



**Faculty Senate
Minutes of the Executive Committee**

Presiding: Jill A. Dapremont

Date: September 21, 2021

Secretary: R. Jeffrey Thieme

Members Present: Jill A. Dapremont (President), W. Pat Travis (President-Elect), Jeffrey G. Marchetta (Past-President), R. Jeffrey Thieme (Secretary), Mark Sunderman (Parliamentarian), Steven L. Nelson (At-Large), and DeAnna Owens-Mosby (At-Large)

Members Absent: None

Guests: David Kemme (Faculty Trustee), Gloria Carr (Ombudsperson), Melanie Murry (University Counsel)

The meeting was held on Tuesday, September 21, 2021 via the Zoom video conferencing platform due to restrictions imposed in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic.

09.21.21.01 Call to Order

President Jill Dapremont called the virtual meeting of the Executive Committee (EC) to order with a quorum at 2:30 pm and welcomed the guests.

09.21.21.02 Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as written with the addition of an Information Security Advisory Committee (ISAC) update to the President's Report after the report on the President Search Committee.

09.21.21.03 Approval of Minutes

(Executive Committee – August 24, 2021)

The minutes of the August 24, 2021 Faculty Senate (FS) Executive Committee meeting were approved as written.

09.21.21.04 President's Report

President's Council Update

President Dapremont reported that enrollment is ending on a strong note. Close to 500 faculty have received Canvas training (averaging about 150 faculty per week). Student training for

Canvas begins in October. Canvas is exporting about 2000 courses per day and is expected to be completed by November 5, 2021. An update will be sent out on Friday. So far, 2400 out of 5300 courses have been migrated. She will invite Dr. Robert Jackson (Chief Information Officer), Dr. Robert Johnson (Associate Chief Information Officer), and Dr. Scott Vann (Assistant Director, Digital Learning) to the September FS meeting for update and questions. Also, ITS (Information Technology Services) is updating the CV reporting process.

Parliamentarian Mark Sunderman asked if course shells could be opened earlier than Thanksgiving. President Dapremont answered that Dr. Jackson is looking into it and will provide an update.

President Dapremont reported that there are very few cases of faculty contracting COVID-19 on campus. Seating charts have helped give faculty guidance on how to handle COVID-19 cases in class. Faculty should continue to visit the COVID-19 website [<https://www.memphis.edu/coronavirusupdates/>] for further guidance. There has been no significant pushback from students with respect to masking requirements. The university has 42 student isolation rooms and has only used 8 rooms so far this semester. Regarding athletics, the UofM was not invited to the Big 12 Conference and conference realignment is ongoing. She reported that University President M. David Rudd is emphasizing that the University of Memphis should be known as the flagship University of the West in TN. He is also working to change the funding formula to reflect the university's status in rankings, research, and student graduation. President Dapremont reported that the President Search Committee met September 15, 2021 and will be doing its work in October. The plan is for candidates to be on campus in early November. The Board of Trustees (BOT) will make the final selection, not the Search Committee. The Search Committee only provides input.

Senator Steven Nelson asked why we keep missing the boat on the Big 12 conference. President Dapremont answered that she's not sure. No rubrics are provided. Faculty Trustee David Kemme added that Senator Nelson could look back at Big 10 expansion. Nebraska was required to increase library spending by \$10M to join the league. It's a big picture point of view. UofM is becoming a better fit than ever before. It's just a matter of time. The board of the conference makes decisions, and no reasons are given why certain schools aren't invited.

09.21.21.05 Old Business

LMCIS phase 1 summary report - Zabihollah "Zabi" Rezaee, PhD

President Dapremont yielded to Senator Zabi Rezaee who summarized his report on phase 1 (see Appendix). He emphasized the lessons learned from phase 1 of the process. He also expressed that he's not very happy with a lack of accountability by some deans and is frustrated with the Provost.

Past-president Jeff Marchetta commented that faculty wanted to be involved and that pathway was provided. For many years, the FS didn't register on the radar for the deans. Now they know that we are going to push for our right to be involved in shared governance. We have a

window this year to establish a more permanent process at the university level to carry this forward. Some of the details aren't as exactly what we'd have liked, but the committee accomplished what we set out to do.

Senator Rezaee commented that he is mostly disappointed with the responses from some of the deans but noted that some colleges are making significant changes for the better. Also, some deans are taking faculty more seriously with respect to their role in shared governance. He asked the EC to accept this report as the committee's final report on phase 1. Regarding phase 2 and future directions, he referred the EC to his report on phase 2.

Secretary Jeff Thieme suggested that Senator Rezaee share the reports with the deans and responses from the deans with the FS. Senator Rezaee responded that it might create more questions than answers. Past-president Marchetta added that our process was to report to the Provost, not to distribute to the FS. It's up to the Provost to decide what should be made available. Senator Rezaee asked President Dapremont if we should reach out to the Provost. President Dapremont agreed that the charge was to send the information to the deans and the Provost. Senator Rezaee added that the budget conditions have changed since this process started.

Senator Rezaee again spoke to his report (See Appendix) to suggest how to proceed to phases 2 and 3.

President Dapremont suggested to move the process to a university committee with Senate representation.

Ombudsperson Search Committee

President Dapremont reported that University President Rudd has nominated Dr. Robin Poston (Dean, Graduate School), Dr. Chuck Pierce (Interim Dean, Fogelman College of Business and Economics), and Dr. Randy Floyd (Chair, Department of Psychology) to serve on the Ombudsperson Selection Committee. So far there has been one nominee from the FS and Dr. Gloria Carr (Ombudsperson) will serve as an advisor to the Ombudsperson Selection Committee.

Faculty Handbook Presentation – Jeff Marchetta, PhD

President Dapremont yielded to Past-president Marchetta who reviewed the presentation, "Why We Need to Make Changes to the Faculty Handbook?" (See Appendix).

Melanie Murry (University Counsel) added that this needs to be done. It's a board responsibility and she doesn't speak for the board. She suggested that the university needs to have the appropriate policies in place so that we can govern. Past-president Marchetta added that we need to have this conversation before the FS moves forward on these issues. President Dapremont added that some schools have had policies forced upon them because they didn't

establish them themselves. Past-president Marchetta added that he doesn't want the board to write policy for faculty. Faculty Trustee Kemme added that he's not speaking for the board. He has spoken with University counsel Murry about this previously. He suggested that we don't want the board to be involved with the entire faculty handbook. Rather, the board should only be involved in tenure, promotion, and faculty code of conduct. He thinks that Past-president Marchetta is the right person for this job. He suggested that it's something that should be done sooner rather than later and agrees that we don't want the board to be involved in writing the policy. Some board members have reservations about tenure and our policies need to be serious. Past-president Marchetta clarified that there are no changes to the handbook without approval from the FS and the Provost first. He's having 1-on-1 conversations with the Provost to negotiate language before engaging the Faculty Policies Committee. So far there is a lot of agreement with the Provost, but there are compromises. He is pushing shared governance.

09.21.21.06 New Business

Policy Review Board (PRB) Committee Update – Pat Travis, PhD

President Dapremont yielded to Pat who had no report.

Committee on Committees Motion

President Dapremont shared the Committee on Committees motion with the EC (See Appendix).

Charge to Business and Finance (B&F) Committee – Phase 2

President Dapremont asked the EC to discuss phase 2 of the LMCIS process. The EC decided to work on a charge for the Budget and Finance Committee before the next EC meeting.

Approve Agenda for 9/28/2021 FS Meeting

President Dapremont reviewed the agenda for the 9/28 FS meeting. The EC approved the agenda.

09.21.21.08 Announcements

David Kemme – Trustee Report

There was no Faculty Trustee report.

Gloria Carr – Ombudsperson Report

President Dapremont yielded to Gloria Carr who had no report but commented that she was pleasantly surprised to find a proclamation from Governor Lee that October 14 is Ombudsperson Day.

09.21.21.09 Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:37pm.

Appendix

A.1. Budget and Finance Committee Report:

Working Group of the Budget and Finance Committee
The Faculty Senate
Phase I: LMCIS/SWOTS Analysis Review Summer 2021

Introduction The COVID-19 pandemic has caused many challenges for our society and organizations of all types and sizes, including the institutions of higher education. The pandemic has already forced the University of Memphis to cut its budget significantly and these budget shortfalls may persist. The University has been able to manage this initial cut with minimum impact on the operating budgets of academic units. It is unknown whether a round of additional new cuts will be necessary in the foreseeable future. Should further budget reductions become necessary, academic deans will have to plan for potential cuts. In the face of budget reductions, academic affairs units must also maintain their educational and financial sustainability. A collaborative effort where academic affairs units provide deans with guidance to assist them, should they need to make difficult budgetary cuts, is the best choice for a university that values shared governance. Examining our academic programs, and considering new configurations of them, is a way of securing our sustainability while providing a quality education that is affordable for our students.

Sustainability is a process (journey) of achieving shared value for all stakeholders. sustainability is a continuous dynamic process whereby universities ensure improvement in the face of everchanging financial and social challenges. Our focus is on the educational, governance, and financial sustainability of all academic units at the University of Memphis. The concept of Lean Management and continuous improvement strategies (LMCIS) encourages colleges to continually monitor spending patterns and constantly looking for ways to conserve without harming productivity and effectiveness of their academic programs. Any savings achieved can be redirected to support new market driven and student demanded programs. New needs may be new software, new databases, faculty conferences on new technology, faculty release time to upgrade skills, and possibly new courses to meet an ever-changing market environment. As a state university, most of our funding is from taxpayers and student tuition. The funds spent here are a burden for taxpayers and students and should be conserved wherever possible. Therefore, we need to establish the best practices of doing university activities better, stronger, and more sustainable (BSS).

Our introductory meeting with deans of Academic Units on November 18, 2020, suggests two major concerns of the “expectation, what needs to be done, and “timing” of when to complete this report. The Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) has decided to conduct the Lean Management and Continuous Improvement Strategies (LMCIS) reviews in three phases, based

on suggestions from deans, insights from faculty and the Faculty Senate, and consultation with 2 the Provost Office and the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). These phases would take place in Spring/Summer 2021, Fall 2021, and Spring 2022.

Phase I of the LMCIS/SWOTS review was conducted as follows:

1. The Faculty Senate approved the following charges given to the BFC by the Provost to initiate phase I of the educational and financial sustainability for all Academic Affairs Units at the University of Memphis:
 - To review and evaluate the efficiency of administrative faculty and staff support in each unit.
 - To review and evaluate academic programs and identify those programs that may be unsustainable and need improvements, restructuring, downsizing, or consolidation.
2. The BFC and its working groups developed material, manageable, and relevant educational and financial KPIs appropriate for the LMCIS review process, following the SRI model.
3. Data for educational and Financial SRI-driven KPIs were collected for five years from 2016-2020 for all academic units and related colleges by the OIR and placed into an “LMCIS Dashboard” accessible to all faculty and administrators through the OIR Academic Unit KPI dashboard.
4. Guidelines to all senators were given for scheduling a meeting with faculty in their units to complete the LMCIS Faculty Senate program review and complete a related strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, and safeguards and sustainability (SWOTS) analysis template.
5. Senators completed and submitted the LMCIS/SWOTS analysis reports for their units by April 15, 2021.
6. The completed and submitted LMCIS/SWOTS analysis reports were compiled and integrated into a single report for each college. Further analyses of KPIs across colleges were conducted by the working groups of the BFC.
7. The integrated LMCIS/SWOTS analysis report for each college and the senators reports for departments within the college were submitted to the dean of each college in May and June 2021.
8. A meeting with deans of all colleges was scheduled in the summer of 2021 and they are asked to submit their report back to the BFC by September 10, 2021.
9. The working group of the BFC received synopsis reports from deans, compiled these reports, and will present the review report to the Faculty Senate indicating that the Phase I LMCIS/SWOTS review is completed.

II. Phase I Final LMCIS/SWOTS Report

This phase I final LMCIS/SWOTS report consists of a summary of the reports received from each unit within the college and a comparison across colleges relevant to educational and financial KPIs and budgetary issues. Recommendations relevant to the educational and financial sustainability of colleges, departments, and programs are for ongoing and future continuous improvement in the post-pandemic era at the University of Memphis. This report details specific challenges, opportunities, strengths, weaknesses, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and comments relevant to Phase 1 educational and financial sustainability of all colleges, departments, and programs.

III. Review Process and Procedures

Phase I of the LMCIS/SWOTS analysis review was conducted in summer 2021 by following the below procedures and step-by-step processes:

1. Access the OIR Academic Unit KPI dashboard for each academic unit (College and Department) for five years 2016-2020.
2. Access Strategic Resource Investment, <https://www.memphis.edu/sri/> for 2022 and use SRI as a benchmark for KPIs.
3. Do trend and variance analyses for the five years KPIs and related SRI benchmark for each department to identify significant abnormality and red flags and cause and effects of abnormalities.
4. Do comparative analyses across colleges to find out significant differences and cause and effects of the differences.
5. The collected KPIs from the dashboard are measures of productivity in each department. They do not represent or measure efficiency and effectiveness. Thus, benchmarks such as SRI, average KPIs over five years, and peer KPIs need to be identified to, compared against, and used as measures of efficiency and effectiveness, which are relevant measures.
6. Integrate all unit's LMCIS/SWOTS reports to one report for each college.
7. Include individual unit's LMCIS/SWOTS reports for all departments within their respective colleges.
8. Submit these individual unit's LMCIS/SWOTS reports for all departments and the integrated report for each college to the dean of that college.
9. Make appointments to discuss the submitted reports.

IV. Plan of Action

A careful review of selected KPIs, SRI data, submitted departmental LMCIS/SWOTS review reports and related synopsis suggests several educational, financial sustainability, and governance issues relevant to each college. Deans of colleges were asked to review these reports and address the important and relevant issues identified by focusing on educational (program results and productivity), financial (effectiveness and efficiency of administrative

faculty and 4 staff support) and governance sustainability. Deans were asked to prepare the self-assessed and faculty-driven review report after all data for the school, departments, and degree programs have been reviewed. Deans were asked to be specific and relate conclusions and recommendations to relevant findings and objectives.

- Strengths
- Weaknesses
- Opportunities
- Threats
- Safeguards/Sustainability

More than 50 important **observations and considerations**, where future actions, changes or explanations are needed, were identified, and discussed with deans of colleges relevant to the three sustainability areas:

- A. Financial Sustainability**
- B. Educational Sustainability**
- C. Governance Sustainability**

V. Completion of Phase I LMCIS/SWOTS Analysis Review Process

Deans of all 12 reviewed colleges were asked to address things that concern them about their college/school educational, financial, and governance sustainability and safeguards that will take to ensure activities will be conducted better, stronger, and more sustainable (BSS). The review process and related reports provide an opportunity and present a platform for deans and the provost to discuss and resolve sustainability-related issues. The deans were submitted to a synopsis one-page report to the BFC. This report provides a synopsis of meeting discussion with deans and their responses to the concerns and challenges raised in the meetings. Several deans took the LMCID/SWOTS analysis review, the meetings with the BFC very seriously and prepared a comprehensive and relevant report in addressing educational, financial, and governance sustainability challenges of their college and discussed safeguards and sustainability measures that are designed to make their college more sustainable. Some deans did the minimum possible to discharge their reporting responsibility, whereas a few deans did not respond at all despite receiving several gentle reminders. Thus, the Phase I of the lean management and continuous improvement strategy (LMCIS) sustainability review process was completed on September 15, 2021. Phases II and III will be determined by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Provost Office and will be presented to senators in October meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Lessons Learned from the LMCIS/SWOTS Analysis Phase I Sustainability Process

- 1.** Sustainability is a process (journey) of identifying concerns and challenges and turning them into opportunities of doing financial, educational, and governance activities better, stronger, and more sustainable (BSS).
- 2.** Educational, financial, and governance sustainability issues are critical in obtaining and sustaining Carnegie Level I (RI) at the University of Memphis.

3. The Phase I LMCIS/SWOTS sustainability review process:

- a. provided a new platform that guaranteed that faculty were given the opportunity for input on financial, educational, and governance issues at the department, college, and university levels.
- b. highlighted the need for and importance of two-way communication between administrators and faculty/staff in narrowing the perceived trust gap and enabling participation, engagement, and impacts of faculty in shared governance and the sustainability decision-making process.
- c. established a common set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for academic units that can be referenced and viewed by administrators and faculty.
- d. provided a framework and roadmap for the continuation of the Phase II and III sustainability review process.
- e. created a pathway that paralleled the SRI budget process for deans of all academic affairs units to have more informed and transparent discussions with the central administration to address financial, educational, and governance issues of colleges and consideration of restructuring organizational structure and academic programs

A.2 Faculty Handbook Presentation



Why We Need to Make Changes to the Faculty Handbook?

Faculty Policies Standing Committee



State Law



2010 Tennessee Code Title 49 - Education
Chapter 8 - State University and Community College System
Part 3 - Tenure
49-8-301 - Authority of board.

- (a) The board shall promulgate a tenure policy or policies for faculty at institutions within the state university and community college system, which policy or policies shall ensure academic freedom and provide sufficient professional security to attract the best qualified faculty available for the institutions.
- (b) Pursuant to this part, the board shall:
- (1) Define the nature of tenure at institutions and the rights and responsibilities of faculty with tenure;
 - (2) Determine the minimum qualifications and requirements for eligibility of faculty for tenure and the conditions precedent to the award of tenure by the board;
 - (3) Provide for the termination of faculty with tenure by institutions for adequate cause, for retirement or disability and for financial reasons or curricular reasons in an institution in the discretion of the board or its designee; and
 - (4) Provide for all other matters relating to tenure deemed necessary by the board.
- (c) (1) Tenure shall only be acquired by a faculty member in an institution upon positive approval by the board, and no other type of tenure or right similar to tenure shall be acquired by a faculty member.
- (2) Faculty with tenure shall be subject to all reasonable changes in the tenure policy adopted by the board; provided, that faculty who have previously been awarded tenure shall retain their tenured status under any new policy. Present faculty in probationary employment shall be given credit for service in an institution toward completion of any new probationary period.



The Present





- The UoM Board of Trustees has not formally adopted any tenure policies or policies related to faculty to date but will be notified this year by legal that it has statutory responsibility to do so
 - The last major overhaul to the University of Memphis Faculty handbook was approved when the institution was Memphis State University
 - The Faculty Senate acknowledged 5 years ago that the Faculty Handbook needed to be significantly updated
 - Significant changes have not happened due to lack of agreement between the Faculty Senate, legal office, and the administration.
- 
- 



The Near Future



- The Board of Trustees is under no obligation to adopt any policies or practices in the current handbook and could write their own.
 - Univ. of Tennessee board approves controversial tenure changes, March 2018
 - Faculty concern over Univ. of Arkansas board policy on tenure, March 2018
 - The administration has expressed its concerns with aspects of the current handbook
 - The Faculty Handbook should reflect the University of Memphis in this century
 - An opportunity exists now for the Senate to have considerable say in faculty policies and practices that follow national norms and best practices that include strengthening shared governance
- 
- 

A.3 Committee on Committees Motion:

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

Be it resolved that, The Faculty Senate appoints the following faculty members nominated by the Committee on Committees to the following University Committees:

Ombudsperson search committee

Maggie Landry
Steven Nelson
Patrick Murphy

Indirect Cost Recovery and Faculty Buyout funds committee

Eddie Jacobs
Frances Fabian
William Alexander

Alcohol and Drug College Campus Connect

Rebecca Howard

Compliance Council

Shemeka Hamlin-Palmer
Esra Ozdenerol

Faculty Athletics Advisory Committee

Tracy M. Collins
Esra Ozdenerol

Eradicating Systemic Racism and Promoting Social Justice committee

Jill Dapremont

Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee

Mark Sunderman