



THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

APPROVED
Office of the President

JUN 29 2023

TO: Joseph S. Paul
President

By: _____

FROM: Gordon C. Cannon
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Faculty Handbook Recommendations

DATE: June 26, 2023

Below you will find recommendations from the Office of the Provost regarding changes to the Faculty Handbook as submitted by the Faculty Handbook Committee. Upon receipt of these documents, I engaged General Counsel in a review to assess for conflicts or potential risk factors. Ms. Coopers' advice is reflected in my recommendations, and I have attached her email for reference.

Items #1-#4 are a result of suggested recommendations from the MS Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) PEER Report. In this report, they reviewed our processes for Promotion and Tenure. After their review, the report provided suggested changes and examples on Tenure Policies, Procedures and Best Practices.

Item # 1(5.3.2.3): APPROVE. Research/Creative Activities. Changes incorporated suggested examples from the report.

Item #2 (5.4.1): APPROVE. Tenure, Introduction. Changes in the language regarding the importance of tenure.

Item #3 (5.3.2.1): APPROVE. Teaching. Changes to add specific examples of high-quality instruction.

Item #4 (5.3.2.2.): APPROVE. Service. Added additional examples that would encompass guidelines for satisfactory service.

Item #5 (5.7.1.5.4): APPROVE. Waiver of Probationary Period. Change of the wording from "approved" to "evaluated."

Item #6 (5.3.2.1) APPROVE. Teaching. An addition was included for Librarianship and specific examples added.

The next items, numbered #7-#11, and #15 are all changes to align with the MS IHL Board policies that were recently changed.

Item #7 (5.1) APPROVE. Board Authority. Language modified to be consistent with board policy

Item #8 (5.4.4) APPROVE. Evaluation Criteria. Language modified to be consistent with board policy

Item #9 (5.8.1.2) APPROVE. Evaluative Levels and Actions. Deletion and changes to language.

Item #10 (5.8.1.2.3.3) APPROVE. President. Deletion and changes to language.

Item #11 (5.7.1.5.4) APPROVE. Waiver of Probationary Period. Deletion and changes to language.

Item #12 (5.8.1.2.3.2) APPROVE. Provost. Change in the remand process regarding promotion and tenure

Item #13 (4.4.1) APPROVE. Annual Activity Report. Change to reflect a new deadline date for submission of academic personnel activity reports.

Item #14 (2.5) APPROVE. Distinguished Professor. Modified to provide more detail to the process and designation.

Item #15 (5.3.2.4) APPROVE. Other Criteria as Required by IHL. Added to reflect changes in Board Policies.

Item #16 (7.1) APPROVE. Grievance Issues Covered in this Chapter. Change and clarification to issues addressed in the Faculty Handbook and Employee Handbook.

Item #17 (4.5.2) APPROVE. Faculty Evaluation Meetings. Change to reflect new dates and elimination of dates for Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Item #18 (5.8.2) APPROVE. Candidate's Right to Update Application Materials and Provide Rebuttals. Changed to clarify where the documents are sent.

The following items are to correct broken URL links and/or office name changes in the following categories. All are APPROVED:

(1.2.1) Schools

(3.3.2) Integrity Assurance Program

(3.3.7) Ancillary Institutional Agreements

(3.4.2.5) Syllabi

(3.4.2.10) Disability Accommodations

(4.5.1.2) Considerations for Online Instruction

(7.3) Scholarly Misconduct

(A.1.1.7) Center for International Education

(A.1.1.8) Office of Disability Accommodations

(A.1.2.1) Career Services

(A.1.2.3) Drapeau Center for Undergraduate Research

(A.4.1.1) Collegiate Recovery Community

(A.4.1.3) LGBTQ Resources

(A.4.2.4) Center for Child Development

(A.4.2.8) University Clinic for Family Therapy

(A.6.1.1) Copy Center Services

(A.6.1.2) Event and Conference Services

Provost Cannon,

During the 2022-2023 school year, the University Faculty Handbook Committee met once a month from September until May. The membership consisted of Allisa Beck from Gulf Coast faculty, Subrina Cooper from University Counsel, Trent Gould from the Dean's Council, Sungsoo Kim from the College of Business and Economic Development faculty, Megan Marlowe from the College of Nursing and Health Professions faculty, Ward Sayre from the Council of Directors, Jeremy Scott from the Faculty Senate, Lorraine Stuart from University Libraries faculty, Alan Thompson from the College of Arts and Sciences faculty and Lindsay Wright from the College of Education and Human Sciences. The first meeting was held September 12th and officer elections were held. Jeremy Scott was elected to be Chair and Lorraine Stuart was elected to be Historian.

At the September meeting two old business proposals from the previous academic year passed the second vote in the approval process for language to be changed in the University Faculty Handbook. The first proposal included examples of accomplishments in research/creative activities in section 5.3.2.3 Research/Creative Activities. This was introduced because of an IHL report suggesting that we include these examples. The second proposal to pass the second vote included language addressing the importance of tenure to the institution in section 5.4.1 Introduction. This was introduced because of the same IHL report. All the proposals mentioned in this annual report are attached at the end of this report.

The next meeting was October 10th and two more proposals passed the second vote in the approval process. The first proposal included examples of evidence of high-quality instruction in section 5.3.2.1 Teaching. The second proposal included examples of satisfactory service in section 5.3.2.2 Service. Both of these proposals were introduced because of the IHL report mentioned previously.

On November 14th a proposal passed the second vote in the approval process. This changed the language from "approved" to "evaluated" in section 5.7.1.5.4 Waiver of Probationary Period to better reflect the tenure-granting process.

During the December 12th meeting a proposal passed the second vote to include examples of high-quality librarianship to section 5.3.2.1 Teaching. This was the second change to the language in this section because library faculty were not included in the previous proposal.

At the January 9th meeting the Chair notified the committee that Sungsoo Kim was no longer employed at the University and an interim representative from the College of Business and Economic Development would be appointed by the Chair prior to the next meeting.

The Chair announced on February 13th that Marco Wolf would be the interim replacement for Sungsoo Kim until the end of the academic year and that an election would be held for that position prior to the next academic year. The Chair also announced that he would solicit nominations for the position through the Dean's office. Five proposals passed the second vote in the approval process during this meeting. The language in sections 5.1 Board Authority, 5.4.4 Evaluation Criteria, 5.8.1.2 Evaluative Levels and Actions and 5.8.1.2.3.3 President were

changed to reflect the changes in Board policies. A sixth proposal passed the second vote and was a second edit to the language in section 5.7.1.5.4 Waiver of Probationary Period. This language also reflects changes in Board policies.

On March 20th there were four proposals that passed the second vote in the approval process. The language in section 5.8.1.2.3.2 Provost was changed so that when the Provost remands promotion and tenure that it is sent to the school committee instead of the college committee. The language in section 4.4.1 Annual Activity Report was edited to establish February 1st as the date for all academic personnel to submit annual activity reports to their director. The language in section 2.5 Distinguished Professor was modified to provide detail regarding the process by which the Distinguished Professor designation is conferred. Section 5.3.2.4 Other Criteria as Required by IHL was added to reflect changes in Board policies. Additionally, the Chair announced that the poll for the election of the faculty representative for the College of Business and Economic Development was ready for dissemination by the Dean's office and the results would be announced at the next meeting.

The committee met on April 10th and the Chair announced that Melinda McLelland won the election and will represent the College of Business and Economic Development for the next academic year. During this meeting two proposals passed the second vote in the approval process. The language in section 7.1 Grievance Issues Covered in This Chapter was edited to clarify which grievance issues were addressed in the faculty handbook and which issues were addressed in the employee handbook. Section 4.5.2 Faculty Evaluation Meetings was changed so the Faculty Evaluation Committee is required to meet between February 15th and May 1st. It also eliminates the requirement for two meetings.

The last meeting of the year occurred on May 8th. Two proposals passed the second vote in the approval process. The language in section 5.8.2 Candidate's Rights to Update Application Materials was edited to clarify that these documents are sent to the Dean's office. The second proposal addressed broken URL links and reflected the changes of names of offices.

I would like to commend the committee members for their hard work and contributions during the academic year. Special recognition should be given to Lorraine Stuart for taking the minutes of each meeting and for keeping accurate records of the proposals and to Lindsay Wright for locating all of the broken links and incorrect office names. The committee recommends that the Provost and President approve these changes to the University Faculty Handbook prior to the next academic year.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jeremy Scott

Chair, University Faculty Handbook Committee

The Faculty Senate proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.3.2.3., Research/Creative Activities, on May 9, 2022.

First Vote Date: May 9, 2022

First Vote Results: 8-0-0-1 for-against-abstain-absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 9/12/2022

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date: 9/12/2022

Second Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 for/against/abstain/absence

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Senate moves that the following section:

5.3.2.3. Research/Creative Activities

Requirements for research/creative activities for tenure-track faculty should be set by the schools and should be comparable to (or exceed) those of peer units at peer institutions. This category may be considered but is not necessary for promotion of non-tenure track faculty.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow)

5.3.2.3. Research/Creative Activities

Requirements for research/creative activities for tenure-track faculty should be set by the schools and should be comparable to (or exceed) those of peer units at peer institutions. Accomplishments in research/creative activities should be a result of continuous contributions to the advancement of knowledge and creativity. Examples of such contributions include, but are not limited to, books, articles and reviews published by commercial or university presses or in refereed scholarly journals with international, national, or regional reputations; active participation in scholarly conferences and

presentations; significant participation in pursuit of research grants or intellectual property; and significant participation in artistic creation, performances, or productions. This category may be considered but is not necessary for promotion of non-tenure track faculty.

Rationale:

The IHL provided the university with a PEER report authored by Dr. Sandra Jordan entitled "Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning Review of Tenure Policies, Procedures and Best Practices". Dr. Jordan writes (page 41), "Listing examples of the components under each of the larger categories of teaching, scholarship, and service is an important element to include. Taking that step gives the tenure committees and individuals who make tenure recommendations guidelines to assist in the evaluation." This proposal is intended to address Dr. Jordan's suggestion.

The Faculty Senate proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.4.1., Introduction, on May 9, 2022.

First Vote Date: May 9, 2022

First Vote Results: 7-1-0-1 for-against-abstain-absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 9/12/2022 _____

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date: 9/12/2022

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 for/against/abstain/absence

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Senate moves that the following section:

5.4.1. Introduction

Although promotion and tenure bear a close relationship with each other in that both recognize faculty members for their records of achievement, the processes serve distinct purposes. Tenure extends an additional level of protection to the faculty member from arbitrary dismissal. Although research/creative activity is a significant component of the University's mission, tenure should not be awarded solely based on this. By granting tenure, the University exercises its belief in academic freedom and recognizes that a faculty member has the knowledge, skills, and professionalism required to make continuing, positive contributions to the discipline, school, and academic community. The tenure guidelines that follow acknowledge that disciplinary variations necessitate a degree of autonomy at the school level.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow/Deletions in red)

5.4.1. Introduction

Although promotion and tenure bear a close relationship with each other in that both recognize faculty members for their records of achievement, the processes serve distinct purposes. Tenure extends an additional level of protection to the faculty member from arbitrary dismissal. Although research/creative activity is a significant component of the University's mission, tenure should not be awarded solely based on this. By granting tenure, the University exercises its belief in academic freedom and recognizes that a faculty member has the knowledge, skills, and professionalism required to make continuing, positive contributions to the discipline, school, and academic community. Tenure is an essential element within our institution. It protects the academic freedom necessary to conduct research, and teaching, and librarianship, provides long lasting student mentoring, and strengthens the university's mission. The tenure guidelines that follow acknowledge that disciplinary variations necessitate a degree of autonomy at the school level.

Rationale:

The IHL provided the university with a PEER report authored by Dr. Sandra Jordan entitled "Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning Review of Tenure Policies, Procedures and Best Practices". In response to 5.4.1., Dr. Jordan writes (pages 40-41), "This conceptualization of tenure is clear, but incomplete. While academic freedom is important and tenure does extend additional levels of due process, tenure is complex and this statement does little to expand upon the definition of tenure in a way that accounts for the benefits to the students and the institution." This proposal is intended to address Dr. Jordan's suggestion.

The Faculty Senate proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.3.2.1., Teaching, on May 9, 2022.

First Vote Date: May 9, 2022

First Vote Results: 8-1-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: September 12, 2022

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date: October 10, 2022

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Senate moves that the following section:

5.3.2.1. Teaching

High-quality instruction should be a requirement for the entire corps of instruction. Therefore, promotion criteria in regards to teaching should be as consistent as possible across disciplines. Schools set their specific evaluation criteria for teaching with an appropriate combination of meaningful metrics.

Have its language changed to: (Additions in yellow , Deletions in red)

5.3.2.1. Teaching

High-quality instruction ~~should be~~ is a requirement for the entire corps of instruction. Therefore, promotion criteria in regards to teaching should be as consistent as possible across disciplines. Candidates for tenure should provide evidence of high-quality instruction. Examples of evidence of high-quality instruction include, but are not limited to, student and peer evaluations, student awards and success, teaching awards and recognitions of excellence, development of educational materials and

presentations, direction of theses and other student-driven research. High-quality instruction is the ability to educate and motivate a wide range of students effectively, imparting the latest knowledge, methods, and standards of the discipline being taught. Schools set their specific evaluation criteria for teaching with an appropriate combination of meaningful metrics.

Rationale:

The IHL provided the university with a PEER report authored by Dr. Sandra Jordan entitled “Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning Review of Tenure Policies, Procedures and Best Practices”. In response to 5.3.2.1., Dr. Jordan writes (page 41), “Listing examples of the components under each of the larger categories of teaching, scholarship, and service is an important element to include. Taking that step gives the tenure committees and individuals who make tenure recommendations guidelines to assist in the evaluation.” This proposal is intended to address Dr. Jordan’s suggestion.

The Faculty Senate proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.3.2.2., Service, on May 9, 2022.

First Vote Date: May 9, 2022

First Vote Results: 8-0-0-1 for -against-abstain-absence

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 9-12-2022

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date: October 10, 2022

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 for -against-abstain-absence

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Senate moves that the following section:

5.3.2.2. Service

Satisfactory service to the discipline, school, and University is a requirement for the entire faculty. Promotion criteria with regards to service should be as consistent as possible across tracks and disciplines. Schools set specific evaluation criteria.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow) (Deletions in red)

5.3.2.2. Service

Satisfactory service to the discipline, school, and University is a requirement for the entire **faculty** corps of instruction. Service encompasses the use of one's professional expertise to enrich the general state of our university, society, and professional communities. Examples of service include, but shall not be limited to, active participation in committees, boards, review of evaluation panels, and professional

organizations. Promotion criteria with regards to service should be as consistent as possible across tracks and disciplines. Schools set specific evaluation criteria.

Rationale:

The IHL provided the university with a PEER report authored by Dr. Sandra Jordan entitled “Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning Review of Tenure Policies, Procedures and Best Practices”. Dr. Jordan writes (page 41), “Listing examples of the components under each of the larger categories of teaching, scholarship, and service is an important element to include. Taking that step gives the tenure committees and individuals who make tenure recommendations guidelines to assist in the evaluation.” This proposal is intended to address Dr. Jordan’s suggestion.

The Faculty Senate proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.7.1.5.4, Waiver of Probationary Period, on October 25, 2022.

First Vote Date: October 10, 2022

First Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 for -against-abstain-absence

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: _____

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date: November 14, 2022

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 for -against-abstain-absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

5.7.1.5.4. Waiver of Probationary Period

Faculty may be hired with a rank higher than assistant professor should circumstances and the candidate’s record warrant it. Similarly, IHL policy permits the award of tenure at the time of hire. The University has a vested interest in attracting the best candidates to all levels of the University. Given that some candidates may be tenured at other institutions and in keeping with IHL policy 403.0101, tenure may be granted to individuals who have held tenure at their previous institution. However, this option should be used with care. Awarding tenure at the time of hire may be more frequently appropriate for hires with administrative duties to avoid putting them in the position of evaluating those who will later evaluate their own tenure application.

The relevant school promotion and tenure committee must be consulted, with adequate time to review the candidate’s qualifications, regarding the award of either higher rank or tenure at the time of hire. Any institutional appointments waiving the probationary period for either promotion or tenure must be approved by the candidate’s school during the hiring/negotiation process, and tenure for these faculty

must be recommended by the President and approved by the Board.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow/Deletions in red)

5.7.1.5.4 Waiver of Probationary Period

Faculty may be hired with a rank higher than assistant professor should circumstances and the candidate's record warrant it. Similarly, IHL policy permits the award of tenure at the time of hire. The University has a vested interest in attracting the best candidates to all levels of the University. Given that some candidates may be tenured at other institutions and in keeping with IHL policy 403.0101, tenure may be granted to individuals who have held tenure at their previous institution. However, this option should be used with care. Awarding tenure at the time of hire may be more frequently appropriate for hires with administrative duties to avoid putting them in the position of evaluating those who will later evaluate their own tenure application.

The relevant school promotion and tenure committee must be consulted, with adequate time to review the candidate's qualifications, regarding the award of either higher rank or tenure at the time of hire. Any institutional appointments waiving the probationary period for either promotion or tenure must be ~~approved~~ evaluated by the candidate's school during the hiring/negotiation process, and tenure for these faculty must be recommended by the President and ~~approved~~ evaluated by the Board.

Rationale:

The word "evaluated" more accurately reflects the tenure-granting process.

The University Libraries proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning 5.3.2.1., Teaching, on November 14, 2022.

First Vote Date: 11/14/2022

First Vote Results: 10-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 12/12/2022

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 12/12/2022

Second Vote Results 10-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section that reads as follows, pending approved changes:

5.3.2.1 Teaching

High-quality instruction is a requirement for the entire corps of instruction. Therefore, promotion criteria in regards to teaching should be as consistent as possible across disciplines. Candidates for tenure should provide evidence of high-quality instruction. Examples of evidence of high-quality instruction include, but are not limited to, student and peer evaluations, student awards and success, teaching awards and recognitions of excellence, development of educational materials and presentations, direction of theses and other student-driven research. High-quality instruction is the ability to educate and motivate a wide range of students effectively, imparting the latest knowledge, methods, and standards of the discipline being taught. Schools set their specific evaluation criteria for teaching with an appropriate combination of meaningful metrics.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow)

5.3.2.1. Teaching/Librarianship

High-quality instruction or librarianship is a requirement for the entire corps of instruction. Therefore, promotion criteria in regards to teaching should be as consistent as possible across disciplines. Candidates for tenure should provide evidence of high-quality instruction or librarianship. Examples of evidence of high-quality instruction include, but are not limited to, student and peer evaluations, student awards and success, teaching awards and recognitions of excellence, development of educational materials and presentations, direction of theses and other student-driven research. High-quality instruction or librarianship is the ability to educate and motivate a wide range of students effectively, imparting the latest knowledge, methods, and standards of the discipline being taught.

Examples of high quality librarianship include, but are not limited to, delivery of high-quality reference services and instruction, collection development that meets the scholarly needs of faculty and students, creation and remediation of metadata, development of research guides, finding aids, and digital collections that provide access to materials, and such outreach activities as exhibitions and events.

Schools and the University Libraries set their specific evaluation criteria for teaching and librarianship with an appropriate combination of meaningful metrics.

Rationale:

The IHL provided the university with a PEER report authored by Dr. Sandra Jordan entitled “Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning Review of Tenure Policies, Procedures and Best Practices”. In response to 5.3.2.1., Dr. Jordan writes (page 41), “Listing examples of the components under each of the larger categories of teaching, scholarship, and service is an important element to include. Taking that step gives the tenure committees and individuals who make tenure recommendations guidelines to assist in the evaluation.” This proposal is intended to extend Dr. Jordan’s suggestion to tenure-track faculty librarians.

The Office of General Counsel and Faculty Handbook Committee propose changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.1 Board Authority, on January 9, 2023.

First Vote Date: 1/9/23

First Vote Results: 8-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 2/13/23

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 2/13/23

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Office of General Counsel and Faculty Handbook Committee move that the following section:

5.1 Board Authority

The Board of Trustees may extend promotions in academic rank and tenure to faculty based upon the recommendation of the University President. Board policy specifies that a candidate for promotion in academic rank must display evidence of (a) professional training and experience; (b) effectiveness of teaching or librarianship; (c) effectiveness in interpersonal relationships, including professional ethics, cooperativeness, resourcefulness, and responsibility; (d) professional growth, such as research, publications, and creative activities; and (e) service, such as economic development and non-teaching activities that further University goals or reflect favorably on the University. The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees state that promotion in academic rank or tenure may be based on other criteria established by the University with the approval of the Board.

Have its language changed to:

5.1 Board Authority

The Board of Trustees may extend promotions in academic rank and tenure to faculty based upon the recommendation of the University President. Board policy specifies that a candidate for promotion in academic rank must display evidence of Board policy 402.03 specifies that in making decisions regarding ranks and promotions in rank, heads of institutions shall take into consideration evidence of professional achievement and academic growth to include but not necessarily be limited to the following: a) Professional training and experience; b) Effectiveness of teaching or librarianship; c) Effectiveness, in interpersonal relationships, including professional ethics, cooperativeness, resourcefulness, and responsibility; accuracy and integrity in communications; The Board endorses the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which states in part: "When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution." d) Effectiveness in interpersonal relationships, including collegiality, professional ethics, cooperativeness, resourcefulness and responsibility; e) The absence of malfeasance, inefficiency and contumacious conduct in the faculty member's performance of his/her faculty position at the university; f) Professional growth, such as research, publications and creative activities; g) Service such as economic development and other non-teaching activities which reflect favorably upon the institution; and h) Any other criteria for promotions in rank set out in the applicable institution's policies which are not inconsistent with Board policy.

Clean Copy:

Board policy 402.03 specifies that in making decisions regarding ranks and promotions in rank, heads of institutions shall take into consideration evidence of professional achievement and academic growth to include but not necessarily be limited to the following: a) Professional training and experience; b) Effectiveness of teaching; c) Effectiveness, accuracy and integrity in communications; The Board endorses the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which states in part: "When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution." d) Effectiveness in interpersonal relationships, including collegiality, professional ethics, cooperativeness, resourcefulness and responsibility; e) The absence of malfeasance, inefficiency and contumacious conduct in the faculty member's performance of his/her faculty position at the university; f) Professional growth, such as research, publications and creative activities; g) Service and other non-teaching activities which reflect favorably upon the institution; and h) Any other criteria for promotions in rank set out in the applicable institution's policies which are not inconsistent with Board policy.

Rationale:

This proposed modification arises from an external review and recommendation to more closely align the section's language with IHL Board policy.

Dr. Jeremy Scott proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.4.4, Evaluation Criteria, on January 9, 2022.

First Vote Date: 1/9/23

First Vote Results: 8-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 2/13/23

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 2/13/23

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Jeremy Scott moves that the following section:

5.4.4. Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for tenure are determined in the typical areas of assessment (teaching, service, research/creative activities) described in 5.3.2 above with additional considerations of collegiality within the University.

Because they aim to become part of the cadre of faculty that will shape the long-term future of the institution, candidates for tenure must exhibit a clear sense of shared responsibility for the excellence of the University; this includes collegiality. Collegiality is interlinked with the categories of evaluation and its evaluation should be in those contexts. Accordingly, the separate category of collegiality should not be added to the traditional three areas of faculty performance. Schools and colleges instead should focus on developing clear definitions of teaching, research/creative activity, and service in which the virtues of collegiality are reflected.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow)

5.4.4. Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for tenure are determined in the typical areas of assessment (teaching, service, research/creative activities, other criteria required by IHL) described in 5.3.2 above with additional considerations of collegiality within the University.

Because they aim to become part of the cadre of faculty that will shape the long-term future of the institution, candidates for tenure must exhibit a clear sense of shared responsibility for the excellence of the University; this includes collegiality. Collegiality is interlinked with the categories of evaluation and its evaluation should be in those contexts. Accordingly, the separate category of collegiality should not be added to the traditional three areas of faculty performance. Schools and colleges instead should focus on developing clear definitions of teaching, research/creative activity, and service in which the virtues of collegiality are reflected.

Rationale: Recent changes in the IHL bylaws have added criteria that must be reflected in the University Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Jeremy Scott proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.8.1.2., Evaluative Levels and Actions, on January 9, 2023.

First Vote Date: 1/9/23

First Vote Results: 8-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 2/13/23

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 2/13/23

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Jeremy Scott moves that the following section:

5.8.1.2. Evaluative Levels and Actions

The President is advised on personnel recommendations by the administrative heads of the University's academic units, the Provost, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the deans, and the college promotion and tenure committees. Advice from the Vice President for Research, General Counsel, and by the other vice presidents may be solicited by the President in matters that are within their administrative jurisdiction. The advice rendered by University officers or committees does not limit the legal authority or responsibility of the President for all personnel nominations and recommendations made to the Board of Trustees.

Review of applications for promotion or tenure occurs at each institutional level of the University in the following sequence: the candidate's school promotion and tenure committee, the school director (or a joint letter from school directors in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the college promotion and tenure committee, the dean of the college in which the candidate's school resides (or a joint letter from

deans from all relevant colleges in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, Provost, and President.

Because promotion and tenure processes often coincide for tenure-track faculty, the composition of the promotion and tenure committees may be similar, but all processes should be separate. The committees are discussed in more detail in Chapter 1 of this Handbook.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, Deletions in red)

5.8.1.2. Evaluative Levels and Actions

The President is advised on personnel recommendations by the administrative heads of the University's academic units, the Provost, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the deans, and the college promotion and tenure committees. Advice from the Vice President for Research, General Counsel, and by the other vice presidents may be solicited by the President in matters that are within their administrative jurisdiction. The advice rendered by University officers or committees does not limit the legal authority or responsibility of the President for all personnel nominations and recommendations made to the Board of Trustees decisions.

Review of applications for promotion or tenure occurs at each institutional level of the University in the following sequence: the candidate's school promotion and tenure committee, the school director (or a joint letter from school directors in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the college promotion and tenure committee, the dean of the college in which the candidate's school resides (or a joint letter from deans from all relevant colleges in the case of interdisciplinary faculty), the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, Provost, and President.

Because promotion and tenure processes often coincide for tenure-track faculty, the composition of the promotion and tenure committees may be similar, but all processes should be separate. The committees are discussed in more detail in Chapter 1 of this Handbook.

Rationale: Recent changes in the IHL bylaws have removed the Board from this process.

Dr. Jeremy Scott proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.8.1.2.3.3, President, on January 9, 2022.

First Vote Date: 1/9/23

First Vote Results: 8-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 2/13/23

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 2/13/23

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Jeremy Scott moves that the following section:

5.8.1.2.3.3. President

In reviewing the recommendations of subordinate evaluators and committees, the President has the discretion to obtain and review any additional evidence of probative value and to interview any party, including candidates.

Presidential decisions will be communicated in writing to candidates. Affirmative Presidential decisions will be recommended to the Board. Promotion in academic rank or the award of tenure occur only after the Board has granted it in writing and the faculty member has received written notice of the promotion or award of tenure from the President. Negative presidential decisions regarding the award of tenure or promotion are final unless the candidate appeals to the Board.

Faculty who wish to appeal the decision of the University President regarding the award of tenure or promotion need to appeal to the Board. Faculty have 30 calendar days to do so, effective from the date of notification by the University President. Appellant should address appeals to the Commissioner of the

IHL and follow the procedures outlined in section 403.0105 of the Policies & Bylaws of the IHL Board of Trustees.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, Deletions in red)

5.8.1.2.3.3. President

In reviewing the recommendations of subordinate evaluators and committees, the President has the discretion to obtain and review any additional evidence of probative value and to interview any party, including candidates.

Presidential decisions will be communicated in writing to candidates. ~~Affirmative Presidential decisions will be recommended to the Board~~ Promotion in academic rank or the award of tenure occur only after the ~~Board~~ **President** has granted it in writing and the faculty member has received written notice of the promotion or award of tenure ~~from the President~~. Negative presidential decisions regarding the award of tenure or promotion are final unless the candidate appeals to the Board.

Faculty who wish to appeal the decision of the University President regarding the award of tenure or promotion need to appeal to the Board. Faculty have 30 calendar days to do so, effective from the date of notification by the University President. Appellant should address appeals to the Commissioner of the IHL and follow the procedures outlined in section 403.0105 of the Policies & Bylaws of the IHL Board of Trustees.

Rationale: Recent changes in the IHL bylaws have removed the Board from this process.

Dr. Jeremy Scott proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.7.1.5.4., Waiver of Probationary Period, on January 9, 2023.

First Vote Date: 1/9/2023

First Vote Results: 8-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 2/13/23

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 2/13/23

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Jeremy Scott moves that the following section pending approval:

5.7.1.5.4. Waiver of Probationary Period

Faculty may be hired with a rank higher than assistant professor should circumstances and the candidate's record warrant it. Similarly, IHL policy permits the award of tenure at the time of hire. The University has a vested interest in attracting the best candidates to all levels of the University. Given that some candidates may be tenured at other institutions and in keeping with IHL policy 403.0101, tenure may be granted to individuals who have held tenure at their previous institution. However, this option should be used with care. Awarding tenure at the time of hire may be more frequently appropriate for hires with administrative duties to avoid putting them in the position of evaluating those who will later evaluate their own tenure application.

The relevant school promotion and tenure committee must be consulted, with adequate time to review the candidate's qualifications, regarding the award of either higher rank or tenure at the time of hire. Any institutional appointments waiving the probationary period for either promotion or tenure must be evaluated by the candidate's school during the hiring/negotiation process, and tenure for these faculty must be recommended by the President and evaluated by the Board.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow/ Deletions in red)

5.7.1.5.4. Waiver of Probationary Period

Faculty may be hired with a rank higher than assistant professor should circumstances and the candidate's record warrant it. Similarly, IHL policy permits the award of tenure at the time of hire. The University has a vested interest in attracting the best candidates to all levels of the University. Given that some candidates may be tenured at other institutions and in keeping with IHL policy 403.0101, tenure may be granted to individuals who have held tenure at their previous institution. However, this option should be used with care. Awarding tenure at the time of hire may be more frequently appropriate for hires with administrative duties to avoid putting them in the position of evaluating those who will later evaluate their own tenure application.

The relevant school promotion and tenure committee must be consulted, with adequate time to review the candidate's qualifications, regarding the award of either higher rank or tenure at the time of hire. Any institutional appointments waiving the probationary period for either promotion or tenure must be approved by the candidate's school during the hiring/negotiation process, and tenure for these faculty must be recommended by the President and approved by the Board President.

Rationale: Recent changes in the IHL bylaws have removed the Board from this process.

The Faculty Senate proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning 5.8.1.2.3.2, Provost, on December 12, 2022.

First Vote Date: 2/13/2023

First Vote Results: 6/3/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 3/20/2023

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 3/20/2023

Second Vote Results 7-2-0-0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Senate moves that the following section:

5.8.1.2.3.2. Provost

The Provost reviews all application materials and recommendations, submitting written recommendations to the President. The Vice President for Research assists the Provost in these matters and may submit independent recommendations to the University President. At this time, the Provost also sends copies to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, deans, college promotion and tenure committees, school directors, school promotion and tenure committees, and to candidates.

If the Provost disagrees with recommendations of both the college promotion and tenure committee and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost will remand the case to the college promotion and tenure committee, providing in writing the rationale for the disagreement. The college promotion and tenure committee then reconsiders the matter de novo, based upon the issues raised by the Provost and all other relevant evidence. After reconsideration, the college promotion and tenure committee submits a recommendation to the dean. The dean then submits a separate recommendation to the Provost, together with the committee recommendation. The Provost then resubmits the case to

the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the matter will proceed in the same manner as an original application for promotion or tenure, except that it will not be subject to remand by the Provost to the college promotion and tenure committee. Copies of the evaluative letters written by the college promotion and tenure committee, the dean, and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee in response to remands from the Provost will be forwarded to the candidate when the letters are forwarded to the next evaluative level.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, Deletions in red)

5.8.1.2.3.2. Provost

The Provost reviews all application materials and recommendations, submitting written recommendations to the President. The Vice President for Research assists the Provost in these matters and may submit independent recommendations to the University President. At this time, the Provost also sends copies to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, deans, college promotion and tenure committees, school directors, school promotion and tenure committees, and to candidates.

If the Provost disagrees with recommendations of both the college promotion and tenure committee and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost will remand the case to the college school promotion and tenure committee, providing in writing the rationale for the disagreement. The college school promotion and tenure committee then reconsiders the matter de novo, based upon the issues raised by the Provost and all other relevant evidence. After reconsideration, the college promotion and tenure committee submits a recommendation to the dean. The dean then submits a separate recommendation to the Provost, together with the committee recommendation. The Provost then resubmits the case to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the matter will proceed in the same manner as an original application for promotion or tenure, except that it will not be subject to remand by the Provost to the college promotion and tenure committee. Copies of the evaluative letters written by the school promotion and tenure committee, the school director, the college promotion and tenure committee, the dean, and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee in response to remands from the Provost will be forwarded to the candidate when the letters are forwarded to the next evaluative level.

Rationale:

In September, the Provost asked the University Faculty Handbook Committee to consider changing the remand process to include the school level. This matter was brought to the Faculty Senate in November for a sense of the senate vote. The Faculty Senate voted 34-1-1 in favor of including the school in the remand process.

The Faculty Senate proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 4.4.1, Annual Activity Report, on January 9, 2022.

First Vote Date: 2/13/2023

First Vote Results: 9/0/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 3/20/2023

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 3/20/2023

Second Vote Results 9/0/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Senate moves that the following section:

4.4.1 Annual Activity Report

All academic personnel must submit annual activity reports to the school director by May 31st. These reports include a summary of professional activities in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service during the year evaluated

If governance option 2 or 3 was chosen by the school, the director distributes the activity reports to appropriate members of the FEC for review. Each member of the committee is evaluated by the other members of the committee. School directors and associate deans are evaluated for all work-related categories, including administrative performance, by the dean and not by the other members of the FEC.

However, evaluations of directors and associate deans in regards to teaching and research/creative activities are to be based on specifications outlined in the relevant school-level documents. Associate directors are reviewed by the FEC in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and non-administrative service while administrative performance is evaluated exclusively by the director.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, Deletions in red)

4.4.1 Annual Activity Report

All academic personnel must submit annual activity reports to the school director by ~~May~~ February 1. These reports include a summary of professional activities in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service during the year evaluated

If governance option 2 or 3 was chosen by the school, the director distributes the activity reports to appropriate members of the FEC for review. Each member of the committee is evaluated by the other members of the committee. School directors and associate deans are evaluated for all work-related categories, including administrative performance, by the dean and not by the other members of the FEC.

However, evaluations of directors and associate deans in regards to teaching and research/creative activities are to be based on specifications outlined in the relevant school-level documents. Associate directors are reviewed by the FEC in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and non-administrative service while administrative performance is evaluated exclusively by the director.

Rationale:

This change is intended to reflect the change from an academic year to a calendar year for annual evaluations.

The Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 2.5. Distinguished Professor, on February 13, 2023.

First Vote Date: 2/13/2023

First Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absence

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 3/20/2023

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 3/20/2023

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section:

2.5. Distinguished Professor

The appointment to a distinguished professorship at the University constitutes the highest honor that can be accorded to a member of the professorate. The title can be conferred on select members of the faculty to recognize distinguished achievement in teaching/librarianship, research/creative activity, and public service.

Distinguished professor candidates must have held the rank of professor at the University for at least five years. Distinguished professors should be recognized nationally, and usually internationally, and consequently, bring distinction to the University as a result of their accomplishments. Typically, a distinguished professor has a superior record in at least two of the following areas: teaching/librarianship, research/creative activities, and service.

Have its language changed to:

2.5. Distinguished Professor

The appointment to a Distinguished Professorship at the University **is among** **constitutes** the highest **of** honors that can be accorded to a member of the **faculty** **professorate**. The title can be conferred upon select members of the faculty to recognize distinguished achievement in teaching/librarianship, research/creative activity, and **public** /or service.

Distinguished professor candidates must have held the rank of professor at the University for at least five years. Distinguished professors should be recognized nationally, and usually internationally, and consequently, bring distinction to the university as a result of their accomplishments. Typically, a distinguished professor has a superior record in at least two of the following areas: teaching/librarianship, research/creative activities, and service.

University Distinguished Professorships are awarded upon the recommendation of the provost and president. The provost will convene the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the candidate's credentials and make a recommendation to the Provost and President for a final decision. From time to time, the provost will request nominations from members of the faculty, deans, and school directors. Nominations may be submitted to the provost at any time, except that no Professor shall be eligible to nominate her/himself. Written nominations submitted to the provost shall include a dossier containing, at a minimum, the following materials: a) a cover letter making or supporting the nomination and providing a brief summary of the candidate's qualifications and achievements, specifying the subjects to which the candidate has made seminal contributions and stating his or her principal contributions to those subjects; b) the candidate's curriculum vitae, including a current list of the candidate's publications, research grants, awards, and other achievements; c) letters of endorsement from relevant college deans and school directors; d) evidence of the candidate's national and international reputation, in the form of at least three letters from persons in university departments of high regard in the candidate's field, assessing the candidate's record of achievements in teaching/librarianship, research, and/or service. The qualifications of those writing letters of endorsement must be furnished. In some cases, letters from persons in prestigious non-university research laboratories or institutes may be appropriate; and e) letters of support from students, faculty, and other colleagues at this University assessing the candidate's record of achievements in teaching/librarianship, research, and/or service.

Rationale: This proposed modification seeks to provide detail regarding the process by which the Distinguished Professor designation is conferred.

Edward Sayre of the Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning 5.3.2.4 "Other Criteria as Required by IHL" on February 13, 2023.

First Vote Date: 2/13/2023

First Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 3/20/2023

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 3/20/2023

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section be added:

5.3.2.4. Other Criteria as Required by IHL

The Board has established other criteria which must be taken into consideration when making decisions regarding promotion (IHL Board policy 402.03) and tenure (IHL Board policy 403.0101).

Rationale: The IHL has changed its role in tenure and promotion decisions, and this amendment/addition denotes that other criteria, which IHL added in 2022, are now part of the review process.

The University Faculty Handbook Committee proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook concerning 7.1 Grievance Issues Covered in this Chapter, on March 20, 2023.

First Vote Date: 03/20/2023

First Vote Results: 9/0/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 4/10/2023

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 4/10/2023

Second Vote Results 9/0/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

The University Faculty Handbook Committee moves that the following section that reads as follows:

7.1 Grievance Issues Covered in this Chapter

Faculty employment grievances apply to annual performance reviews, pre-tenure reviews, personnel actions involving adjustments in compensation, denial of sabbatical, and violations of academic freedom. More generally, it covers allegations of the violation, misinterpretation or misapplication of a rule, policy or procedure in relation to personnel policies, procedures, or practices including teaching assignments, working hours, release time, general working conditions, nonacademic leave, employment benefits, etc. See the Employee Handbook for other issues, such as sexual harassment, discrimination, and reasonable accommodations.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow/Deletions in red)

7.1 Grievance Issues Covered in this Chapter

The faculty employment grievance procedure apply applies to annual performance reviews, pre-tenure reviews, personnel actions involving adjustments in compensation, denial of sabbatical, and violations of academic freedom. More generally, it covers allegations of the violation, misinterpretation or misapplication of a rule, policy or procedure in relation to personnel policies, procedures, or practices including teaching assignments, working hours, release time, general working conditions, nonacademic leave, employment benefits, etc. The faculty employment grievance procedure does not apply to the denial of promotion and/or tenure. Likewise, the faculty employment grievance procedure does not address See the Employee Handbook for other issues, such as sexual harassment, discrimination, and reasonable accommodations, as these are addressed in the Employee Handbook.

Rationale:

Rationale: Provides clarification on which issues are and are not handled through the faculty employment grievance procedure.

The council of directors proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 4.5.2, Faculty Evaluation Meetings, on March 20, 2023.

First Vote Date: 3/20/2023

First Vote Results: 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 4/10/2023

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date: 4/10/2023

Second Vote Results 9-0-0-0 For-Against-Abstain-Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Ward Sayre moves that the following section:

4.5.2. Faculty Evaluation Meetings

The annual evaluation process offers an opportunity to review activities from the previous year, for faculty to discuss professional objectives and goals for the year ahead, and to request necessary resources with their directors.

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between June 1st and September 30th. Two distinct meetings are generally necessary to complete the annual evaluation process for each faculty member: (1) review and discussion of the previous year's activities and (2) establishment of professional objectives and workload allocation for the year ahead.

The first meeting is optional and may include the faculty member, school director, and/ or FEC members. The proceedings include discussion of the basis of the evaluation and the opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings. At this meeting, the evaluation is signed by the faculty member, school

director(s), and FEC members, if appropriate. Faculty member signature does not signify concurrence with the evaluation, only receipt.

Prior to signing completed annual evaluations, faculty may request written communication from administrative evaluators to outline strategies for improving workload allocation issues or request resources available for high-quality teaching and research/creative activities. Faculty also may appeal the results of their annual evaluations if they disagree with the assigned ratings or written comments from the evaluation committee. If the response remains unsatisfactory to the faculty member and efforts to resolve issues are unsuccessful at the school level, an appeal can be initiated in accord with the grievance procedure outlined in Chapter 7.

The second meeting is between the school director and the faculty member. When a faculty member and the director are unable to agree on appropriate annual objectives, the dean serves as the final arbiter.

Schools will determine an internal timeline to accommodate the entire annual evaluation process, including the FEC review and evaluation period, when faculty members receive the reports of their annual evaluation, and when optional meetings with FEC and/or school director occur.

Quarterly or mid-year meetings between the school director and faculty member are highly recommended for all faculty with faculty development plans (section 4.5.4). Quarterly or mid-year meetings are strongly encouraged between faculty and school directors to revisit objectives and to promote faculty success and continuous professional development.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, Deletions in red)

4.5.2. Faculty Evaluation Meetings

The annual evaluation process follows a specific pathway which can involve meetings with the FEC and/or School Director. Based upon the governance option selected, the faculty member may have one or more meetings with the FEC and Director. offers an These meetings offer opportunities to review activities from the previous year, for faculty to discuss and finalize professional objectives and goals for the year ahead, and to request necessary resources with their directors.

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between June 1st and September 30th February 15 and May 1. Two distinct meetings are generally necessary to complete the annual evaluation process for each faculty member: (1) review and discussion of the previous year's activities and (2) establishment of professional objectives and workload allocation for the year ahead.

The first meeting is optional and may include the faculty member, school director, and/ or FEC members. The proceedings topics for the meeting include a discussion of discussing the basis of the evaluation, allowing the faculty member and the opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings, and finalizing the professional objectives for the following year, and reviewing any recommended changes in faculty workload for the coming year. At this meeting, the evaluation is signed by the faculty member, school director(s), and FEC members, if appropriate. Faculty member signature does not signify concurrence with the evaluation, only receipt.

Prior to signing completed acknowledging receipt of the annual evaluations, faculty may request an evaluation meeting as outlined above. In addition, faculty may request written communication from administrative evaluators to outline strategies for improving workload allocation issues or request resources available for high-quality teaching and research/creative activities. Faculty also may appeal the results of their annual evaluations if they disagree with the assigned ratings or written comments from the faculty evaluation committee (FEC) evaluators. If the response remains unsatisfactory to the faculty member and efforts to resolve issues are unsuccessful at the school level, an appeal can be initiated in accord with the grievance procedure outlined in Chapter 7. In this case, the faculty member should acknowledge receipt of the annual evaluation prior to initiating the grievance process. Faculty member acknowledgment does not signify agreement with the evaluation, only receipt.

The second meeting is between the school director and the faculty member. When a faculty member and the director are unable to agree on appropriate annual objectives, the dean serves as the final arbiter.

Schools will determine an internal timeline to accommodate the entire annual evaluation process, including the FEC review and evaluation period, when faculty members receive the reports of their annual evaluation, and when meetings with FEC and/or school director occur. Annual evaluation meetings are required for all unpromoted tenure-track faculty, any faculty who receives a rating of “does not meet expectations” in any domains, and any faculty who requests such a meeting. Annual evaluation meetings are recommended for any faculty going up for promotion in the following academic year. For all other faculty, the meetings are optional and up to the discretion of the school’s policies. In schools where the evaluation is completed by the committee and the director (option 2) the meetings can include the committee and the director or the director only, depending upon the preference of the faculty member.

Quarterly or mid-year meetings between the school director and faculty member are highly recommended for all faculty with faculty development plans (section 4.5.4). Quarterly or mid-year meetings are strongly encouraged between faculty and school directors to revisit objectives and to promote faculty success and continuous professional development.

Rationale: The requirement for two meetings were unwieldy and not implemented in most larger schools in practice. This becomes an especially challenging requirement with changing the timeline to the spring for meetings. Dates were changed to change to annual (calendar year) evaluations rather than academic year.

Here is a clean version of the new text without the highlighting:

4.5.2. Faculty Evaluation Meetings

The annual evaluation process follows a specific pathway which can involve meetings with the FEC and/ or School Director. Based upon the governance option selected, the faculty member may have one or more meetings with the FEC and Director. These meetings offer opportunities to review activities from the previous year, for faculty to discuss and finalize professional objectives and goals for the year ahead, and to request necessary resources with their directors.

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually between February 15 and May 1.

The topics for the meeting include discussing the basis of the evaluation, allowing the faculty member the opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings, finalizing professional objectives for the following year, and reviewing any recommended changes in faculty workload for the coming year.

Prior to acknowledging receipt of the annual evaluations, faculty may request an evaluation meeting as outlined above. Faculty also may appeal the results of their annual evaluations if they disagree with the assigned ratings or written comments from the evaluators. If the response remains unsatisfactory to the faculty member and efforts to resolve issues are unsuccessful at the school level, an appeal can be initiated in accord with the grievance procedure outlined in Chapter 7. In this case, the faculty member should acknowledge receipt of the annual evaluation prior to initiating the grievance process. Faculty member acknowledgment does not signify agreement with the evaluation, only receipt.

Schools will determine an internal timeline to accommodate the entire annual evaluation process, including the FEC review and evaluation period, when faculty members receive the reports of their annual evaluation, and when meetings with FEC and/or school director occur. Annual evaluation meetings are required for all unpromoted tenure-track faculty, any faculty who receives a rating of "does not meet expectations" in any domains, and any faculty who requests such a meeting. Annual evaluation meetings are recommended for any faculty going up for promotion in the following academic year. For all other faculty, the meetings are optional and up to the discretion of the school's policies. In schools where the evaluation is completed by the committee and the director (option 2) the meetings can include the committee and the director or the director only, depending upon the preference of the faculty member.

Dr. Wolf proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning 5.8.2. Candidate's Right to Update Application Materials, for meeting on April 10, 2023.

First Vote Date: 04/10/2023

First Vote Results: 9/0/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 5/8/2023

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date: 05/08/2023

Second Vote Results 9/0/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Marco Wolf moves that the following section:

5.8.2. Candidate's Right to Update Application Materials and Provide Rebuttals

Materials in applications may not be removed during the evaluation process. However, candidates for promotion or tenure do have the right to withdraw their applications at any time. Candidates may add information and materials to their applications up until the time the school promotion and tenure committee completes its evaluation of the candidate.

Because there can be situations during the course of the promotion or tenure application process that could positively affect the candidate's chances of success (e.g., an additional article accepted for publication), the candidate can provide updates via written memo to the evaluative body currently reviewing the tenure applications. These updates must be limited to the material already mentioned in the original application and must be properly documented.

Except when the Provost remands a case to the college and University promotion and tenure committees, promotion and tenure are unidirectional processes. Consequently, these evaluations may not be referred back to a previous evaluative committee or individual once the committee or individual has rendered a decision. Provost remands are discussed in section 5.8.1.2.3 above.

However, candidate rebuttals to recommendations made by the evaluative officers and committees are permitted at the following levels: (1) after the school promotion and tenure committee's and the school director's letters have been submitted, (2) after the college promotion and tenure committee's and the dean's letters have been submitted, and (3) after the University Promotion and Tenure Committee's letter has been submitted. If the candidate wishes to provide a rebuttal, it must be done within ten working days of the receipt of the relevant letters. Rebuttal letters must be provided to the proper university office at which point a university staff or administrator will place the rebuttal letter immediately after the referenced evaluative letter. Candidates do not place their rebuttal letters in their application. Rebuttals from other individuals are not permitted.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, ~~deletion in red~~)

5.8.2. Candidate's Right to Update Application Materials and Provide Rebuttals

Materials in applications may not be removed during the evaluation process. However, candidates for promotion or tenure do have the right to withdraw their applications at any time.

Candidates may add information and materials to their applications up until the time the school promotion and tenure committee completes its evaluation of the candidate.

Because there can also be situations during the course of the promotion or tenure application process that could positively affect the candidate's chances of success (e.g., an additional article accepted for publication), the candidate can provide updates via written memo to the evaluative body currently reviewing the promotion and tenure applications by submitting the material to the respective Dean's office. These updates must be limited to the material already mentioned in the original application and must be properly documented.

~~Except when the Provost remands a case to the college and University promotion and tenure committees, promotion and tenure are unidirectional processes. Consequently, these evaluations may not be referred back to a previous evaluative committee or individual once the committee or individual has rendered a decision. Provost remands are discussed in section 5.8.1.2.3 above.~~

Except when the Provost remands a case to the school, college and University committees for further review consistent with section 5.8.1.2.3 above, promotion and tenure applications are a unidirectional processes and may not be referred back to a previous evaluative committee or individual once a decision has been rendered.

However, candidate rebuttals to recommendations made by the evaluative officers and committees are permitted at the following levels: (1) after the school promotion and tenure committee's and the school director's letters have been submitted, (2) after the college promotion and tenure committee's and the dean's letters have been submitted, and (3) after the University Promotion and Tenure Committee's letter has been submitted. If the candidate wishes to provide a rebuttal, it must be done within ten working days of the receipt of the relevant letters. Rebuttal letters must be provided to the proper university office at which point a university staff or administrator will place the rebuttal letter immediately after the referenced evaluative letter. Rebuttal letters must be submitted through the candidate's respective Deans office which then directs the rebuttal to the appropriate university office. A university staff or administrator will then place the rebuttal letter immediately after the referenced evaluative letter. Candidates do not place their rebuttal letters in their application. Rebuttals from other individuals are not permitted.

Dr. Wright proposes changes to the University Faculty Handbook Committee concerning deadlinks/incorrect office names, on April 10, 2023.

First Vote Date: 4/10/2023

First Vote Results: 9/0/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Length of Review and Potential Second Vote Date: 5/8/2023

University Counsel Opinion: _____

Employee Handbook Opinion: _____

Faculty Senate Opinion: _____

Council of Directors Opinion: _____

Deans Opinion: _____

Vice President of Research Opinion: _____

Provost Opinion: _____

Second Vote Date 05/08/2023

Second Vote Results 9/0/0/0 For/Against/Abstain/Absent

Majority Opinion: _____

Minority Opinion: _____

Presidential Approval or Rejection with date: _____

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

1.2.1. Schools

Schools are the overarching units of academic program organization within Colleges. A [school directory](#) can be found on the Provost's website. Each school is comprised of multiple programs that work together for the delivery of curriculum, promotion of student retention, and support of faculty research, teaching, and service.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, deletions in red)

1.2.1. Schools

Schools are the overarching units of academic program organization within Colleges. A [school directory](#) can be found [here](#) on the Provost's website. Each school is comprised of multiple programs that work together for the delivery of curriculum, promotion of student retention, and support of faculty research, teaching, and service.

Rationale: The original hyperlink was dead.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

3.3.2. Integrity Assurance Program

All members of the University involved in research/creative activities, whether faculty, staff, or student, are required to participate in the University's Research and Scholarly [Integrity Assurance Program](#) (IAP). ('IAP' is USM's term for what is referred to in federal regulations and elsewhere as Responsible Conduct of Research: "RCR".) IAP includes online modules, provided by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) and campus workshops and forums managed by the Office of Research Integrity. All who are covered by the policy are expected to complete CITI's basic or "Common" course; different versions of the Common Course are available depending on discipline and relationship to the University. Researchers submitting applications to the IRB also must have completed the Human Subjects Course; researchers submitting applications to the IACUC must have completed the IACUC Course.

Have its language changed to: **Changes in yellow, deletions in red)**

All members of the University involved in research/creative activities, whether faculty, staff, or student, are required to participate in the University's Research and Scholarly [Integrity Assurance Program](#) (IAP). ('IAP' is USM's term for what is referred to in federal regulations and elsewhere as Responsible Conduct of Research: "RCR".) IAP includes online modules, provided by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) and campus workshops and forums managed by the Office of Research Integrity. All who are covered by the policy are expected to complete CITI's basic or "Common" course; different versions of the Common Course are available depending on discipline and relationship to the University. Researchers submitting applications to the IRB also must have completed the Human Subjects Course; researchers submitting applications to the IACUC must have completed the IACUC Course.

Rationale: This link goes to the main institutional policies page and the only policy on polycstat is just called Integrity Assurance. I'm not sure what the "program" is.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

3.3.7. Ancillary Institutional Agreements

With approval, academic personnel may provide institutional services outside the scope of their regularly contracted duties. In so doing, they may earn remuneration in addition to that stipulated in annual employment contracts. These ancillary institutional agreements include summer semester employment; employment within the University's programs in international and continuing education; employment on a domestic campus, extension center, or teaching/research facility of the University removed from the place of regularly contracted employment; teaching within the University's Interactive Video Network; directing University-sponsored projects; and serving as an internal consultant to the University. For details, see the [Employee Handbook](#), sec. 3.7 (On Campus Consulting).

Have its language changed to: **Changes in yellow, deletions in red)**

With approval, academic personnel may provide institutional services outside the scope of their regularly contracted duties. In so doing, they may earn remuneration in addition to that stipulated in

annual employment contracts. These ancillary institutional agreements include summer semester employment; employment within the University's programs in international and continuing education; employment on a domestic campus, extension center, or teaching/research facility of the University removed from the place of regularly contracted employment; teaching within the University's Interactive Video Network; directing University-sponsored projects; and serving as an internal consultant to the University. For details, see the [Employee Handbook](#), sec. 3.7 (On Campus Consulting).

Rationale: The original hyperlink was dead.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

3.4.2.5. Syllabi

Instructors are expected to make syllabi available to students on the first day of class. [Guidelines](#) for writing class syllabi, including topics the University requires on all syllabi, are available from the Provost's [website](#).

Have its language changed to: [Changes in yellow](#), ~~deletions in red~~)

Instructors are expected to make syllabi available to students on the first day of class. [Guidelines](#) for writing class syllabi, including topics the University requires on all syllabi, are available from the [Center for Faculty Development](#) ~~Provost's~~ [website](#).

Rationale: Both original hyperlinks were dead, and syllabi guidelines are no longer on the provost website.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

3.4.2.10. Disability Accommodations

The Office of Disability Accommodations (ODA) verifies students' eligibility for accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). ODA works with eligible students individually to develop and coordinate reasonable accommodations specific to their disabilities. Academic personnel are responsible for implementing reasonable accommodations identified in a letter sent by ODA on behalf of the student.

Have its language changed to: [Changes in yellow](#), ~~deletions in red~~)

3.4.2.10. [Student Accessibility](#)

The Office of [Student Accessibility Services \(SAS\)](#) ~~Disability Accommodations (ODA)~~ verifies students' eligibility for accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). [SAS](#) ~~ODA~~ works with eligible students individually to develop and coordinate reasonable accommodations specific to their disabilities. Academic personnel are responsible for implementing reasonable accommodations identified in a letter sent by [SAS](#) ~~ODA~~ on behalf of the student.

Rationale: ODA changed to SAS

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

4.5.1.2. Considerations for Online Instruction

Due to the unique nature of the online learning environment, online teaching requires its own set of evaluation benchmarks. While specific assessment benchmarks may vary from one academic unit to another, each unit should develop online teaching evaluation criteria that meet or exceed standards set through the [online instructional policy](#).

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, deletions in red)

Due to the unique nature of the online learning environment, online teaching requires its own set of evaluation benchmarks. While specific assessment benchmarks may vary from one academic unit to another, each unit should develop online teaching evaluation criteria that meet or exceed standards set through the [online instructional policy](#).

Rationale: Original hyperlink goes to the main institutional policies page, and I can't actually find a policy called that on the polycystat page. The CFD teaching resource site does have minimum expectations for online courses on letterhead from the provost office, which may be what this is referring to?

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

7.3. Scholarly Misconduct

Faculty who wish to appeal decisions regarding scholarly misconduct should consult the [Policy on Scholarly Misconduct](#).

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, deletions in red)

Faculty who wish to appeal decisions regarding scholarly misconduct should consult the [Policy on Scholarly Misconduct](#).

Rationale: Original hyperlink goes to the old student academic integrity policy and reporting website. I believe the faculty misconduct should link to the institutional policies page.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.1.1.7. Center for International Education

The [Center for International Education](#) coordinates programs and services that extend the University to our local and global communities. The Center provides intensive English language instruction, administers the University's extensive study abroad programs, and coordinates international admissions and student services for international students and scholars. The Center is operationally divided into the [English Language Institute](#), [Study Abroad](#), [International Admissions](#), and [International Student and Scholar Services](#).

Have its language changed to: Changes in yellow, deletions in red)

The [Center for International Education](#) coordinates programs and services that extend the University to our local and global communities. The Center provides intensive English language instruction, administers the University's extensive study abroad programs, and coordinates international admissions and student services for international students and scholars. The Center is operationally divided into the [English Language Institute](#), [Study Abroad](#), [International Admissions](#), and [International Student and Scholar Services](#).

Rationale: Original hyperlink link went to the main admissions website. I changed it to the international admissions website.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.1.1.8. Office of Disability Accommodations

The [Office for Disability Accommodations](#) (ODA) supports students who are eligible for accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). ODA verifies students' eligibility and works with eligible students on an individual basis to develop and coordinate plans for reasonable accommodations.

Have its language changed to: Changes in yellow, deletions in red)

A.1.1.8. Office of Student Accessibility Services

The [Office of Student Accessibility Services](#) (SAS) ~~Office for Disability Accommodations (ODA)~~ supports students who are eligible for accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). SAS ~~ODA~~ verifies students' eligibility and works with eligible students on an individual basis to develop and coordinate plans for reasonable accommodations.

Rationale: ODA changed to SAS

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.1.2.1. Career Services

Career Services in [Hattiesburg](#) and at [Gulf Park](#) helps students with job placement through career counseling and provides instruction on job search strategies, résumés, cover letters, and practice interviews. They work with students individually, in workshops, and faculty-arranged classroom visits. They also work with employers, hosting career fairs and on-campus interviews. Over 14,000 jobs are posted annually in Handshake, a free online database.

Have its language changed to: Changes in yellow, deletions in red)

[Career Services](#) in [Hattiesburg](#) and at [Gulf Park](#) helps students with job placement through career counseling and provides instruction on job search strategies, résumés, cover letters, and practice interviews. They work with students individually, in workshops, and faculty-arranged classroom visits.

They also work with employers, hosting career fairs and on-campus interviews. Over 14,000 jobs are posted annually in Handshake, a free online database.

Rationale: Original "gulf park" hyperlink was dead. Career services seems to have just one website for both locations now.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.1.2.3. Drapeau Center for Undergraduate Research

The [Drapeau Center for Undergraduate Research](#) (DCUR) works to enhance the undergraduate experience by promoting and supporting student-faculty collaborations in research, creative projects, and scholarship. Faculty interested in mentoring and collaborating with students are encouraged to become faculty affiliates. Students may apply for funding to support their work through the Eagle Scholars Program for Undergraduate Research (SPUR) and present their findings at the [Undergraduate Symposium on Research and Creative Activity](#).

Have its language changed to: **Changes in yellow, deletions in red**)

The [Drapeau Center for Undergraduate Research](#) (DCUR) works to enhance the undergraduate experience by promoting and supporting student-faculty collaborations in research, creative projects, and scholarship. Faculty interested in mentoring and collaborating with students are encouraged to become faculty affiliates. Students may apply for funding to support their work through the Eagle Scholars Program for Undergraduate Research (SPUR) and present their findings at the [Undergraduate Symposium on Research and Creative Activity](#).

Rationale: Original hyperlink was dead.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.4.1.1. Collegiate Recovery Community

The [Collegiate Recovery Community](#) (CRC) is a program for students who are in recovery from addictive disorders including alcohol, drugs, and eating disorders.

Have its language changed to: **Changes in yellow, deletions in red**)

The [Collegiate Recovery Community](#) (CRC) is a program for students who are in recovery from addictive disorders including alcohol, drugs, and eating disorders.

Rationale: Original hyperlink is dead and the main page when I googled it also links to a dead page. I'm unsure if this program still exists.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.4.1.3. LGBTQ Resources

The Southern Miss [PRISM LGBTQ+ Resource Office](#) works to create an affirming and supportive campus environment for students of all gender and sexual identities. The Office provides academic, campus, and community resources for students and employees of the University.

Have its language changed to: **Changes in yellow, deletions in red)**

The Southern Miss [PRISM LGBTQ+ Resource Office](#) works to create an affirming and supportive campus environment for students of all gender and sexual identities. The Office provides academic, campus, and community resources for students and employees of the University.

Rationale: Original hyperlink just went to the main Diversity and Inclusion website. I changed it to their actual website.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.4.2.4. Center for Child Development

The Center for Child Development provides high quality educational and care services to children eight-weeks to five-years-old and is an academic teaching and research facility for students and faculty across the University. The [Center](#) operates on Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast campuses.

Have its language changed to: **Changes in yellow, deletions in red)**

The Center for Child Development provides high quality educational and care services to children eight-weeks to five-years-old and is an academic teaching and research facility for students and faculty across the University. The [Center](#) operates on Hattiesburg ~~and Gulf Coast campuses~~ **campus**.

Rationale: There is no longer a center on the Gulf Coast campus.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.4.2.8. University Clinic for Family Therapy

The [University Clinic for Family Therapy](#) is an academic teaching and research center for clinical faculty, marriage and family therapy graduate students, and family relations undergraduate students. The Clinic serves individuals, couples, and families experiencing a wide range of personal or relationship problems allowing students to develop clinical skills in a closely supervised environment.

Have its language changed to: **Changes in yellow, deletions in red)**

A.4.2.8. **Center for Family Therapy**

The **Center for Family Therapy** ~~University Clinic for Family Therapy~~ is an academic teaching and research center for clinical faculty, marriage and family therapy graduate students, and family relations undergraduate students. The **Center** ~~Clinic~~ serves individuals, couples, and families experiencing a wide range of personal or relationship problems allowing students to develop clinical skills in a closely supervised environment.

Rationale: The original hyperlink was dead and the name has been changed.

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.6.1.1. Copy Center Services

The [University's Copy Center](#) provides printing services for business cards, letterhead, envelopes, brochures, posters, and copies.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, deletions in red)

A.6.1.1. Copy Center Services

The [University's Copy Center](#) provides printing services for business cards, letterhead, envelopes, brochures, posters, and copies.

Rationale: This no longer exists

Dr. Wright moves that the following section:

A.6.1.2. Event and Conference Services

[Event Services](#) oversees the reservation and setup for events held in the Thad Cochran Center, R.C. Cook University Union and Hub, as well as the first level of the Trent Lott National Center.

Have its language changed to: (Changes in yellow, deletions in red)

[Event Services](#) oversees the reservation and setup for events held in the Thad Cochran Center, R.C. Cook University Union and Hub, as well as the first level of the Trent Lott National Center.

Rationale: Original hyperlink was dead.