

5-5-2000

## Faculty Senate Minutes - May 5, 2000

USM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes](http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes)

---

### Recommended Citation

USM Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes - May 5, 2000" (2000). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 14.  
[http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes/14](http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/14)

This 1999/00 Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Archive at The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact [Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu](mailto:Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu).

*The University of Southern Mississippi*  
Faculty Senate Minutes  
May 5, 2000

**Members Present:** **College of the Arts:** Kimberley Davis, DeAnna Douglas, Shellie Nielsen; **College of Business Administration:** Trellis Green, Bob Smith; **College of Education and Psychology:** Sheila Alber, Jesse Palmer, John Rachal, Lillian Range; **College of Health and Human Sciences:** Susan Hubble, Michael Forster, Mary Frances Nettles; **College of Liberal Arts:** Linda Goff, Art Kaul, Allan McBride, Stephen Oshrin; **College of Nursing:** Janie Butts, Norma Cuellar; **Institute of Marine Science:** Steven Lohrenz; **College of Science and Technology:** David Beckett, Douglas McCain, Bob Coates, Dean Dunn, Mary Dayne Gregg, Charles Hoyle, Mary Lux, Grayson Rayborn; **Gulf Park:** Darlys Alford, J. Pat Smith; **University Libraries:** Sherry Laughlin.

**Members Represented by Proxy:** **College of Health and Human Sciences:** Susan Graham-Kresge (pr. Sherry Laughlin); **College of Liberal Arts:** Karen Austin (pr. Shellie Nielsen), Charles Bolton (pr. Bill Scarborough), Michael Dearney (pr. Art Kaul), David Goff (pr. Linda Dysart Goff), Kim Herzinger (pr. Art Kaul), Alexandra Jaffe (pr. David Hunt); **University Libraries:** Karolyn Thompson (pr. Joyce Radcliff). **College of Science and Technology:** Lida McDowell (pr. Sherry Laughlin).

**Members Absent:** **College of Business Administration:** Ernest King, Scott Magruder ; **College of Education and Psychology:** Marvin Lanmon; **College of International and Continuing Education:** Mark Miller.

FORUM SPEAKER: Lynda Gilbert, Vice President for Business and Finance

L. Gilbert brought with her Linda McFall and Nancy Whitacker, the new Director of Financial Affairs, to help answer questions. J. Rachal began by pointing out the issues of concern about the pay conversion plan that would be voted on today in a resolution. (1) Too short of turn around to make a major decision regarding 9 over 9 vs. 9 over 12 with a default to 9 over 12 permanently if faculty did not respond in two days by April 30. (Note: the memo was dated April 20 but most faculty did not receive it until April 27.); (2) The selection of the bi-weekly plan over the twice-monthly. The twice-monthly plan was felt to be far superior to the other; and (3) Actions taken in her office didn't adequately consult faculty entities that had a vested interest in these kinds of decisions. They just get announced to us. L. Gilbert pointed out that she had come to a Faculty Senate meeting in November and she "did not recall receiving any comments from anybody about going bi-weekly". D. Beckett countered saying that he indeed had made the comment at that meeting pertaining to the fact that since Ole Miss had gone to the twice-monthly plan, he felt we should do the same. L. Gilbert then pointed out the differences between Ole Miss's Financial Affairs staffing budget, \$1.28 million, as opposed to our Financial Affairs staffing budget, \$300,000. Part of the decision was based on the lack of resources. It also was based on the fact that the majority of our employees are staff and most of them are already on the bi-weekly system. Only about 600-700 employees are faculty. She brought charts to show that we would get our money faster, quicker than twice a month. J. Palmer stated that the issue was not about how fast we would receive the money but the actual dollar amount per check. He presented figures showing that someone being paid over 12 months on a bi-weekly rather than a twice-monthly system would actually receive less per month because of the two extra checks. He noted that eventually you would catch up with those two extra checks, but for someone who lives from month to month, the less money per month could be a hardship. L. Gilbert stated that they had to make a decision based on the large number of staff that were already on bi-weekly rather than convert everyone over to twice-monthly. They also had to consider their resources that they had as well as the impact it would have on other groups. She reiterated that over the year we would get the same amount of money. When asked if it would be possible to have two systems, she said "No," pointing out that they only have three people to run payroll for the whole university. Most organizations our size have up to 14 people running payroll. Due to the lack of resources, they are trying to streamline the payroll process to make it more effective and user friendly. Currently they have 2800 employees on multiple payrolls. J. Rachal asked if she would give us some commitment with regards to consulting with appropriate faculty entities on major decisions that affect their financial welfare in the future? She did say she listened to us and that is why they did the 9 over 9 and the 9 over 12. She apologized for the timing and said that they had already extended the deadlines and that they were just trying to get it to us before the semester ended. She stated that we could try the 9 over 12 for a year and switch back. The Senate was quick to point out that the memo stated that the 9 over 12 was permanent and asked why that statement was included. L. Gilbert replied that it was partially due to the complexity of the benefit deductions for two different payrolls and to make sure the retirement and leave time are accurate. They don't have the staff to check to be sure it's accurate if people switched back and forth from one option to the other. In regards to questions if the direct deposit would be affected, they stated that it would not affect 9 month faculty but it would affect those choosing 12 months. J. P. Smith pointed out that the extra money the university holds for the three months in the summer usually goes into an interest bearing account. He would feel better about going to 12 months if at least it was recognized that what he was doing was giving the university the use of money that he had already earned. L. Gilbert stated that that interest, which wasn't very much, goes back into the general fund. They can't give us credit for that and "That's just the way life is". In regards to questions about car payments, the Credit Union was going to split loans into 24 payments or they would change the frequency to 26 payments. For 9 month faculty, they would get their first payment Sept. 1, 2000. For 12 month faculty it would be August 4, 2000. As for withholdings, faculty who choose the 12 month option would have to fill out a new W-4. When asked to discuss the importance of the implementation of PeopleSoft she noted that the former system was very old and that the university now is being required to have a new accounting system which requires us to redo our general ledgers. As for monthly deductions, they stated that all checks except the two extra checks would have half of the deductions taken out. The two extra checks would only have state, retirement and taxes taken out. As to the law, it states twice a month. She stated that there was no difference between twice a month and bi-weekly. J. Rachal then asked if she could assure us that tickets would be given the first day of classed in the Fall. L. Gilbert stated that she had not been given that job yet and that it still was being handled by Joe Paul.

**1.0 Call to order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m.

**2.0 Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved with two additions to Old Business.

**3.0 Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the April meeting were approved with two corrections.

**4.0 Executive Committee Reports**

**4.1. President's Report: Art Kaul**

**\*\*Post-Tenure Review.** The IHL approved, with modifications, a post-tenure review policy at its April 20 meeting. The modifications to the original policy proposal include: [1] specifying consequences of unsatisfactory performance, "including termination of service"; [2] the IHL Commissioner "shall review the policies and procedures for consistency with Board policy and recommend modifications as appropriate"; [3] annual institutional reports on post-tenure reviews to the IHL by August 1. Notably, the post-tenure review policy allows each institution to

develop its own policy and does not mandate a specific type of post-tenure review process. [Copies of the adopted Post-Tenure Review policy were distributed to Faculty Senators.]

**\*\*University Faculty Senates Association [UFSA] Meeting, 19 April 2000.** Mississippi Valley's and Mississippi State's Faculty Senates have endorsed the Southern Mississippi Faculty Senate's Tuition Waiver [GPA] Requirement Resolution. The University of Mississippi Faculty Senate Executive Committee also endorsed. UFSA representatives plan to meet with IHL Commissioner Tom Layzell on May 15 to discuss a variety of issues, including Tuition Benefit Restoration and its Portability.

**\*\*President's Cabinet Meeting, 24 April 2000.** President Fleming indicated that promotion and completion-of-degree raises will continue, even though a general faculty salary increase will not be available. Employee Appreciation Day has been canceled in an effort to cut costs. Last year's event cost approximately \$53,000.

**\*\*State Economist Phil Pepper's Budget Presentation, 26 April 2000.** Mr. Pepper's analysis indicates that less-than-anticipated revenues during the next three to four years will prevent any increases and may require additional cuts in legislative appropriations for higher education. He was not so "pessimistic" to predict cuts during each of the next three to four years. The legislature may look at increasing the percentage of gaming revenues coming to the state treasury, he said. Mr. Carl Nicholson of Hattiesburg, who will become the new IHL Board President in May, told the audience that he does not believe there are now enough votes on the IHL to endorse a tuition increase. The situation may change with five appointees by Gov. Musgrove who are expected to take office at the May meeting.

**\*\*Expanded President's Cabinet, 1 May 2000.** President Fleming indicated that a legislative conference committee may have restored \$2 million to the USM base budget, thus the projected \$2.54 million budget cut may not be that severe. However, President Fleming cautioned that new "built-in" operating costs [for example, PeopleSoft implementation, health insurance, student financial aid, among others] totaling an estimated \$3.3 million will kick in this budget year.

In addition, President Fleming announced that a separate Athletic Foundation is expected to be developed in the next six months to provide a source/vehicle to generate "venture capital" to support athletics. A new Fundraising Council would coordinate all fundraising efforts.

Ms. Rebecca Woodrich of the University of Northern Iowa will become the Southern Miss diversity officer, effective 1 July 2000.  
**\*\*Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting, 28 April 2000.** Dr. Glenn Matlack presented a report from the Environment Committee on the "Composition and Health of Urban Forest" ["Tree Survey"] at USM. The report offers eight recommendations. The Environment Committee is expected to seek Faculty Senate endorsement of those recommendations.

\*\*A one-page summary of the AAUP's "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1999-2000", published in the March-April 2000 issue of *Academe*, was distributed to Faculty Senators.

#### **4.2 President-Elect's Report: Sherry Laughlin**

The nominations for President-Elect and Secretary-Elect were distributed to the Faculty Senate to be voted on next meeting. S. Laughlin reminded everyone that nominations could also be made from the floor.

#### **4.3. Secretary's Report: Shellie Nielsen** No report.

#### **4.4. Secretary-Elect's Report: Michael Forster**

Proxies received were read and an attendance roster was passed.

#### **5.0. Old Business**

##### **5.1. Handbook Task Force**

M. Forster filled in for D. Goff, starting with recommendations for Chapter 11 of the Handbook.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.1):** refer to last months minutes

**RECOMMENDATION (11.2):** This is a specific clarification of the membership status of a staff member employed with a fractional FTE and academic rank in a department which is not covered in the handbook under chapter 11 section 8.3 which defines membership of departmental personnel bodies. S. Oshrin moved and S. Hubble seconded the motion to accept the recommendation. The recommendation passed unanimously. **RECOMMENDATION (11.3):** This addresses the current prohibition under governance option 2 which states that the chair may not serve on the personnel committee without the rank of full Professor. The recommendation is to remove the sentence which states, "This option may not be elected unless the departmental chair holds the rank of professor". D. Douglas moved and J. Rachal seconded the motion to accept this recommendation. A Kaul noted that he had received two memos, one from the English Department signed by 17 faculty members and one from the Department Chair of Journalism endorsing this very recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.4):** This recommends adding the following sentence in 11.2 paragraph 4 after the first sentence of that paragraph to clarify the evaluation process: "Department Chairs in Departments operating under option 1 will be evaluated in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service by the three elected members of the Departmental Personnel authority." M. Gregg moved and S. Nielsen seconded the motion to accept this recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.5):** This departs from the meaning of the final statement in 11.2 paragraph 4. The point made was that in departments operating under option 3, faculty do not necessarily want to relinquish the right to evaluate the chairs in the areas of Teaching, Research and Service. The recommendation is to change the sentence to read "Departmental chairs in Departments operating under option 3 should be evaluated in the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service by members of their Department." J. Butts moved and D. Beckett seconded the motion to accept this recommendation. S. Hubble questioned the rationale for instructors evaluating full professors. D. Alford felt it was important for everyone to have input. D. Beckett also felt that it was important for everyone, no matter what rank, to evaluate the chair. Several faculty members pointed out that they had never seen chairs evaluated on Teaching, Research, and Service. The committee felt the department would be more knowledgeable about their own area to evaluate the Chair as opposed to the Dean who might be in a different discipline. J. Palmer noted that the only evaluation of the chairs is the one being conducted by the Faculty Senate. M. Forster pointed out that now, if you have Option 3, only the Dean evaluates the Chair. J. Palmer moved and S. Oshrin seconded to table the recommendation. The motion passed with 1 opposed.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.6):** This recommends adding the phrase "...by the personnel authority of the academic department in which they serve as faculty" in 11.2 paragraph 5 second sentence after "These administrative officers will not be evaluated . . ." The intention is to clarify who is going to carry out the evaluation of the administrator. D. Alford moved and J. P. Smith seconded the motion to accept the recommendation. S. Hubble pointed out that chairs now might be evaluated by Deans, if they have academic rank, on Teaching, Research, and Service. B. Scarborough noted that previously administrators were only to be evaluated in respect to their administrative duties. S. Lohrenz thought that it was based on the time and effort spent on their two roles. D. Alford felt it was important for administrators to be on the receiving end of academic criteria. To dish it out and never have to receive it makes them insensitive to it. S. Hubble agrees with the concept, but, in reality, how valid are the decisions of the chair evaluating the Dean when in reality those decisions may come back and impact that chair

and that chair's department. The motion carried with 16 for and 11 opposed.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.7):** This adds clarification to the second sentence in 11.2 paragraph 5 that states "These administrative officers will not be evaluated. . ." The recommendation is to add ". . ." in their academic department. . ." at that point in the sentence. M. Gregg moved and D. Dunn seconded the motion. S. Lohrenz asked if it affects, in any way, the Deans evaluation forms we are just completing? He noted that it seems to go against this. J. Palmer stated that we did not want to jeopardize the evaluation we now have in place. It was pointed out that this would take us out of the loop to evaluate Deans. M. Gregg suggested that instead of the words academic department, maybe we should say academic units. S. Laughlin noted that we didn't want any language that would exclude anyone from evaluating them. S. Hubble suggested a friendly amendment to strike "not" in that sentence and add "and" so that it would indicate that we want both levels of evaluation to remain. B. Coates seconded. J. Palmer felt that it would strengthen our evaluations to say that it was administered through the Faculty Senate through the Provost office. The final version that was voted on was "These administrative officers will be evaluated in their academic units using the Faculty Senate Evaluation Form ; and administrative evaluation is conducted by the supervising administrative officers to whom they report." The motion passed unanimously.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.8):** This recommendation adds to the end of the last sentence of 12.2 . . ."from among the faculty who are tied in the voting." J. P. Smith moved and J. Rachal seconded the motion to accept the recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.9):** This recommendation concerns consistency among three sections of chapter 11 that relate to Department Promotion/Tenure Committees. It states that sections 12.6, 13.4, and 13.6 should be consistent regarding the number of signatures required, the requirement of a written rationale, the role of abstentions and absentee ballots, and the requirement of a vote count. S. Oshrin moved and J. Rachal seconded the motion to accept the recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.10):** This recommendation would require Colleges to evaluate and either reaffirm or modify the apportionment and size of College Advisory Committees no less often than every five years. S. Hubble moved and D. Alford seconded the motion to accept the recommendation. D. Beckett asked to change the wording to "at least every five years" as a friendly amendment. The amendment then would "require colleges to evaluate and either reaffirm or modify the apportionment and size of College Advisory Committees at least every five years". The motion passed unanimously as amended.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.11):** This recommendation is directed toward consistency between the functions of College and University Advisory Committees as stated in section 17. College Advisory Committees and section 20. The University Advisory Committee. Currently the College Advisory Committees do not have, as do the University Advisory Committees, the discretion of reviewing the merits of faculty recommended for Promotion and Tenure according to the language in these two sections. The recommendation is that the standard practice is for College Advisory Committees to "Review the Merits" of faculty recommended for Promotion/Tenure. Therefore, this recommendation is to add similar language to the College Committee section to be consistent with the University Committee language. J. Rachal moved and S. Oshrin seconded the motion. Discussion: B. Scarborough noted that it was sticky point. The concern is that there are people on the College and University Committees from different disciplines that don't have the knowledge to evaluate the research performance of someone in a different discipline. He did not like the wording "review the merits". He felt the point was to assure consistency within the College and the University. D. McCain pointed out that it is not possible for the College Committee to do its job without assessing the merits. In reality, we do it anyway so it's nice to have the language. J. Rachal noted that there might be a danger if we were to become strictly a procedural judge. Part of the purpose is to make reasonably judicious estimations of people's progress towards Tenure and Promotion and we do look at the merit especially if there are great distinctions between what the department might have said and the College might say. D. McCain stated that the point is to make sure that they are more or less following the same standards. M. Gregg noted that if the wording is already on the University Committee statement, then why omit it on the College Committee statement? The motion carried unanimously.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.12):** This recommendation has to do with the current requirement for recusal of members of College Advisory Committees in section 17.5 who have already voted at the departmental level and then can't vote at the College level. This recommendation would allow members to vote at each level. The recommendation states that "Several members of the Task Force believe that duly elected College Advisory Committee members should be able to vote at each level. This same idea would extend to the recusal statement in 20.4 regarding the University Advisory Committee". J. Rachal urged the Faculty Senate to strongly endorse this recommendation. D. Dunn noted that recusal at the College level prevents someone to serve as an advocate. If at the University level he was recused, he would not be able to vote on any individuals from his College. One individual stated that they liked the present system. L. Goff stated that there is an assumption that every College and every Department has a representative on the committee, but that is not so. D. Alford pointed out the difficulties associated with recusal and lack of knowledge about the coast faculty. She questioned why it hurt when one person votes too many times. It was noted that politics can come into play with a Departmental vote and an opposite vote at the College level by the Departmental Representative. It could work for you or against you. M. Forster pointed out that this recommendation extends to all levels. D. Alford moved and J. Rachal seconded to allow voting at all levels. The motion passed with 25 yes and 8 nos.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.13):** This recommendation has to do with the requirement in section 17.6 which states ". . . members indicating if they have abstained or have recused themselves from voting". The Task Force feels this requirement could compromise confidentiality and therefore recommends striking this statement. J. Rachal moved and D. Dunn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**RECOMMENDATION (11.4):** Passed last meeting.

J. Rachal at this time had several proposals relative to Chapter 11. A. Kaul requested that he email these recommendations to the facsen list serve and put them in writing for consideration at the next meeting.

A. Kaul requested, in the interest of time, that the Senate stop on the Handbook and save Chapter 12 for the next meeting.

### **5.2. Grievance Policy**

M. Lux stated that the document presented was modeled after the existing Ole Miss policy but was tailored in regards to the time line for our own situation. M. Gregg felt it was a step in the right direction. M. Lux stated that this policy, if adopted, will go into the Faculty Handbook. The motion passed unanimously. (See the April minutes for the full policy)

### **5.3. Faculty Senate Representative at Budget Meetings Resolution**

M. Lux restated the resolution included in the April minutes which calls for faculty representation at budget hearings. S. Nielsen then read a statement from the Theatre and Dance Department, which also reflected concerns from the College of the Arts as a whole, regarding the process and the perceived lack of faculty input into next year's fiscal budget. It was presented as a possible preamble to this resolution. G. Rayborn strongly endorsed this statement. However, he did note that Provost Henry did issue some guidelines to the chairs, and he wasn't sure that Provost Henry was the right one to meet with us. These problems are occurring at the Presidential Cabinet. He pointed out that if you review the past few years, there is a systematic disdain for academic affairs. When money comes in to the University it is not going into Academic Affairs and when it comes out, it leaves Academic Affairs, even more so this year due to budget shortfalls. D. Alford wanted to see this added as a preamble. M. Lux pointed out that the original resolution states that we want to be present, different from the statement S. Nielsen presented. It was felt that it might need to be a separate resolution. J. P. Smith noted that the budget process is a fast process and things

get moved around quickly. Thus, it would be beneficial to everyone to understand what the considerations are. M. Lux suggested that we look at these two separately, voting on the original one today and looking at the issues S. Nielsen presented today next time. The original resolution passed unanimously. The text is available on the Senate web site.

A. Kaul requested that the following statement, presented today regarding the budget process, be included in the minutes for consideration at the next meeting.

#### **Budgeting Process Statement**

It is our perception that neither faculty nor staff have adequate advisory and consultative roles in this process. The freeze of faculty and staff positions, the delay of current searches, and rumored discussions concerning the possible elimination of positions have generated a climate of concern and fear among us. This climate has been exacerbated by the lack of candor about the budget process and the way in which it has been conducted behind closed doors. We have no clear idea about the guiding principles behind the process nor the decisions which the process may deliver. We have little or no visible input concerning the decisions which will affect our students and the environment in which we work as educators and artists.

These conditions are detrimental to faculty and student morale. In such a climate, the retention of the best faculty and students is made more difficult. We are already seeing the first early signs that, unless addressed now, might lead to the loss of valuable faculty members and to some of our best students.

We call upon the Administration to join with representatives from the faculty and staff to work on resolving our fiscal concerns as a community.

#### **5.4 Course Prerequisite Proposal**

J. Rachal noted that this was an issue from K. Austin. It was tabled in order to consult with the registrar. K. Austin discovered that under their existing program this would be impossible to do, but under PeopleSoft, this would be easy to do. However, the prerequisites need to be written up front now rather than later. This is quite implementable. The original resolution was left tabled. A rewritten version was presented today. J. Rachal moved to introduce this new version. J. Rachal moved and D. Alford seconded to suspend the rules to vote on the new version. The motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously. After no discussion, the motion to adopt the new version passed unanimously. The text is available on the Senate web site.

#### **5.5 Reaffirmation of May 7, 1999 ROTC Resolution**

D. Dunn stated that the ROTC letter requesting early final grades for ROTC members being commissioned surfaced again. D. Dunn suggested inviting both commanding officers from the Air force and Army to the Faculty Senate to let them know that giving grades to a third body was not deemed appropriate. A. Kaul then read the original resolution from last year. J. P. Smith moved and S. Hubble seconded the motion to reaffirm last year's resolution. Discussion: D. Beckett pointed out that the suggestion of a date after graduation for the commissioning of officers seemed great, but it would make a hardship for families coming that want to come to both. S. Hubble noted that there was another option stated in the original resolution. D. Beckett liked this other option. L. Range noted that the point of the original resolution was not about specifying how they do it, but to tell them not to ask us for grades early and give them to a third party. The motion carried with D. Beckett abstaining.

#### **6.0 Committee Reports**

**6.1 Academic and Governance: Mary Lux** No report

#### **6.2 Administration and Faculty Evaluations: Kimberley Davis**

K. Davis stated that she just found out about some problems with this past year's evaluation process. The Committee hopes to correct those problems next year. The Upper Administration is no longer evaluated and it was brought to her attention that at one time they were. She asked if we could reinstate this. A. Kaul said a faculty member in the College of Business Administration reported that a departmental meeting had not been called to do Administrative Evaluations. It was A. Kaul's understanding that these were required. If that's true that a meeting was not convened, what then? This becomes a serious issue. K. Davis stated that several departments had not turned in their forms. A. Kaul's response to the faculty member was that they first inform their Dean and then, if there was no satisfaction on this, report it to the Provost. K. Davis will look into this for next meeting.

**6.3 Archives: Shellie Nielsen** No report.

#### **6.4 Athletic Liaison: Trellis Green**

T. Green stated that he had not had time to look into the Athletic Foundation. It might make more sense to separate athletics from the academics. He then wanted to remind everyone about the girls softball tournament that was being held here.

#### **6.5 Awards: Lillian Range**

Done!

#### **6.6 Benefits and Work Environment: John Rachal**

J. Rachal presented the following Pet Insurance Resolution from K. Austin for consideration at the next meeting. Included in the handout was a newspaper article from the Hattiesburg American showing how some employers were beginning to offer pet insurance as a benefit. The following will be voted on next meeting.

#### **Pet Insurance Resolution**

##### **Whereas:**

Many Faculty and (staff) members own pets, and medical care for such animals can constitute a major expense; and

##### **Whereas:**

A growing number of companies now offer pet health insurance as part of their optional benefits package.

##### **Therefore,**

The Department of Human resources should undertake (1) to find a good purveyor for pet health insurance and (2) to add such insurance to the optional benefits package for USM employees.

J. Rachal then presented two more resolutions for consideration of suspension of the rules to be voted on this meeting. The first one refers to the pay plan. He suggested deleting #1 and the letter (a) out of the resolution and delete the word "also" out of #2 in light of Lynda Gilbert's presentation today. The other two he felt were still applicable. It was suggested to leave the resolution as is. J. Rachal moved and J. Palmer seconded to suspend the rules. The motion carried to suspend the rules. Discussion centered around the fact that Lynda Gilbert stated that the issue had to do with lack of staff. It was finally pointed out by D. Beckett that she stated that it boiled down to the fact that it would be easier for them to do bi-weekly regardless of what we wanted. He pointed out to Gilbert after she made the statement that she did not get any feedback that several options were suggested by Faculty Senators in the November meeting with her. J. P. Smith moved and L. Range seconded to delete # 2. J. Rachal pointed out that that #2 didn't indicate that we were endorsing the decision, but that we wanted a choice. The motion to delete #2 failed. The full resolution remained on the floor. L. Range stated that the issue was the fact that we were force fed and not given a choice. J. P. Smith then moved and L. Range seconded changing the wording in #2 to state "about the way the choice was made". J. Palmer suggested adding "without faculty input." J. Rachal noted that item #2 was intentionally ambivalent. It does try to address the concern about the notion of dictating rather than giving us a choice. T. Green asked if we could table it and rewrite it. It was pointed out that we couldn't as we had suspended the rules. M. Gregg stated that since we were investing a lot of money into PeopleSoft, she didn't understand why we couldn't have choices. D. Beckett pointed out that we had just been told it would be easy for PeopleSoft to look at every student's file to make sure they had the prerequisites for courses, **yet** it could not handle an option A or B for the payroll. After further discussion the motion on the amendment to the resolution failed. The motion to adopt the original resolution passed with 3 no's. The text of the following resolution is available on the Senate web site.

### **Pay Plan Resolution**

#### **Whereas:**

1. Faculty Senate is concerned about a memo from Human resources dated April 20, 2000 in which faculty were informed that they have until "the end of April" to make a critical decision concerning how they are paid. Apparently most faculty did not receive this memo until Wednesday, April 26. Since most nine month faculty are currently paid on a 9 checks over 9 months basis, it is unreasonable to require faculty to make this decision in less than a week or have their pay defaulted to a 9 over 12 system. This default to 9 over 12 is particularly undesirable since it will be "a permanent selection for the remaining period of employment."
2. Faculty Senate is concerned about the choice of a bi-weekly plan over a twice-monthly plan. The University of Mississippi has opted for a twice-monthly plan, which would seem more compatible with the current end-of-the-month plan with which faculty are familiar;
3. Faculty Senate is particularly disturbed that critical decisions concerning the faculty's financial welfare are made with negligible faculty consultation and are simply announced after they are decided;

**Therefore, Faculty Senate urges the administration to** (a) substantially extend the deadline for faculty to make this important decision about the 9 vs. 12 month pay plan; and (b) implement a twice-monthly plan rather than a bi-weekly plan; and (c) consult appropriate faculty entities when making decisions that affect faculty members.

The next resolution presented dealt with raising tuition due to the projected budget cuts. After pointing out that our tuition is currently lower than both MSU and Ole Miss, J. Rachal felt that this would help us generate much needed money next year. J. Rachal moved and J. Butts seconded to suspend the rules to vote on this resolution at this meeting. The motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously. G. Rayborn suggested removing the actual dollar amount from the first sentence. It was also suggested that we just delete #1. The final suggestion was to change #1 to read "There has been a recent cut in the IHL's legislative allocation for the coming year." The amended motion passed with 5 opposed-L. Range, D. McCain, A. McBride, G. Rayborn, and M. Lux. The text of the following resolution is available on the Senate web site.

### **Tuition Increase Resolution**

#### **Whereas:**

1. There has been a recent cut in the IHL's legislative allocation for the coming year;
2. Reliable predictions by Mississippi Chief Economist Pepper concerning the state's economic outlook through 2004 indicate a bleak financial future based on projected tax revenues;
3. This forecast will result in (a) no increases and possible continued cuts to IHL through 2004, (b) extreme fiscal burdens for the university, and (c) no faculty raises for the foreseeable future;
4. USM's tuition is \$1435 per semester, which is \$74 less than MSU's \$1509 and \$92 less than UM's \$1527;
5. Based on the USM (Hattiesburg and Gulf Park) enrollment of 11,307 for fall and 10,570 for spring 1999-2000, a \$74 tuition increase beginning in the fall semester would result in an additional \$1,618,898 in university revenue;

#### **Therefore, Faculty Senate resolves that:**

The University Administration propose to the IHL an appropriate increase in tuition.

**6.7 Constitution and Bylaws: Allan McBride** No report.

**6.8 Elections: Steven Lohrenz**

The newly elected and reelected Senators were read. There is a runoff in the Business Administration area and the new Senator will be announced at the next meeting. S. Lohrenz passed out the following resolution regarding the compilation of lists of eligible Faculty for Faculty Senate Elections to be voted on next meeting.

### **Proposed Recommendation for Compilation of Lists of Eligible Faculty for Faculty Senate Elections**

**Whereas** the compilation of accurate lists of faculty eligible for candidacy and voting for Faculty Senate elections is essential to ensure the democratic nature of said elections, and

**Whereas** it is in the best interest of each division for which candidates are being elected to ensure that an accurate list of faculty eligible for

candidacy and election is made available to the Faculty Senate Elections Committee, and

**Whereas** it is essential that each division be involved in the process of identifying which of its faculty are members of the "Corps of Instruction",

Be it hereby resolved that Faculty Senate representatives from each division shall be responsible for providing to the Elections Committee a list of faculty from their division that are eligible for candidacy or voting. It is recommended that one individual from each division be designated to provide such a list and that that individual confer with the Dean's or Director's office, or the equivalent, of their division in developing an accurate and up-to-date list. The list of eligible faculty should be provided to the Chair of the Elections Committee no later than 1 February of the election year. The Elections Committee shall then be responsible for preparing a draft ballot for each division having an election and distributing it for review and approval by a selection of Faculty Senate representatives from each division prior to the election.

#### **6.9 Environment (ad hoc): Dick Conville**

D. Conville opened by thanking and naming his committee members. The committee had two major projects this year: (1) tree survey and (2) a survey of universities around the country with regard to the organizational structure they use for managing the natural environment. His report pertained to the tree survey, an essential tool for planning, with materials distributed at the meeting which summarized the survey. He stated that the university is built in an urban forest that needs preserving and enhancing as an important contribution to the university's living, working and learning environment. Glen Matlock was the lead person who counted all 3800 trees on this campus. They then created a grid of the campus in hundred meter squares in which they assessed every tree as to their size, location, species, and health. Their findings were as follows: (1) Very narrow species diversity was found with 60% in 3 species and 90% in only 10 species; (2) Early in the history of the campus many shade trees, primarily Oak, were planted. Recently, there has been a reluctance to plant large shade trees; (3) There is a great swamp or trough through the central part of campus. The campus is bisected north and south by an absence of trees, the most notable absences of trees found around the new Theatre and Dance Building. D. Conville noted that the oldest trees on campus are those at the end of fraternity drive, about 30-36 inches in diameter and close to 100 years old. Based on this survey, the committee is asking the Senate to endorse the following recommendations at the next meeting.

#### **Recommendations from the Environment (ad hoc) Committee**

The urban forest contributes substantially to the quality of life on the USM campus. Protecting existing trees, replacing losses, and enlightened landscaping of developed areas should be a priority in the maintenance of the campus. In this vein we make the following suggestions.

- 1. The trough.** Trees should be planted in the newly exposed central section of campus, which appears as a trough in three-dimensional graphs of tree density and diameter. Trees should be used to break the stark architectural lines and shade the south-facing walks beside the new Liberal Arts and Theatre and Dance Buildings.
- 2. Shade trees.** New planting should use trees with potential heights >50 feet, i.e. trees which can cast effective shade on walks and public places. In particular, shade trees should be planted in south-facing, masonry-lined areas adjacent to buildings ("solar furnaces"). Short species such as Bradford Pears and Crabapples should be avoided.
- 3. Species diversity.** To relieve the visual monotony of some parts of campus, tree species other than Oaks and Pines should be planted. We favor species native to the Gulf Coast region, consistent with our natural heritage and emphasizing our commitment as a regional institution. Species diversity has the additional advantage of protecting the urban forest from disease. Suggestions are made in our previous list of tree recommendations (Appendix B).
- 4. Construction.** Tree protection clauses should be built into all future agreements with building contractors. These clauses should be explicit as to how trees will be guarded, should include escrow funds for tree replacement, and should be verified by frequent inspection. The regular staff of Physical Plant should be trained in tree protection measures, and should have ready access to the new Grounds Department for consultation when needed.
- 5. Injury hotspots.** Local areas of frequent or severe injury identified in this report should be inspected. Although many injured trees are structurally sound and can potentially shade the campus for decades more, a few trees are in such bad shape that they should probably be removed. The severely rotten Oak at the southeast corner of McLemore Hall is an example. The grounds crew should work with fraternity members and residents of Pine Haven to protect trees in those areas.
- 6. Canopy death.** Pecans, Dogwoods, and Cherries, which showed excessive canopy death in this study, should be inspected by a professional tree pathologist. The Mississippi State Extension Service can provide such a person.
- 7. Root plates.** Although it is impossible to avoid contact of tree roots with pavement and masonry, an effort should be made to allow adequate space for tree growth. Less than 50% root plate coverage for all campus trees is a reasonable goal.
- 8. Natural areas.** Some infrequently used parts of campus have a semi-natural appearance and could easily be converted to natural vegetation. The Long Leaf Pine stand north of the Speech and Hearing Building, for example, resembles natural Long Leaf Savanna. Such conversion would benefit biology classes and would not affect other uses of these areas.

#### **6.10 Faculty Development: Karolyn Thompson** No report.

#### **6.11 Technology: Dean Dunn**

D. Dunn stated that there is a virus, technically a worm, that goes through and finds everything in your microsoft outlook address book and sends itself to it. If you get a message that says "this is funny", "this is a funny joke", or "this is a good joke", delete them before reading them. They are now recommending that you update your anti virus software for windows every week from now on. Symantech which is Norton anti virus or McAfee which you can download are recommended. Mac users are unaffected. J. Butts asked if we have an updated anti virus program, why do we have to update it? D. Dunn stated that that you have to set the clock on it so that the next time you turn on your computer it automatically goes out there. Check your scheduler for McAfee or Norton to see if it automatically downloads the anti virus program every time you turn on your computer.

#### **6.12 University Club: Kim Herzinger** No report

#### **6.13 Transportation Committee: Bill Scarborough**

The grim news is that Lynda Gilbert's office is not going to run the parking enforcement next year. They were physically supposed to split parking enforcement from the rest of the police department, but that evidently isn't going to happen. We're still under Joe Paul. There is almost no enforcement now as they are getting ready for graduation. Cecil Wilson wants us to ticket as much as we can, but Joe Paul and the President are stopping us from helping out with the ticketing. B. Scarborough is against the parking garage but wants feedback from other

faculty on the issue. He pointed out that the only way they are going to get one is by raising the parking fees substantially- student fees to \$100/year, faculty fees to \$200/year, and the gated lots to \$300. He pointed out that Elam Arms and the large Theatre and Dance parking lots have plenty of spaces. Students just don't want to park that far. S. Hubble was in support for the parking garage mainly for visitors who currently have to fight to find spaces. As to the figures, she asked if they actually did the research to figure out if that's what it would cost? B. Scarborough stated that they have had a parking consultant and that there is a lease back plan that they seem to have rejected. M. Lux felt that a survey needed to be taken for individual buildings and areas so that there are enough parking spaces set aside for faculty and staff that work in those buildings. She didn't feel that there has been any effort to do this and that the spaces have been arbitrarily assigned mostly to students. She felt that the people who come everyday to work in those buildings and stay all day long should realistically park somewhere near their buildings and not have to walk far distances. All the people that we have hired for thousands of dollars to do the survey haven't looked at the faculty problem which boils down to giving some respect to the people that are here. B. Scarborough noted that the last time the committee met with the President, the idea was that the closer to the center of campus would be faculty and staff parking and then it would go out from there for students. D. Dunn stated that zone 5, which is more strictly enforced, doesn't have a problem. He also felt that "if you build it, they won't come". Enforcement is still going to be the main problem. He opposes a parking structure due to the fact that all of our other benefit costs have gone up. A substantial parking fee increase would not offer any guarantee of a benefit. B. Scarborough stated that the committee had not voted on this. S. Hubble's concern was that green space would be taken up. S. Nielsen pointed out the issue that was brought up at a former Senate meeting of faculty having to pay for a student parking facility. At that same meeting it was suggested that possibly a small fee be charged for all students like they did for the building of the Payne Center. B. Scarborough asked that any other ideas be sent to him regarding this issue.

**6.14 AAUP: Michael Dearmey No report.**

**6.15 Faculty Handbook Task Force (ad hoc): David Goff** (see Old Business 5.1)

**6.16 Grievance Policy (ad hoc): Karen Austin** (see Old Business 5.2)

**7.0 New Business:** No new business.

**8.0 Announcements:** No announcements.

**9.0 Adjournment** The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Shellie C. Nielsen, Faculty Senate Secretary

---

Last modified June 9, 2000 [Faculty Senate Secretary](#)

[Faculty Senate Home Page](#)

URL: <http://www-org.usm.edu/~fsenate/minutesmay00.html>