

**MINUTES of the  
December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 Meeting of the  
University Faculty Handbook Committee  
International Center, Room 514  
Kimberley Davis, presiding  
APPROVED (2/28/17)**

The University Faculty Handbook Committee met December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 in room 514 or the International Center Building. The meeting was called to order at 10:38 a.m. by Chairperson, Dr. Kimberley Davis.

**Members Present:** Samuel Bruton; Tisha Zelner; Subrina Cooper; Ann Blackwell (proxy for William Powell), Max Grivno; Ann Blankenship; Rebecca Powell; William Powell (by proxy); and Kimberley Davis. We were joined by guests: Dr. Mac Alford and Dr. David Beckett.

**I. Approval of 18 November 2017 Meeting Minutes**

The motion was made by Dr. Samuel Bruton to approve the Minutes of the November meeting as presented; it was seconded by Dr. Ann Blackwell and received approval by all members.

**II. Approval of Agenda for December 9, 2016.**

The motion to approve the meeting agenda for December 9<sup>th</sup> was made by Dr. Samuel Bruton and seconded by Tisha Zelner. The motion carried and the agenda was approved.

**III. Discussion Item 1 – Dr. William Powell / Dr. Sam Bruton– Academic Dishonesty, 4.5.5 – Student Dishonesty. **Proposal Item 3. Vote 2 taken today.****

At the October 2016 meeting of the University Faculty Handbook Committee, Dr. William Powell recommended revising the **Academic Dishonesty** or **Student Dishonesty** statement in Section 4.5.5 of the Faculty Handbook. We received the proposed change from Dr. Sam Bruton. After discussion, the first vote was taken at the November meeting to approve the proposed change. **The second vote took place** at the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting and **the change received committee approval.** The motion to approve was made by Sam Bruton; it was seconded by Tisha Zelner. The new policy statement is as follows:

**4.5.5. Student Dishonesty.** In the event of student dishonesty, instructors may impose various sanctions, depending on the circumstances of the case, as described in the University's Academic Integrity Policy

(<https://www.usm.edu/institutional/policies/policy-acaf-pro-012>). Instructors must make every effort to meet with the student to explain the nature of the alleged violation, the basis for believing the student has violated the policy, the penalty to be imposed, and the process for appeal.

- IV. **Discussion Item 2** – Council of Chairs/Tisha Zelner – continuation of discussion from October/November meetings. Vote 2 on *Eligibility to Serve on Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committees*, comprised of a change/addition to section 9.5.2. Proposal Item 1. **Vote 1**. The first vote was tabled at the November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting pending report from constituencies. The proposed verbiage was amended and committee members voted to accept the new language pending approval and/or feedback by constituents. The new language was reconsidered with an **initial vote**; it was approved with one recusal. 9.5.2 will now read as follows (pending approval by the President and Provost):

**9.5.2 Departmental Promotion Committees.** Upon receipt of promotion dossiers, department chairs must first confirm the eligibility of applicants for promotion in academic rank and then convene the Departmental Promotion Committees to consider the qualifications of candidates for promotion. Departmental Promotion Committees *would* consist of departmental faculty members *who are not currently under review for tenure and who hold* academic rank equal to, or higher than, that being sought by candidates for promotion.

The motion to take a vote on the amended language was made by Samuel Bruton and seconded by Ann Blackwell. The majority of the committee voted to accept the proposed or amended language; there was one recusal by Rebecca Powell.

- V. **Discussion Item 3** – Dr. David Beckett (as Guest Proposer) –
- 3a. Modification to Section 2.11.2, The College Advisory Committee;
  - 3b. Modifications to Sections 9.5.2, Departmental Promotion Committees; and 9.7.1, Types of Tenure Proceedings / Departmental Tenure Committees.

Discussion Item 3 was brought to us by guest, Dr. Dave Beckett. Dr. Beckett proposed threefold modifications to Section 2.11.2, which deals with *The College Advisory Committee*; to Sections 9.5.2, *Departmental Promotion Committees*; and 9.7.1, *Types of Tenure Proceedings / Departmental Tenure Committees*.

2.11.2 presents a conflict between the two paragraphs of the section; Beckett proposes modifying the second paragraph of this section and replacing it with a shorter paragraph that does not “stand in opposition” to the first. There was heavy discussion and the matter was **TABLED**.

As regards items 9.5.2 and 9.7.1, Dr. Beckett proposes clarifying that *All* eligible members of the Departmental Promotion Committees will be invited to participate in the evaluations of that committee. The change in 9.5.2 would mirror the description of the membership of the Departmental Tenure Committee. The equivalents of Promotion and Tenure Committees for Departments and Schools not having multiple Departments would also be indicated.

After long and thorough discussion, this second part of Dr. Beckett's two-part proposal was **accepted** with an **initial vote**.

“...*The membership of* Departmental Promotion Committees (would) consist of *all* departmental faculty members (*who are not currently under review for tenure and who hold*) ~~holding~~ academic rank equal to or higher than that being sought by candidates for promotion.

The Meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Kimberley Davis  
Chair, University Faculty Handbook Committee