



ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE

Uncorrected Minutes of September 9, 2022

The Robert Holland Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University held its regular monthly meeting in Bost Auditorium South at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, September 9, 2022.

Members absent and excused were Jenna Altomonte, Jeb Cade, Robert Grala, Alicia Hall, Michael Jaffe, Andrew Jarosz, Sol Pelaez, James Sobaskie, Kimberly Wood, and Molly Zuckerman.

The meeting was called to order by Senate President Jason Barrett.

President Barrett said there was an incorrect date in the minutes which were initially sent out. He said the date has been corrected on the minutes that appear on the website. President Barrett asked for any additional corrections to the minutes of the August 19, 2022 meeting. Hearing no corrections, President Barrett accepted the minutes as presented.

GUESTS

Mr. Kennedy Guest, Student Association President

Mr. Guest said he came to address the Senate to provide some insight into the request for a public grade distribution site by the Student Association. He said students heavily rely on feedback when making their schedules. First, they will seek personal feedback from those they know. An example of this would be sending a text to an organizational GroupMe. If this does not work, the students tend to turn to the website Rate My Professor. Mr. Guest said that this website is highly inaccurate with no controls over who can post. The Student Association thought there must be a better way to allow for an evaluative measure through the institution.

Mr. Guest said the feedback on courses plays a large role in the classes students select. He said he would say it is on par with the recommendations students get from academic advising. Advisors tell the students which classes to take, and feedback is how they select their section.

Students will move times around and make classes inconvenient for themselves to be in sections for which they receive good feedback. Mr. Guest said there are two types of feedback students look for - is "What grade did you make?" and "What did you learn?". The Student Association recognized this and made sure to address it when asking for a public grade distribution system.

Mr. Guest said Rate My Professor is largely unreliable and has no verification system. He said just before the meeting he went to the site and tried to post a comment for a professor at Vanderbilt University. He said he did not post a comment on the professor, but he got to the point where all he had left to do was to hit submit. He said there were no verifications that he took a class with the professor or that he even attended the school. He said he believes that a professor can post that they are the professor, but there is no way to eliminate posts from non-students. Mr. Guest said we talk about issues of bias with regard to student evaluations and the only students who fill them out are mad. He asked how much madder a student must be to create an account on an external non-university website and leave a review. Bias is far expounded on Rate My Professor. He said a vast majority of professors receive very low ratings. Mr. Guest said professors he has previously taken whose classes he enjoyed and learned from and classes which were easy have horrible ratings on Rate My Professor. He said the only students that leave a rating are the ones that fail the class.

Mr. Guest said public grade distribution is not new and has been around for a long time at some of our peer institutions both inside and outside of the SEC. It allows students to see objective measurements. It is also controlled and overseen by the university. If there is an issue on Rate My Professor because of some technical glitch, there is nothing that can be done about it. If the same thing happens with a system MSU controls, it can be corrected before students are led astray. Mr. Guest said a university system will also minimize bias. He said he understands that not every student fills out the surveys, although he believes a good portion do. The easier we make it for students to provide feedback, the more positive feedback we will get.

Mr. Guest said the Student Association liked the systems at Auburn University, University of Georgia, Texas A&M, and Clemson University. The system at the University of Kentucky did not interest them as it looked like it was designed for children. There were a lot of graphs that tried to make it simple but made it hard to read. The system at UT-Austin was hard to understand without a degree in statistics.

Mr. Guest said he knows a lot of people will look at this request and think that students just want to be able to identify a class that they can get an A in. He said for some students this is true. These are the students who ask "What grade did you get?" He said there is another class of students, who he believes faculty want in the classroom, who are the "What did you learn?" students. These are the students not interested in grade inflation, but investment in the future.

For these students this is a schedule planning tool above all else. He said some say that just because a class has a high percentage of As does not make it easy, and that's true. Students have a motivation to maintain their GPA. They want to know that they can take classes they can succeed in. Some classes such as Organic Chemistry or General Physics are hard classes where a lot of times students are fighting for Bs or As. Students certainly do not want to take four or five of these classes in the same semester. Mr. Guest said he is currently in a very difficult class called Municipal and Government Accounting. It is a difficult class, but it is structured in a way that there is some leeway into earning the A and B grades. Students treat this class a little differently. He said it is not that this class is less important, it is that they can handle more of these classes while taking an extraordinarily difficult course. The students see this tool as a way to plan their schedule and make sure they are not overloaded academically, but also to make sure they are not taking five easy classes which will mess them up down the road when they have to take the harder courses. Mr. Guest said the Student Association has been in touch with other student governments around the SEC and they say that they use it. The Student Association President at the University of Georgia said that Rate My Professor has pretty much died because they have a system like this. The President also said they have received great feedback from students including the grade inflation students, but mainly from the investment in the future students who want to take the best professors and not the easiest professors.

Senator Williams asked if the students would be opposed to faculty using the site as leverage to increase student participation in the surveys. He said he does not take issue with the students having the data as it should be considered publicly available data. He said what the students have asked to see raises some questions for him. He asked if students would be amenable to needing to have a 75% or 80% response rate on course surveys before they are able to access the data. He said his response rates are low and this seems like an opportunity to improve them. Mr. Guest replied he believed every student would completely understand this request. He said he is in full support of having such a requirement. He said he would ask that we avoid a system where students are relying on other students such as a requirement for 80% of students to have completed their evaluations. He said he believes a system which requires a student to complete a certain percentage of their evaluations, if not all, to access the site would be completely fair and is a good opportunity to increase survey participation rates. The point was made that consideration of this must account for incoming freshman and transfer students.

Senator Gregory said her department has a staff advisor who works with the students to manage their course load. She said they even have a flowchart with suggested courses to be taken at certain times. She said she is a little concerned that students are relying on other students and not their academic advisors to make these decisions. Mr. Guest replied that academic advising is certainly a piece of the puzzle in the student's minds. Students, like all of

us, rely on their peers. He said his academic advisor does a great job of being real with students, but he has heard from other students that their advisor doesn't know what they are doing or the class they knew from Clemson is not the same as it is here and it is hard not easy. He said some students are not happy with their academic advising, so they rely more heavily on their peers. Mr. Guest said, even as a student with a good advisor, he still wants to hear from his peers who took the class the year before about what their experience was. He said he does not feel that academic advising is getting thrown to the wayside, but there are additional components going into decision making, of which one is peer feedback. Senator Gregory said this site would provide a GPA related to a faculty member related to a class. She said this is not really hearing from your peers, it is disconnected from the peer experience. Mr. Guest replied he believes seeing the numbers is a part of the peer experience by showing what happened. In his opinion, it answers the questions is this course difficult and is this a class I'm going to be able to succeed in if I'm taking this other course.

Senator Gregory said her department has many courses which are only taught by one particular faculty member. She said the tool is for students to be able to choose between faculty. She asked what the benefit is for this situation. Mr. Guest replied that the benefit is it helps with schedule building by allowing the student to estimate the time requirements for courses. He said not all programs on campus allow for this flexibility, but a fair number do.

Senator Gregory said she thinks if there is this much trouble with advising perhaps the Faculty Senate and the Student Association could work together to determine how to improve advising. She said she has a concern that students will rely too heavily on this tool rather than their staff advisor who is trained.

Senator Chamberlain said some students will certainly use this as a way to choose the easiest courses instead of using it to choose the best courses for them to grow as Mr. Guest earlier recognized. He said this does not serve to aid these student's education in any way. He said Mr. Guest made some very good arguments for the tool. Senator Chamberlain said when this was announced, faculty in his department were completely opposed to it. They were upset about the way it had been handled and felt it was inappropriate. He said he feels there is some openness to this, but a good argument must be made to faculty about the educational benefits of it.

Ms. McNeel, President of the Graduate Student Association, said, from a student's perspective, it would be beneficial to tie in student course surveys to the tool. She said the comments would provide additional information to the students about the workload. Ms. McNeel said one thing that her department has done which may be beneficial to others is the creation of two student advising assistants. She said freshman and sophomore students have felt more

comfortable expressing some of their concerns to these older students rather than their academic advisor.

Senator Vivier said he strongly opposes the idea of wrapping significant amounts of evaluation data into this tool. He said student evaluation data suffers from the same if not more egregious bias issues than Rate My Professor. Senator Vivier said the idea that GPA data is an objective replacement for Rate My Professor is a problematic argument. He said he can teach the exact same class to three different groups of students and get widely different GPA results. He said he believes the result of this system will be that most students will use this to shop for easy As, but that won't actually be true. He said there are a significant amount of problems with reading the data.

Senator Sutton agreed with Senator Vivier that faculty would not like more of the evaluations tied to the system. She said there is a large body of research that shows that student evaluations are racist and sexist.

Dr. Tracey Baham, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Strategy and Effectiveness

Dr. Baham said her team created the student information tool which faculty are currently reviewing. She said the data which went into instrument came from two sources. One source is the grade data about the course. This information is reported to IHL at the end of every semester. This is pulled from BANNER and consists of every faculty member who is an instructor of record. The data includes the number of students, the number of credit hours, and the grade distribution. The second source is one question from the student course surveys. She said it is the one question which is consistent across both the old and new versions of the survey instrument. The data extracted is the frequency of agree and strongly agree to whether they would recommend the instructor to other students. A threshold has been set on this data of either at least 6 students or 33% or more of the students in the course. If the threshold is not reached, the data is not displayed. The dashboard distinguishes between data not being available and not having met the threshold for response rate.

Dr. Baham said the student surveys are 100% anonymous. There is no way of determining who did and did not fill out the survey so it would not be possible to tie access to the dashboard to participation. She said the threshold can be altered if necessary. She said 33% is not a very high percentage and we still do not have much of the data meeting the threshold.

Dr. Baham said graduate students have not been included in the dashboard. The rationale was that graduate students have fewer options for courses and this tool would not help them choose which courses to take.

Dr. Baham said the audience for this tool is broader than just the students. Academic advisors can also use this information to help create student schedules. She said she is still collecting feedback on the instrument and has already made several changes based on feedback received. Faculty members who have passed away or have stepped into a course late have been removed from the system. She said her office is still having trouble matching survey information to courses which are split-level or cross-listed. This will be looked at further to determine if and how to separate this data.

Dr. Baham said that this is not released to the students at this point and there is still time to provide feedback. She said feedback can be emailed directly to her. She said she has received feedback concerning both grade inflation and grade deflation. She said she has a large amount of data and this will be monitored to determine the effect on GPAs after the tool is released.

Senator Williams asked if the dashboard could be connected to Canvas to check if students completed the survey in order to limit access the instrument. Dr. Baham said she knows there is a way that faculty can determine if the link to the survey was clicked through Canvas. She said this data does not follow through to the result so it would not be able to be added to the dashboard.

Dr. David Shaw, Provost and Executive Vice President

Dr. Shaw said Mr. Guest presented a good case and Dr. Baham will remain available to answer questions at any time. He thanked Dr. Baham and her team for not only creating the dashboard but fielding the questions. Dr. Shaw said he will entertain any questions or feedback the senators have.

Senator Popescu said the faculty she represents were opposed to this tool. She said the reasons given were that a committee carried out the initiative to create this system and that felt wrong to the faculty she represents, the surveys and sites like Rate My Professor are biased, it will lead to academic inequality, it will lead to grade inflation, it will harm collegiality within a department and trust between colleagues, and it may harm the P&T process.

Senator Gregory said faculty in her college have concerns about the instrument. She said faculty in her college overwhelmingly object to the use, dissemination, and publication of the information for public use since the short- and long-term effects of this instrument must be critically evaluated to determine the impact on faculty. Some concerns she received were why faculty were not consulted, why administration only discussed the database with the Student Association, why were the students as producers of the data consulted over the faculty who are users of the data, is the goal to allow students to shop for the easiest class or professor or identify statistically the courses which has the highest chance of an A/B/C, how are these courses measured in terms of outcomes and assessments. She said data concerns were raised

including the quality of feedback from students, particularly poor performing students and participation in the surveys is incredibly low thus the data only shows a small percentage of feedback that can skew the overall score or ranking of faculty. She said she has also heard students do not take the survey seriously or write valuable information, the tool does not show how prejudicial intervention between competing faculty, the lack of transparency by the administration, selection and distribution bias, and misrepresented data sets are quantified. Senator Gregory said she also heard that the system privileges less rigorous courses and penalizes faculty who offer challenging or work intensive curricula. There is not a clear breakdown of the number in each letter grade or information about said data. Statistical data shows there is a heavy self-selection bias in non-mandatory evaluations. Some other concerns were that anonymous responses do not hold students accountable, there is no data or clarification of other factors that result in a lower or higher average, minimal deviation between instructors or courses, overall average GPA not provided, disparity between MSU GPA and GPA, students who fail due to non-attendance are calculated in average, inconsistent results based on current and previous scales on surveys, and qualitative metrics are low quality and not indicated.

Senator Kelly said her colleagues provided feedback and the response was pretty uniformly negative. The critiques fell into two areas, those criticizing what is happening and those criticizing how it happened. She said in terms of what is happening she heard comments about gender and race bias in evaluations, how it will be used informally in P&T decisions, and this furthers the push of higher ed into a customer service model which students shop for the outcome they want instead of a learning experience. Senator Kelly said how it happened seemed to be a bigger sticking point. She said faculty would like to know why the full Faculty Senate had been bypassed and have concerns about the erosion of shared governance. She said some perceived this as a slippery slope such as when the Senate raised concerns about the sharing of student comments with department heads and deans or the resistance to online only distribution of student surveys which were both overridden.

Senator Allison said the faculty she has spoken with are also opposed to this tool for many of the same reasons already stated. She said they also said there is a large body of scholarship on teaching and learning which addresses a lot of these very issues. There is a sense that if students are looking for a good assessment of course workload so they can balance their courses or indicators of effective teaching, the scholarship should be at the center of how we develop these measures. She said it does not seem that this was the case for this tool.

Senator Freeman said it seems everyone agrees the instrument is flawed, the methodology is flawed, and the reporting results are flawed. This means the data is inherently flawed. He said the students have asked for bad data. He asked why not just give it to them. He said if you

have bad data, you make bad decisions. He said if it is not accurate to what is happening in the classroom he does not care if they have it. Senator Freeman said he requested feedback from faculty in the School of Human Sciences about the instrument and received none.

Senator Gregory said Rate My Professor is not an official university website while this instrument will be an official university website. She said this will not just impact who enrolls in faculty's courses, but collegiality, promotion and tenure, and other things that will impact the faculty.

Senator Rai said the argument that this is being done in other places is extremely seductive because since others are doing it, somehow that makes it right. He said he thinks student feedback and evaluation is a very useful tool for the professor. He said when he gets a comment he has some context and can evaluate whether the comment is correct or not. Every student is different and in a class of 50 or 100 we will see a spectrum of feedback which faculty are trained to examine in a careful manner. Senator Rai said he thinks we should be thoughtful in what we are presenting to the students. He said taking a large body of data and providing small bits of it is very dangerous. It has been scientifically proven how it affects faculty from different ethnicities and genders. He said he believes we should rethink the tools existence itself.

Senator Haynes said it has been discussed that there are issues with the data. She said the educator in her does not want to encourage our students to be okay with this data. She said there is concern that this data will be used by others such as administrators or colleagues. Senator Haynes said she has heard many concerns about the process of how this was introduced. People have expressed concerns and cynicism because of not knowing how the process of how this came about. They do not know that during the summer Senate does not meet and the Executive Committee has to make decisions. This makes it seem like things are getting pushed through. She said she thinks it would help if we take some time and make sure that faculty have this information. She said the information provided by Dr. Baham is also very helpful, especially the fact that we are required to report some of this data. Senator Haynes said it would be helpful to take more time to share information so people can feel more comfortable about the process and gain trust in the legitimacy of it.

Senator Freeman made a motion to close informal discussion. Senator Robichaux-Davis seconded the motion. The motion to close informal discussion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Dr. Shaw said it was not the intent to create something that would cause dissention or distrust with the Student Association, the Faculty Senate, or the faculty at large. The process used was to take what the Student Association had proposed and take a look at what a number of other

institutions were doing to develop what we thought was the best instrument. He said he wanted to wait until faculty returned to put it out there for the very feedback that the senators and faculty are providing. The Student Association requested just GPA data. Dr. Shaw said as he consulted with Dr. Baham, the Senate Executive Committee, and the deans he brought up the fact that there are courses which GPA does not tell the full story. He said the question on the student survey seemed like the best way to provide the second piece of the picture. He said he is fully aware of the prior conflict over how the surveys are used. He said the presence of the survey question on the instrument is open for discussion. Dr. Shaw said he is more than willing to take the feedback received today and do a lot more thinking. He said he thinks the points have been well taken and much of the feedback that was desired has now been received. Dr. Shaw said it was never the intent to bypass Faculty Senate in any way. He said putting the question to the entire faculty is, to him, the epitome of shared governance. This may be perceived differently for other people. Dr. Shaw said we need to continue this conversation. He said he and Dr. Keenum feel it is not an unreasonable request by the Student Association for them to have a much more effective tool than a Rate My Professor. He said if there are other ways to approach this, please share them with him but asked that we not just say no and walk away without answering what the students have requested in any way. He asked that we think about ways that we can approach this in a more effective way.

Senator Allison said prior communications have indicated that feedback would be accepted until October 1st and at some point thereafter the tool would go live. She asked if it is a possibility that the tool will be scrapped entirely and will not go live. Dr. Shaw replied that based on the feedback received today, the tool will not go live on October 1st. He said the senators have given a lot of information that indicates we have to continue the conversation on some things. He said he not willing to say that it is scrapped altogether at this point because he feels the students have made a reasonable request. He said if we remove the survey component and look at the GPA data, the students are requesting data that they can get anyway. Dr. Shaw said the tool will not go live this fall based on today's feedback.

Senator Gregory said she appreciates Dr. Shaw's flexibility and willingness to move the deadline back. The idea of a resolution was proposed, and was redirected to the appropriate section for application.

Senator Williams said his department is trying to work through updating the departmental P&T document. He asked if there could be a standing working group from the Provost's Office to answer questions as the work is done on the document. He said they have questions about things such as who gets to vote on whose promotion and does a Clinical Instructor get to vote to promote a regular Instructor. He said we have all these categories now and they are trying to make sure it stays fair for everyone. Dr. Shaw replied that Dr. Jim Dunne is the person who

can answer the questions about the updating of departmental documents. He said Dr. Dunne can be contacted directly or asked to meet with committees to address questions. Dr. Shaw said he is fielding a lot of these questions and is listening to feedback. Dr. Dunne is trying to develop a compendium of best practices he is hearing about across campus.

Senator Kelly said she is very happy that we were able to add the new faculty ranks to recognize those that do the heavy lifting in teaching and produce the most credit hours. She said she noticed the amounts for promotion are quite low. She said it is a \$7,500 raise to be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and \$10,000 to be promoted from Associate Professor to full Professor for tenure-track faculty. She said the raise schedule for teaching faculty, who already make substantially less than tenure-track faculty, are \$5,000 for both increases. She asked who she should speak to about having teaching faculty's raise schedule match that of tenure-track faculty. Dr. Shaw said we are in the process for setting these policies as we speak. He said part of the logic, flawed or not, is that teaching faculty are at a lower salary level and the \$5,000 is representative of the same percentage of raise as tenure-track faculty. He said this may or may not be valid logic, but it is the logic being used. Senator Kelly said it just seems like being promoted should be a big deal as we have some instructors who have been here for over a decade and \$5,000 after taxes, especially with inflation the way it is, will not seem that significant.

Senator Williams said he knows an Instructor who has won a Grisham Master Teacher Award, an advising award, and has been here for numerous years. He said once it is available, this Instructor will only be able to apply for Instructor II. He asked why this particular individual is not able to apply for Instructor III. He said what could possibly be asked of this individual to make the jump from Instructor II to Instructor III given what they have already done. Dr. Shaw replied that this is a point that there has been much discussion about. He said it has to be understood that allowing for these promotions is a massive lift on our budget. Senator Williams said there are only three instructors who have been awarded the Grisham Master Teacher Award. Dr. Shaw said Senator Williams raises a good point and he would take this into further consideration. He said when he met with the deans, they provided a lot of individuals that they wanted to take from a I to a III. He said he wants people to be aware that we want those who have given to this institution so much to go from a I to a III in an expedited way. He said some good conversations are being had on how to do that so we don't have a five year window if they have a number of years of service. Dr. Shaw said it was felt that we could not take the financial hit of a hundred or more people going from a I to a III. He said it is recognized that this is long overdue and he and Dr. Keenum are the strongest advocates for what we have done in terms of recognizing the contribution that folks have made. Dr. Shaw said we need to figure out how to accelerate the process for those who have contributed so much. He said going from a I to a II is excellence in teaching. He said going from a II to a III is not just

continued years of excellence in teaching and he is not sure that we have defined that well. This is something we, as a university, have to grapple with. He said part of the conversation we need to work through this fall is how do we go from a II to a III. Senator Williams said we have defined the instructor positions, but we also have a service component. He said he believes there are a lot of instructors who are nervous about how we are going to evaluate it. We will hire someone to teach and we then tell them they have to be a really good teacher and do significant service in order to be promoted to a III. He said that may not be why they got into this job and their offer letter may not say anything about service. He said every time they get evaluated it may say 100% teaching and 0% service. Senator Williams said he believes that service for instructors need to be defined. Dr. Shaw said he strongly agrees with the questions Senator Williams raised. He said these are the conversations that are going to have to happen in departments and across campus this spring and fall to be able to answer these questions.

Senator Freeman said in the guidelines passed by Faculty Senate last spring it was said that if departments can adopt their guidelines in the fall, they can have individuals go up in the spring for promotion from I to II. Then the P&T committees can consider someone going from II to III prior to the five year standard based on years of service. He said this means it would be possible to go from a I to a III by fall 2024, but it is up to the faculty and the departmental P&T committee to pass the guidelines as quickly as possible.

Senator Rai asked if there is a timeline established for getting all of this in place for promotion and tenure. Dr. Shaw replied that it was agreed that all departments need to work out the pathway by January so those that want to go up for II can do so in the spring. He said that is why there is some urgency on this conversation. Dr. Shaw said the last thing he wants to see happen is that we have an instructor that could go up in the spring and the departmental committee has not done its work to be able to enable that to happen. He said this penalizes them very unfairly. He said we have more time on the new categories of Teaching Professor and Professor of Practice as we do not have any of these positions in place yet. Dr. Shaw said we do not have a lot of time on this though because he is already seeing requests for these positions. He said by the time we fill these positions next fall we need to have the promotion and tenure process in place so they know the promotion guidelines.

Senator Kundu asked if a department that does not have any instructors who could go for promotion in the spring needs to have their document updated by January. Dr. Shaw replied that if a department has instructors, they need to have the document updated by January. If they do not have any instructors, then it is not as critical.

Senator Tagert asked if the universal annual evaluation developed by the Task Force was still going to be deployed given the changes made to the P&T process. Dr. Shaw replied that the universal annual evaluation is currently in the Faculty Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate and

he would like for the recommendation coming from Senate to include recommendations on incorporating the changes to the P&T process.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

I know we have had a very quick turnaround since the last Faculty Senate meeting in August, so I hope you all are settling in well. It has been a busy three weeks as we are compiling our university committees, filling vacant senate seats, and conducting the College of Business Dean Search committee faculty representation elections.

I had the privilege of representing you at the Fall Convocation held on Thursday August 23rd at the Humphrey Coliseum. I saw a good number of faculty present, and I think that is a great showing of support.

As I have said before, please know that the Senate is always open and wants to hear from and work with faculty. This is your office so please reach out with any questions and/or comments that make MSU a better place.

Reports from Committees on which I serve:

Athletic Council – Met with Dr. Brent Fountain for representation on the Athletic Council because a committee member left the university. We will look to have Dr. Fountain as our Faculty Athletic Representative to attend the November 2022 and April 2023 meeting of Senate. First meeting is scheduled for Wednesday September 14, 2022.

Still waiting to hear back on the final dates for volleyball and soccer. They will be either in October or November.

*The Faculty/Staff Day at football practice will be on Tuesday, September 20th from 4:00-6:00pm at the Leo Seal Football facilities. Here is the link, which has additional information: <https://tickets.formstack.com/forms/facultyday>

A few important notes, guests are invited (e.g., spouses, children, parents, etc.) and registration is required to attend. I would encourage each faculty/staff even in the same household to register individually.

*Information on the football game on September 24th including the discount code:

If they will visit hailstate.com/tickets and click on the *Bowling Green game*, then enter the code **FSDEAL22** they will be able to purchase tickets for \$5 each.

*Coach Leach will be having a couple of student-athletes recognizing a favorite faculty member to participate in game week activities this season. This is something he has done at his other

schools, and he is very excited to bring it to Mississippi State. As I get more information, I will be sure to pass it along.

Executive Council (August 22, 2022) – Discussion was had to elect a representative from the Office of Public Affairs (OPA) to the Executive Council and passed. Next step will be in the selection of the representative. Mr. Sid Salter gave an update on the new branding and you all may have seen by now the new National Commercial. “Taking Care of What Matters”

OP Review and Approval

OP 03.02 Statement on Equal Opportunity and Nondiscrimination

OP 91.304 Free Speech and Assembly

OP 60.109 Records Management and Security

OP 56.06 Research, Extension, and Clinical Faculty Positions was rescinded due to the update to the Faculty Handbook and inclusion of these ranks. (Page 14 under The General Faculty Composition)

Executive Enrollment Management Committee – Has not met since the last faculty senate meeting. The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday September 20, 2022.

Faculty/Staff Housing Appeals Committee – We have had one appeal come before the committee. It was handled via email and approved a 6-month lease extension.

Inclusive Excellence Leadership Council – Has not met since the beginning of the semester. Vice President Forbes says she plans to reconvene the committee sometime in late September once a chair has been identified. The previous chair left MSU.

IT Council (August 2, 2022) – We met via Webex. The bulk of discussion was related to the Adobe Creative Cloud. The Adobe Team will be coming to campus on August 17th and 18th for “Adobe Days”. Adobe would like to be in the classroom with our Faculty and Students utilizing. MSU has made the Adobe suite of products available to any and all faculty, staff, and students that want the products/tools. The suite can be purchased at <https://www.adobe.msstate.edu/>. Also, look for two-factor authentication on desktops machines/computers. We will have a DUO upgrade as the university tightens restrictions. Please be conscious of hacking and phishing attempts and report them.

Master Plan Development and Advisory Committee – Has not met since I took office. The next scheduled meeting is October 13, 2022.

Parking and Traffic Regulation Committee - Has not met since I took office. The next scheduled meeting is September 22, 2022.

President's Committee on Planning – Has not met.

Special Events and Game Day Operations Committee (August 24, 2022) – Approval of gameday campus building restrooms. Athletic Marketing request for Hailstate Tailgate location in the Junction. You may have seen or noticed this already if you attended the game on Saturday September 3, 2022.

Sustainability Committee – Has not met since I took office. Mr. JD Hardy has moved positions and Mr. Joseph Paige left MSU for another position. Once the positions are backfilled, the committee may reconvene.

Design Review Committee (July 2, 2022) – Has not met since last Faculty Senate Meeting.

Senator Gregory asked if Giles Hall was one of the buildings approved for public restroom access on gameday. She said Giles Hall is a 24/7 building and the students are there all of the time. She said there have been instances of students being threatened and harassed by tailgaters wanting to be let in to use the restrooms in the past, so she has concern if the building is opened to the public. President Barrett said he would pass Senator Gregory's concern to the committee.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE VICE PRESIDENT

Academic Deans Council

No meetings were held since the last Vice President's report.

Committee on Campus Access

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

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 September meeting was cancelled.

Undergraduate Research and Creative Discovery Committee

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

FACULTY DESIGNATES ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

BUSINESS TO BE SENT TO COMMITTEE

1. Letter of Request: Addition to University Syllabus (Student Affairs)

President Barrett said the letter of request received from Senator Sutton serves as a motion and asked if there was a second. Senator Kelly seconded the motion to send the letter to committee. President Barrett asked for any discussion on sending the letter requesting an addition to the University Syllabus to the Student Affairs Committee.

The motion to send letter to the Student Affairs Committee passed by unanimous voice vote.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs **No Report**

Ancillary Affairs **No Report**

Charter & Bylaws **No Report**

Faculty Affairs

1. Update on AOP 13.06 Sabbatical Leave

Senator Breazeale gave an update on the status of AOP 13.06 Sabbatical Leave. He said the policy was assigned to the Faculty Affairs Committee in the spring. He said over the summer, Legal pulled the policy to make updates which reflect IHL recommendations. Senator Breazeale said the Senate will receive the policy to continue consideration once Legal has completed their updates.

Student Affairs **No Report**

University Resources **No Report**

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Gregory made a motion to consider a resolution and provided the resolution to President Barrett to be read aloud.

President Barrett read "I propose a resolution that the deadline for faculty feedback on the new course evaluation tool be postponed to Friday, November 4th and that an Ad Hoc Committee be

formed, composed of volunteers from the Faculty Senate, to evaluate the information provided today by Dr. Shaw, Dr. Baham, and President Guest to allow for sufficient time to discuss and provide official feedback from the Faculty Senate at the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting on Friday, October 7th.”

Senator Haynes made a friendly amendment to remove the deadline for faculty feedback and the deadline for reporting to the Faculty Senate. Senator Gregory accepted the friendly amendment.

President Barrett read the resolution as amended. “I propose a resolution that an Ad Hoc Committee be formed, composed of volunteers from the Faculty Senate, to evaluate the information provided today by Dr. Shaw, Dr. Baham, and President Guest to allow for sufficient time to discuss and provide official feedback from the Faculty Senate.”

Senator Gregory asked if the resolution should be sent to committee since it is asking for the creation of a committee. Senator Freeman said Senator Gregory could withdraw her motion and ask President Barrett to establish a committee to review the subject without a motion as the establishment of the committee is within President Barrett’s purview.

Senator Gregory withdrew her motion to consider the resolution.

Senator Gregory asked President Barrett to form an ad hoc committee to review the new student grade tool. President Barrett said he would create an ad hoc committee to review the grade tool and provide feedback to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Robichaux-Davis made a motion to adjourn. Senator Haynes seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

Submitted for correction and approval.

Beth Stokes, Secretary

Jason Cory, Administrative Assistant II