Minutes of the Faculty Senate

Presiding: William P. Travis (Health Studies) **Date: 1-31-2023**

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

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

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

Senators Absent: Brian Janz (Info & Tech), Daniel E. Millican (Military Sciences, Naval Sciences), James McGinnis (Engineering Tech), Patrick Murphy (Counseling, Edu Psychology & Research), Esra Ozdenerol (Earth Sciences), Matthew Parris (Biological Sciences), and Zabi Rezaee (Accountancy).

Faculty Senate Information Officer: To be determined.

Guests: Sara K. Bridges (Ombudsperson), Jill Dapremont (Past President), Bill Hardgrave (UofM President), Richard Evans for David Cox (UMAR Rep), Markia Hilliard (Admin Assoc), David Kemme (Faculty Trustee), Abby Parrill-Baker (Provost), and Leigh Williams.

The four-hundred-and-ninety-third meeting of the University of Memphis Faculty Senate was held on Tuesday, January 31, 2023, via the Zoom video conferencing platform due to restrictions imposed in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic.

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

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

1.31.23.02   APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as written.

1.31.23.03   APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the November 29, 2022, Faculty Senate (FS) meeting were approved as written.

1.31.23.04   PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Travis reported that he sent out the notice for Faculty Trustee applications, revised the due date for Faculty Trustee applications to February 1, 2023, and attended all President's Council meetings.

President Travis yielded to University President Bill Hardgrave who reported that the TN legislature went into session a couple weeks ago. The University has requested $65M request in research modernization which would be used to renovate fifteen buildings on campus and includes converting some space into labs. The proposal was highly ranked by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC). The University also requested $5.4M for safety and security measures that would include fencing, police cars, cameras, software, etc. The city of Memphis asked for a couple hundred million dollars for renovation of the Liberty Bowl. Decisions on the proposals won't be known until the legislative session ends, probably in mid-May. The Governor's state of the state address is next Monday, so we may get some indication from that speech. Regarding the strategic plan, over 1,100 people provided input and feedback on the draft plan. The strategic planning team has incorporated feedback into the plan and circulated it to key stakeholders. The final draft will go to the Board of Trustees on March 1 for vote on adoption. If approved, the University will begin rolling it out immediately.

1.31.23.05   REPORTS

Standing Committee Reports

Committee on Committees: Chair, Genae Strong

President Travis yielded to Committee on Committees (CoC) Chair Genae Strong who reported that the Committee has worked to secure nominations for the Faculty Appeals Committee relative to the 2022 Faculty Handbook in the event of a tribunal. The motion presented today provides a list of nineteen faculty nominations and their proposed term limits.

A second motion from the CoC has a list of nominations for appointments to various University committees. It will be presented in the next meeting

The CoC seeks tenured faculty at the professor rank who are well versed in the appeals process, not currently serving on the Faculty Appeals Committees, and able to serve as a conflict-free advisor to an appellant during the appeals process. There is currently a need for three Appeals Advocates and she solicited those interested to contact her.

Academic Policies Committee: Chair, Edith Gnanadass

President Travis yielded to Academic Policies Committee Chair Edith Gnanadass who reported that the Committee has nothing to report.

Academic Support Committee: Chair, Andrew Hussey

President Travis yielded to Academic Support Committee Chair Andrew Hussey who reported that the Committee is working on two charges. One is the role of Canvas observers. The Committee is aiming to provide alternative options to the current approach – ones that might be seen as less intrusive by some faculty members. Their hope is to have something substantive to report on this at the next FS meeting.

The Committee is also looking into the allocation and carry forward of TAF funds. There is nothing to report on this issue at this time.

Also, Senator Hussey reported on a feature in Canvas that the University is trying to implement - the student display name option. While different pronouns are available, for the student's name, only the default given legal name is currently allowed. This is an issue related to inclusiveness and equity. It seems there are some technical issues with allowing flexibility of names, but this is something that is likely to be available relatively soon – perhaps this summer.

Faculty Policies Committee: Chair, Jeff Marchetta

President Travis yielded to Faculty Policies Committee Chair Jeff Marchetta who reported that the Committee has nothing to report.

Research Policies Committee: Chair, Mike Gkolias

President Travis yielded to Research Policies Committee Chair Mike Gkolias who reported that the Committee has reviewed the intellectual property policy. The Committee met with Dr. Jasbir Dhaliwal (Executive Vice President for Research and Innovation) last week and will meet with the University of Memphis Research Council (UMRC) in March to get feedback.

Administrative Policies Committee: Chair, Ted Burkey

President Travis yielded to Administrative Policies Committee Chair Ted Burkey who reported that the Committee is working on two charges. The first is a review of the faculty survey of administrators to determine whether the FS should continue with the annual survey and if it should continue, should it be revised. As was seen in an earlier report from the Committee, response rates for the survey have been low. The Interim Provost suggested that dean performance information could be made available to relevant faculty ahead of the survey. The Committee is considering a request to the Provost and University President for similar information to be made available to faculty ahead of the survey. The Committee believes that even with low response rates, the surveys are useful and provide faculty an opportunity to voice their opinions.

The second charge that the Committee is working on is a review of the Children on Campus policy to determine if there is any need for revision. The Committee's first step on this charge is to create a report comparing policies from other universities. A subcommittee has discovered that some of this work has already been completed (See Appendix A.1). The policy is currently under review by a committee in Human Resources (HR) and the Committee is waiting for that review to be completed before moving forward.

Library Policies Committee: Chair, Frances Fabian

President Travis yielded to Library Policies Committee Chair Frances Fabian who reported that the Committee has nothing to report.

Budget and Finance Committee: Chair, Zabi Rezaee

President Travis yielded to Senator Alistair Windsor who reported on behalf of Budget and Finance Committee Chair Zabi Rezaee that one of the charges before the Committee is to compare our faculty salaries with faculty salaries from peer institutions. Because the University recently achieved Carnegie R1 status, our list of peer institutions is in flux. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) has recently published a revised list of peer institutions that is very different from the list the Committee received in October. Senator Windsor suggested that Senators review the revised list of peer institutions with faculty in their unit ahead of a vote on the list that the Committee intends to bring forward in the next FS meeting (See Appendix A.2 for more details).

1.31.23.06   NEW BUSINESS

Motion to approve the proposed COC list of tenured faculty for T&P Appeals Committee Dr. Genae Strong, Chair Committee on Committees

President Travis yielded to Committee on Committees Chair Strong who presented the motion (See Appendix A.3).

Parliamentarian Jeff Marchetta made a motion to amend, and the motion was seconded by Past President Jill Dapremont.

Motion to amend: Replace Celia Anderson with William Hunter, Professor, Instructional and Curriculum Leadership and replace Kenneth Haggerty with Kimbrough Oller, Professor, Communication Sciences and Disorders. Change term of Lisa Lucks Mendel from 2-year term to 1-year term and change Dennis Laumann's term to a 2-year term.

The motion is amended by a vote of 38 for, 0 against, and 1 abstain.

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

Motion to approve peer institutions recommended by the Business and Finance Committee Dr. Alister Windsor, member Business and Finance Committee

The motion was withdrawn by the Business and Finance Committee.

Motion to approve Deans Evaluations, Dr. Theodore Burkey Chair Administrative Policies Committee

The motion was withdrawn by the Administrative Policies Committee.

1.31.23.07   ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Travis announced that Faculty Trustee David Kemme is available for questions about the Faculty Trustee position either during this meeting or afterwards in private.

1.31.23.08   ADJOURN

President Travis made a motion to adjourn, and the motion was seconded by Parliamentarian Marchetta.

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

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 pm.

Children on Campus Policy Review

Contributors

Leah C. Windsor
Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English
Institute for Intelligent Systems
Director, Women+'s Mentorship Network

Leigh Harrell-Williams
Associate Professor, Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology and Research
College of Education
Director, Women+'s Mentorship Network

Alistair J. Windsor
Associate Professor, Department of Mathematical Sciences
Director, Institute for Intelligent Systems

Current Status of the Research

AAUP Overview

In their AAUP article on campus policies on children, Olson Beal et al., begin by discussing their prior efforts to ensure their college campus is a family-friendly environment for employees to bring their children [1]. The authors highlight their roles as mothers, knowing firsthand that certain environmental factors (e.g., the availability of changing tables and lactation spaces) are important when balancing work and parenthood and ensuring full opportunities for women to fulfill their work and family obligations.

Olson Beal et al surveyed campus employees on the types of policies at their universities that address the presence of employees' children on campus via academic social-media groups and through professional organization email lists. They found that 121 (48.4%) of the 250 respondents did not work at a university where there was a children on campus policy and, to their knowledge, there was no such policy in progress. Additionally, 69 respondents (27.6%) were unsure if their university had a policy, 6 respondents (2.4%) said that their institution did not have a policy but was developing one, and 54 respondents (21.6%) said that their institution did have a child on campus policy. Beal et al also analyzed the existing policies from the 30 institutions that had existing child policies. The policies outlined appropriate times for children to be on campus. Many institutions noted in their policies that bringing a child into the workplace is not a substitute for

regular childcare. Many of the policies also note that some areas on campus always prohibit children - including areas such as laboratories, equipment rooms, food preparation areas, etcetera. They also note that many of the policies mention that children on campus may have several implications such as disrupting the workplace, affecting productivity or other activities.

Pandemic-era changes to family life

As Crawford and Windsor have noted, the pandemic put the work-life nexus on full display since parents were suddenly forced to cope with working and monitoring their children's learning-from-home arrangements when schools and workplaces closed in March 2020 [2,3]. Remote work and school co-existed simultaneously, and adults found themselves juggling work responsibilities and childcare duties with little preparation or assistance. The COVID-19 pandemic put childcare front and center as a national crisis [4,5] which disproportionately affected women [6,7].

The Gender Double Bind

The gender double bind describes how women face negative consequences for behavior that runs contrary to commonly, widely held beliefs about how men and women should behave [8]. When women flout these gender norms, their careers and reputations can suffer. Women and men faculty, staff, and students encounter different consequences for the same behavior. Because of gendered norms of behavior, women face penalties for behavior for which men are praised, for example in performance evaluations, stopping the tenure clock, and equity in the quality of letters of recommendation [9–12].

Women who advocate for themselves (in negotiations for salary or compensation, for example) are often labeled aggressive or contentious, whereas men who engage in similar self-advocacy are rewarded for being proactive and ambitious. Commonly accepted wisdom has held that women are paid less than men, or promoted less than men, because they fail to ask and advocate for themselves. Recent findings from an Australian study find contrary evidence: women, in fact, do lobby on their own behalf, but not only are they denied better salaries or promotions, but they also face reputational consequences for speaking up [10]. Furthermore, the gender double bind is exacerbated under the conditions of intersectionality [13]. BIPOC, LGBTQIA+, and neurodivergent scholars face compounded challenges, as the biases and hurdles they encounter are amplified across layered identities [14–16].

The gender double bind also applies to bringing children to campus. Anecdotally, men have reported that they bring their children - even infants - to campus, and receive praise for "being a good dad [17]." On the other hand, women in academia who bring their children to campus are labeled "unprofessional," especially in their teaching evaluations which often count toward tenure and promotion. These disparities are often seen in the Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness (SETEs), where negativity bias emphasizes the elements of classroom environments

2

that students did not like. In many cases, the open-ended survey responses elicit feedback that is not germane to the learning environment but rather focus on instructor attributes, such as attractiveness. To be clear, both men and women who do not follow prescribed gender norms can suffer consequences in their careers, but the implications for men are often attenuated as compared to women.

To mitigate the effects of the gender double bind, university policies should be clearly communicated, transparent, and equitably applied across individuals, departments, and colleges/schools.

Cradle to College: The UofM Context

The University of Memphis has demonstrated a commitment to supporting families from the "cradle to college." Under this model, the UofM houses the Early Learning Resource Center for children ages 2 through 5 (or just prior to starting kindergarten). Campus School teaches Kindergarten through 5th grade, and Campus Middle and Campus High Schools currently extend through the 9th grade and will continue to expand through 12th grade in the upcoming years. The University of Memphis also recently updated its Family Leave policy, initiating paid parental leave for six weeks for the arrival of a new child.

As the Daily Memphian describes, "Soon, a youngster will be able to attend a University of Memphis school from the cradle all the way to college — and part of that is the new University High. The school will open next fall in the new Orgel Education Center, named after Shelby County Schools board member Billy Orgel and his wife Robin Salky Orgel. They have pledged $1 million to University Middle and University High. The U of M is also opening Plum Academy in Orange Mound early next year; it will serve 300 children, ranging from infants to pre-K."

One of the UofM's core strengths is that it educates many non-traditional students, including student-parents, military veterans, and returning learners. A university survey/study would help to identify how a more family-friendly campus would provide these non-traditional students with opportunities to complete their degrees more efficiently and improve graduation rates.

Summary of the Current UofM Policy

The University of Memphis' policy toward children on campus begins with the following statement: "The University of Memphis encourages safe, supervised campus visitations by children for the purposes of making decisions about their academic future; attending music classes, educational, cultural, or sporting events and camps; and authorized use of facilities such as the Campus Recreation Center."

The key points from Policy HR 5063 - Children on Campus are as follows:

- The University seeks to ensure the appropriate supervision of children on campus
- Children are defined as minors under the age of 18
- Supervised is defined as a responsible adult attending to the health, safety, and welfare of child/ren in their care
  - Unsupervised is defined as children in the care of an adult while s/he is performing work, teaching, or other activities that distracts their attention from the child.
- Instructors may use their discretion to have children in the classroom with "infrequent exceptions due to temporary, unforeseen emergencies."
- Children are allowed in offices for:
  - Short, occasional visits
  - Infrequent exceptions granted by a supervisor
- Children are not allowed in offices for:
  - An alternative to regular childcare provisions (infant care; childcare during summers and holidays)
  - When the child is too ill to attend regular accommodations
  - Provision of child care (including early dismissals)
  - Times when the presence of the child interferes with normal operations.
- Supervisors are accountable for ensuring these policies are upheld.
  - Faculty/staff needing time to resolve childcare issues must take personal/sick leave to do so.
- Children are not allowed to roam campus unsupervised, and there are many locations that are strictly off-limits due to health and safety hazards.
- A set of Frequently Asked Questions outlines how to address problems such as:
  - What a supervisor should do if an employee brings a child to work without permission.
  - How to handle childcare hardships (see HR 5061 - Alternative Work Arrangements).

Summary of Policy Typologies

> ### Safety, welfare, and well-being of minors on campus

These policies address mandated reporting, FERPA guidelines, minor children enrolled in programming and/or research studies on campus, and identifying abuse and neglect.

➢ **Maintaining a professional, safe work environment**

These policies address maintaining a safe, professional work environment and make clear that children are only allowed for short, infrequent visits due to unforeseen circumstances. Children may not be in the workplace in lieu of other childcare arrangements, and employees seeking exceptions must be approved by a supervisor.

➢ **No policy reported**

Several institutions have no formal policy regarding children or minors on campus.

➢ **No specific children on campus policy; general family-friendly policy**

Some universities have no specific policy prohibiting children on campus, nor defining the parameters of children on campus. Rather, they have a general family-friendly policy of accommodation.

Summary of Findings from Peer Institutions

Institution	Link	Summary
Boise State University	https://www.boisestate.edu/compliance/minors-on-campus/faq/	Minors on campus related to protection, safeguarding, background checks, and child care.
West Virginia University	https://diversity.wvu.edu/equity-assurance/children-on-campus	Child safety and protection, minors on campus, protecting children; housed under Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
University of Wisconsin-Madison		No specific policy; children in college (learning program)
University of North Carolina-Greensboro	https://policy.uncg.edu/university-policies/minors_on_campus/	Protection of children on campus; mandatory reporting
University of Nevada-Reno	https://www.unr.edu/administrative-manual/3000-3999-students/3025-children-in-the-	Policy of limited time on campus/in the classroom for children (not appropriate venue)

	classroom	
Texas Tech University	https://www.depts.ttu.edu/opmanual/OP34.16.php	Children permitted as guests on a limited basis
Kent State	https://www.kent.edu/compliance/campus-activities-involving-minors	Protection of minors on campus
East Carolina University	https://library.ecu.edu/2022/08/09/a-welcoming-environment-for-young-visitors/	Welcoming policy for minors at the University libraries
University of New Mexico	https://compliance.unm.edu/minors-on-campus/index.html	Protection of minors on campus
Mississippi State University	https://www.ocrm.msstate.edu/focus-areas/children-youth	Protection of minors on campus
University of North Texas		None found. There are policies for parental leave, lactation, and youth programs, but nothing about faculty bringing children to work.
Auburn	https://sites.auburn.edu/admin/universitypolicies/Policies/PolicyonChildrenintheWorkplace.pdf	Auburn University cannot allow the continued or reoccurring presence of children (defined as persons below the age of eighteen years old) in the workplace for the following reasons: (1) the potential for interruption of work; (2) health and safety concerns; and (3) liability to the University. It is not appropriate for children to be in the workplace on a regular basis, including after school or school holidays. Children may be brought to the workplace by parent employees for other exceptional times when common sense would dictate that it is more efficient for the employee to bring the child into the workplace.
Texas State University	https://policies.txst.edu/university-policies.html#sitesearch=policies.tx	The alternate work location must be free of distractions. Remote work arrangements are not intended to serve as a routine substitute for child or adult care. For long-term remote work

	st.edu&query=chi ldren&page=1&s ort=relevance&sit e=txstate_no_user s&client=txstate	arrangements only, if children or adults in need of primary care are in the alternative work location during the employee's work hours, some other individual must be present to provide the care. https://policies.txst.edu/university-policies/04-04-01.html#section.06.01 University employees may bring their children to the workplace, provided that the visits are infrequent, brief, and planned in a fashion that limits disruption to the workplace. If a child's presence in the workplace becomes problematic, the employee will be advised and expected to take corrective action.
Cornell University	https://static1.squ arespace.com/stat ic/58e51ba6db29 d619dcb73826/t/5 a904e3a085229b2 645a3be4/151940 6653812/cornellp olicy_regardingm inors.pdf	Protection of minors, reporting abuse, duty to report
University of Alabama at Birmingham	https://www.uab.e du/youthprotectio n/our-policy	UAB places importance on creating a secure environment for children. Policies focus on reporting abuse and child safety.
Columbia University		I cannot find any mention of a policy about children on campus at Columbia. The faculty handbook is here: http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/handbook/ and a more up to date list of "essential policies" is here: https://fas.columbia.edu/home/essential-policies-columbia-community
UNC Chapel Hill	https://policies.un c.edu/TDClient/2 833/Portal/KB/Ar ticleDet?ID=1318 64	Protection of minors, duty to report
Vanderbilt University	https://www.vand erbilt.edu/riskman agement/pompoli cyJune2018.php	Protection of minors; duty to report; interacting with minors; research with minors
The University of Southern California	https://policy.usc. edu/minors-on- campus/	
UCLA	http://www.colleg	Bringing children into the workplace creates a

	e.ucla.edu/person nel/staff/poli_chil .asp	number of problems, and puts the College at risk. Although it may be a good solution for an individual employee, compared to the expense and logistics of external childcare, it is problematic for supervisors, co-workers, and the work environment of the College. • Children are distracting, especially young children, even when they are well-behaved • Few buildings on campus were designed for the safety of children • Most departments don't have extra space for children • Some amount of adult supervision is required if children are present, and any time spent on that supervision is time not spent on departmental work • Employees without children, or those who have made other arrangements for the care of their children, resent the perceived benefit received by those who bring their children to work
University of Michigan	https://childrenon campus.umich.ed u/about/policy/	Reporting obligations; background checks; safety of children
Georgetown University	https://protectiono fminors.georgeto wn.edu/policy/#	Mandated reporters, focused on safety of children; abuse and neglect
Baruch College - CUNY	https://president.b aruch.cuny.edu/le gal-and- labor/baruch- cuny-policies- forms/children- on- campus/#:~:text=I n%20general%2C %20employees% 20are%20prohibit ed.health%2C%2 0safety%2C%20a nd%20welfare.	In general, employees are prohibited from bringing children on campus except as permitted by the College policy, so as to ensure that employees, students and visitors are not exposed to harm or risks to their health, safety, and welfare. Children in the workplace create potential liabilities for the College, departments, offices, and managers themselves. Due to the potential health risks to others, children with a communicable illness cannot be brought to campus. However, Baruch College, as an equal opportunity employer, is committed to equal access to employment conditions regardless of an individual's status with respect to other family members or dependent care. Moreover, the College is committed to promoting an equitable culture that is supportive of the needs and career aspirations of

		employees and creating "Family friendly" work strategies to assist staff trying to balance the various demands of work and family responsibilities. **Baruch College has a form for employees to fill out to bring a child into the workplace
George Mason University	https://universityp olicy.gmu.edu/pol icies/children-and-minors-in-the-workplace/	While Mason is very oriented toward flexibility and work/life integration, the safety and well-being of all faculty, staff, and visitors is of utmost importance. The worksite is not necessarily designed for children, and can pose safety hazards for them. Further, children and minors at the worksite can distract employees from their primary duties.
Borough of Manhattan Community College - CUNY	https://www.bmc c.cuny.edu/hr/em ployees/policies/c hildren-on-campus/	For this reason, young children who are not registered in the child care center should not be brought to the campus, and, of course, may not attend classes with their parent or guardian. There may be occasions when brief visits by children of students may be necessary. Children may visit college offices and facilities, **other than classrooms,** for limited periods of time when their parent or guardian is conducting routine business at the college. **Regular repeated visits by children are not permitted.**
Florida International University	https://policies.fiu .edu/files/42.pdf	University employees are prohibited from bringing children on campus during working hours. Supervisors may grant permission for a temporary, unforeseen emergency, but no parent can have a child in the workplace without the supervisor's permission or use the workplace as an alternative to childcare or for any other purpose. However, children exhibiting symptoms of potentially contagious illnesses will not be allowed.
Tennessee State University	https://www.tnsta te.edu/hr/docume nts/policiesandpro cedures/Children %20in%20the%2 0Workplace.pdf	University policy prohibits the presence of children in the workplace for other than official university activities involving children. Employees with dependent children are expected to make regular arrangements for proper care of their children while at work.
Yale University	https://your.yale.e du/work-yale/staff-	Children may not be cared for in the workplace. Other arrangements must be made.

	workplace-policies	
Vanderbilt University	https://hr.vanderbilt.edu/policies/relationships-in-workplace.php	Children, family members, associates or friends are welcome for occasional, brief visits in the workplace. However, children may not visit the workplace if their presence conflicts with department policy, federal or state law. Employees may bring children to appropriate University-sponsored programs and activities. Supervisors may approve non-routine visits that do not interfere with an employee's ability to perform his/her work functions or the productivity of a work unit.
Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis (Department of Developmental Biology)	https://developmentalbiology.wustl.edu/items/children-in-the-workplace/	It is inappropriate for children and other relatives of employees to remain in the employee's workplace during working hours. In addition, University property whether owned or leased should not be used in lieu of making appropriate child care arrangements elsewhere. This policy is intended to minimize potential liability to Washington University, avoid risk of harm to children and reduce distractions and disruptions affecting employee productivity.
University of Missouri-St Louis	https://www.umsl.edu/studentconduct/guidelines-for-children-on-campus.html	However, the campus is not usually an appropriate place for pre-high school aged children to be present on a frequent or continuing basis, except when the child is accessing a university sponsored and/or approved program or residing in a campus residence with an enrolled student or active employee. The following points limit the presence of children on the UMSL campus: 1. There are many campus environmental factors that could pose a danger to children. 2. Children can create distractions that interfere with education-related activities and general operations of the university. 3. Any incident in which a child is harmed could create liability for the university. 4. Children should not be brought to campus on a regular basis in lieu of childcare.

California State University, Los Angeles (could not find campus wide policy, only one for the library, though they have a child care center on campus)	https://www.calstatela.edu/library/unattended-children-policy	The University Library at California State University, Los Angeles welcomes children as long as they are accompanied by a parent or adult caregiver and under appropriate supervision.
University of Oregon	https://policies.uoregon.edu/vol-5-human-resources/ch-4-workplace/work-life	University leaders, managers, and supervisors are expected to provide support and flexibility to their employees, while at the same time, ensuring that the unit is able to meet operational needs. Whenever possible, supervisors are strongly encouraged to provide support and flexibility when employees have personal needs that arise outside the workplace or classroom. These needs may include, but are not limited to: death of a loved one; caring for children or other family members; personal physical, mental and emotional wellness; major life changes, such as job loss, birth or adoption of a child, etc.
SFA	https://www.sfasu.edu/sites/default/files/2019-06/children-in-the-workplace-13.15.pdf	The purpose of this policy, which applies to all Stephen F. Austin State University (SFA) employees, is to support the university's commitment to fostering a healthy balance between workplace obligations and family. The university welcomes young children and families to the campus while at the same time providing guidelines to protect the safety of children in the workplace and to maintain a professional workplace environment. This policy is not intended to apply to situations including, but not limited to, children utilizing facilities that are open to the public and whose age is appropriate for them to be unsupervised; children attending special occasions that are employer-sponsored, scheduled during the regular work day and where attendance by children is encouraged; or children accompanying a parent or

		guardian during hours other than the official university hours as defined by university policy.
University of Arkansas	https://vcfa.uark.edu/fayetteville-policies-procedures/hmrs/7320-20030215.pdf	It is University policy that only those providing or making use of university programs and services should be on campus regularly or routinely, except as bona fide visitors. Consequently, neither employees nor students should have family members, including children, or friends as a regular presence in their workplace or classrooms and other areas of instruction, including laboratories. Exceptions should only be made in response to special circumstances for short periods of time and must be approved by the employee's supervisor.
Rhodes College	https://handbook.rhodes.edu/college-handbook-employee-policies/employment-policies/protection-minors-policy	Protection of minors, FERPA, reporting abuse
The Pennsylvania State University	https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ad39	Safety, mandated reporting, abuse, programmatic oversight

Recommendations

1. A campus-wide survey, led by the Faculty Senate, to evaluate faculty, staff, and student perspectives regarding children on campus
   a. The survey results should be made public with next steps and recommendations derived from the outcomes and responses
2. A commitment to ensure that policies are clearly communicated, transparent, and equitably applied across colleges, schools, departments, and individuals
3. A stronger connection between employees, supervisors, administrators, and HR to develop and implement policies that foster a family-friendly environment

References

1. Beal HKO, Brewer LE, Cross C, Gull SJ. What Do We Know about Campus Policies on Children in the Workplace?
2. Windsor L, Crawford KF. The Differential Effects of Pandemic Parenting. The ADVANCE Journal. : 24816. doi:10.5399/osu/ADVJRNL.2.2.4
3. Windsor LC, Crawford KF. Snow days, holidays and pandemic quarantines: why we need to be looking after parents. In: Medium [Internet]. 23 Mar 2020 [cited 13 May 2020]. Available: https://medium.com/international-affairs-blog/snow-days-holidays-and-pandemic-quarantines-why-we-need-to-be-looking-after-parents-a3dc38413548
4. Becker-Blease KA. Ten steps to more equitable academic publishing in the pandemic. ADVANCE Journal. 2020;2. Available: https://www.advancejournal.org/article/18061-ten-steps-to-more-equitable-academic-publishing-in-the-pandemic
5. Breuning M, Fattore C, Ramos J, Scalera J. The Great Equalizer? Gender, Parenting, and Scholarly Productivity During the Global Pandemic. PS: Political Science & Politics. 2021; 1–5.
6. Miller CC. The Pandemic Created a Child-Care Crisis. Mothers Bore the Burden. The New York Times. 18 May 2021. Available: https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/05/17/upshot/women-workforce-employment-covid.html. Accessed 13 Sep 2022.
7. Schilder D, Sandstrom H. The Pandemic Exacerbated the Child Care Crisis. How Can States Reverse the Trend? In: Urban Institute [Internet]. [cited 13 Sep 2022]. Available: https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/pandemic-exacerbated-child-care-crisis-how-can-states-reverse-trend
8. Diekman AB. Negotiating the Double Bind: Interpersonal and Instrumental Evaluations of Dominance. Sex Roles. 2007;56: 551–561. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9198-0
9. Akos P, Kretchmar J. Gender and ethnic bias in letters of recommendation: considerations for school counselors. Professional School Counseling. 2016;20: 1096–2409.
10. Amanatullah ET, Morris MW. Negotiating gender roles: Gender differences in assertive negotiating are mediated by women's fear of backlash and attenuated when negotiating on behalf of others. Journal of personality and social psychology. 2010;98: 256.
11. Antecol H, Bedard K, Stearns J. Equal but Inequitable: Who Benefits from Gender-Neutral Tenure Clock Stopping Policies? American Economic Review. 2018;108: 2420–41.
12. Axelson RD, Solow CM, Ferguson KJ, Cohen MB. Assessing implicit gender bias in medical student performance evaluations. Evaluation & the health professions. 2010;33: 365–385.
13. Pirtle WNL. Motherhood While Black: The hard truth about race and parenthood. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 4 Apr 2018The Awakening. Available: https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/the-awakening
14. Tevis T. By obligation and by choice: Taking on extra responsibilities during COVID-19 and the Black Lives Matter Movement. ADVANCE Journal. 2021;2. Available: https://www.advancejournal.org/article/18872-by-obligation-and-by-choice-taking-on-extra-responsibilities-during-covid-19-and-the-black-lives-matter-movement
15. Torres S, Torres E. Healthcare Bias and Discrimination. Contexts. 2020;19: 96–96. doi:10.1177/1536504220977953

16. Laster Pirtle WN. Racial Capitalism: A Fundamental Cause of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic Inequities in the United States. Health Education & Behavior. 2020;47: 504–508.
17. Crawford K, Windsor L. The PhD Parenthood Trap: Caught Between Work and Family in Academia. Georgetown University Press; 2021.

A.2 Peers and Aspirants List with Variables

University of Memphis

Peers and Aspirants

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

Peer List (7 R1 and 3 R2):

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

Aspirants (all R1):

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

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

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

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

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

A.3: Motion to approve the proposed COC list of tenured faculty for T&P Appeals Committee Dr. Genae Strong, Chair Committee on Committees

M2023.31.1 Motion to Appoint Faculty Representatives to the Faculty Appeals Committee

Originator: Committee on Committees

Whereas:

The 2022 faculty handbook indicates the following regarding the faculty appeals committee composition:

> The Faculty Appeals Committee is comprised of nineteen (19) full-time, tenured faculty members appointed to staggered three-year terms. Faculty cannot serve on the Faculty Appeals Committee if they hold an administrative appointment which exceeds 50%. At least ten (10) of the members must hold the rank of professor. Ten (10) of the members will be appointed by the Faculty Senate and nine (9) will be appointed by the president. The president will select the chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee from amongst the ten members appointed by the Faculty Senate. The chair must hold the rank of professor. The composition of the committee should reflect diversity in terms of race, gender, and academic unit. Membership is for three years with staggered terms to ensure conformity and continuity in the committee function.

Whereas:

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

Whereas:

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

COC's nominations of the President

1. Jessica Jennings, Associate Professor, Biomedical Engineering (3-year term)
2. James Vardaman, Professor, Department of Management (3-year term)
3. Brandt Pence, Associate Professor, Health Sciences (3-year term)
4. Celia Anderson, Professor, Instruction and Curriculum Leadership (2-year term)
5. Verner Mitchell, Professor, English (2-year term)
6. Carol Silkes, Associate Professor, Kemmons Wilson (2-year term)
7. Kenneth Haggerty, Associate Professor, University Libraries (1-year term)
8. Annapoorna Mary, Associate Professor, LCON (1-year term)
9. Andre Johnson, Associate Professor, Communication and Film (1-year term)

COC's nominations of the Faculty Senate

10. Lawrence Weiss, Professor, Health Sciences (3-year term)
11. Lorelei Corcoran, Professor, CAS- Architecture (3-year term)

12. Mark Gillenson, Professor, Business Information and Eco   (3-year term)
13. Lisa Lucks Mendel, Professor, CSD   (2-year term)
14. Jeffrey Marchetta, Professor, Mech Engineering   (2-year term)
15. Joseph Zhang, Professor, Accountancy   (2-year term)
16. Jill Dapremont, Professor, LCON   (2-year term)
17. Cody Havard, Professor, Sport Commerce   (1-year term)
18. Carol Irwin, Professor, Health Sciences   (1-year term)
19. Dennis Laumann, Professor, CAS- History   (1-year term)

Be it resolved that,

The Faculty Senate approves the recommendations of the Committee on Committees and their prospective term limits as stipulated by the 2022 Faculty Handbook.

Recipients:
Faculty Senate