



**Faculty Senate  
Minutes of the Executive Committee**

**Presiding:** Jill A. Dapremont

**Date:** November 23, 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)

The meeting was held on Tuesday, November 23, via the Zoom video conferencing platform due to restrictions imposed in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic.

**11.23.21.01 Call to Order**

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

**11.23.21.02 Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved as written.

**11.23.21.03 Approval of Minutes**

***(Executive Committee – October 19, 2021)***

The minutes of the October 19, 2021, Faculty Senate (FS) Executive Committee meeting were approved as written.

**11.23.21.04 President's Report**

***President's Council Update***

President Dapremont reported that there is no President's Council Update because the meetings have been canceled for the remainder of the year.

***Dean's Council Meeting***

President Dapremont reported that Provost Tom Nenen told the deans that faculty must comply with the January 4 mandate for full vaccination. Also, Dr. Nenen will address questions

regarding vaccinations in the next FS meeting. He suggests that faculty with questions should visit the university's COVID website for more information:  
<https://www.memphis.edu/coronavirusupdates/communications/november2021.php#mandate>

All exemption requests are processed through Human Resources (HR). Appeals will go through the Provost and President.

Senator Steven Nelson asked if faculty could take their vaccine card to HR instead of scanning/uploading? President Dapremont answered that she's not sure.

### ***Provost Nenon Meeting with EC***

President Dapremont reported that faculty must comply with the January 4 mandate for full vaccination, salary increase discussions depend on the governor's budget proposal and budget decisions are made in June. After discussion, the EC agreed to set a deadline of February 2021 for a Budget and Finance Committee charge on raise priorities. Faculty Trustee David Kemme noted that inflation is running about 6.2%.

### ***Canvas Steering Committee***

President Dapremont reported that access to Desire2Learn (D2L) will end for campus users in mid-December (around 12/17/2021) and Canvas Bootcamp training will take place between December 13 and December 16 (<https://www.memphis.edu/um3d/canvas/index.php>).

Parliamentarian Mark Sunderman reported that there are only two Canvas classes left for signup. President Dapremont will ask Dr. Scott Vann (Assistant Director of Digital Learning) about additional training opportunities. Parliamentarian Sunderman suggested that more Canvas training sessions should be scheduled in early January before the semester begins. President Dapremont to pass on the request to Scott Vann.

President Dapremont reported that Robert Jackson (Chief Information Officer) noted in an email to her that the law school will be allowed early access to Canvas on December 27. Further, CIO Jackson noted that there are problems with granting access that early. He suggested opening courses on January 3 so that the university will be open and support will be available. President Dapremont to work with the Administrative Policies Committee on the issue.

### ***Preparedness Planning Meeting***

President Dapremont reported that the Preparedness Committee met last week. The University of Memphis and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville have received an exemption for vaccination mandates. HR will process vaccine cards. The mask mandate is still in place. Exemptions for the vaccine mandate will go through HR. Appeals will go through the Provost and the President. The Provost has not gone on record concerning consequences, but he will be in the FS meeting to answer questions.

### **11.23.21.05 Old Business**

#### ***Presidential Search Committee***

President Dapremont reported that Dr. Bill Hardgrave has been selected to serve as the 13th President of University of Memphis by the Board of Trustees (BOT). We don't know his start date yet.

#### ***Ombudsperson Search***

President Dapremont reported that the Ombudsperson Search Committee put forth the name of Dr. Sara K. Bridges, Associate Professor, Counseling, Educational Psychology & Research. The EC can't share that information until President M. David Rudd has an opportunity to review the nomination.

Parliamentarian Sunderman asked about the university's R1 status. President Dapremont replied that we're still waiting on confirmation.

### **11.23.21.06 Reports**

President Dapremont reported that Senator Mihalios Golias, Research Policies Committee Chair, submitted responses to the EC's questions (see Appendix). She spoke to the document and the EC discussed a potential motion for Faculty Policies Committee on the new rankings. The EC agreed that President Dapremont will ask Senator Golias to discuss the report in the next FS meeting and post the report in MS Teams for comments. His report to the FS should be a discussion about recommendations for promotions beyond the current three ranks.

President Dapremont made the EC aware of the other reports that will be on the FS agenda.

The EC agreed to charge the Administrative Policies Committee with the question about non-compliance on security awareness training.

Parliamentarian Sunderman noted that ITS (Information Technology Services) does not follow up when faculty report to [abuse@memphis.edu](mailto:abuse@memphis.edu).

Past-president Marchetta reported that the draft of the handbook is about 75% complete. He also reported that some faculty have requested that categories be collapsed between instructor and lecturer. The Provost supports the idea. He plans to make changes with other handbook change motions.

### **11.23.21.07 New Business**

President Dapremont reviewed the motions that have been submitted for the next FS meeting. She began with the motion from Senator Scott Sundvall - Motion to End University Contracting with Upswing (See Appendix). After discussion, the EC decided that President Dapremont will request that Richard (Dick) Irwin (Executive Dean, UofM Global, Academic Innovation, College of Professional & Liberal Studies) attend the FS meeting to address the Upswing motion.

President Dapremont brought to the attention of the EC the motion from Senator Sundvall - Motion to Overhaul LMCIS Initiative and Process (See Appendix) and the motion from Senator Ted Burkey - Motion to Survey U of M faculty need for student access to online course content (See Appendix).

Past-President Marchetta suggested that the motion from Senator Burkey be sent to CIO Jackson and Dr. Vann. President Dapremont to send the back to the Administrative Policies Committee and suggest that Senator Burkey specify that it be sent to the CIO, UM3D and the Provost as well as making a title change.

President Dapremont reviewed the draft FS agenda for the November 30, 2021, meeting.

#### **11.23.21.08 Announcements**

President Dapremont announced that graduation is at the FedEx Forum on December 12, 2021. There will be no Executive Committee or Faculty Senate Meeting in December 2021.

#### ***David Kemme – Trustee Report***

There was no Trustee report.

#### ***Gloria Carr – Ombudsperson Report***

There was no Ombudsperson report.

#### **11.23.21.09 Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:31pm.

## Appendix

### *Research Policies Committee responses to EC questions:*

#### UMRC T&P Carnegie R1 Taskforce: Aligning T&P Promotion

#### Response to Faculty Senate Comments

11/08/2021

1. Full Professor continue be the highest rank at the university. Only a few universities have adopted additional ranks.

**Committee Response:** We agree with this assessment. On the positive side, we have an opportunity to become one of the first universities in our region to set this new trend by offering new post-professor promotion opportunities for our faculty. The proposed additional ranks are of particular benefits to UofM in its transition from R2 to R1 status, providing opportunities for keeping nationally/internationally renowned faculty, as well as increased ability to attract such faculty to the institution.

2. Looking at the composition of the committee making the recommendations, it seems clear STEM faculty who bring in significant amounts of external funding will be the beneficiaries of additional promotions. The arts, humanities, education, and law amongst other faculty as a whole will be shut out.

**Committee Response:** We note that our current committee consists of three faculty in STEM disciplines and six from non-STEM disciplines such as business school, nursing, fine arts, public health, hospitality, and education. Their diverse experiences and opinions helped the committee arrive at the current wording in the recommendations that recognize achievements of each faculty in their respective disciplines and contributions to their respective departments/colleges. The criteria for promotion to these ranks will be developed within each unit as a part of their T&P guidelines. Therefore, if external funding is not already an important criterion in a discipline, it will not necessarily be added for the additional ranks.

3. Many colleagues may not be able to achieve the suggested higher ranks.

**Committee Response:** See response to #2 above. The additional ranks are meant to be for exceptional performance and stature in ones discipline, therefore, not meant to be common at the university.

4. These ranks create two separate universities.

**Committee Response:** See response to #2, #5, and #7. Many universities have faculty ranks such as Distinguished Professor. In the same way that Assistant/Associate/full professor ranks do not create separate universities, there is no reason to believe the additional proposed ranks will.

5. While the morale for a few faculty will increase, the morale for most who feel they may not be able to achieve this level of productivity will decrease.

**Committee Response:** We would welcome suggestions on how best to address this as the intent of the recommendations are to help improve the prestige of the entire university that can, in turn, increase the pride of each faculty. The additional ranks are expected to increase to moral of faculty who achieve them and be aspirational for other faculty. The same argument can be made for the ranks of Assistant/Associate/Professor.

6. How will salary increases for these ranks be paid for?

**Committee Response:** The general salary level of faculty at R1 institutions are higher than at R2 institutions. It is because of increased support from the state, greater access to external funds, higher tuition revenue, and larger donations, among others. While quantifying the expected increase in resources can be the task of another committee on financial aspects of these recommendations, it is expected that greater productivity can bring in greater revenues than that needed to pay for these newly proposed promotions.

7. Salary compression and inversion amongst the three ranks we have is still a significant issue and has not been significantly addressed. Given the limited salary pools we currently have to work with annually, the compression and inversion will only get worse if 3 additional ranks are added. We will continue to fall behind in cost of living.

**Committee Response:** We very much recognize these concerns and agree with the need to use the current salary pool allocations to address salary compression and inversion. As described in response to #6, we believe that boosting faculty productivity can not only bring in additional revenue to address salary compression and inversion, but it can also raise the general salary level in the university to be more in line with a solid R1 university.

8. The university already have endowments and chairs of excellence for faculty who achieve very high research productivity.

**Committee Response:** While we are fortunate to have some chair of excellence positions at UofM that help us attract and retain some star faculty, we believe that we have many more highly productive faculty whose efforts go unrecognized with elevation in ranks and salary due to the very limited number of such endowed positions. Further, unlike the systematic process (i.e., the T&P guidelines) in place that any current faculty can follow to attain the ranks of Associate and Full professor (usually in their first 12-15 years of faculty career), there is no process in place to continue to earn similar promotion in 30+ years that faculty spend at the rank of full professor. For example, the T&P guidelines do not provide a path to earn an endowed or chair of excellence rank. These recommendations are meant to address these shortcomings, and create new promotion opportunities for each faculty at UofM.

9. The university already have endowments for faculty who achieve very high research productivity.

**Committee Response:** See response to #8 above.

## **A.2 Motion to End University Contracting with Upswing**

### **MOTION TO END UNIVERSITY CONTRACTING WITH UPSWING**

Submitted to President Dapremont

October 29, 2021

Whereas,

Upswing is a third-party, private sector, online academic support platform that costs upwards of \$23 an hour for their tutors/consultants, while consultants for the Center for Writing and Communication (CWC) make \$17 an hour or less, with tutors in Educational Support Programs (ESP) making even less;

Whereas,

Upswing consultants/tutors often hold only Bachelors degrees from universities less prestigious than our own and often claim expertise in fields outside of their degrees;

Whereas,

Upswing consultants/tutors are not vetted, hired, or trained by the CWC or ESP;

Whereas,

Upswing consultants/tutors are not University of Memphis (UofM) students in need of additional, institutional support;

Whereas,

All CWC consultants are graduate students from the English Department or the Department of Communication;

Whereas,

The UofM has a fiscal and academic responsibility to our students (both CWC/ESP consultants/tutors and the corresponding clients) to provide the best and most cost-effective academic support, of which Upswing provides neither;

Whereas,

Scott Sundvall, previous Director of the CWC, has noted this issue for the past two years in all his semester and annual reports, and has recursively brought it to the attention of Student Academic Success in individual meetings without any reasonable explanation or move to change such contracting in response.

Be it resolved,

Faculty Senate recommends that the UofM cease renewal of contracts with Upswing and provide all academic support (whether face-to-face or in-person) in-house. It further recommends an increase of pay to all UofM consultants/tutors to \$20 an hour for graduate students and \$15 an hour for undergraduate students, as such is still nonetheless well below the demonstrated market price, of which the UofM is otherwise willing to pay to less qualified, non-UofM consultants/tuto



### **A.3 Motion to Overhaul LMCI Initiative and Process**

#### **MOTION TO OVERHAUL LMCI INITIATIVE AND PROCESS**

Whereas,

Faculty Senate has received conflicting, inconsistent, or contradictory information regarding the exigence and procedural protocol for the Lean Management and Continuous Improvement (LMCI) initiative, including but not limited to the following:

a) Provost Thomas Nenon explicitly stated during a Faculty Senate meeting that the LMCI initiative was faculty-initiated, yet the motion on which the Faculty Senate voted (M2020.21.13) on October 27, 2020 states that, “On September 1, 2020, Provost Nenon requested the Budget and Finance Committee (BFC) to conduct Lean Management and Continuous Improvement reviews.”

b) Faculty Senate was repeatedly told in meetings that such an LMCI process was not intended to significantly cut or eliminate departments or programs, specifically with regard to their budgets, but to improve their general operation and value, as implicitly reflected in the verbiage of the motion (M2020.21.13) itself; yet, the “Faculty Senate Charge Log AY2020-21” clearly states the following: “Work with Administration to quantify and carefully assess low producing programs for potential permanent budget reductions beginning FY22. Consider student success, student retention, research productivity, and the broader impacts of budget reductions to the unit or university,” (8/25/2020) and “Review unit budget proposals for potential permanent budget reductions beginning FY22. Look for Administrator and Staff efficiencies at unit levels. Student success, student retention, and research productivity should be considered” (8/25/2020).

c) As reflected in an email thread (10/23/2021 – 10/29/2021) between members of the Budget and Finance Committee, there is disagreement amongst the members of this committee regarding the history, development, and execution of the LMCI initiative.

d) There has been little verbal or written transparency regarding the LMCI process, as reflected in the written documents herein provided (see: Appendix) but not previously provided to the Faculty Senate. There has been no relay of the concluding reports of Phase I of the LMCI initiative as presented to the Deans to the Faculty Senate in general, the executive chair members of the corresponding sub-committees (financial and non-financial) in particular, nor were such entities consulted in the formation of such

concluding reports.

e) Verbal accounts of the history and purpose of the LMCI initiative, as given during Faculty Senate meetings over the past year, have been inconsistent at best, contradictory at worst.

Whereas,

The Faculty Senate cannot have any trust in the LMCI initiative as it has been presented and undertaken, as reflected by the above preambulatory clause.

Whereas,

The Faculty Senate carries the charge and responsibility of, amongst other things, protecting the interests of faculty and not those of Administration or the Board of Trustees.

Whereas,

Provost Nenon (and by extension, Administration) ostensibly supports faculty-initiated participation in academic and budgetary reviews.

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate 1) has no confidence in the LMCI initiative; 2) does not support any conclusions found in the reports of Phase I of the LMCI initiative as provided to Deans; 3) calls for the formation of a faculty-initiated academic and budgetary review committee, as inaugurated by the Faculty Senate, Academic and Budget Transparency Committee (ABTC). The ABTC will be comprised of five (5) members from Faculty Senate, to be nominated and elected via a separate motion, pending the passing of this motion.

***Motion to Survey U of M faculty need for student access to online course content***

**M2021.11.30 Motion to Survey U of M faculty need for student access to online course content**

**Originator: Administrative Polices Committee**

Whereas,

The Administrative Polices Committee used Qualtrics to survey U of M faculty need for student access to online course content before classes start. As of Nov 12, 373 faculty responded, 130 (34.85%) said they would like the students to have early access while 243 (65.15%) said they would not like the students to have early access. It is clear to the committee that both options should be available.

Be it resolved that,

Student access to early online course content should not be for all or no courses. Prior to the beginning of classes each semester, faculty should be able to select which courses students have access before the first day of class. Likewise online course content for classes that are not selected would not be available until the first day of classes.

Recipients:

Faculty Senate