Minutes of the Faculty Senate

Presiding: William P. Travis (Health Studies)　　　　　**Date: 2-28-2023**

Secretary: R. Jeffrey Thieme (Marketing & Supply Chain Management)

Senators Present: Reza Banai (City and Regional Planning), Lynda Black (School of Law), Theodore Burkey (Chemistry), Gerald Chaudron (Libraries), Melanie Conroy (World Languages and Literatures), Frances Fabian (Management), Hal Freeman (Liberal Studies), Rhema Fuller (Hospitality), Edith Gnanadass (Leadership), Mihalis Golias (Civil Engineering), Rebecca Howard (Art), Stephanie Huette (Psychology), Andrew Hussey (Economics), Eddie Jacobs (Electrical and Computer Engineering), Brian Janz (Business Information and Technology), Jessica Jennings (BioMedical Engineering), Shelley Keith (Criminology and Criminal Justice), Maggie Landry (School of Social Work), Jeni Loftus (Sociology), Jeff Marchetta (Mechanical Engineering), Scott Marler (History), Daniel E. Millican (Military Sciences, Naval Sciences), Deborah Moncrieff (Sciences & Disorders), Deanna Owens-Mosby (Instruction and Curriculum Leadership), Patrick Murphy (Counseling, Edu Psychology & Research), Fawaz Mzayek (Public Health), Dursen Peksen (Political Science), Michael Perez (Anthropology), Zabi Rezaee (Accountancy), Martha Robinson (Lambuth Campus), Brian Ruggaber (Theatre & Dance), Sajjan Shiva (Computer Science), Michael Anderson Shults (School of Music), Genae Strong (Nursing), Mark Sunderman (Fin, Ins, and Real Estate), Jeff Thieme (Marketing & Supply Chain), William Travis (Health Sciences), Alistair Windsor (Mathematical Sciences), Leah Windsor (English), and Amanda Young (Communication & Film).

Senator Present by Proxy: Kas Saghafi proxy for David Grey (Philosophy)

Senators Absent: Tori Cliff (Journalism and New Media**),** James McGinnis (Engineering Technology), Sanjay Mishra (Physics and Materials Science), Esra Ozdenerol (Earth Sciences), Matthew Parris (Biological Sciences), Jennifer Thompson (Architecture), and Jill Dapremont (Past President).

Faculty Senate Information Officer: To be determined.

Guests: Sara K. Bridges (Ombudsperson), David Cox (UMAR Rep), and Markia Hilliard (Admin Assoc).

The four-hundred-and-ninety-fourth meeting of the University of Memphis Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, February 28, 2023, via the Zoom video conferencing platform due to restrictions imposed in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic.

02.28.23.01   CALL TO ORDER (2:40 P.M.)

President Pat Travis called the virtual meeting to order at 2:40 pm with a quorum present.

02.28.23.02   APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Travis noted that today's agenda is the corrected agenda that was sent via email yesterday. The agenda was approved as written.

02.28.23.03   APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 31, 2023, Faculty Senate (FS) meeting were approved by acclamation as written.

02.28.23.04   PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Travis reported that he developed the timeframe and schedule for the election of the Faculty Trustee, the FS Executive Committee (EC) completed interviews of the four candidates for Provost, the EC charged the Academic Policies Committee with researching artificial intelligence and academic dishonesty, he attended President's Council meetings each Monday in February, the EC postponed their monthly meeting with President Bill Hardgrave due to a scheduling conflict with a Provost candidate presentation, the EC met with Interim Provost Abby Parrill-Baker, he attended a monthly meeting with Dr. Robert Jackson (Chief Information Officer), he attended the Dean's Council meetings, he attended his third meeting with of the Budget Redesign Steering Committee, and he attended the Stepping Blocks Faculty luncheon.

02.28.23.05   REPORTS

Standing Committee Reports

Committee on Committees: Chair, Genae Strong

President Travis yielded to Committee on Committees Chair Genae Strong who reported that the Committee has two motions on the agenda. Also, the Committee has been very busy recruiting faculty representatives for University committees.

Academic Policies Committee: Chair, Edith Gnanadass

President Travis yielded to Academic Policies Committee Chair Edith Gnanadass who reported that the Committee has three charges. Last year, the Committee was charged with reviewing the University's textbook affordability policy. However, since the new Tigers SmartStart program was implemented this semester, the Committee has decided to evaluate the program at the end of this first semester of implementation. Then, the Committee will revisit the textbook affordability charge with respect to the new program. The Committee would also like

to have someone from the bookstore or otherwise associated with the new program speak to the FS about it so that we might better understand how it is intended to benefit our students. Senator Rebecca Howard will continue leading this charge.

On the second charge to revise the student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (SETE), Senator Brian Janz has led this effort and will be presenting a motion on it later in the meeting.

On the third charge, the Committee has been asked to investigate the impact that recent artificial intelligence tools (i.e. ChatGPT) might have on academic integrity at the University. The Committee has been asked to propose policies to address any issues that are warranted based on our research into the issue in consultation with the Provost's Office, the Chief Information Officer's (CIO) Office, the Academic Integrity Task Force, and other initiatives to coordinate efforts across campus. The Committee is actively moving on this charge. Senator Janz has met with the CIO and has been in communication with the Interim Provost and the chair of the Academic Integrity task force.

Academic Support Committee: Chair, Andrew Hussey

President Travis yielded to Academic Support Committee Chair Andrew Hussey who reported that the Committee has continued to make progress regarding their charge related to observers in Canvas, and they expect to have something substantial to bring to the FS in an upcoming meeting.

In addition, Information Technology Services (ITS) would like to encourage faculty to avoid the telephone option for the duo authentication app whenever possible as the University incurs a cost when it is used. Duo's user interface will be even more streamlined in an upcoming upgrade. As an alternative to the app, the option to receive a text message remains.

Also related to phones, the University is upgrading the on-premises phone system that is over twenty years old to a cloud-based platform. This will be a versatile system that will have many helpful features. The transition will be made sometime in the upcoming academic year.

Faculty Policies Committee: Chair, Jeff Marchetta

President Travis yielded to Faculty Policies Committee Chair Jeff Marchetta who reported that the Committee worked with the Provost's Office to complete the review and update of the revised Academic Affairs (AA) Policies for Professional Development Assignments (PDAs) and Faculty Authored Materials & Textbooks. Both policies were updated and adopted when the Faculty Handbook was approved last year. The motions presented today simply reflect an

update to the AA Policies to match the adopted language in the Faculty Handbook. The first significant change in the PDA policy is the inclusion of a required new minimum in the number of PDAs that must be funded by each academic unit (i.e. college). Each college must now fund PDAs for at least 5% of the full-time faculty in the academic unit as long as the applications for the PDAs are meritorious. Second, PDAs are now extended to include non-tenure track full time faculty. The committee is continuing to work with the Provost's Office on the revision of the AA policy on faculty hiring. Those two motions on PDA and faculty authored materials motions will be presented later under New Business. In addition, the Committee will be presenting a set of proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook at an upcoming FS meeting which are intended to address some minor inconsistencies and ambiguities in the Handbook language which have been identified as a consequence of operationalizing the Handbook this year.

Research Policies Committee: Chair, Mike Gkolias

President Travis yielded to Research Policies Committee Chair Mike Gkolias who reported that the Committee is waiting to meet with the University of Memphis Research Council (UMRC) in March to discuss the issues that the Committee has with the proposed intellectual property policy.

Administrative Policies Committee: Chair, Ted Burkey

President Travis yielded to Administrative Policies Committee Chair Ted Burkey who reported that with respect to their charge to review the policy on the annual evaluation of administrators, the Committee will be having a meeting with the Interim Provost and President on March 21. The Committee would like to explore with them how faculty can be better informed about their annual accomplishments.

The Committee's other charge is to review the children on campus policy. In cooperation with Human Resources (HR), a committee consisting of three University faculty has reviewed the University of Memphis policies as well as those of several other universities and submitted a report to HR with their recommendations. A subcommittee is waiting for HR recommendations before taking further actions.

Library Policies Committee: Chair, Frances Fabian

President Travis yielded to Library Policies Committee Chair Frances Fabian who reported that they are hoping to meet with John Evans (Executive Director of the Libraries) in the coming month.

Budget and Finance Committee: Chair, Zabi Rezaee

President Travis yielded to Budget and Finance Committee Chair Zabi Rezaee who reported that the two subcommittees have gathered sufficient data to conduct their analyses of both faculty salary comparison and compression. The Committee will submit its reports to the FS in March 2023 for inclusion in the March 28 FS meeting Agenda.

Chair Rezaee has prepared a working draft of a motion for 2024 faculty salary raise distribution based on the proposed 5% salary increase. The draft motion will be discussed with the Committee and submitted to the FS for inclusion in the agenda for the March meeting.

Chair Rezaee attended the third meeting of Budget Redesign Steering Committee in February 2023.

Chair Rezaee attended interview presentations of all four Provost candidates and asked questions about their views and role in maintaining our R1 status, the revised SRI model, resource allocation particularly between revenue-generating and non-revenue generating units, and their relationship with the FS in ensuring shared governance and faculty participation, engagement, and impacts.

The Committee has one motion on the list of peer institutions that will be presented later in the meeting by Senator Alistair Windsor.

02.28.23.06   NEW BUSINESS

President Travis informed the FS that Senator Mark Sunderman is acting as Parliamentarian for motions related to the Faculty Trustee selection process.

President Travis apologized for announcing the open forum for Faculty Trustee candidates before a vote on the slate in the FS.

Motion to Adopt Slate of Faculty Trustee Candidates, Executive Committee

President Travis presented the motion on behalf of the EC (See Appendix A.1).

The motion is adopted by a vote of 37 for, 0 against, and 1 abstain.

Note: President Travis informed the FS that Parliamentarian Jeff Marchetta recused himself from all deliberations with respect to the Faculty Trustee position as soon as he submitted his materials for consideration.

Motion to Address Conflict of Interest in Faculty Trustee Voting (Senator Candidates), Executive Committee

President Travis presented the motion on behalf of the EC (See Appendix A.2).

The motion is adopted by a vote of 38 for, 0 against, and 0 abstain.

Motion to Address Conflict of Interest in Faculty Trustee Voting (Marriages), Executive Committee

President Travis presented the motion on behalf of the EC (See Appendix A.3).

Senator Alistair Windsor moved to amend the motion (Seconded by Senator Brian Ruggaber): Add to the end of the To Be Resolved section: "The department chair of the independent unit or the area head will designate a faculty member to conduct the election."

The amendment is adopted by a vote of 33 for, 0 against, and 2 abstain.

The amended motion is adopted by a vote of 36 for, 0 against, and 0 abstain.

Note: Parliamentarian Marchetta resumed his role as Parliamentarian.

Motion for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators, Administrative Policies Committee, Ted Burkey

President Travis yielded to Administrative Policies Committee Chair Burkey who presented the motion on behalf of the Administrative Policies Committee (See Appendix A.4).

The motion is adopted by a vote of 34 for, 1 against, and 0 abstain.

Motion to Accept Revised SETE Evaluations, Academic Policies Committee, Brian Janz

President Travis yielded to Senator Brian Janz who presented the motion on behalf of the Academic Policies Committee (See Appendix A.5).

The motion is adopted by a vote of 18 for, 17 against, and 2 abstain.

Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to University Committees, Committee on Committees, Genea Strong

President Travis yielded to Committee on Committees Chair Strong who presented the motion on behalf of the Committee on Committees (See Appendix A.6).

Senator Alistair Windsor moved to amend the motion (Seconded by Senator Lynda Black): Correct Senator Leah Windsor's information in each instance in the motion to reflect that she is an Associate Professor and her affiliation is with the Institute for Intelligent Systems and department of English.

The motion is amended by a vote of 32 for, 1 against, and 0 abstain.

Senator Rebecca Howard moved to amend (Seconded by Senator Alistair Windsor): Correct Lucienne Dorrance Auz's information to reflect that she is in the department of Art.

The motion is amended by a vote of 32 for, 0 against, and 0 abstain.

The amended motion is adopted by a vote of 32 for, 0 against, and 1 abstain.

Senator Sunderman asked for clarification on when these nominations are effective. Parliamentarian Marchetta responded that the appointments are effective immediately.

Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to Faculty Appeals Committee, Committee on Committees, Genae Strong

President Travis yielded to Committee on Committees Chair Strong who presented the motion on behalf of the Committee on Committees (See Appendix A.7).

The motion is adopted by a vote of 34 for, 0 against, and 0 abstain.

Motion to Recommend Approval of Policy AA3009, Faculty Policies Committee, Jeff Marchetta

President Travis yielded to Faculty Policies Committee Chair Marchetta who presented the motion on behalf of the Faculty Policies Committee (See Appendix A.8).

The motion is adopted by a vote of 34 for, 1 against, and 1 abstain.

Motion to Recommend Approval of Policy AA3016, Faculty Policies Committee, Jeff Marchetta

President Travis yielded to Faculty Policies Committee Chair Marchetta who presented the motion on behalf of the Faculty Policies Committee (See Appendix A.9).

The motion is adopted by a vote of 36 for, 0 against, and 0 abstain.

Motion to Recommend Approval of New List of Peer and Aspirations Institutions, Budget and Finance Committee, Alistair Windsor

President Travis yielded to Senator Windsor who presented the motion on behalf of the Budget and Finance Committee (See Appendix A.10).

The motion fails by a vote of 3 for, 26 against, and 3 abstain.

Parliamentarian Marchetta moved to refer the items in the previous motion back to the Committee (Seconded by Senator Eddie Jacobs).

The motion is adopted by a vote of 31 for, 1 against, and 2 abstain.

02.28.23.07   ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Travis announced that the Faculty Trustee Candidate Forum is March 2, 2023, from 2:00pm – 3:00pm in the University Center Bluff Room (UC 304).

02.28.23.08   ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 pm.

Appendix

A.1: Motion to Adopt Slate of Faculty Trustee Candidates, Executive Committee

Motion to Adopt Slate of Candidates for Faculty Trustee

Originator: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Whereas,

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has put forward to the Faculty Senate four candidates for the Faculty Trustee position.

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate adopts the following four candidates to be considered for the Faculty Trustee position:

Jeffrey Marchetta

Zabihollah Rezaee

Brian Waldron

Leah Windsor

Recipients:

Faculty Senate

A.2: Motion to Address Conflict of Interest in Faculty Trustee Voting (Senator Candidates), Executive Committee

Motion to Address Conflict of Interest in Faculty Trustee Selection Voting – Senator Candidates

Originator: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Whereas,

Faculty Senators are charged with representing the will of the faculty in their unit when voting on the Faculty Trustee.

Whereas,

It is a conflict of interest for Faculty Senators who are candidates for the Faculty Trustee position to represent the faculty in their unit when casting a vote for the Faculty Trustee.

Be it resolved that,

Units with Faculty Senators who are also candidates for the Faculty Trustee position will elect a proxy to represent that unit for the Faculty Trustee vote. The election of the proxy will follow Article III, Section 4. Guidelines for Faculty Senate Elections in the Articles of Authority: Constitution of the University of Memphis Faculty and the Faculty Senate (See Appendix).

Recipients:

Faculty Senate

Unit heads (department chairs, directors, etc.) and deans for units with Faculty Senators who are also Faculty Trustee candidates

Appendix:

Section 4. GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY SENATE ELECTIONS

- In December of each year the Faculty Senate President will notify the current senator and the department chair or head of independent units and areas that need elections. Those elections should take place no later than March. The chair or independent unit and area head will give at least a one week written notice to all faculty of the meeting in March when the election will occur.

- The current senator will serve as the election official unless the current senator is a nominee for election. If the current senator is to run for reelection, the department chair of the independent unit or the area head will designate a faculty member to conduct the election.

- Nominations for senators may be by written petition signed by at least three faculty members and by open nomination from the floor.

- Voting

    o Voting shall be by secret ballot unless a nominee is uncontested.

    o In elections where there are more than two nominees and no candidate receives a majority vote, the candidate with the lowest vote total will be dropped from the next ballot. This practice will continue for each ballot until a majority vote is received.

    o Certificate of Agreement to Serve
    All newly elected or re-elected senators shall complete the Certificate of Agreement to Serve and return it to the Office of the Faculty Senate no later than the first Tuesday in April.

A.3: Motion to Address Conflict of Interest in Faculty Trustee Voting (Marriages), Executive Committee

Motion to Address Conflict of Interest in Faculty Trustee Selection Voting - Marriages

Originator: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Whereas,

Faculty Senators are charged with representing the will of the faculty in their unit when voting on the Faculty Trustee.

Whereas,

It is a conflict of interest for Faculty Senators who are married to a candidate for the Faculty Trustee position to represent the faculty in their unit when casting a vote for the Faculty Trustee.

Be it resolved that,

Units with Faculty Senators who are married to a candidate for the Faculty Trustee position will elect a proxy to represent that unit for the Faculty Trustee vote. The election of the proxy will follow Article III, Section 4. Guidelines for Faculty Senate Elections in the Articles of Authority: Constitution of the University of Memphis Faculty and the Faculty Senate (See Appendix).

Recipients:

Faculty Senate

Unit heads (department chairs, directors, etc.) and deans for units with Faculty Senators who are married to a Faculty Trustee candidate

Appendix:

Section 4. GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY SENATE ELECTIONS

- In December of each year the Faculty Senate President will notify the current senator and the department chair or head of independent units and areas that need elections. Those elections should take place no later than March. The chair or independent unit and area head will give at least a one week written notice to all faculty of the meeting in March when the election will occur.

- The current senator will serve as the election official unless the current senator is a nominee for election. If the current senator is to run for reelection, the department chair of the independent unit or the area head will designate a faculty member to conduct the election.

- Nominations for senators may be by written petition signed by at least three faculty members and by open nomination from the floor.

- Voting

    o Voting shall be by secret ballot unless a nominee is uncontested.

    o In elections where there are more than two nominees and no candidate receives a majority vote, the candidate with the lowest vote total will be dropped from the next ballot. This practice will continue for each ballot until a majority vote is received.

    o Certificate of Agreement to Serve
    All newly elected or re-elected senators shall complete the Certificate of Agreement to Serve and return it to the Office of the Faculty Senate no later than the first Tuesday in April.

A.4: Motion for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators, Administrative Policies Committee, Ted Burkey

Administrative Policies Committee

Whereas,

The administrative Policies Committee was charged to review the administration of the Surveys of Administrators to determine whether the Faculty Senate should continue with the annual surveys and suggest revisions if continuation is recommended.

Whereas,

The committee reviewed administrator evaluations of peer universities and met with the Provost to propose guidelines for administrator evaluations by faculty.

Be it resolved,

The Faculty Senate supports the submission of annual reports by Deans/Directors to the Provost and to the faculty of respective colleges followed by the administration of faculty surveys as described in the attached report titled, "The Faculty Senate Administrative Committee report on Faculty evaluation of administrators".

Recipients:

Dr. Abby Parrill Baker, Interim Provost

Ms. Helen Johnson, Office of the Provost

 Dr. Bill Hardgrave, University President

Recommendations on Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

Summary: The committee concludes that without annual reports from administrators, faculty do not have sufficient information to evaluate administrators and that this lack of information is likely the main cause of low faculty response. The committee proposes that each Dean/Director submit an annual report that is available to their faculty. Subsequently (date determined by the Committee and CREP) faculty will evaluate their Dean/Director with an online survey. All survey results will be made available on the Faculty Senate Website.[1]

Background and Analysis

According to the March 2022 CREP Reports,[1] 170 faculty evaluated their Dean/Director (0-24% response rates). Only four colleges had a submission rate for Deans/Directors greater than 10%. Response rates were similarly low for the President (11%) and Provost (10%). The low response rates led the committee to question whether the results of the surveys were useful.

The committee sought information from peer institutions (via peer institution Faculty Senate personnel) to determine if any had procedures that produced high faculty response rates (Table 1). More often than not, faculty at these institutions do not evaluate presidents or provosts. In some cases, administrators were evaluated only by their immediate supervisor (*e. g.* Provost evaluate Deans, President evaluates Provost). When faculty from peer institutions did evaluate supervisors, the response rates were similar to rates observed for UOM faculty.

The committee concludes that faculty without sufficient information regarding administrator activities and accomplishments are reluctant to evaluate administrators. The committee suggests that administrator reports of their accomplishments and activities would result in higher response rates and more meaningful evaluations. The committee generally believes the surveys are otherwise not likely to be useful, although there is evidence there can be exceptions: the results may be useful if the survey results are overwhelmingly negative or positive event though the response rate is low as it was in the case for Miami University (30%, see Table 1).

Conclusions and proposal

An administrator's supervisor is in the best position to evaluate administrator's performance.

In the interest of shared governance faculty should participate in the process.

Faculty cannot realistically evaluate administrators without relevant information/reports and is likely a major reason for poor faculty response on surveys.

---

[1] https://www.memphis.edu/facultysenate/resources/surveys.php

Faculty evaluations of administrators would be based on (a) annual reports of administrator's objectives/goals, (b) administrator plans to achieve objectives/goals, and (c) administrator reports of progress in attaining objectives/goals.

An annual report should include but not limited to the following information.

> A description of new programs/policies/funding initiated under the dean's supervision to improve performance of college departments.

> Evidence that new programs/policies/funding resulted in improve performance of college departments.

> Explain (justify) priorities in capital investment, hiring of personnel, funding of instrumentation.

> College accomplishments.

> College weaknesses. Indicate measures taken or recommended to make improvements.

Guidelines for Faculty evaluations

(Adapted from https://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EO20.html#2)

Faculty evaluations should be used as an advisory source by supervisors. Survey of faculty evaluations of deans/directors should include the following questions and information.

> Is the dean's/director's annual plan realistic?

> Is the dean's/director's reported objectives and goals worthwhile?

> Is the dean's/director's annual plan consistent with reported objectives and goals?

> Are there problems that did not receive adequate attention?

> Overall, was execution of the dean's/director's annual plan effective?

> List examples where the dean/director acted but was not effective.

> List problems that did not receive adequate attention.

> If "Deans and Directors Assessment from Provost" (attachment 4) is used by the Provost for evaluation, then the Deans and Directors should provide reports that address each relevant item of the assessment.

> Deans should review periodically **Dean/Director responsibilities/activities (attachment 3).**

Table 1. Summary of president/provost evaluations by Peer institutions		
	Faculty evaluation	notes
Colorado State University		No email response
Florida International University	yes	6-11% in 3 yrs
University of Alabama	no	
University of Arkansas	no	
University of Cincinnati	no	
University of Illinois Chicago		No email response
University of Miami (Ohio)*	yes	30% faculty response, *Provost resigned*
University of Milwaukee, Wisconsin	yes	21% response
University of Mississippi		No email response
University of Pittsburgh	no	

*Not listed as peer institution, information obtained from websites:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1EL_JNATtZ5-Jst2vz0w18yO4FmL2j_Om/edit#gid=79395949

https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2022/10/resign-osborne-third-year-evaluation?ct=content_open&cv=cbox_featured

Attachments/links
1. Proposed UOM Peers and Aspirant List
2. Proposed Dean/Director Report to Provost
3. Proposed responsibilities of deans: What a dean does
   https://www.washington.edu/provost/leadership-searches/what-a-dean-does/
4. Provost survey of Deans and Directors
5. Current lists of Peer institutions. **Link only**:
   https://www.memphis.edu/oir/about/peer.php
6. Previous administrator surveys **Link only:**
   https://www.memphis.edu/facultysenate/resources/surveys.php

Attachment 1: Proposed UOM Peers and Aspirant List (Provided by Provost)

As a part of the strategic planning process, it was determined there was a need to update the institution's peers and aspirants list. As such, a statistical analysis was conducted that looked at all higher education institutions that met the criteria of National, Public, Large, Carnegie R1/R2, and 4-year institutions (excluding HBCUs). This analysis yielded 132 institutions. From those 132 institutions, a cluster analysis using 52 data points was performed to determine those institutions most similar to the University of Memphis, thus creating a peer list. The cluster analysis also yielded a pool of institutions that scored marginally higher on the 52 data points and this pool was used to determine the aspirants.

Peer List (7 R1 and 3 R2)

Texas Tech University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 213)
Mississippi State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 196)
University of Louisiana-Lafayette	(R1, NSSE Peer, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 323)
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	(R1, Urban 13 Peer, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 249)
Old Dominion University	(R1, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 263)
University of New Mexico	(R1, Ntl. Rank 196)
University of Nevada-Reno	(R1, Ntl. Rank 227)
University of North Carolina, Greensboro	(R2, NSSE Peer, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 239)
Boise State University	(R2, Ntl. Rank 299)
East Carolina University	(R2, Ntl. Rank 213)

Alternates: Central Michigan University, Ball State University, Kent State University, Utah State University, Montana State University

Aspirants (all R1)

Oklahoma State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 187)
Washington State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 179)
Louisiana State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 172)
University of Arkansas	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)
Oregon State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)
Kansas State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)
University of Mississippi	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)
University of Alabama	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)

Colorado State University   (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)

University of Texas-Dallas   (R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 136)

    Alternates: University of Nebraska, University of Oklahoma, University of Missouri

Note: University of Memphis is R1, an Urban 13 institution, and nationally ranked 249

Attachment 2. Proposed Dean/Director Report to Provost

(To be distributed to the Provost and all members of the Dean's/Director's college/division)

Provide a description of new programs/policies/funding initiated under the dean's/director's supervision to improve performance of college/division.

Evidence that previous programs/policies/funding resulted in improve performance of college/division departments.

Report and explain (justify) priorities in capital investment, hiring of personnel, funding of instrumentation.

Report college/division accomplishments.

Report college/division weaknesses. Indicate measures taken or recommended to make improvements.

Attachment 3: Dean/Director responsibilities/activities

Adapted from https://www.washington.edu/provost/leadership-searches/what-a-dean-does/

Deans/Directors are responsible to the Provost for all matters relating to the educational, budgetary and administrative affairs of their units. Deans/Directors are charged with providing the vision and leadership needed for their college or school to excel and to advance the University's teaching, research and service missions.

Unit leadership
- Deans/Directors advance the University's vision and goals through the creation of a strategic academic business plan and future initiatives.
- Deans/Directors nurture, facilitate growth and development, and set and uphold high standards for faculty, staff and students.
- Deans/Directors create a positive work and learning environment within their college or school.
- Deans/Directors advocate to the Provost and/or president for the interests of their college or school.

Academic/scholarly leadership
- Deans/Directors lead the educational, research, scholarly and public engagement activities of their college or school through planning, implementation and evaluation initiatives that ensure success, relevancy and sustainability.
- Deans/Directors advocate on behalf of students and create initiatives to increase the diversity of the student body.
- Deans/Directors are expected to actively participate in the 7-year program reviews managed by our Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Accreditation & Academic Assessment.
- If the college or school contains accredited programs, deans/directors lead compliance with accreditation standards.
Deans/Directors represent their colleges or schools to external constituencies and audiences.

Personnel leadership
- Deans/Directors mentor leaders of their academic units and programs.
- Deans/Directors are responsible for recruitment, appointment and retention of academic administrators, faculty and staff for their college or school.
- Deans/Directors create hiring plans for their college or school and participate in the recruiting and hiring process for faculty and staff.
- Deans/Directors participate in the review of each faculty application for promotion/tenure and provide recommendations to the provost.
- Deans/Directors ensure meaningful performance evaluations of faculty and staff are regularly conducted.
- Deans/Directors review and retain documentation of merit salary adjustment recommendations of their college or school faculty and provide recommendations to the provost.

Financial leadership
- Deans/Directors are responsible for the effective management of the financial resources of their college or school.
- Deans/Directors develop and implement strategies for providing competitive salaries to faculty and staff which includes planning with the elected faculty council and executive leadership for the use of the tools available in the Faculty Salary Policy.
- Deans/Directors develop budget proposals for their college or school and ensure the effective management of allocated resources.

Managerial leadership
- Deans/Directors enhance a culture of collaboration within their units to include meaningful engagement with faculty, staff and student governance councils and committees.
- Deans/Directors ensure that their college or school adheres to university policies and procedures.
- Deans/Directors manage the allocation of space within the facilities assigned by the provost for the use of their college or school. Deans/Directors enhance a culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion within their college or school.

Engagement with faculty, staff and students
- Deans/Directors conduct regular and meaningful consultation, dialogue and engagement with faculty, students, and staff.

Engagement with alumni, donors and external community
- Deans/Directors engage with external stakeholders including alumni, donors, employers of graduates, and interested community organizations to solicit external input regarding the impact of their college or school.
- Deans/Directors develop and implement fundraising strategies to obtain needed philanthropic support for college or school initiatives.
- Deans/Directors engage stakeholders in meaningful interactions with the college or school that foster pride, advocacy and private support.
- Deans/Directors enhance the stature and professional standing of their college or school among peers and relevant constituencies.

Engagement with the University community beyond the unit
- Deans/Directors actively participate in the Dean's Council meetings and other activities to provide advice to the provost.
- Deans lead and participate on university committees to support University requirements and advance the University's vision and goals.
- Deans/Directors participate in numerous University events as the representative of their college or school.
- Deans/Directors collaborate with other academic leaders to advance University-wide and interdisciplinary initiatives.

DEANS/DIRECTORS ASSESSMENT

Name:

Date:

Please indicate your College or School
☐ Arts and Sciences
☐ Communication and Fine Arts
☐ Education
☐ Herff College of Engineering
☐ Fogelman College of Business
☐ University College
☐ Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law
☐ University Libraries
☐ Loewenberg College of Nursing
☐ School of Health Studies
☐ School of Public Health
☐ Kemmons Wilson School of Hospitality and Resort Management
☐ School of Communication Sciences and Disorders

Please select your level of agreement with the following statements. The Dean/Director...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Evidence on which to Base Opinion
1. Articulates a clear and compelling vision for the College/School/Unit.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Sets appropriate goals for the College.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Clearly identifies College priorities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Involves faculty in planning for the future.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. Acts decisively on important issues.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Organizes and administers in a manner that inspires confidence and facilitates faculty productivity.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Works with Chairs or Leadership team and/or administrative staff to create, manage, and support a cohesive, effective leadership team.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Makes thoughtful, high-quality decisions based on available data.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Listens and responds to faculty ideas, concerns, and/or needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Is an effective communicator.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Looks out for the best interest of college faculty and staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Works wisely to increase student enrollment, retention, and graduation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Fosters effective College/community partnerships.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Is transparent.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Is an effective manager of fiscal resources.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Is an effective manager of human resources.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Makes effective programmatic decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Delegates responsibility and authority appropriately.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Generates a spirit of cooperation and teamwork in the College/School.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Ensures that policies and procedures are administered equitably.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Ensures that tenure and promotion decisions are based on policy.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Is committed to a diverse academic community in which individual differences are respected.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Exhibits integrity.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

24. Follows through on commitments.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Creates an atmosphere of trust among faculty and staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Works to grow and support faculty research initiatives.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

What do you believe the Dean/Director is doing well?

What do you believe the Dean/Director could improve upon?

Provide additional comments you may have in the space below.

M2023.02.28 Motion to Recommend Adoption of Revised SETE Items

Originator: Faculty Senate Academic Policies Committee

Whereas,

The Provost's Office and Faculty Senate organized a workgroup to revise the Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) items in 2021, and

Whereas,

The workgroup revised, piloted, and validated the items during the Summer 2021, Fall 2021, Spring 2022, and Summer 2022 semesters in consultation with Dr Eli Jones in Educational Psychology and Research (EDPR), Dr. Bridgette Decent and colleagues in the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), and other members of the campus community, and

Whereas,

The Academic Policies Committee reviewed the proposed SETE items and the validation process in the August 30, 2022, Faculty Senate meeting, presented by Dr Eli Jones (See Appendix for proposed SETE items).

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University adopt the revised SETE items in the Appendix as soon as feasible.

Recipients:
Faculty Senate
Dr. Abby Parrill-Baker, Interim Provost
Dr. Bridgette Decent, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Analytics, Director Office of Institutional Research
Dr. Robert Jackson, Chief Information Officer

Appendix. Proposed SETE Items

Student Engagement

1. The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject matter.

2. The instructor helped me stay motivated.

3. The instructor encouraged me to actively participate in course activities.

Climate & Inclusion

4. The instructor accepted students with varied identities and abilities.

5. The instructor treated students with respect.

6. The instructor valued contributions from students across genders, races, and cultures.

Communication

7. The instructor made it easy to access and track course requirements.

8. I had an opportunity to ask questions in or outside of class.

9. The instructor clearly communicated course objectives to students.

Content Knowledge

10. I have become more knowledgeable in this subject because of this course.

11. My experience in this course has encouraged me to think critically about the subject, develop new ideas, and think more broadly.

12. Topics, readings, and activities assigned for this class helped me understand important concepts and objectives.

Responsive Instruction

13. The instructor adjusted instruction to meet students' needs during the course.

14. The instructor used a variety of activities to teach the course.

15. The instructor included examples relevant to my experiences when teaching.

Assessment & Feedback

16. The assessments (e.g., exams, performances, projects, etc.) in this course fairly evaluated my learning.

17. The instructor gave me quality feedback on my performance.

18. The assessments were related closely to the expected learning outcomes.

A.6: Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to University Committees, Committee on Committees, Genea Strong

M2023.31.1 Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to University Committees

Originator: Committee on Committees

Whereas:

The Faculty Senate is responsible for appointments to various university committees. The Committee on Committees is responsible for making nominations to the Faculty Senate for faculty appointments to university committees.

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate appoints the following faculty members nominated by the Committee on Committees to the following University Committees:

<u>Office of the President</u>

Institutional Effectiveness Council

  Eli Andrew Jones

Honorary Degree Committee

  Jaqueline Bowen Buford

<u>Office of the Provost</u>

Faculty Safety & Securities Committee

  Bert Owen Burraston

Graduate Grade Appeals Committee

  Stephen Karr

University Council for Graduate Studies

  Robin Lennon-Dearing

Space Policy Council

Tim Ryan

Division of Business & Finance

Facilities & Service Committee

Leah Windsor

Lucienne Dorrance Auz

Fee Refund & Appeals Committee

Culeta Byars

Reba Umberger

Stacey LaBarre-Powell

Public Records & Forms Committee

Perveen Rustomfram

Traffic & Parking Committee

Robert J Seals

Ben Smith

Information Technology Division

IT Policy & Planning Council

Leah Windsor

Technology Access Fee Committee

Michael S O'Nele

Enterprise Systems Advisory Committee

Sandeford Schaeffer

Information Security Advisory Committee

Leah Windsor

Teaching & Learning Advisory Committee

     Scott Vann

<u>Division of Research & Innovation</u>

Research Council

     Leanne Lefler

     Stephen Watts

     Alycia Taylor

     Bentuo Zheng

     Shahram Pezeshk

Recipients:
Faculty Senate

A.7: Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to Faculty Appeals Committee, Committee on Committees, Genae Strong

M2023.28.2 Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to Faculty Appeals Committee

Originator: Committee on Committees

Whereas, the Committee on Committees is responsible for making nominations to the Faculty Senate for faculty appointments to Senate and university committees.

Be it resolved that,

The Committee on Committees nominates the following faculty members to serve on the Faculty Appeals Committee as described in the 2022 Faculty Handbook.

COC's Nominations of the President
1. Chunrong Jia, Professor, School of Public Health   (2-year term)

Alternates
1. Kenneth Haggerty, Associate Professor, University Libraries
2. Duane McKenna, Professor, Department of Biological Science

Recipients:
Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

Motion to Recommend Approval of Policy AA3009 – Professional

Development Assignments Originator: Faculty Policies Committee

Whereas,

It was necessary to revise policy AA3009 to match newly adopted language in new 2022 Faculty Handbook.

Whereas,

The Provost and Faculty Policies Committee reviewed historical trends in the number and distribution of Professional Development Assignments (PDAs) and discovered disparities across academic units. Feedback from faculty members in different units indicated that awareness, unclear processes, and workplace culture in the unit were the primary reasons for the disparities. To address these disparities, additional language has been added to the revised university policy such that "at least five (5) % of the eligible faculty in a college or school be recommended for PDA awards if sufficient meritorious applications are submitted." In addition, procedures have been added to clarify the application process for PDAs and the reporting requirements after the PDA is completed.

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the attached new policy AA3009 – Professional Development Assignments

Recipients:
Faculty Senate
William Travis, Policy Review Board Faculty Senate
Representative Abby Parrill-Baker, Interim Provost
Helen Johnson, Office of the Provost

Policy Title: AA3009 - Professional Development Assignments

Subject Area: Academic

Responsible Official(s): Executive Vice President and Provost

Responsible Office(s): Office of the Provost

Policy

Professional Development Assignments (PDA) allow faculty members to develop proficiencies as teachers, scholars, and researchers. The period of an award may be for a half year at full pay, or for one academic year at half pay. PDA approved by the university may be credited toward completion of the probationary period.

All full-time faculty are eligible for PDAs on a competitive basis.

- **Half year PDA:** Faculty are eligible for a half year PDA with minimum of seven (7) years full-time service since appointment or any previously granted professional leave.
- **One year PDA:** Faculty members are eligible for a one-year PDA with a minimum of five (5) years full-time service since appointment or any previously granted professional leave.

In rare instances, the provost may grant exceptions.

Definitions

Year (12-month faculty): For faculty with 12-month appointments, a year aligns with the fiscal year (July 1 through the following June 30).

Year (9-month faculty): for faculty with 9-month appointments, a year aligns with the academic year.

Half year (12-month faculty): for faculty with 12-month appointments, a half year is 6 months, starting either July 1 (fall) or January 1 (spring).

Half year (9-month faculty): For faculty with 9-month appointments, a half year is one academic semester.

Procedures

Funding

1. PDAs are awarded at full pay for a half year or one-half pay for one year.
2. The total number of PDAs may vary from year to year, with the number per college or school to be determined by the dean and approved by the provost. It is expected that at least five (5) % of the eligible faculty in a college or school be recommended for PDA awards if sufficient meritorious applications are submitted.
3. Faculty members are encouraged to seek additional, non-university support for the period of their leave, and attempts to secure funds should be included in the proposal.
4. Colleges/schools are responsible for costs associated with the PDAs.
5. Department chairpersons and college deans shall provide detailed budgets to account for any teaching personnel whom the departments and colleges expect to employ as temporary replacements of faculty members granted PDA.
6. It is expected that departments will normally absorb the instructional loads of faculty members who are granted PDAs.

Application and Reporting

Faculty should follow the procedures below to apply for and report on a PDA.

1. PDA applications will be invited in mid-September and will be due in mid-October. College deans will recommend PDA awards to the provost by mid-December of the fiscal year prior to the PDA award.
2. Faculty interested in applying for a PDA should discuss their professional development plans and PDA timeframe with their supervisor (chair, director, or dean) prior to preparing their application for input and endorsement.
3. Faculty should prepare a proposal with a specific plan for the use of the time and a statement of the expected benefit to the faculty member, department/college, and university. This proposal should be submitted to the Dean's office following college procedures.
4. Faculty should update their online CV.
5. Faculty supervisor (chair, director, or dean) will endorse the application according to college procedures.
6. PDA proposals are reviewed by the college and the dean forwards recommendations to the Office of the Provost for approval.
7. Faculty who accept a PDA award agree to remain with the University of Memphis for at least one full year after the assignment is completed.

8. Faculty members submit a report following college procedures within 3 months of completing a PDA assignment. Reports should describe the accomplishments and benefits of the assignment. A copy of the report should be forwarded by the college to the Office of the Provost.

Limitations on PDA Compensation

1. If the recipient of the PDA obtains a grant or other compensation from non-university sources for the period of the leave, the university shall not be obligated to pay more than the amount of the PDA compensation which, when added to the non-university compensation, will equal no more than 100 percent of the individual's annual base salary for the period of leave. If an allowance for transportation and/or cost-of-living differential is included, the amount of this allowance will be disregarded in computing the PDA compensation to be paid by the university.
2. A faculty member who is on PDA, whether in residence or away from the campus, may not, as an employee, provide any services to the university for which compensation is paid in excess of the approved PDA compensation.

Related Documents, Policies and Forms

HR5011 - Extra Compensation and Outside Employment
HR5012 - Summer Compensation for Nine-Month Faculty

Last Revision Update Log: Not Set

AA3009 – Revised (ADD DATE)
UM1288 – Revised: March 4, 2014
UM1288 – Issued: September 15, 2003 - supercedes policy number 1:2B:01:13 and 2B:01:13A AA3009 supercedes UM1288

Motion to Recommend Approval of Policy AA3016 – Faculty Authored Educational Materials

Originator: Faculty Policies Committee

Whereas,

It was necessary to revise policy AA3016 to match newly adopted language in new 2022 Faculty Handbook.

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the attached revision of policy AA3016 – Faculty Authored Education Materials

Recipients:
Faculty Senate

William Travis, Policy Review Board Faculty Senate Representative

Abby Parrill-Baker, Interim Provost

Helen Johnson, Office of the Provost

Faculty Senate

Motion to Recommend Approval of New List of Peer and Aspiration

Institutions Originator: Budget and Finance Standing Committee

Whereas,

Peer institutions are institutions that are selected to be used for comparative analysis and benchmarking of institutional qualities. Peers usually have common qualities such as level of resources, student headcount, and institutional goals. It is periodically necessary to update a university's List of Peer and Aspirational Institutions to reflect the change in qualities of the institution over time.

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the attached List of Peer and Aspirant Institutions proposed by the Office of Institutional Research.

Recipients:
Faculty Senate
Abby Parrill-Baker, Interim Provost
Raaj Kurapati, EVP, CFO, COO
Jasbir Dhaliwal, EVP, Office of Research and Innovation
Helen Johnson, Office of the Provost
Bridgette Decent, Associate Vice Provost for Strategic Analytics, Director of OIR

University of Memphis

Peers and Aspirants

As a part of the strategic planning process, it was determined there was a need to update the institution's peers and aspirants list. As such, a statistical analysis was conducted that looked at all higher education institutions that met the criteria of National, Public, Large, Carnegie R1/R2, and 4-year institutions (excluding HBCUs). This analysis yielded 132 institutions. From those 132 institutions, a cluster analysis using 52 data points was performed to determine those institutions most similar to the University of Memphis, thus creating a peer list. The cluster analysis also yielded a pool of institutions that scored marginally higher on the 52 data points and this pool was used to determine the aspirants.

Peer List (7 R1 and 3 R2):

Boise State University	(R2, Ntl. Rank 299)
East Carolina University	(R2, Ntl. Rank 213)
Kent State University	(R1, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 212)
Mississippi State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 196)
University of Nevada-Reno	(R1, Ntl. Rank 227)
University of New Mexico	(R1, Ntl. Rank 196)
University of North Carolina, Greensboro	(R2, NSSE Peer, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 239)
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	(R1, Urban 13 Peer, IPEDS Peer, Ntl. Rank 249)
West Virginia University	(R1, Ntl. Rank 234)

Aspirants (all R1):

Colorado State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)
Kansas State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)
Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 172)
Oklahoma State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 187)
Oregon State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)
University of Alabama	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)
University of Arkansas	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 162)
University of Mississippi	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 148)
University of Texas-Dallas	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 136)
Washington State University	(R1, Power 5, Ntl. Rank 179)

Note: University of Memphis is R1, an Urban 13 institution, and nationally ranked 249 This is based on a cluster analysis using the following 52 variables

1. Percent of Faculty with Terminal Degree
2. Average alumni giving rate
3. First Year Freshmen Average High School GPA
4. Cost of Room and Board

5. Percent of First Year Freshmen in top 10% of high school class
6. Average indebtedness of Graduating UG Class
7. Percent of applicants accepted
8. Six year graduation rate
9. First Year Freshmen One Year Retention Rate
10. Educational expenditures per student
11. First Year Freshmen Enrollment
12. Number of Full Time Faculty
13. Cost of In State Tuition and Fees
14. Need Based Financial Aid Awarded to First Year Freshmen
15. Cost of Out of State Tuition and Fees
16. Student to faculty ratio
17. UG % Black or Hispanic
18. UG % Female
19. UG % International
20. UG % of students with financial need
21. Percent of classes with 50 or more students
22. Percent of classes with 20 or fewer students
23. Percent of faculty who are full time
24. Four Year graduation rate
25. Academic Support Expenditures
26. Average percent of UG need met
27. Bachelors degrees awarded
28. Campus size in acres
29. Institutional support expenditures
30. Masters degrees awarded
31. Number of freshmen with Need fully met
32. Public services expenditures
33. Research expenditures
34. Student Services Expenditures
35. Total enrollment
36. Percent UG In State
37. Percent UG On Campus
38. Endowment
39. Professional degrees awarded
40. Average federal indebtedness of UG Graduating class
41. Doctoral degrees awarded
42. Number of graduates with federal loans
43. Average faculty salary
44. Percent of UG with Pell grants
45. Percent of faculty who are minorities
46. Percent of First Year Freshmen with Pell grants
47. Six Year graduation rate gap between Pell/nonPell
48. Carnegie Classification

49. Coalition of Urban Serving Institutions flag
50. Research expenditures in Non-science and Engineering
51. Average ACT score of first year freshmen
52. Percent of classes offered online