hope your spring 2022 semester has been both rewarding and successful across the teaching, research and service endeavors with which you are involved. I also hope you will be able to take a well-deserved break this summer and come back refreshed and rejuvenated.

As this is the last regular meeting of the Robert Holland Faculty Senate for the 2021-2022 academic year, I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to each of you for your service on the Faculty Senate this past year and for your on-going dedication to excellence in teaching, research and service for our great university. While this year presented its fair share of challenges and difficulties, we certainly could not have had the tremendous success that we had this past year during a global pandemic without the determination and commitment of each of you.

I would like to extend a special thank you to those senators who are finishing their terms of service and rolling off of the senate. Thank you, Senators Matthew Brown, Robin Fontenot, Melissa Moore, and Mark Welch. Additionally, an extra special thank you to those senators who are finishing their second consecutive terms of service and also rolling off of the senate. Thank you, Senators Tom Carskadon, Brian Davis, Randy Follett, Lyndsey Miller, and Rosangela Sebba.

As this is my last regular meeting in this role, I would also like to extend an extra special thank you to my Executive Committee, Senators Robert Banik, Jason Barrett, Randy Follett, Robin Fontenot, Missy Hopper, Stephanie King, Lyndsey Miller, and Beth Stokes. This team of senators has helped me and supported the work of the Faculty Senate in countless ways throughout the past year. They were never too busy for an additional meeting or to help me out in whatever ways I needed. Their dedication to the Faculty Senate was always apparent. Last, but certainly not least, I would like to extend a huge thank you to Jason Cory, our Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant for his constant assistance and help this past year. Whether it was securing our chocolate chips cookies prior to meetings, reserving meetings spaces for various committee meetings, putting together our meeting agendas, or locating the specific date that a certain AOP was passed along with countless other things, Jason was always ready and excited to assist in any way he could.

Next, I would like to welcome our newly elected senators who are joining us for the first time today. Welcome, Senators Frank Adams, Jenna Altomonte, Jeb Cade, Robert Grala, Andrew Jarosz, Cheryl Justice, Jesse Morrison, Neeraj Rai, Tara Sutton, and Eric Vivier. I also want to give a warm welcome back to Senators Gnaneswar Gude, Andy Perkins, Paul Spurlin and Beth Stokes who were re-elected by their colleges to serve an additional three-year term.

As I look back on this past year, I am filled with gratitude to you for giving me the opportunity to serve as your President. Thank you to each of you who shared kind words with me in response to my monthly update emails, to individual requests that I made, and unsolicited words of appreciation you send to me. I hope my monthly email updates provided you with useful information. I am very grateful for your responses whenever I sent out surveys or other requests for input. If we are to continue to engage in shared governance as a deliberative body, your input is always welcomed and needed. Although this year was another one-of-a-kind year, I truly believe it was a successful year for the Faculty Senate as we addressed important issues and approved 12 AOPs . We also heard from 11 guests at our



monthly meetings, primarily in response to your requests. I hope the information these speakers shared with you was also useful.

During this past year, we partnered with the Athletics Department to organize a Faculty/Staff Athletics Appreciation month in both the fall and spring semesters, including bringing back an open football practice for faculty and staff. We also unanimously approved of a new student course survey which is in its second semester of implementation. To that end, I worked with Dr. Shaw and Tracey Baham to facilitate the use of a question bank to allow faculty to individualize the student course surveys used in their classes this semester. Additionally, on your behalf I put forward a recommendation that a university committee be created to oversee the effectiveness of all other university committees. This committee will be instituted soon. I also convened an Ad hoc Onboarding Committee in response to informal conversations with some of our first-year senators. I am hopeful to institute at least part of their recommended onboarding process this year. We continued to use our Twitter account for daily tweets that promoted our great institution and the work of its faculty. We also worked to improve the Faculty Confidence Survey experience by working with ITS to create an automatic email to the person completing the survey that lets them know their survey was successfully submitted. With the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, I worked closely with Drs. Keenum and Shaw to get to the point where we were ready to call a Special Meeting of the General Faculty so that the additional instructional faculty ranks that we proposed at the April 2021 meeting could be voted on. As you know, this meeting will take place on April 28<sup>th</sup> with voting to remain open for three business days after the meeting. I am hopeful that we will move forward into the next academic year with new instructional ranks. I look forward to continuing to serve the Faculty Senate for the remaining two years of my term.

#### **Reports from Committees on which I Serve:**

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

*COVID-19 Task Force* – This committee met once since my last report. Given that the COVID-19 Pandemic is moving into the endemic stage, the Task Force voted to remove the COVID-19 campus testing data, the COVID-19 information websites, the vaccine website and the vaccine status box on MyState at the end of the Spring 2022 semester. Information about the COVID vaccine will be moved to the Longest Student Health Center website. The Task Force continues to monitor COVID-19 cases and national trends.

*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 met on March 28<sup>th</sup>. Changes to AOP 10:08, *Classroom Regulations*, was approved. HRM policy 60.405, *Separation of Employment – Staff*, OP 61.05, *Fixed Price and Residual Balance*, were approved. Last, the Council voted in favor of rescinding OP 80.03, U.S. National Industrial Security Program Security Incident Policy, because the policy

is no longer needed to address compliance issues with the U.S. Department of Defense or similar federal agencies.

*Executive Enrollment Management Committee* – This committee met on April 4<sup>th</sup>. John Dickerson and Lew Sanborne of Ruffalo Noel Levitz shared an update on the thirteen enrollment strategies that we previously decided should be implemented. The strategies were presented in three clusters. Cluster One, *New Student Acquisition*, includes four strategies: Expand and Increase Market Reach, University-Wide Undergraduate Recruitment Communications Plan, Coordinated Graduate Student Recruitment Communications Plan, and Comprehensive, University-Wide Marketing Plan. Cluster Two, *Student Success, Diversification, and Yield*, includes five strategies: Enhance and Execute an Incoming Student Onboarding Experience, Comprehensive University-Wide International Recruitment and Partnerships, Further Develop Student Success Strategies for Campuses 2 and 5 (already being implemented), Comprehensive and Holistic Review of Undergraduate Financial Aid Awarding, and Develop Broad Academic Support Strategies. Cluster Three, *Essential to Launch with a Longer Runway*, includes four strategies: University-Wide Expansion of Non-Traditional Terms, Streamline and Improve Processes for Graduate Admissions, Graduate Assistant Funding Strategy (already being implemented), and Graduate Stackable and Micro-Credential Development. The committee spent time discussing the need to develop a process for the expansion of non-traditional terms to include more 8-week courses and potentially some 5-week courses during the regular semesters of the academic year. We are losing online students to other institutions because if they miss our start date, they can't begin classes until the start of the next semester which could be up to four months later.

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

*Game Day and Special Events* – This committee has not met since my last report.

*Information Technology Council* – This council has not met since my last report.

*Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee* – This committee has not met since my last report, but we did have an email vote on March 9<sup>th</sup> on two consent agenda items in lieu of an in-person meeting. Through this email vote, we approved the plans for the MSU High Performance Computer Data Center and the Softball Field House.

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

*Sustainability Committee* – This committee met on March 23<sup>rd</sup>. There will be a Glass Recycling Drive on April 12<sup>th</sup> from 1:00 to 5:00 in the Sanderson Center parking lot. We have begun an outreach program with Partnership Middle School. Sustainability personnel are speaking to 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> graders about sustainability and the importance of recycling. Sustainability personnel along with an environmental science class conducted a “Weigh the Waste” study in Perry cafeteria and Fresh Foods. Food waste was higher in Perry cafeteria. About 18 pounds of waste was collected every 30 minutes. We have about 25,000-30,000 pounds of food waste per year.

“Food Waste” is categorized as edible, non-edible and trash. A more comprehensive report of this study is forthcoming. Earth Week will be April 19-22<sup>nd</sup>. On Tuesday of that week, there will be a Sustainability Boot Camp. On Wednesday there will be a Fashion Show and a campus clean-up event, “Get Swept Up.” On Thursday, there will be a Climate Change Lunch and Learn and a presentation on the impact on water resources. Friday there will be an organization fair with food trucks. Everyone is encouraged to wear Green on that Friday to support the “Maroon Goes Green” effort. More information on these events is also forthcoming and will be posted on the Sustainability website.

## REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE VICE PRESIDENT

### **Academic Deans Council**

The Academic Deans Council scheduled to meet on March 16 was cancelled.

### **Committee on Campus Access**

The Committee on Campus Access scheduled to meet on March 7 was cancelled. The next meeting scheduled for April 4 was also cancelled.

### **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 had two Consent Agenda items this month: the MSU High Performance Computer Data Center and the Softball Field House. In the absence of other new business or an objection, the MPDAC did not meet but requested a vote on the consent agenda via email on March 10th.

### **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**

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

Updated on April 4, 2022

Respectfully submitted, Missy Hopper

## REPORTS FROM FACULTY DESIGNATES ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

### BUSINESS TO BE SENT TO COMMITTEE

1. [AOP 13.02 Giles Distinguished Professors](#) (Faculty Affairs)..... (p. 67)

## STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

### ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. AOP 11.11 Auditing a Class

#### **Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate**

#### **Academic Affairs Committee**

#### **Report on AOP 11.11 Auditing a Class**

**April 4, 2022**

#### **Background**

This AOP was brought to senate after clarification was added to indicate that graduate students may not use audit hours to satisfy any requirement for full-time enrollment. It was distributed to our committee and a few minor editorial changes were made to enhance the readability and clarity of the document.

#### **Recommendation**

The Academic Affairs recommends that the Robert Holland Faculty Senate approve the AOP as amended.

#### **Discussion**

There were two sentences initially stating the same thing, for a graduate student not on assistantship versus one on an assistantship. Since they were the same rule, we decided to merge the two for clarity and to eliminate some redundancy. Also, referring to a student who audits a class as an “auditor” seemed unclear, so we changed that to simply refer to them as a “student”, to match similar sentences in the AOP.

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



## AOP 11.11: AUDITING A CLASS

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to standardize procedures for undergraduate and graduate students desiring to audit a class.

### POLICY/PROCEDURE

Upon recommendation from the relevant course instructor and subject to approval by the appropriate dean and Registrar, a student may enroll to audit a course. The approval to audit must occur by the last day to add a course in the semester. A student may not change from credit to audit or audit to credit status after the last day to add a course in the semester. An audited course counts as part of an undergraduate student's regular load. For graduate students, regardless of whether or not they receive an assistantship, audit hours may not be used to satisfy the full-time enrollment requirement in any semester. For graduate students on assistantships, audit hours cannot be used to satisfy the full-time enrollment requirement. Students auditing a class are not required to take tests and/or examinations or to prepare other written assignments. Otherwise, conformity to regular classroom rules including attendance requirements is the same as for students taking the course for credit. At the time the request for audit is approved, the professor will inform the student auditing the class of attendance expectations. Failure to meet any or all of these requirements may result in an auditor that student being administratively dropped from the class roll. No audited course may be counted as part of the required hours of any degree or program requirement.

### REVIEW

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

REVIEWED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and  
Dean of the Graduate School

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost and Executive Vice President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
President, Robert Holland Faculty Senate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Vice President, Institutional Strategy & Effectiveness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
General Counsel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

ANCILLARY AFFAIRS  
CHARTER & BYLAWS

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### **1. AOP 13.08 Travel by Faculty and Staff**

**Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate**

**Executive Committee**

**Report on AOP 13.08 – Travel by Faculty and Staff**

**April 5, 2022**

#### **Background**

AOP 13.08 – Travel by Faculty and Staff is duplicative to OP 62.01: Travel. When previously asked to rescind this AOP, the Faculty Senate did not support this because of the statement concerning Extension faculty within the AOP. However, after consulting with the Vice-President of Finance and the Division of Agriculture, Forestry and Veterinary Medicine, it was determined that the statement within AOP 13.08 about Extension faculty is too limiting and that OP 62.01 already states that no prior approval for in-state travel is needed except for the circumstances that are listed in the policy. The statement contained in OP 62.01 is inclusive of more MSU personnel than Extension faculty.

#### **Recommendation**

Based on the information provided, the Executive Committee of the Robert Holland Faculty Senate recommends that AOP 13.08 be rescinded.

#### **Discussion**

The Executive Committee reviewed AOP 13.08 and OP 62.01 and agreed that AOP 13.08 is duplicative and not necessary given the contents of OP 62.01. No further discussion was needed.

**Committee Members: Rebecca Robichaux-Davis (Chair), Robert Banik, Jason Barrett, Randy Follett, Robin Fontenot, Stephanie King, Missy Hopper, Lyndsey Miller, Beth Stokes**

# MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY™

## Policy and Procedure

### ACADEMIC OPERATING POLICY AND PROCEDURE

MEMORANDUM All Holders of Mississippi State University Academic Operating  
TO: Policy and Procedure Manuals

DATE: April, 1989

SUBJECT: AOP 13.08 – Travel by Faculty and Staff

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to establish the following procedure with regard to travel.

Travel by University personnel is governed by a Board of Trustees policy. Additional information related to travel is covered in [OP 62.01 Travel](#).

### REVIEW

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

### POLICY/PROCEDURE

Travel by staff and faculty members to professional, scientific, and educational meetings for the purpose of the improvement of instruction and of professional advancement for official business of the institution shall be encouraged within budgetary limitations of the institution. Faculty and staff members must obtain prior approval before traveling outside the state. Members of the Extension Service, due to the nature of their work, do not ordinarily secure prior approval for routine travel within Mississippi. Faculty and staff members must obtain prior approval before traveling to attend in-state conventions, associations, conferences, workshops, seminars, clinics and for in-state group travel.



Faculty and staff are recommended to complete and submit the Travel Authorization and Reimbursement Form for all work related travel.

Faculty and staff members are requested to keep accurate records of their expenses and should check with the Office of the Travel Services for information concerning requested documentation to substantiate expenses. The website for travel services at the university contains the most specific guidelines regarding the interpretation of the rules and existing practices. (<http://www.travel.msstate.edu/>)

## RESPONSIBILITIES

<u>Position</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Year</u>
<a href="#">Associate Provost for Academic Affairs</a>	Review	2017

### APPROVED:

<u>/s/ Peter L. Ryan</u>	<u>03/04/13</u>
Associate Provost for Academic Affairs	Date
<u>/s/ Jerome A. Gilbert</u>	<u>03/07/13</u>
Provost and Executive Vice President	Date
<u>/s/ Meghan Millea</u>	<u>03/18/13</u>
President, Robert Holland Faculty Senate	Date

### REVIEWED BY:

<u>/s/ Lesia Ervin</u>	<u>03/15/13</u>
Director, Office of Internal Audit	Date
<u>/s/ Joan L. Lucas</u>	<u>04/30/13</u>
General Counsel	Date

### APPROVED:

<u>/s/ Mark Keenum</u>	<u>05/06/13</u>
President	Date



## **OP 62.01: TRAVEL**

### **POLICY**

The expenditure of funds for travel related purposes must be closely monitored to ensure expenditures are allowable, appropriate and properly approved. The purpose of this policy is to establish definitive direction for faculty, staff, and students traveling on official University business. This policy covers all University related travel within state, out-of-state, and outside the continental United States.

### **PROCEDURE**

In keeping with State Statute (Section 25-3-41) of the MISSISSIPPI CODE of 1972, Annotated, Mississippi State University (MSU), as a State Institution, shall make reimbursement to any officer or employee who is required to travel in the discharge of official duties to the extent of actual, ordinary and necessary costs incurred within those limitations imposed by state law, contractual agreements, or the administrative policies of the University.

#### **A. Travel Authorization**

Prior approval is required when traveling out-of-state, for in-state or out-of-state group travel, or when attending any conventions, associations, conferences, workshops, seminars or clinics. Travel outside the continental United States (except to Alaska) is considered international travel and requires the signature of the President of the University.

All international travel requests will route through the International Institute for safety and security review. All prospective international travelers are required to check the Department of State Travel Warning country list prior to application for international travel. Prior to travel, faculty and staff must sign an "Assumption of Risk and Release Form" if the country of travel is an elevated-risk country as defined in the procedure. University sponsored or approved student travel to elevated-risk countries is generally prohibited. All international travel should adhere to the International Travel Procedures and Guidelines maintained by University Travel Services.

#### **B. Travel Prepayments**

All forms of prepayment (except those allowed on the procurement card) are treated as advance payments and charged to the approved traveler's receivable account and will remain the traveler's personal obligation to the University until settled. These charges should be settled through the submission of the expense voucher and will be considered

past due if not received within ten (10) business days after the end of the month in which the travel was completed or immediately upon cancellation of a trip. Extensions may be granted due to extenuating circumstances that might preclude the traveler's ability to settle on a timely basis. Travel Services is authorized, with the understanding of the traveler, to withhold from the traveler's salary any past due amounts.

1. Advances for travel must be requested in writing and approved prior to travel taking place
2. Conference registration fees may be prepaid by University check directly to the conference through Direct Pay process or by the traveler/ traveler's department via the procurement card.
3. The University's Employee Business Travel Account (EBTA) may be utilized for public carrier purchases made through the University's contracted travel agency.

### C. Allowable Travel Costs

1. **Meals:** The reimbursable meal allowance per day is the total of actual up to the "maximum daily meal allowance" as determined by the Department of Finance and Administration. The maximum daily allowance for Alaska is limited to the domestic high cost area rate. Meals are not reimbursable for non-overnight travel as they would be deemed taxable by the IRS. Alcoholic beverages are not reimbursable under any condition(s). Meal tips should be included in the actual meal expense unless the inclusion of the tips would cause the meals to exceed the maximum daily limitations. If the daily limitation is exceeded, the traveler is allowed to record meal tips as another authorized expense up to 20% of the maximum daily meal reimbursement claimed.

Other instances where meals are allowable in travel status include:

- Meals included in conference registration fees and documented by conference officials. Meals included in the conference registration fees should be noted by an asterisk in the meal section and may exceed the daily limit.
- The meal expense is incurred while discussing business with others. To qualify, the meal expense must be directly related to the active conduct of the University's business and the meal must be during, or directly before or after, a substantial and bona fide business discussion. A receipt and an Entertainment Form explaining the nature of the business meal must be attached to the travel voucher.

2. **Lodging:** The University shall reimburse the actual cost of lodging incurred in the discharge of official duties. Itemized receipts must be provided showing the name of the traveler, number of occupants, date of stay, and amount(s) of expenses incurred.

Lodging other than hotels/motels, such as apartments, dormitories, etc., may be used when they result in a lower cost. An itemized receipt is still required. If lodging in a condo, an apartment or other, there should be a cost comparison with three hotels in the area to show the cost savings to the University. All applicable costs (cleaning fees, etc) should be included in the cost comparison.

In the event that two or more persons share the same room, and the additional persons are employees traveling in an official capacity, claims for reimbursement should be made on the travel form of the employee who incurred the lodging cost. The other employee's name and MSU ID or travel document number should be submitted with the reimbursement claim. If the additional persons are not authorized travelers, the employee should request that the rate for a single room be entered on the receipt by the hotel clerk, and claim reimbursement for that amount only.

3. **Transportation:** Whether by public transportation, privately-owned vehicle, State-owned vehicle, etc., reimbursement will be made for the most direct practicable route.

Private owned vehicle use in the discharge of official university business shall be reimbursed at the same mileage rate determined for federal employees for each mile actually and necessarily traveled. When determining and claiming such reimbursable expenses for out-of-state travel, the "total cost of driving" must be compared with the "total cost of flying". When two or more employees travel in one private vehicle, only one travel expense at the authorized reimbursement rate per mile shall be allowed.

Rental Vehicle travel will be reimbursed by the University provided the rental is in conjunction with a public carrier and made by the contract travel agent, the rental is necessary due to the use of a state-owned vehicle, or another similar circumstance requires the use of the rental. Otherwise, the University will reimburse travel in a rental vehicle limited to the actual rental costs not to exceed mileage calculations at the current rate for a private owned vehicle. Check with Travel Services website for current rental contracts and contract ID numbers and rates.

The University will not reimburse for rental vehicles obtained for personal use, such as sightseeing or optional travel to and from restaurants, while on official business travel.

State owned vehicle actual operating expenses incurred for official travel will be reimbursed on presentation of receipts. No mileage reimbursement will be made for State-owned vehicle use.

Public carrier travel is defined as a commercial airline, train, or interstate bus line carrier. An employee should have all travel arrangements (transportation, lodging and rental cars) handled by the contract travel agent when traveling by public carrier unless they are able to demonstrate a significant savings to the University.

The University shall reimburse the actual cost of properly authorized transportation by public carrier at the coach fare unless such space is unavailable. The employee shall certify that coach accommodations were not available in order to claim reimbursement for first-class fare, or the employee shall determine and claim only the cost of coach fare if the first-class travel was for personal convenience.

If public transportation is not used, the traveler is free to make lodging arrangements without the use of the contract travel agent.

4. **Other Travel Costs:** The University shall reimburse the actual cost of other necessary expenses incurred by the traveler in the discharge of official duties. Refer to Travel Services website for a list of required receipts.

Registration Fees/Workshop Tuition when paid by the traveler, receipts are required in the traveler's name, indicating the date, the amount paid, and that the payment was received by a meeting official. Registration fees may be processed as described in the "Travel Prepayments" section of this document. It should be noted that Membership dues are not reimbursable through Travel Services.

Business Meal reimbursement of expenses for entertaining others while in travel status will be reimbursed only when the request for reimbursement is accompanied by a receipt and an Entertainment Form (MSU Form AO-8).

- D. Business Travel Expense (BTE) Program for Non-Employees Public carrier expenses of official guests, consultants, and others not employed by the University, as well as unitary group/team travel may be arranged with the contract travel agent and charged to the University's Business Travel Account.

## REVIEW

The Vice President of Budget and Planning is responsible for the review of this operating policy every four years or as needed.

**Please visit Travel Services for forms and procedures:**

<http://www.travel.msstate.edu/policy/>

<http://www.travel.msstate.edu/form/>

**REVIEWED BY:**

/s/ Don Zant  
Vice President for Finance

04/23/2018  
Date

/s/ Joan Lucas  
General Counsel

04/23/2018  
Date

/s/ Timothy N. Chamblee  
Assistant Vice President and Director  
Institutional Research and Effectiveness

04/23/2018  
Date

**APPROVED BY:**

/s/ Mark Keenum  
President

04/23/2018  
Date

FACULTY AFFAIRS  
STUDENT AFFAIRS  
UNIVERSITY RESOURCES

**1. AOP 13.20 Exit Interviews of Departing Faculty**

**Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate**

**University Resources Committee**

**Report on AOP 13.20**

**April 4, 2022**

**Background**

This AOP “Exit Interviews of Departing Faculty” was assigned to the University Resources Committee for a regular four-year review.

**Recommendation**

The committee recommends adding the phrase “or retirement” in the policy/procedure and clarifying the language in the final paragraph to forward the report to the “appropriate” Dean.

### **Discussion**

Departing faculty members generally leave the university through resignation to accept a position somewhere else, or by retirement from the university. The existing language only specified resigning faculty, and these interviews are conducted for retiring faculty as well. Therefore, the language should reflect the groups of faculty that HRM are dealing with in this situation.

Additionally, the language in the final paragraph was updated to specify delivery of the report to the Dean associated with the departing faculty’s position.

### **Committee Members**

Beth Stokes (chair), Todd Archer, Thu Dinh, Santanu Kundu, Sol Pelaez, Rosangela Sebba, Mary Love Tagert, and Molly Zuckerman



## AOP 13.20: EXIT INTERVIEWS OF DEPARTING FACULTY

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to promote an understanding about the policy related to exit interviews of departing faculty members. Exit interviews of departing faculty members can provide useful information to the administrative decision-making process of this university.

### POLICY/PROCEDURE

A departing faculty member who wishes, is encouraged to express his/her views or to provide an evaluation of one's working environment, and shall be granted an opportunity for an exit interview with the appropriate department head, director, or dean as requested by the exiting faculty member. Exiting faculty are also strongly encouraged to complete the online Faculty Exit Survey. An invitation to submit the online survey will be sent via email upon notification of resignation or retirement to Human Resources Management.

It shall be the responsibility of the appropriate department head, director, or dean to notify the departing faculty member of these opportunities, allowing sufficient time to complete the process (i.e. participate in the interview, sign the report, and if necessary rebut the report) before they depart the university.

If an exit interview is given, a summary report should be prepared by the department head, director, or dean of the departing faculty member(s) for the purpose of addressing any problems or concerns. A possible format for such a report should contain the following information:

1. Date
2. Name, position/rank
3. Date of separation
4. Length of service at Mississippi State
5. Reason(s) for leaving
6. The departing faculty member's suggestions for improvement.

Finally, this report should be forwarded to the appropriate Dean, ~~then and~~ to the Provost and Executive Vice President. An online submission of the Faculty Exit Survey will automatically be reviewed by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President.

### 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.



REVIEWED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and  
Dean of the Graduate School

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost and Executive Vice President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
President, Robert Holland Faculty Senate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Vice President, Institutional Strategy & Effectiveness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
General Counsel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **2. AOP 13.21 Faculty Released Time for Specified Committee Chairs**

**Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate**

**University Resources Committee**

**Report on AOP 13.21**

**April 4, 2022**

### **Background**

This AOP “Faculty Released Time for Specified Committee Chairs” was assigned to the University Resources Committee for a regular four-year review.

### **Recommendation**

The committee finds no necessary updates in this AOP.

### **Discussion**

None.

### **Committee Members**

Beth Stokes (chair), Todd Archer, Thu Dinh, Santanu Kundu, Sol Pelaez, Rosangela Sebba, Mary Love Tagert, and Molly Zuckerman



## AOP 13.21: FACULTY RELEASED TIME FOR SPECIFIED COMMITTEE CHAIRS

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Operating Policy and Procedure (AOP) is to promote an understanding among the holders of this manual regarding faculty reassigned time for the Robert Holland Faculty Senate President, the Robert Holland Faculty Senate Vice President, the Faculty Athletics Representative, and the University Committee on Courses & Curricula Chair.

### POLICY/PROCEDURE

The University operates under the philosophy that certain committee positions filled by faculty members carry specified released time in order to perform the assigned functions. There are four such positions. The University will reimburse the appropriate departments for the percent of faculty time released based upon 9-month salary or equivalent for these activities according to the following:

1. Faculty Senate President – Released time of 50% during the fall and spring terms, plus 16.67 % for the summer. The rate for the summer is based on the salary of the faculty member at the time he/she serves as chair. These equivalent funds will be transferred to the faculty member's department in August of each year. In the event the faculty member fails to complete the year's obligation, the funds remaining revert to the Office of Academic Affairs.
2. Faculty Senate Vice President – Released time of 25% during the fall and spring terms plus 8.33% for the summer. These equivalent funds will be transferred to the faculty member's department in August of each year. In the event the faculty member fails to complete the year's obligation, the funds remaining revert to the Office of Academic Affairs.
3. Faculty Athletics Representative – Released time of 25% during the fall and spring terms. These equivalent funds will be transferred to the faculty member's department in August of each year. In the event the faculty member fails to complete the year's obligation, the funds remaining revert to the Office of Academic Affairs.
4. University Committee on Courses and Curricula Chair – Released time of 25% during fall and spring terms. These equivalent funds will be transferred to the faculty member's department in August of each year. In the event the faculty member fails to complete the year's obligation, the funds remaining revert to the Office of Academic Affairs.

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.

REVIEWED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and  
Dean of the Graduate School

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost and Executive Vice President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
President, Robert Holland Faculty Senate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Vice President, Institutional Strategy & Effectiveness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
General Counsel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

### **3. Library Concerns Letter**

#### **Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate**

#### **University Resources Committee**

#### **Report on Academic Journal Subscriptions by the MSU Libraries**

**April 4, 2022**

#### **Background**

In October 2017, faculty of the Department of Anthropology and Middle Eastern Cultures delivered a letter to the Faculty Senate addressing concerns over the cancellation of certain academic journal subscriptions. The core concerns of the letter were that cancellation determinative metrics affect smaller departments disproportionately, and that more cancellations address journals used by small departments, which may have limited distribution, relatively low readership, or highly specific areas of focus. To address the inquiry by faculty, this matter was handed over to the University Resources Committee to gather information.

#### **Recommendation**

Dean Lis Pankl has been contacted with the collected information and emailed a response indicating she would like to maintain this conversation and inquiry. A meeting is recommended with the Dean and the 2022-23 University Resources committee at the members' convenience.

#### **Discussion**

In 2020, Interim Dean Anderson shared information in a response letter to the Faculty Senate. He summarized that MSU hosts the average number of databases across the responding SEC Universities, with 452 available databases. Additionally, Dr. Anderson compiled information responding to the questions "What resource report numbers do you use to determine the cost-per-use of a subscribed e-journal?" and "What is the language of your collection development policy regarding e-journals, their acquisition and cancellation?". Dr. Anderson also determined that MSU Libraries have cancelled over 1,400 journal titles since 2005, most often due to rising subscription rates and budget limits. Dr. Anderson also introduced the idea of a collaborative survey of all faculty, administration, and graduate students across the MSU campuses who utilize the MSU online journal resources.

#### **Committee Members**

Beth Stokes (chair), Todd Archer, Thu Dinh, Santanu Kundu, Sol Pelaez, Rosangela Sebba, Mary Love Tagert, and Molly Zuckerman

#### **4. Faculty Senate Meeting Space**

##### **Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate**

##### **University Resources Committee**

##### **Report on Faculty Senate Meeting Space Concerns**

**April 4, 2022**

##### **Background**

A request was made by Senator Alexis Gregory for the Faculty Senate to investigate the availability of meeting spaces on campus that would be compatible with the needs of Faculty Senate. This task was assigned to the University Resources Committee.

##### **Recommendation**

The committee created a ranked list of options based on the collected information and have provided this list of preferred meeting spaces to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to follow up with booking 2022-23 meetings. Top selections were: Wingo Auditorium, Old Main Academic Center; Fowlkes Auditorium, Colvard Student Union.

##### **Discussion**

The University Resources committee created a spreadsheet of the usable meeting spaces associated with campus that would fit the needs of the Senate including all required accommodations for total capacity with and without social distancing requirements, potential virtual meetings, video and audio recording, uncrowded seating space for Senators and guests, and parking availability. The committee also requested information from the appropriate facility managers on the availability of each space, any costs associated with rental, whether classes or other committee meetings were also assigned to the space, and other related information.

Franklin Center, 140 Dorman Hall, McComas Auditorium, and the Trotter Room at CAVS were not strongly recommended by their facility managers because of various parking complications. The Mill at MSU was offered as a potential space with ample meeting room and parking but did not receive strong interest from the committee. Bost Theater and Bettersworth Auditorium are also available options but had limited interest.

##### **Committee Members**

Beth Stokes (chair), Todd Archer, Thu Dinh, Santanu Kundu, Sol Pelaez, Rosangela Sebba, Mary Love Tagert, and Molly Zuckerman

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

### **1. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Senate Onboarding**

**Report to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate**

**Ad Hoc Committee for Senator Onboarding**

**April 5, 2022**

#### **Background**

This committee was formed by President Robichaux-Davis for the purpose of getting specific recommendations for a new onboarding process for senators elected to the Robert Holland Faculty Senate. Her charge to the committee was:

Develop recommendations for (1) a process for onboarding newly elected senators including the format of this process, (2) what the contents of the onboarding should be; (3) who should conduct the onboarding process; and (4) when the onboarding process should take place. (Basically, the who, what, when and how for onboarding newly elected senators). Additionally, if you feel that senators in general, given that the last two years have been quite unprecedented, would benefit from all or parts of this onboarding process, please recommend to me the specifics of a more “general” onboarding for senators who will remain on senate for 2022-23.

#### **Recommendations and Discussion:**

Prior to onboarding new Senators, we recommend including a brief list of RHFS commitments and expectations when soliciting nominations for new senators at the unit level, such that nominees have an opportunity to comprehensively determine if they can accept this service role. This standardized list should be provided as a part of the call for nominations, and should also be posted on the senate’s website.

Newly elected Senators should attend an in-person onboarding session that provides an overview of senate operations, general rules of conduct, roles and responsibilities of senators and collaborative organizational bodies, as well as an introduction to the senate organizational structures, committees, and charge regarding the business we handle and overarching goals of

the faculty senate at MSU and other universities. We also recommend that the onboarding process is somewhat informal, allowing for discussion with and amongst new senators and the other senators assisting with the onboarding process, and that time is reserved for dynamic Q&A with senior senators and leadership to ensure that all senator expectations and RHFS procedures are clear and transparent, that misconceptions are proactively addressed, and such that new senators may recognize where their strengths and interests may best serve the RHFS.

Contents of the onboarding process:

In the remainder of this report, we outline general content that would be useful to include in an onboarding session, as determined by the experiences, knowledge, and observations of the committee:

A. General Introduction to Faculty Senate (both at MSU and at other universities)

At the beginning of the onboarding process, the primary facilitator should make some general comments that will serve to provide an overview of what it means to be a senator at Mississippi State University, as compared to being a senator elsewhere. Some of the following ideas just provide a list of things that need to be talked through, and in other cases have some sample verbiage included.

Many times, I've heard new faculty at MSU talk about what a waste of time the faculty senate "job" was at their previous university, and I've even seen an article entitled "Shared Governance is a Myth" published in the Chronicle of Higher Education. The main premise of that article is somewhat like the experience of faculty who talk about faculty senate at other universities: Upper administration loops faculty into the conversation under the guise of it being a meaningful discussion, but ultimately administration has to make up their own mind, and there is no guarantee that the faculty opinion gets any weight. To that, I say, yes, that is a possibility. However, at least right now, upper administration at MSU is definitely invested in getting faculty participation in the process of discussion of just about everything that happens on campus, mainly in the form of involvement of faculty senate representatives on a wide variety of university committees. These include the Associate Deans Council, the Academic Deans Council, and the Executive Council, along with a long list of other committees. What are do they each do and who do they report to?

Other major questions do occur regarding the value of service on the senate. These could be briefly described in terms of a couple of popular misconceptions.

- It is just a time sink, with senate having no actual power to enact change.
- As a senate, we are only allowed to address things that don't matter.

Many people are tempted to not participate in senate due to these potential issues, but that leads to the possibility that when something of actual importance comes up, faculty could get locked out of the discussion since they haven't been participating in the process all along.



## B. Guidance for Senator Conduct and Robert's Rules of Order

Some thoughts about Robert's Rules of Order (RRO) and why it is important to follow that process could be provided at this point, ideally with some "cheat-sheet" that briefly summarizes the most useful points in RRO.

RRO was always a mystery to me until I read the introduction of the actual book. It turns out that General Henry M. Robert, of the U.S. Army wrote the original set of rules to give some consistency to the meeting experiences that people were having. These meetings were all over the map on whether they were rigidly run meetings, or very loosely run, or if it just depended on what the current chair of the group felt like.

Robert's rules essentially address a few very basic ideas, including how to work through the deliberative process for making a decision, but also how to make sure that everyone gets an opportunity to speak if they want to, and that no one person is allowed to dominate the discussion. They also focus on keeping things civil, so that nobody is allowed to start a disparaging tirade against an individual, which is not allowed. What is allowed is just the discussion of the topic at hand, without any remarks about the intent of someone who is for/against the topic, or any ulterior motives.

Making sure that a consistent process is adhered to for consideration of ANY topic is a way to make sure that no proposal is ushered through without debate, as well as making sure that they aren't dismissed without proper discussion. Deliberative bodies must deliberate, and that requires thought and discussion. If you can't have a polite discussion, it is bad news for getting anything done.

It is also important to talk about some of the rules/responsibilities for being on senate and being on the faculty in general (There are lists of things that fall into this category that can be pulled from the Faculty Handbook.)

## C. Basis for RHFS, Institutional Role, Organizational Structure and General Operations

Basis for senate; how does it serve the faculty and the university? (Governance Document) and organizational structure of the senate vs. that for the university

- a. Show the organization of the general faculty (from the Faculty Handbook)
- b. Show the basic organization of the senate (also from the Faculty Handbook)
  - i. Officers
  - ii. Committees (and their chairs)
  - iii. "Regular senators"
  - iv. Flow of business to and from other University units
  - v. How other business is brought to RHFS and how it is handled within RHFS

- c. Operating Policies (including AOPs) and how they "work".

(Operating policies govern how things happen in a wide variety of circumstances. Certain of these policies are distinctively “academic” in nature, so they are called AOPs, and require approval of the senate to be changed. This can result in a cycle that repeats itself over and over sometimes, but it doesn’t change the requirement of senate approval.) Certain OPs can require senate approval even though they aren’t specified as AOPs. (Example, the OP on the Post-Tenure Review Process is “ours”.)

- d. For an AOP to be changed, it goes through the Associate Deans Council, the Deans Council, and Faculty Senate as many times as it takes to gain consensus on the changes being proposed. This CAN take years, but most often it takes about a semester or so. Why? Mainly because the topics covered in AOPs and OPs are important! Also, because there are very often opposing viewpoints which take time to work through and resolve.

#### D. Opportunities for service as a senator

- a. Committees on senate (all senators serve in this fashion except the president and vice president)
  - i. Academic Affairs
  - ii. Ancillary Affairs
  - iii. Charter and Bylaws
  - iv. Faculty Affairs
  - v. Student Affairs
  - vi. University Resources
- b. University-level committees
  - i. Specific committees which are normally assigned based on an office or position held by a senator
  - ii. Other committees which are assigned by the president of senate, based on interest in the topic being covered.
- c. Ad hoc committees set up by the senate
- d. Ad hoc committees set up by upper administration
- e. Spring Administration/Faculty Roundtable

Each spring, there is a roundtable discussion that takes place between three groups of people: administrators, senators, and other faculty. This

discussion is organized by the Vice President of the senate, and is generally an entire afternoon discussion of the topic(s) agreed upon by the president of the university and the president of senate, based on recommendations from the vice president of senate. (Note that the vice president is responsible for selection of senators and other faculty, and the university president chooses the administrators.)

E. Open discussion/Q&A

We feel that it would be rather difficult to identify all of the topics that will be of interest to the new senators, and therefore recommend that sufficient time be allowed for them to bring up any questions that they might have. Of course, this puts the facilitators on the spot to be able to address those questions, but anything with no clear answer can be made note of and addressed after further investigation.

Some final thoughts on the overall process of onboarding:

We recommend that the onboarding process be facilitated by the RHFS leadership team and a small panel (3-5) of other current senior senators to provide diverse opinions on how each senator views and fulfills their RHFS service role and why the role is important to them. We also recommend that the RHFS onboarding process be conducted prior to the first meeting for new senators, which places it after their election and before the April meeting each year. There is also a challenge to find a time when everyone is available, so this is something that will have to be tried, and probably revised as some experience is gained with this process. [NOTE: It is possible that the onboarding may have to occur during the fall semester, due to the short turnaround in April, and the tendency for faculty to be less available during the summer.]

**Committee Members:** Randy Follett (Chair), Beth Baker, Mike Breazeale, Stephanie King, Kevin Williams

## PENDING BUSINESS

### **1. Promotion and Tenured Document Edits for Additional Faculty Ranks**

# DRAFT COPY

## V. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

---

Revised and Approved by the Robert Holland Faculty Senate, 2-13-2015  
Signed by Provost and Executive Vice President, Jerome Gilbert, 2-13-2015

Signed by President Mark Keenum, 3-6-2015

### A. Scope

Section V of the Faculty Handbook~~This document~~ records Mississippi State University's policies and procedures governing academic tenure and promotion in rank. These policies and procedures were drawn up by the Robert Holland Faculty Senate in accordance with the Bylaws and Policies of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) (sections 402, 403, and 404) and have been approved by the Robert Holland Faculty Senate, the provost, and the university president.

~~This document~~ (Section V of the Faculty Handbook) applies ~~only~~ to faculty members in tenure-track positions and professional-track positions hereto referred to as general faculty. The appointment and termination of professional~~non-tenure~~-track faculty members is governed by IHL Board Policy 404.01-404.02, and their promotion is governed by university, college, school and department policies. Professional-track~~Such~~ faculty members are ~~not~~ eligible for promotion~~tenure~~, but not tenure. Professional-track faculty may apply for open tenure-track positions or vice versa.

Suggested changes and recommendations to Section V~~this document~~ can originate with the university president, the provost, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Faculty Senate, and/or the general~~tenured and tenure-track~~ faculty. The president of the Faculty Senate will distribute copies of the suggested change(s) and recommendation(s) to all senate members and the Faculty Senate will prepare its own recommendation(s). The Faculty Senate's report on the recommended changes to Section V of~~in the Faculty Handbook~~ promotion and tenure document will be reviewed at two regularly scheduled senate meetings before a vote on the recommendations will be held. A copy of the Faculty Senate's decision will be sent to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Final action on the recommendation(s) will be taken by the university president and announced through all appropriate channels.

The procedure outlined in the previous paragraph will be followed, unless some extraordinary occasion should demand a more immediate change. In all cases, however, the Faculty Senate must vote to approve all changes to Section V and the

# DRAFT COPY

University Committee on Promotion and Tenure will be a part of the process of consideration [as described below](#).

The policies and procedures in effect [during](#) any academic year must have been fully approved by the Faculty Senate and signed by the provost and the [university](#) president. If the changes to [Section V the university document](#) are approved between May 16 and October 1 of a given year (calendar year 1), then ~~the changes to the university document~~ will go into effect May 16 of the following year (calendar year 2). If the changes are approved after October 1 (calendar year 1) and before May 16 of the subsequent year (calendar year 2), then changes ~~in the university document~~ will go into effect on May 16 of the following year (calendar year 3). In both cases, all college and department documents must be revised as necessary no later than the effective date of the revised [Section V of the Faculty Handbook university document](#). Copies of all officially ~~approved university~~ promotion and tenure policies and procedures, including subsequent revisions, together with their dates of approval, will be kept in the Faculty Senate Office and the Office of the Provost. In addition, an electronic copy of the current policies and procedures will be posted on the MSU website (at [www.facultysenate.msstate.edu](http://www.facultysenate.msstate.edu)).

## **B. Academic Rank**

A faculty member of professorial rank must have a professional or terminal degree appropriate to the discipline (or the equivalent in training and experience), a strong commitment to higher education and to the mission of Mississippi State University, and a willingness to assume the responsibilities and obligations appropriate to a university faculty member.

[Faculty tracks Academic ranks](#) at Mississippi State University include [tenure-track positions and professional-track positions](#).

### **Tenure-Track Positions:**

*Assistant Professor ([Rank 1](#)):* A faculty member who has met the requirements in the first paragraph of ~~this~~ section [B. Academic Rank](#) and has the potential to be successful in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service.

*Associate Professor ([Rank 2](#)):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for assistant professor, who has consistently demonstrated an ability to perform at a satisfactory level in teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service, and who excels in at least one of these areas. Based upon the criteria established in the department promotion and tenure documents, an associate professor is developing a national and/or international reputation; and is showing a potential for

# DRAFT COPY

making sustained contributions to the university and to his/her profession, field, or discipline.

*Professor (Rank 3):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for associate professor, who has consistently demonstrated an ability to perform at a satisfactory level in teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service, and who excels in at least two of these areas. Based upon the criteria established in the department promotion and tenure documents, a professor must have a national and/or international reputation within his/her profession, area of expertise, or discipline.

## Professional-Track Positions

### Teaching Professor Ranks:

*Assistant Teaching Professor (Rank 1):* A faculty member with a terminal degree in a discipline appropriate for the position, who possesses the potential for successful performance in instructional activities in a university environment, and who should contribute to the service and/or other scholarly activities of the unit, university, and/or profession.

*Associate Teaching Professor (Rank 2):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for assistant teaching professor, has demonstrated an ability to perform at a level of excellence appropriate for the rank in instructional activities, and who significantly contributes to the service and/or other scholarly activities of the unit, university, and/or profession.

*Teaching Professor (Rank 3):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for associate teaching professor, has consistently demonstrated excellence in instructional activities, and who is consistently contributing at a high level to the service and/or other scholarly activities of the unit, university, and/or profession.

### Professor of Practice Ranks:

*Assistant Professor of Practice (Rank 1):* A faculty member with a terminal degree in a discipline appropriate for the position or its equivalent in professional achievement, who possesses the potential for successful performance in instructional activities in a university environment, and who should contribute to the service and/or other scholarly activities of the unit, university, and/or profession.

*Associate Professor of Practice (Rank 2):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for assistant professor of practice, has demonstrated an ability to perform at a level of excellence appropriate for the rank in instructional activities, and who significantly

# DRAFT COPY

contributes to the service and/or other scholarly activities of the unit, university, and/or profession.

*Professor of Practice (Rank 3):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for associate professor of practice, has consistently demonstrated excellence in instructional activities, and who is consistently contributing at a high level to the service and/or other scholarly activities of the unit, university, and/or profession.

## **Clinical/Extension/Research Professor Ranks:**

*Assistant Clinical/Extension/Research Professor (Rank 1):* A faculty member with a terminal degree in the discipline, who possesses the potential for successful performance in clinical/extension/research activities or creative achievement in a university environment, and who should contribute to the service of the unit, university and/or profession.

*Associate Clinical/Extension/Research Professor (Rank 2):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for assistant clinical/extension/research professor, has demonstrated an ability to perform at a level of excellence appropriate for the rank in clinical/extension/research activities or creative achievement, and who significantly contributes to the service of the unit, university, and/or professions.

*Clinical/Extension/Research Professor (Rank 3):* A faculty member who has consistently demonstrated excellence in clinical/extension/research activities or creative endeavors, and who is consistently contributing at a high level to the service of the unit, university, and/or profession.

## **Instructor Ranks:**

*Instructor I (Rank 1):* A faculty member with a minimum of a Master's degree or higher, who possesses teaching credentials appropriate for the position and the potential for successful performance in instructional activities in a university environment, and who should contribute to the service of the unit, university, and/or profession.

*Instructor II (Rank 2):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for instructor I, has demonstrated an ability to perform at a level of excellence appropriate for the rank in instructional activities, and who significantly contributes to the service of the unit, university, and/or profession.

*Instructor III (Rank 3):* A faculty member who has met the criteria for instructor II, has consistently demonstrated excellence, and who is consistently contributing at a high level to the service of the unit, university, and/or profession.

# DRAFT COPY

## Clinical/Extension Instructor Ranks:

Clinical/Extension Instructor I (Rank 1): A faculty member with a minimum of a Master's degree or higher as appropriate to the profession, in a discipline appropriate for the position, who possesses the potential for successful performance in clinical/extension activities or creative achievement in a university environment, and who should contribute to the service of the unit, university and/or profession.

Clinical/Extension Instructor II (Rank 2): A faculty member who has met the criteria for clinical/extension instructor I, has demonstrated an ability to perform at a level of excellence appropriate for the rank in clinical/extension activities, and who significantly contributes to the service of the unit, university, and/or profession.

Clinical/Extension Instructor III (Rank 3): A faculty member who has met the criteria for clinical instructor II, has demonstrated excellence in clinical/extension activities, and who is consistently contributing at a high level to the service of the unit, university and/or profession.

## **C. Faculty Advancement**

### **Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty**

#### **Promotion**

Promotion is never granted simply for satisfactory performance or for length of service, but reflects progressively higher professional competence and accomplishment. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, or from associate professor to professor, will normally only be considered after a faculty member has served at least five years in rank so that sustained productivity at MSU can be demonstrated. Applications for promotion prior to that time will be regarded as early action and considered only for exceptionally strong and well documented cases. Rank should reflect comparable stature with others in similar disciplines in other university settings. Professional achievement at another academic institution may be considered for promotion.

#### **D. Tenure**

The granting of tenure is a faculty-driven process and is the academic community's chief guarantee of academic freedom for the faculty member to perform his/her academic duties without undue or inappropriate external pressures.

Definition: *Tenure* is defined by IHL Board Policy 403.01 as "Continuing employment that may be granted to a faculty member after a probationary period upon nomination by the Institutional Executive Officer for election by the Board."



# DRAFT COPY

IHL Board Policy 403.0104 further provides that a tenured faculty member is protected from dismissal except under the extraordinary circumstances stated in section *L. Dismissal of Tenured Faculty* of this document.

According to IHL Board Policy 403.01, tenure is granted in a department, unless otherwise designated by the IHL Board.

Attainment of tenure at Mississippi State University is by no means automatic, based on years of service, but is the result of a thorough evaluation of a faculty member's performance in teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service. The proportions of these activities may vary by discipline. Excellence in one area and satisfactory performance in the others are needed to qualify a faculty member for tenure.

Tenure is granted with the university's expectation that the faculty member will continue to perform at or above the minimum standards set by the department, or school, ~~or~~ college, and university.

Eligibility. Tenure may be granted to professors, associate professors, and simultaneously to assistant professors upon promotion to associate professor. Faculty members of all professorial ranks in specifically designated tenure-track positions may work toward tenure. An employee cannot be promoted into a professorial position unless specified in the original offer letter. Non-tenure track faculty positions cannot be converted to tenure track positions (IHL section 404.01).

## ***Probationary Period***

A tenure-track faculty member must apply for and be recommended for tenure by the university president during the sixth full contract year of employment in a tenure-track position. Failure to earn tenure at the end of the sixth full contract year will result in a terminal contract in the seventh full contract year. The probationary period for tenure-track faculty begins at the start of the faculty member's first full contract year. A full contract year is defined as one that starts on August 16 for 9-month employees and on July 1 for 12-month employees and continues until the next contract period. If the initial contract is for a partial year, e.g., starts after August 16 for a 9-month employee and or after July 1 for a 12-month employee, that time is not included in the probationary period.

Up to five years of professorial experience at other universities may be counted in this probationary period, as determined and agreed upon by the department promotion and tenure committee, the department head or director, the dean, and the faculty member in the letter of offer at the time of initial appointment.

# DRAFT COPY

For clearly stated personal reasons (e.g., emergencies related to health, activation of military service, pregnancy, adoption, childcare, care of parents), a [tenure-track](#) faculty member may request an extension of up to two years from the first five years of this probationary period for an approved leave of absence or a modified assignment. Specific aspects of such an extension must be established by the department head or director, the dean, the provost, and the faculty member. Such an agreement must be in writing. The department promotion and tenure committee shall be notified in writing of the extension and the revised probationary period.

IHL Board Policy 403.0101 allows a faculty member or an administrative employee who held faculty rank at the level of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor and tenure at another institution to be awarded tenure at the time of initial appointment if recommended by the faculty of the tenuring department, the dean, the provost, and the [university](#) president, and awarded by the IHL Board.

For [tenure-track](#) faculty members with a shortened probationary period as specified in an offer letter or an approved extended probationary period, the "third-year review" should be held at the midpoint of the individual's probationary period.

## ***E. Relationship Between Promotion and Tenure***

[Tenure-track faculty](#)~~Faculty~~ members who have met the requirements for promotion, but who have not fulfilled the probationary period for tenure, may be promoted without tenure.

[Tenure-track faculty](#)~~Faculty~~ members who are granted tenure as assistant professors automatically meet the criteria for promotion to associate professor.

## ***F. Performance Standards and Evaluation of Professional Activities***

Every faculty member is expected to meet high standards of professional competence and integrity and to further the goals of his/her department or unit. In every case, a [tenure-track](#) faculty member's performance in teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service will be judged by all participants in promotion and/or tenure decisions on the basis of specific criteria in written policy statements, developed by the appropriate academic units.

In evaluating a tenure-track faculty member being considered for tenure and/or promotion, the appropriate faculty committees and academic administrators will give adequate consideration to the faculty member's professional performance as a function of his/her relative academic workload assignments within the three academic missions of service, teaching/instruction, and research/creative activities. Adequate consideration of a tenure case consists of a conscientious review, which seeks out and considers all available evidence bearing on the relevant performance of the faculty member and

# DRAFT COPY

assumes that the various academic units follow their approved procedural guidelines during the tenure and promotion review process. Such consideration should be based upon adequate deliberation over the evidence in light of relevant standards and exclusive of improper standards (i.e., any criterion not related to the professional performance of the faculty member). The evaluation of a tenure case should constitute a bona fide exercise of professional academic judgment.

All criteria should be based on the application of the highest professional standards and are to be in harmony with the following university criteria:

*Teaching.* Criteria [for assessing instructional activities](#) may include regular classroom and laboratory instruction; supervision of field work, internships, performances, and fellowships; direction of theses and dissertations; development of educational materials; conduct of other academic programs that confer university credit; invited presentation of non-credit and off-campus lectures and demonstrations; and other teaching activities as defined by the academic units. Excellence in teaching, [as defined by the current academic operating policy/policies](#), includes the ability to impart the knowledge, methods, and standards of the discipline, the ability to communicate effectively with students by counseling, advising, or motivating them, the ability to direct students in their own research, and the ability to evaluate student work accurately and fairly according to prevailing academic standards of the discipline.

*Research and/or Creative Achievement.* Criteria [for assessing research and/or creative achievement activities](#) may include systematic, original investigation directed toward the enlargement or validation of human knowledge, the solution of contemporary problems, or the exploration of creative forms that bring greater meaning to life. Excellence in research and/or creative achievement must be established by critical peer evaluation, using standards prevailing in the discipline. Excellence may be documented by books, articles, or reviews published by commercial or university presses or in refereed journals of international, national, or regional prestige; research grants, leading to high quality research, intellectual property; presentation of papers before professional groups; invited participation in scholarly conferences; editorial work for professional journals or publishers; or artistic or humanistic performances, presentations, or shows. Evidence of substantive progress on long-term projects that meet the criteria above may be considered as specified by the academic units.

*Service.* Criteria [for assessing service activities](#) may include activities which enhance the scholarly life of the university or the discipline, improve the quality of life or society, or promote the general welfare of the institution, the community, the state, the nation, or international community. Thus it includes outreach and extension of academic knowledge to the public, participation on department, college, or university

# DRAFT COPY

committees, or on regional, national, or international scholarly committees, boards, or review panels, or on public boards as a representative of the scholarly community. Membership or participation in such bodies may constitute satisfactory service, but excellence requires leadership or initiative leading to substantial improvements or progress.

## ~~In evaluating a faculty member being considered for tenure~~**C. Annual Faculty Evaluation and Review**

At the time of initial appointment, each faculty member will be informed in writing by the department head or unit administrator whether the appointment is tenure-track or ~~professional non-tenure~~-track and referred to the Promotion and Tenure Procedures section of the Faculty Handbook ([Section V](#)), as well as college and department promotion and tenure policies (e.g. appropriate websites with online versions of these documents). The new faculty member will agree by signature to the understood and agreed upon terms of employment.

During the probationary period, the department head will counsel each [tenure-track](#) faculty member annually about progress toward promotion and tenure. This annual evaluation will comprise a written review of the previous year's progress and a written agreement about the faculty member's objectives, responsibilities, and expectations for the coming year, and the department head's or director's assessment of progress toward [promotion and](#) tenure.

The written agreement about the coming year must be consistent with the promotion and tenure criteria of the department, the school or college, and the university. If the department head or director and the faculty member cannot reach agreement, the matter will be referred to the dean.

The annual evaluation, signed by both parties, will be sent to the dean. A copy will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The faculty member has the right to attach a dissenting statement to all copies of this evaluation.

No record in personnel files relating to promotion or tenure is to be added, changed, or withdrawn without the knowledge of the faculty member and the unit administrator. Personnel files are confidential and are available only to the faculty member and university officials. Appropriate administrators will make all pertinent information available to elected promotion and tenure committees and administrators when the faculty member is a candidate for promotion and tenure. If material from a personnel file (or other material that is not in the candidate's promotion or tenure application) is provided to a committee or administrator, then the candidate will be provided a copy of the material and an opportunity to submit his/her written comments regarding the

# DRAFT COPY

material before the material is considered by the committee or administrator. Otherwise, no additions will be made.

## Promotion of Professional-Track Faculty

### Promotion

Promotion is never granted simply for satisfactory performance or for length of service, but reflects progressively higher professional competence and accomplishment. Promotion from one level to the next will normally only be considered after a professional-track faculty member has served at least five years in rank so that sustained productivity at MSU can be demonstrated. Applications for promotion prior to that time will be regarded as early action and considered only for exceptionally strong and well documented cases. Rank should reflect comparable stature with others in similar disciplines in other university settings. Professional achievement at another academic institution may be considered for promotion.

### Performance Standards and Evaluation of Professional Activities

Every faculty member is expected to meet high standards of professional competence and integrity and to further the goals of his/her department or unit. In every case, the performance of professional-track faculty members will be judged by all parties involved in promotion decisions on the basis of written promotion policies, and criteria specified therein. Those documents shall be developed by the faculty and shall apply to the faculty in specific units which may be departments or divisions.

In evaluating a professional-track faculty member being considered for promotion, the appropriate faculty committees and academic administrators will give adequate consideration to the faculty member's professional performance as a function of his/her relative academic workload assignments within the three academic missions of service, teaching/instruction, and research/creative activities as stated in the faculty member's offer letter. Adequate consideration for promotion consists of a conscientious review, which seeks out and considers all available evidence bearing on the relevant performance of the faculty member, and assumes that the various academic units follow their approved procedural guidelines during the promotion review process. Such consideration should be based upon adequate deliberation over the evidence in light of relevant standards and exclusive of improper standards (i.e. any criterion not related to

# DRAFT COPY

the professional performance of the faculty member). The evaluation of a promotion case should constitute a bona fide exercise of professional academic judgement.

All criteria should be based on the application of the highest professional standards and are to be in harmony with the following university criteria:

*Teaching:* Criteria for assessing instructional activities may include regular classroom and laboratory instruction; supervision of field work, internships, performances, and fellowships; direction of theses and dissertations; development of educational materials; conduct of other academic programs that confer university credit; invited presentation of non-credit and off-campus lectures and demonstrations; and other teaching activities as defined by the academic units. Excellence in teaching as defined by the current academic operating policy/policies includes the ability to impart the knowledge, methods, and standards of the discipline, the ability to communicate effectively with students by counseling, advising, or motivating them, the ability to direct students in their own research, and the ability to evaluate student work accurately and fairly according to prevailing academic standards of the discipline. Excellence in teaching may be documented by peer reviews, student awards, student evaluations, student successes, faculty teaching awards, recognition of teaching excellence, sample course materials, recordings of teaching sessions, graduate student theses and dissertations, and any other documentary materials that demonstrate teaching effectiveness on the university campus or at the national or international level.

*Service:* Criteria for assessing service activities may include activities which enhance the scholarly life of the university or the discipline, improve the quality of life or society, or promote the general welfare of the institution, the community, the state, the nation, or international community. Thus it includes outreach and extension of academic knowledge to the public, participation on department, college, or university committees, or on regional, national, or international scholarly committees, boards, or review panels, or on public boards as a representative of the scholarly community. Membership or participation in such bodies may constitute satisfactory service, but excellence requires leadership or initiative leading to substantial improvements or progress.

*Research and/or Creative Achievement:* Research is not an expectation of instructional faculty (i.e. Teaching Professors, Professors of Practice, and Instructors) and should not be a requirement for promotion. Research that allows

# DRAFT COPY

the instructional faculty member to remain active in their discipline or that contributes to their excellence in instruction or service may be included in the evaluation.

Professional-track faculty who are not in instructional tracks may be required to perform research and/or creative achievement activities. Criteria for assessing research and/or creative activities may include systematic, original investigation directed toward the enlargement or validation of human knowledge, the solution of contemporary problems, or the exploration of creative forms that bring greater meaning to life. Excellence in research and/or creative achievement must be established by critical peer evaluation, using standards prevailing in the discipline. Excellence may be documented by books, articles, or reviews published by commercial or university presses or in refereed journals of international, national, or regional prestige; research grants, leading to high quality research, intellectual property; presentation of papers before professional groups; invited participation in scholarly conferences; editorial work for professional journals or publishers; or artistic or humanistic performances, presentations, or shows. Evidence of substantive progress on long-term projects that meet the criteria above may be considered as specified by the academic units.

## **Annual Faculty Evaluation and Review**

At the time of initial appointment, each faculty member will be informed in writing by the department head or unit administrator whether the appointment is tenure-track or professional-track and referred to the Promotion Procedures section of the Faculty Handbook (Section V) as well as college and department promotion policies (e.g. appropriate websites with online versions of these documents). The new faculty member will agree by signature to the understood and agreed upon terms of employment.

On an annual basis, each department head/unit administrator and each professional-track faculty member will agree in writing to the faculty member's objectives, responsibilities, and expectations. This written agreement must be consistent with the promotion criteria for professional-track positions of the department and the university. This agreement will be reviewed by the next appropriate administrator, and a copy placed in the faculty member's promotion file. If the department head/unit administrator



# DRAFT COPY

and the professional-track faculty member cannot reach an agreement, the matter will be referred to the next appropriate administrator.

An annual performance review, based on the previous year's goals and objectives and consistent with AOP 13.24 (Annual Faculty Review Process), will be conducted by the department head/unit administrator or appropriate officer for each professional-track faculty member in the department. A copy of this review will be signed by both the head/director and the faculty member. It will also be reviewed and signed by the next appropriate administrator and placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The faculty member may attach a dissenting statement to all copies of this review.

The department head/unit administrator shall maintain a personnel file for each faculty member. No record in the file is to be added, changed, or withdrawn without the knowledge of both parties. The responsible administrative officer will make all pertinent information available to the appropriate individuals when the faculty member is a candidate for promotion, or when the information is needed in an appeals or grievance case.

## **E. Promotion and Tenure Committees**

### **University Committee on Promotion and Tenure**

The University Committee on Promotion and Tenure serves ~~five~~four functions:

- ~~To~~ advise the provost on promotion and tenure matters, including the review of criteria, policies, and procedures for promotion and tenure used by schools or colleges;
- To review suggested changes in this document;
- To review and approve appropriate requests related to variations made during the review process;
- ~~To~~ hear appeals from faculty members whose nominations for promotion or tenure have been denied; and
- ~~To~~ review suggested changes in this document; and to hear appeals from tenured faculty members who have been recommended for termination.

The committee consists of one member elected from each academic unit with an administrative head. Members elected by each academic unit must be full-time, tenured professors, who hold Rank 2~~rank of associate professor~~ or above. In addition to academic unit representatives, one member will be elected to represent each of the professional-tracks. Members elected for each professional track must be full-time faculty and hold a rank above the minimum for their professional-track. No faculty



# DRAFT COPY

member functioning as an administrator, department head, or director of an academic unit will be a member of the committee. Academic unit representatives Committee members are elected in the fall by a majority vote of the unit's full-time general faculty. Each professional/tenured or tenure-track representative is elected in faculty members with the fall by a majority vote/rank of the full-time faculty members within the respective professional-track. Only tenured faculty may vote on a tenure recommendation. ~~assistant professor and above.~~ Members may serve for two consecutive three-year terms, excluding partial terms. A partial term will be filled by election, as needed. Annually the Committee members will elect a chair who reports directly to the provost. The ~~committee will annually elect its~~ chair, who will be a full voting member of the committee.

## College Promotion and Tenure Committees

Every college will establish and maintain a promotion and tenure committee. Each college will develop its own criteria for membership on the committee, and the procedures for electing members to that committee. These criteria and procedures must be approved by both a majority vote of the college's full-time ~~tenured and tenure-track~~ faculty and the college dean, consistent with the following:-

- The membership of the committee should reflect the composition of the full-time faculty in the college;
- The length of terms will be determined by the unit;
- Committee members must hold a rank (i.e., 2, 3) at or above/least as high as the candidate's aspirant rank to review and vote on each case. For example, a Rank 2 faculty member cannot vote on a candidate's an associate professor can participate in the review of dossiers for tenure and promotion to Rank 3;
- ~~associate professor but not on the committee reviewing dossiers for promotion to professor.~~ Only tenured faculty may vote on a tenure recommendation:-

~~The length of terms will be determined by the unit.~~

- No member of the committee will consider the application of a relative. Appearance of conflicts of interest should be avoided:-
- No faculty member functioning as an administrator, department head or director of an academic unit will be a member of the committee:-
- No faculty member may participate in a candidate's promotion or tenure review at more than one level:-
- The committee will annually elect its chair:-
- The membership of the committee will be made known to the faculty; and:-

# DRAFT COPY

- An individual will not serve in a year that his/her promotion application is being considered.

The responsibilities of a college promotion and tenure committee will be the following:

- To write the college's promotion and tenure policies and procedures which must be consistent with university promotion and tenure policies, include the mechanism for their adoption and revision, describe the procedures that will be followed if sufficient numbers of members are not available because of absences, recusal or insufficient rank, and identify the participation of the different categories of faculty in the college promotion and tenure process;
- To approve the promotion and tenure documents of department committees within the college and to ensure that such documents are consistent with the mission of the university and the college, and the university promotion and tenure document;
- To assist departments in developing procedures for a third-year review of all non-tenured, tenure-track faculty;
- To assist departments in developing criteria for external peer reviews, including the identification of peer departments or schools at other colleges or universities;
- To assist departments in developing definitions of excellence, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory as it pertains to the evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure;
- To assist departments in developing definitions of teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service consistent with the mission of the department or school;
- To conduct a vote on all dossiers for promotion and tenure, ensuring department standards are fairly applied and university standards are maintained; and
- To approve the department promotion and tenure document and policies and all subsequent changes.

## **Department and School Promotion and Tenure**

Every department and school will establish and maintain a promotion and tenure committee. The department committee may include any ~~category of faculty~~ ~~track with professorial rank~~. The promotion and tenure procedures must specify the inclusiveness of the committee composition and clearly establish the eligibility for voting and participation within the department promotion and tenure process. In ~~comprehensive~~ departments where there may be ~~professional-non-tenure~~ track faculty of rank serving on department committees along with tenured faculty, it is permissible for all faculty members on the committee of appropriate rank to vote on promotion to ~~Rank 2 associate professor~~ or to ~~Rank 3 professor rank~~. Only tenured faculty members on the committee

# DRAFT COPY

can vote on the tenure decision. When a candidate is being considered for promotion to associate professor or to professor and for tenure at the same time, any non-agreement of the promotion vote and the tenure vote will be resolved by vote of only the tenured faculty members on the committee.

The faculty of each school or department will determine the structure of its promotion and tenure committee, subject to the conditions that:

- ~~1. A minimum~~The committee consists of ~~at least~~ three tenured faculty must be available to vote on tenure decisions;~~members.~~
- Committee members must hold a rank (i.e., 2, 3) at ~~or above~~least as high as the candidate's aspirant rank ~~to in order to review and~~ vote on each case. For example, a Rank 2 faculty member cannot vote on a candidate's associate professor can participate in the review of dossiers for tenure and promotion to Rank 3. associate professor but not on the committee reviewing dossiers for promotion to professor.
- ~~2.~~ The department promotion and tenure policies shall describe the procedures that will be followed if sufficient numbers of members are not available because of absence, recusal or insufficient rank. Only tenured faculty may vote on a tenure recommendation;~~;~~
- ~~3.~~ Unless a unit uses a committee-of-the-whole, the members of the committee must be elected. The length of terms will be determined by the unit;~~;~~
- ~~4.~~ No member of the committee will consider the application of a relative. Appearance of conflicts of interest should be avoided;~~;~~
- ~~5.~~ No faculty member functioning as an administrator, department head or director of an academic unit will be a member of the committee;~~;~~
- ~~6.~~ No faculty member may participate in a candidate's promotion or tenure review at more than one level;~~;~~
- ~~7.~~ The committee will annually elect its chair;~~;~~
- ~~8.~~ The membership of the committee will be made known to the faculty; and~~;~~
- ~~9.~~ An individual will not serve in a year that his/her promotion application is being considered.

Among the responsibilities of the department and school promotion and tenure committee are the following:

- To establish procedures for a third-year review of all non-tenured, tenure-track faculty;
- To specify a mandatory date by which candidates must notify the department head of their intent to submit an application for tenure and/or promotion;

# DRAFT COPY

- To specify criteria for external peer reviews, including the identification of peer departments or schools at other colleges or universities;
- To facilitate all votes related to the promotion and tenure process, including the vote to approve the original promotion and tenure document and policies and all subsequent changes;
- To conduct a review by the end of the third year of all non-tenured, tenure-track faculty; and
- To conduct a vote on all dossiers for promotion and tenure.

College, school or department promotion and tenure committees will consider, if submitted, but are not bound by, the department head's annual review of a candidate's progress toward tenure or promotion.

Prior to the offer of hire, the appropriate promotion and tenure committee will make a formal recommendation about:

- ~~The~~ the initial appointment of a faculty member or administrator at the level/rank of Rank 2 ~~associate professor~~ or Rank 3;
- ~~The professor, about the~~ acceptance of experience as the equivalent of a terminal degree; and
- ~~The acceptance about the award~~ of years of credit at another institution of higher education toward fulfillment of the minimum probationary period for tenure.

Every department and school will write a promotion and tenure document, which is approved by a majority vote of the professorial full-time faculty. In comprehensive departments with both tenured/tenure-track and ~~non-tenured/tenure~~ professional-track faculty, the promotion ~~only portions~~ section of the document will be approved by a majority vote of the professorial full-time faculty, while the tenure section of the document will be approved by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. The department document must:

- Contain the criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure;
- Define teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service, consistent with the mission of the department or school, including criteria for developing a national reputation and an established national reputation;
- Specify criteria for excellence, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory as it pertains to the evaluation of candidates for promotion and or tenure;
- Determine the structure of the department promotion and tenure committee;
- Specify the criteria for eligibility of full-time faculty to serve on the department promotion and tenure committee; and

# DRAFT COPY

- Describe any specifics, including any uniqueness, of the department or school in which the individual is to be tenured.

## **IF. Procedures for Faculty Promotion and Tenure**

### **The process**

#### **Notification of Application for Promotion and/or Tenure**

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion must notify the department head of his/her intent to submit his/her application for review on or prior to a date that must be specified in the department promotion and tenure document. Department heads must inform tenure-track assistant professors of this date during the annual faculty review for the fifth year of their employment contract.

The date by which candidates must notify their department head of their intent can vary between departments and colleges, but it must provide sufficient time to notify external reviewers and receive their letters of evaluation prior to October 1<sup>st</sup> or any official stage of application review. The solicitation process for external evaluators will be initiated when the candidate notifies the appropriate department head or unit director of his/her intent to be considered for tenure and/or promotion.

#### **External Letters**

External letters will be solicited from professionals in the field who can provide an impartial evaluation of the candidate's work and accomplishments.

In the case of professorial tracks, The external reviewers ~~should~~will generally be tenured faculty at peer to peer-plus institutions, or peer to peer-plus departments. In the case of Instructor tracks, external reviewers must be external to the department, but may be internal or external to the university. External faculty reviewers should not include individuals who have a professional or personal conflict-of-interest with the candidate. Conflicts-of-interest in general would include but not necessarily be restricted to previous mentors, previous graduate students, collaborating co-authors, collaborating co-investigators, or relatives/past-relatives. In disciplines or fields where the general conflict-of-interest definition commonly does not apply, external reviewers normally excluded from the process can be utilized if complete and adequate justification is provided. Definition of what constitutes a conflict-of-interest may be further defined in the department promotion and tenure document and be in accord with the Policy and Procedures Document for Conflict-of-Interest and Ethics (Department of Human Resources and Management: Employee Relations Section Mississippi Code of 1972 Sections 25-4-101 through 25-4-105). The candidate, the department promotion and

# DRAFT COPY

tenure committee, and department head will each provide a list of names that will be used to create a master list of potential external reviewers.

The department head and department promotion and tenure committee chair will jointly select the final list of external reviewers from whom letters of evaluation will be requested and should include faculty names provided by all three sources. Both the department head and department promotion and tenure committee chair are responsible for eliminating, to the best of their knowledge, all external reviewers that have a conflict-of-interest.

Dossiers must contain an explanation of the credentials and qualifications of each external reviewer regarding his/her training/background in addition to the extent of his/her contact, interaction or relationship with the candidate. External letters of evaluation must be received from a minimum of four external reviewers for inclusion in the dossier of the candidate. It is the responsibility of the chair of the department committee or the department head to obtain at least the minimum number of letters of evaluation from external reviewers who have agreed to function in this capacity. All letters received from external reviewers must be included in the dossier of the candidate unless the department head and department promotion and tenure committee collectively decide to withdraw a letter from the review process if it contains information that refers to or describes a conflict-of-interest. In instances when substantial modifications of the application have occurred (e.g. official notifications of accepted publications or awarded grants) after documentation has been forwarded to the external reviewers, these achievements can be communicated in a letter written by the candidate and forwarded to the department head. The letter should be included in the section of the dossier containing the external letters of review.

The identity of the external reviewers will not be revealed to the candidate and communications must not include any information that might indicate the identity or location of any external reviewer. Exceptions may include situations as may be required by law or ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction. The specific procedures regarding solicitation and use of external letters of evaluation are to be detailed in school and department policies.

## Candidate Application

The candidate makes a formal application for promotion and/or tenure by completing the MSU Application for Promotion and Tenure form and attaching supporting documentation. Each unit will specify the format and the level of detail for the supporting documentation. No additional support material may be added or removed from this file after a decision has been made at the department level, unless the candidate, department head and the department committee mutually agree. The request will be made in writing, define what is being added or removed, state the purpose for the

# DRAFT COPY

change in the application, be signed by all parties, and be included as part of the formal application. Letters of recommendation will be added to the dossier at each level of review. If the candidate submits letters of factual correction for any level of review, those letters and any review-level response (described below) will also be included in the dossier.

A complete dossier for promotion and tenure for the official review process will include the application submitted by the candidate and at least the minimum of four external letters of review. Only complete dossiers for promotion and tenure that contain the application for the candidate and the minimum number of external letters will be evaluated at the level of the department promotion and tenure committee, department head, college committee, college dean, or university provost.

Except for the candidate's optional letters of factual correction (described below), the candidate takes no part in the process after submission of the application, unless requested to do so by those considering the dossier. No discussion of correspondence relating to the dossier is to be initiated by the candidate with the reviewing authorities. Deliberation at all levels will be confidential.

## Dossier Review

The department promotion and tenure committee will review the information in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The committee will make a recommendation on the question of promotion or promotion and tenure by a single vote evaluating the three areas (teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service) as a whole. The committee's recommendation will be based on a simple majority vote, conducted by secret ballot. The committee chair will submit a letter of recommendation and rationale to be included in the candidate's dossier. The candidate will receive a copy of the committee's letter of recommendation and rationale that is redacted only insofar as necessary to conceal the identity of external reviewers. The rationale shall characterize external reviewers' comments that informed the committee's decision. The letter of recommendation and rationale of the committee will be included in the dossier as it proceeds through the review process. The chair will notify the department head of the committee's recommendation.

The department head or director will separately and independently review the dossier. His/her recommendations will be based on pertinent evidence documented in the faculty member's dossier and information in the personnel file that is applicable to the candidate's performance in professional activities. The candidate will receive a copy of the department head's or director's letter of recommendation and rationale that is redacted only insofar as necessary to conceal the identity of external reviewers. The rationale shall characterize external reviewers' comments that informed the department head's or director's decision. The letter of recommendation and rationale of the



# DRAFT COPY

department head or director will be included in the dossier as it proceeds through the review process.

The candidate may respond to the department promotion and tenure committee's and/or the department head's or director's letters to correct any factual errors represented therein within 5 working days of the candidate's receipt of each letter. The candidate's letter(s) of factual corrections must be sent to the review level to which the response was made. That level may address the concerns in a new letter to be included in the application within 5 working days of receipt of the candidate's letter of factual correction. All letters shall be included in the dossier as it proceeds through the review process.

The college promotion and tenure committee will review the information in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The committee will make a recommendation on the question of promotion or promotion and tenure by a single vote evaluating the three areas (teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service) as a whole. The committee's recommendation will be based on a simple majority vote, conducted by secret ballot. The committee chair will submit a letter of recommendation and rationale to be included in the candidate's dossier. The candidate will receive a copy of the college promotion and tenure committee's letter of recommendation and rationale that is redacted only insofar as necessary to conceal the identity of external reviewers. The rationale shall characterize external reviewers' comments that informed the committee's decision. The letter of recommendation and rationale of the committee will be included in the dossier as it proceeds through the review process. The candidate may respond to the college promotion and tenure committee's letter to correct any factual errors represented therein within 5 working days of the candidate's receipt of the letter. The committee may address the concerns in a new letter to be included in the dossier within 5 working days of receipt of the candidate's letter of factual correction. All letters shall be included in the dossier as it proceeds through the review process.

The dean will review the dossier and make a recommendation based on pertinent evidence documented in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier and information in the personnel file that is applicable to the candidate's performance in professional activities. The candidate will receive a copy of the dean's letter of recommendation and rationale that is redacted only insofar as necessary to conceal the identity of external reviewers. The rationale shall characterize external reviewers' comments that informed the dean's decision. The letter of recommendation and rationale of the dean will be included in the dossier as it proceeds through the review process. The candidate may respond to the dean's letter to correct any factual errors represented therein within 5 working days of the candidate's receipt of the letter. The dean may address the concerns in a new letter to be included in the dossier within 5 working days of receipt of the candidate's letter of factual correction. All letters shall be included in the dossier as it proceeds through the review process.



# DRAFT COPY

The faculty member has the right to discontinue the review process for tenure or promotion at any point before a decision has been made. His/her request must be made in writing to the department head or director before a final decision has been rendered.

Department and college committees on promotion and tenure will assist their department head or director and dean, respectively, in reviewing the eligibility of all faculty members who have met the minimum requirements for advancement in rank or tenure.

On rare occasions and in exceptional circumstances when a ~~minor~~ variation of the process described in this document needs to be initiated in order to be fair to the faculty member while still ensuring a rigorous review of the candidate's dossier, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee will review and approve any such appropriate requests during the review process. These ~~approved~~~~minor~~ variations of the process described by this paragraph cannot be the sole basis for an appeal.

## **Chronology**

The receipt dates listed below for the department and college represent suggested guidelines intended to facilitate an organized and efficient review of candidates' dossiers during each official phase of the evaluation process. Minor chronological delays that may occur beyond these dates do not represent a significant procedural error. Departments and colleges may specify deadlines that are earlier, but not later, than those cited below.

On a date specified in the department promotion and tenure guidelines but no later than October 1, the candidate for tenure and/or promotion will notify the department head and the chair of the department promotion and tenure committee of his/her intent to submit his/her application for tenure and/or promotion. The department head has the responsibility to assist, where appropriate, the faculty member in preparing the application for tenure and promotion review.

By October 1 (or first working day thereafter), or earlier if specified in the department promotion and tenure document, a faculty member eligible for consideration for promotion and/or tenure must have provided the department head with all pertinent and available information to apply for consideration.

By November 15 (or first working day thereafter), or earlier if specified by the college promotion and tenure document, each faculty member's complete dossier will be provided to the college promotion and tenure committee. This will include letters of recommendation and rationale from both the department promotion and tenure committee and the department head. Each of these letters of recommendation and rationale will be copied to the candidate. The letters will be redacted only insofar as necessary to conceal the identity of external reviewers. These letters must include a

# DRAFT COPY

summary of the procedures followed by the academic unit in evaluating the candidate and the committee's and head's independent evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, research and/or creative achievement, and service to the profession and university. The chair of the college promotion and tenure committee is responsible for inserting letters of recommendation and rationale from the department head and the department promotion and tenure committee, along with any letters related to correction of factual errors at the department level, into the dossier of each candidate reviewed by the college promotion and tenure committee.

By December 15 (or first working day thereafter) or earlier if specified by the college promotion and tenure document, the college promotion and tenure committee's letter of recommendation and rationale for each candidate shall be sent to the college dean. Letters of recommendation and rationale shall be copied to the candidate. The letters will be redacted only insofar as necessary to conceal the identity of external reviewers. The letter concerning each candidate must include the committee's summary of the procedures followed by the college committee in evaluating the candidate and the committee's evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, research and/or creative achievement, and service to the profession and university. The college promotion and tenure committee chair is responsible to provide the dean with each candidate's dossier including letters from previous stages of review. For each candidate, the dean is responsible for collection and inclusion of any letters related to correction of factual errors at the college level.

By January 15 (or first working day thereafter), the dean's letter of recommendation and rationale for each candidate shall be sent to the provost and copied to the candidate. The letter concerning each candidate must include the dean's evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, research and/or creating achievement, and service to the profession and university. The dean is responsible to provide the provost with each candidate's dossier including letters from previous stages of review. Copies of publications, works of art, etc., will be included only if specifically requested by the provost.

By March 10 (or first working day thereafter), the provost will have reviewed each candidate's dossier and will make a recommendation to the [university](#) president. Copies of the provost's recommendation will be sent to the candidate with copies to the dean, department head, and chairs of college and department promotion and tenure committees.

The [university](#) president will review the recommendation of the provost and will decide to accept or reject that recommendation.

# DRAFT COPY

The [university](#) president will transmit that decision, together with reasons for a negative decision, to the faculty member directly, with copies to the dean, department head, and chairs of college and department promotion and tenure committees.

The decision to recommend tenure to the IHL Board of Trustees is made by the [university](#) president. All judgments made at lower levels of the university are recommendations to the [university](#) president.

## **G. Appeals**

Faculty members who have been denied promotion or tenure may, within ten working days of the date on the [university](#) president's decision letter, request an appeals hearing before the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The request must be made through the provost who will forward the request to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Grounds for requesting an appeal are:

- That the decision was prejudiced, arbitrary, or capricious; or
- That the procedures contained in the promotion and tenure policies of the IHL, MSU, or those in the candidate's college or unit promotion and tenure policies were not properly followed.

The University Committee on Promotion and Tenure, upon request of the provost, will review the entire case. The appeal will be heard by at least five members. Members should recuse themselves from appeals by candidates who are relatives or with whom they have some conflict-of-interest, if the committee member has served in the previous levels of evaluation of the appellant or if for any reason the committee member feels he/she cannot be objective. A committee member will not vote on an appeal unless he/she has heard all hearings pertaining to the case. If five members are not available because of absence or recusal, the chair may, with the concurrence of the committee, appoint substitutes from among the professors of the general faculty. In special circumstances potentially prejudicial to the appellant, the chair may, with the concurrence of the committee, appoint an ad-hoc committee to assist in the resolution of the appeal. This ad-hoc committee reports its findings back to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

The committee will review all available pertinent information and will conduct interviews with appropriate persons, i.e., appellant, unit head, unit committee chair, dean, college committee chair and provost. The committee will render its recommendation, in writing, to the provost. The committee will also provide a copy of this written recommendation to the candidate.

The provost will transmit the committee's written recommendation along with his/her own recommendation to the [university](#) president, who will make the final on-campus

# DRAFT COPY

decision. This decision will end the university appeals process. A copy of each recommendation will be provided to the candidate.

The Board of Trustees of the Institutions of Higher Learning may grant a further appeal as outlined in Board of Trustees Policy 403.0105.

Candidates who are denied tenure and who have no time remaining in their probationary periods will receive terminal contracts for the following year.

## **HK. Notice of Non-reappointment of Non-tenured, Tenure-track Faculty**

Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members will be notified in writing of the university's intention not to renew their contracts as provided in IHL Board Policy 403.0102:

- Not later than March 1 before the date of contract termination during the first year of service;
- Not later than December 1 before the date of contract termination during the second year of service; or
- Not later than September 1 before the date of contract termination after two or more years of service.

This schedule of notification does not apply to persons holding temporary, part-time, or adjunct positions

## **IL. Dismissal of Tenured Faculty**

Termination of service of a tenured faculty member is made only under these extraordinary circumstances (as outlined in IHL Board Policy 403.0104):

- Financial exigencies as declared by the Board;
- Termination or reduction of programs, academic or administrative units as approved by the Board;
- Malfeasance, inefficiency or contumacious conduct; or
- For legitimate and justifiable cause.

Termination for cause of a tenured faculty member or the dismissal for cause of a faculty member prior to the expiration of a term appointment will not be recommended by the institutional executive officer until the faculty member has been afforded the opportunity for a hearing. In no event will the contract of a tenured faculty member be terminated for cause without the faculty member being afforded the opportunity for a hearing.

# DRAFT COPY

In all cases, the faculty member will be informed in writing of the proposed action against him/her and that he/she has the opportunity to be heard in his/her own defense. Within ten (10) working days from the date of the [university](#) president's decision, the faculty member will state in writing his/her desire to have a hearing. He/she will be permitted to have with him/her an adviser of his/her own choosing who may be an attorney. The institution is directed to record (suitable for transcription) all hearings. In the hearing of charges of incompetence, the testimony will include that of faculty and other scholars.

Tenured faculty members, who are dismissed for financial exigencies or termination or reduction of program, academic or administrative units will remain employed for a minimum of 9 to 12 months, consistent with current contract periods of time, from date of notification. Tenured faculty members, who are dismissed for malfeasance, inefficiency, contumacious conduct or for a legitimate and justifiable cause will have their contracts terminated at any time subsequent to notice and hearing with no right to continued employment for any period of time. At the discretion of the Institutional Executive Officer, any faculty member's salary may be paid, and he/she may be relieved of all teaching duties, assignments, appointments and privileges when he/she is dismissed for any reasons stated above or pending a termination hearing.

APPROVED:

/s/ Randolph F. Follett 2/13/15

Randy Follett, Faculty Senate President Date

/s/ Jerome A. Gilbert 2/13/15

Jerome A. Gilbert, Provost and Executive Vice President Date

/s/ Mark E. Keenum 3/6/15

Mark E. Keenum, President Date

## **VI. Department of Human Resources Management Policies and Procedures**

# DRAFT COPY

---

Important personnel issues, including those in state and federal law, are established as Human Resources Management Policies and Procedures by the Department of Human Resources Management in consultation with impacted units. These policies are periodically revised by the Department of Human Resources Management. A record of HRM policies is available at the Office of Internal Audit at [www.msstate.edu/dept/audit/mainindex.html#VOLUME\\_V](http://www.msstate.edu/dept/audit/mainindex.html#VOLUME_V)

## **VII. Other University Policies**

---

It is the obligation of all members of the university community, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students, to adhere to the policies of the university. To ensure the ease and accuracy of compliance, all policies are available at the Office of Internal Audit at [www.msstate.edu/dept/audit/mainindex.html](http://www.msstate.edu/dept/audit/mainindex.html)

## **VIII. Employee Benefits**

---

Current records of employee benefits are available for the Department of Human Resources Management and are located at <http://www.hrm.msstate.edu/benefits/>

## ELECTION OF OFFICERS

### President

Jason Barrett

Missy Hopper

### Vice President

Robert Banik

### Secretary

Beth Stokes

## NEW BUSINESS

## ADJOURN



## 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 t~~ 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