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Faculty Senate Minutes

December 8, 2000


Visitors: D. Conville, Environmental Committee chair; M. Henry, Provost; M. Sumrall, Staff Council.

Forum Speaker: President Horace Fleming

President Fleming offered brief remarks on the university's financial situation, wishing to leave time for dialogue with senators.

In October, Gov. Musgrove gave us a reprieve from his order of a 5% reduction in state agency spending. We are most grateful for the exemption. It would have been extremely difficult to cut in mid-year, given that 71% of our budget is personnel, and we already had lost several staff and faculty positions due to the earlier budget shortfall. These positions were painful to lose. In the faculty area, we are left with limited room to maneuver in covering part-time teaching requirements.

At present, legislative projections are that IHL will need to reduce spending around $55 million, about a 14.5% reduction in the overall IHL budget. This is a major challenge. Whether in fact the system will be required to absorb a reduction
of this size is not yet clear; there are different opinions.

Considering prospects for current year, it is possible, even likely, that the revenue picture will get worse. The actual revenue shortfall appears to be running twice what was assumed by legislative projections.

Gov. Musgrove was on campus the day of the East Carolina football game, and visited at the president's home with about 150 members of the USM foundation board, the alumni leadership, the athletic association board, donors and the cabinet. The governor spoke and answered questions with this group, and then met privately with the presidents of our volunteer organizations.

We will do everything that we can. We will concede nothing, and will insist that we cannot absorb further reductions. We're planning a series of meetings with the media. We will distribute fundamental fact sheets, and make our case for a reordering of priorities.

A tuition increase is virtually assured, although how large it will be and how it will be implemented is not yet established. We're examining our entire tuition strategy. We received a 10% increase for years '98, '99 and 2000, following several years without any increase. Yet with a 3% annual inflation rate factored in, we are back to where we started. Currently, as the first part of our strategy, we are hoping for a basic increase of 10%. A second issue is that for the last few years we’ve charged about $90 less in tuition than MSU and Ole Miss; the rationale is that at one time USM delivered fewer services that the other comprehensive universities. That rationale no longer exists, and the tuition gap needs to be closed. A third tuition issue is the tuition cap at 12 credit hrs. (i.e., students do not pay for credit taken beyond 12 hours). We need to standardize the way we price tuition, as well as make it more fair for students taking fewer hours, even should we decide to make any adjustment revenue neutral. If our strategy succeeded perfectly, we could realize a windfall; however, tuition alone can not make up for major budget cuts. To cover a $10 million cut would require a 33% increase in tuition. Students have been involved in discussions of tuition increases. Their greatest concerns are about losing faculty and staff, but there are limits to the size of a tuition increase they can absorb; 33% is clearly out of the question.

It is important to have everyone involved in budget discussions. Faculty should be involved in formulating departmental budgets, which then percolate upward through the administration. The central administration must provide guidelines, but faculty need to take charge of the curriculum and determine how to commit resources. The hope is to institute at some point activity-based costing, in which revenues are attributed in the first place to academic units, increasing the degree of faculty control. The current use of "abbreviated responsibility centered
management" by the deans is a step in that direction.

The president's priorities at this time are: First, the financial health of the university. Second, parity in appropriations. The current allocation formula is hurting USM. Our position is that money should be allocated according to student credit hour production, with appropriate weighting of hours to address differences in program costs. Other priority issues include the Gulf Park expansion, continuing facilities and technology infrastructure development, and a successful capital campaign, which we need in order to realize the vision of excellence captured in the strategic plan.

Comments/ Questions for Pres. Fleming:

T. Green asked about the impact of recent proposals to settle the Ayers case. Pres. Fleming: There is nothing in the current proposal that would adversely affect USM programs, though history suggests that every time there is talk of a settlement, USM loses a program. We have had concerns about our Master of Public Health program, but it seems agreed all around that our program offers no competition to Jackson State, since we serve a local population of students and have no interest in developing a doctoral program in public health.

T. Green asked specifically about the impact of proposed salary increases for faculty at the historically black universities; would USM be hurt by these? Pres. Fleming: In the current fiscal context any movement of dollars is a threat, since there is no extra money available. Parenthetically, published salary figures for the comprehensive universities are misleading, as they include medical, pharmaceutical, law, etc. school faculty salaries.

W. Scarborough commented on the subject of salary comparison, noting that USM used to be ahead of other schools, but has slipped backward. He wondered if faculty and staff salaries should not be ahead of other priorities, in order to retain quality personnel. Pres. Fleming: A top priority must be retaining faculty and staff. The administration has given the maximum raise allowed by the legislature since I have been here. We are in fact losing more senior faculty and investing more in junior faculty. The situation is distressing; we are now looking at a second year without a raise since I have been here. We are about $4000 on average below regional salary levels. We must be innovative, find ways to direct more money in the university toward salaries. The board needs to understand this. Why, for example, can’t we keep money saved from lost faculty lines if we can maintain the quality of the education? I would like you the faculty to be able to reward yourself for being efficient.

G. Stringer asked how much closing the tuition gap would help USM. Pres.
Fleming: It would help tremendously, since closing the $90 per semester gap would net close to $2 million. An additional tuition increase would bring in another $2 million plus. The problem remains, however, that we are looking at making cuts of $5-6 million.

D. Duohon asked if it is possible that a portion of any tuition increase money would be put toward faculty and staff raises. Pres. Fleming: In the face of dramatic cuts, our first priority is to save academic programs, and our second is to save academic positions and people. When we lose programs we lose students; when we lose good people, they are gone for good, even when the times improve. We’ll do the best we can. We have to be careful about hiring, because we don’t want to bring people in and then have to cut programs. Another critical area is money for scholarships, because institutional aid is being heavily pressured.

J. Olmi suggested that USM has been consistently reasonable in attempting to address fiscal issues, but it seems than no one is listening. Perhaps it is time to be more aggressive? Pres. Fleming: Some would say that we haven’t been too polite in making our case thus far. I had a paper prepared for the board showing that though we are number one in productivity, we are seventh out of eight schools in allocation. The paper was distributed to each board member and just about everyone jumped on us. The parity discussion really hasn’t begun; it is likely to become quite vocal. Our volunteer leadership has already said to the governor and to our legislative delegation that something must be done.

J. Olmi indicated that the faculty would like to join the president and support him in the discussion over parity funding. Pres. Fleming: Faculty, staff and friends have already done much, and will continue to have opportunities to participate in discussions. Much support is needed, because on vital issues such as Gulf Park expansion and parity funding, we cannot expect help from the other schools.

D. Beckett posed two questions. First, if there is no money for anything else, where will the money for the proposed Ayers settlement come from? Second, why is there in fact "no money" if the state revenue is growing every year by about 4%? If the university's budget were growing by 4% annually, we would be in good shape. At the very least we should expect to be staying even, rather than dealing with a series of budget reductions. Pres. Fleming: Potential sources for an Ayers settlement include a software-related lawsuit settlement, the state's "rainy day" fund, so-called "tobacco money," and general obligations debt. It's clear that money doesn’t exist in the general revenue. As for the university's 4%, I can only say that our share hasn't arrived. We are still growing in enrollment and collecting more revenue than ever before, but our obligations are increasing proportionately. Some have asked why gaming industry-related revenues are not supporting education; but those monies go into the general revenue fund, and are not targeted
for education. Some have suggested raising the gaming taxes and earmarking them for education; but a recent USM study suggested that a tax increase would be unwise.

J. Smith suggested that if the point of the Ayers case is school desegregation, then a straightforward solution would appear to be the strategic use of scholarships; minorities could receive generous scholarships to attend historically white schools, and whites could receive scholarships to attend historically black universities. Pres. Fleming: We now have two different approaches to Ayers. Judge Biggers has treated it as a desegregation case, and has held up monies to Alcorn State, for instance, for spending on programs that have failed to attract more whites to the university. The plaintiffs have argued, however, that the case is not about desegregation per se, but rather about the historical inequity between white and black schools. The purpose of any settlement, they say, should be to provide enough money to the historically black universities to let them be the kind of institutions they want to be, regardless of enrollment patterns. The USM view is that Ayers is about a spirit of inclusion.

J. Olmi stated that Ayers also has an adverse impact on some programs. Clinical programs have been duplicated at other schools, for example; if we attack the duplication, however, we could lose our own programs. Pres. Fleming: There is no question that black and white schools were treated inequitably in the past. But now the problem is the larger one that many are trying to be everything to everybody without regard to the quality of the programs being offered. One school recently brought forth a proposal to establish a school of engineering technology, for example, though USM already has that program. Our issue is not with the historically black universities, which we want to succeed. We are, however, involved in a serious institutional struggle, and we have to dig in.

D. Cabana noted that the south Mississippi legislative delegations have begun to form a caucus at last, and asked if Dr. Fleming or other university representatives been invited to meet to focus on a university legislative agenda. Pres. Fleming: Let me mention a couple of things. Several months ago I invited 14 people, alumni and prominent business people, to dinner and had a ‘scare the hell out of you’ evening, focusing on financial and other issues. The group has continued to meet regularly, and also spawned another organization called the Southern Mississippi Partnership. The Area Development Partnership in Hattiesburg and the Coast 21 group came together to do this. This group has a number of objectives, including enhancing the presence of southern Mississippi in policymaking circles, and assisting USM in the Gulf Coast expansion effort. The group had a reception two weeks ago at the convention center and a great deal of commitment to USM was evident. In addition, the past presidents of our alumni council are putting forward some initiatives. A number of legislators have expressed concern and have been
invited to visit and talk with us. In short, there are many people working very hard now on our behalf.

T. Green commented on USM’s evident underfunding, noting that while it is perhaps not diplomatic to point this out, the truth should come out. Pres. Fleming: When the issue is joined, I will speak to this strongly. I have spoken on this at IHL meetings because we can’t keep going as we have and it is time to stop pretending that we can easily adjust to cutbacks.

J. Smith noted that within two weeks, the Coast 21 group will have a website up. Most of the information on the site will concern USM.

J. Rachal stated that in face of rising insurance costs and declining coverage and benefits, the Senate's Faculty Welfare committee is proposing that part of the state's tobacco settlement be used to cover rising costs of treating smoking related ailments. Can Dr. Fleming support this approach? Pres. Fleming: The approach sounds reasonable. I would make another point with university presidents and IHL board members as well – Why not take some of the tobacco money to create some endowments or other sources of funding for health and human sciences programs? The larger issue is health and not simply smoking. I'd like to see us be more innovative with those funds.

Pres. Fleming wrapped up by commenting that it is distressing to have to spend so much time talking about bureaucratic issues, to the neglect of important and exciting issues such as evaluating learning outcomes, the freshmen experience, program excellence and so on. It is dangerous to become immersed in bureaucratic matters, because it can kill our spirit and our enthusiasm. Opportunities still lie before us. We will find ways to be innovative, and we’ll fight to keep the money that we save through innovation. In my second year we began to give back lapsed salaries and other saving to the departments, and I want to see this kind of commitment continue. We’ll be strident on issues when we are right.

Following discussion with Pres. Fleming, Pres. Laughlin introduced Becky Woodrick, director of the Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Office, to answer questions about the university's pilot mediation program. B. Woodrick explained that in her recent email message on the program she inadvertently left out a list of mediators, which she then passed out to senators. She explained further that the program will run as a pilot for about a year. If it proves valuable it will become a permanent university program. At that time there will be an invitation extended to any employees who wish to become mediators. She asked that senators keep the mediation program in mind as they encounter situations for which working with a neutral third party might be an appropriate route to problem resolution, but stressed that the program does not alter anyone's right to file a
formal grievance under current policy. The current focus of the mediation pilot is on employees and not students; if successful, however, the program might expand to students with trained students serving as mediators.

M. Cobb asked if the mediation approach might apply to grade appeals. B. Woodrick responded that it would not. In general, it would not be appropriate to use mediation to address issues of academic standing or terms of employment.

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.
2. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda was approved as distributed.

3. **Minutes Approval.** Minutes of the November meeting were approved as distributed. The minutes were corrected to show that D. Duhon was not present, but rather was represented by J. Carr.

4. **Executive Committee Reports**

4.1 **President’s Report.** Pres. Laughlin delivered the following report:

**Campus Master Planning Committee**

I’ve attended a few meetings since we met three weeks ago. The Campus Master Planning Committee is continuing its work. We’ve had subcommittee meetings during the past few weeks, and there will be a full committee meeting on Monday. I hope something will be released early in the spring term for the university community to review. You need to be aware that this is a long range planning effort with the assumption that our student enrollment will increase significantly in the long term. The committee has been struggling with many issues, including how to accommodate that growth and still maintain attractive green space; how to provide for vehicular access and storage, while moving toward a pedestrian and bicycle friendly campus; how the university articulates with the surrounding community—visually and logistically; and how we can use space to maintain and strengthen campus traditions. It is also very important for you to note that very few of the new structures that you will see on this plan have been proposed or funded.

**Communications Committee**

This week the Communications Committee interviewed graduate and undergraduate and international students in an effort to get information on communication issues the students feel are important.

**Expanded Cabinet**

In Expanded Cabinet, Jane Siders, Director of the Institute for Disability Services,
made a presentation on the services they provide. The President announced that the Legislative Budget Office recommendation for next year’s budget includes a 14.57% reduction in funding for IHL. And it was announced that David Cooke of the Defense Department will be the 2:30 commencement speaker and Representative Gene Taylor will speak at the 6:30 ceremony.

Cabinet

In the Cabinet meeting this morning there was discussion of several items including the need for a "University Guest" parking space for invited university visitors; the bat problem in Panhellenic; and the need for faculty and staff representation on administrative search committees. This last item came up in relation to the Dean of Nursing search.

A draft of the new SACS accreditation standards is out and the President is asking for comment on those. The proposed standards are on the SACS web site at http://www.sacs.org

Our United Way contributions are at about 84% of our goal, and we are not certain that we will be able to make our goal.

University Faculty Senates Association

At 1:00 today, the University Faculty Senates Association held a joint meeting with the Mississippi Association of Staff Council Organizations. The purpose of the meeting is to reach agreements on issues that will allow both groups to speak with a united voice to key constituencies, such as the Governor and the Legislature. We will get Art Kaul’s report on that meeting later.

4.2 President-Elect’s Report. No report.

4.3 Secretary’s Report. No report.

4.4 Secretary-Elect’s Report. D. Alford read out the proxies. [See members represented by proxy above.]

5.0 Committee Reports.

5.1 Academic and Governance. M. Lux reported that the committee has initiated discussions with Provost Henry and Associate Provost McMahon concerning the meaning and implications of "expanded scholarship."

5.2 Administration and Faculty Evaluations. K. Davis reported that the committee met with J. T. Johnson, director of the Center for Research Support, to
discuss ways to improve the processing of administrative evaluations. A letter from the committee, along with a sample copy of the evaluation form, will be distributed to faculty through the provost's office explaining the process and emphasizing the importance of the deadline for submission. The committee letter will be out the first week of classes, followed by an endorsement letter from the provost's office. The evaluation forms themselves, which have modified slightly, will be distributed during the third week of January. Administrative evaluations are now on the Academic Calendar, and will be routinely distributed during the third week of January from now on.

5.3 Archives. No report.

5.4 Athletic Liaison. T. Green reported that he is trying to set a meeting with Athletic Director Giannini to discuss the interference of basketball game parking with night classes. The issue was raised at a previous Senate meeting.

5.5 Awards. D. Alford reported that notices to Faculty Excellence award nominees have been distributed. The deadline for submission of supporting materials by nominees is in early February, after which the committee will meet to review the materials.

5.6 Faculty Welfare. J. Rachal reported that the committee met with L. McFall, director of Human Resources, to discuss health insurance issues. Based on that meeting the committee drafted two resolutions, authored by D. Goff, previously sent to senators via email.

Resolution #1

"In the interest of improving the financial condition of the State & School Employees' Life and Health Insurance Plan and improving the value of insurance benefits for employees, the Faculty Senate requests that the Office of the President petition the state legislature to consider subsidizing the Plan for the full cost of smoking/tobacco related illness with funds from the state's tobacco settlement."

Resolution #2

"Due to budget reductions the USM Department of Human Resources lacks the personnel needed to evaluate new insurance/benefits programs available in the private sector. Due to the changing, often declining, value of available health insurance benefits for all university employees, the Faculty Senate requests that additional funding be provided to Human Resources for the restoration of the position of Benefits Manager beginning with the 2001-2002 FY."
J. Rachal moved to suspend the rules to allow consideration of and vote on the resolutions today. D. Cabana seconded the motion, which subsequently carried.

Discussion of Resolution #1:

D. Goff noted that to date all efforts have been devoted to reducing health insurance benefits in line with revenues; the approach proposed in the resolution offers a way to enhance the revenue side of equation.

S. Hubble shared two pieces of feedback she had received on the resolution from faculty in the College of Health & Human Sciences: 1) that since smoking is a behavioral choice, its health consequences should not be subsidized in this way; 2) we need greater focus on the prevention and cessation of smoking, rather than on merely addressing illness.

D. Goff responded that the latter point is a separate issue, and would be best addressed in a distinct resolution. Regarding the first concern, the rationale of the resolution is that there has been tremendous costs associated with smoking related illness, which have to be addressed anyway.

J. Palmer recommended that instead of asking the president to petition the legislature we find a legislative sponsor for a bill that would accomplish the intent of the resolution.

J. Rachal agreed with finding a legislative sponsor, but indicated that he still would like the president to advocate for the measure.

J. Smith suggested that the president is constrained by the board’s priorities, which may or may not include health insurance, and recommended working directly with legislators. Moreover, he said, the scope of the proposal might be expanded beyond smoking related illness; already tobacco funds are being used to help fund comprehensive health insurance for children.

D. Duhan agreed that a comprehensive approach is important; the legislature might well support some tobacco spending, but at too low a level. The level of present legislative contribution appears to be limited.

D. Cabana pointed out that Governor Musgrove has suggested that the legislature allocate additional funds toward the health system in lieu of pay raises for state employees.

J. Smith further observed that legislators on the joint legislative budget committee admit that the deterioration of the health system is a conscious decision. This deterioration is likely to continue as long as state employees will quietly accept it.
D. Duhon suggested that the resolution is a good idea, but represents only a small part of what the state needs to do to support the system adequately.

J. Smith followed up earlier remarks, stating that opening a debate on the use of tobacco funds in this way is good, but we should look at the entire system and not focus only on tobacco related health problems. If the state will buy insurance for children, it should buy insurance for minimum wage employees who cannot cover their families.

J. Palmer moved to amend the resolution by eliminating the phrase that specifies subsidizing the plan for the "full cost of treating smoking related illness." The motion failed to receive a second.

D. Goff moved to insert the words "no less than" after the word "for" in the final clause of the resolution. J. Smith seconded the motion, which subsequently passed.

Further discussion of the amended resolution:

D. Cabana noted that the health insurance board is powerful in its own right, aside from the legislature, and recommended that the board be put on notice that employees are dissatisfied with the benefit package.

G. Stringer argued that nothing would prevent the legislature from reducing its own contribution to the system by the amount of the tobacco money put in, and moved that concluding language be added, "and that savings thereby accrued be returned to the system." D. Cabana seconded the motion, which subsequently passed.

Discussion returned to the issue of primary emphasis, whether to place it on the president or on a direct approach to legislators. D. Duhon suggested passing the resolution without further amendment, and directing J. Palmer to seek legislative sponsorship for a bill reflective of the resolution’s intent.

Pres. Laughlin called for a vote on the resolution as amended, i.e.:

"In the interest of improving the financial condition of the State & School Employees' Life and Health Insurance Plan and improving the value of insurance benefits for employees, the Faculty Senate requests that the Office of the President petition the state legislature to consider subsidizing the Plan for not less than the full cost of smoking/tobacco related illness with funds from the state's tobacco settlement, and that savings thereby accrued be returned to the system."
The resolution was adopted. Pres. Laughlin directed J. Palmer as chair of the Government Relations committee to work toward getting an appropriate bill drafted for introduction into the upcoming legislative session.

J. Smith moved that the Senate adopt a distinct resolution directing the Government Relations committee to seek legislative sponsorship of a subsidization bill. Such authorization from a large body of faculty would help the committee in its efforts to secure a sponsor. D. Goff seconded the motion. Pres. Laughlin called for a motion to suspend the rules to permit action on the proposed resolution today. J. Palmer so moved, and D. Alford seconded the motion, which subsequently carried. Pres. Laughlin then called for a vote on the resolution itself; the resolution was adopted.

J. Rachal recommended holding over the second resolution offered by the committee for consideration at next month’s meeting. Rachal further suggested that L. McFall be invited to speak to the Senate. During McFall’s meeting with the committee, a number of significant issues emerged that the committee was not aware of, for example, the limited availability of PERS workshops on retirement. Rachal subsequently made inquiries and discovered that workshops open to all interested parties at a given institution can be arranged. Human Resources is now working to set up such a workshop at USM, perhaps in February.

5.7 Constitution and Bylaws. R. Smith was not in attendance.

5.8 Elections. No report.

5.9 Environment. The committee’s landscape proposal appears under Old Business below.

5.10 Faculty Development. B. Coates distributed the syllabus for a new research ethics course, and announced that M. Lux will co-teach the course.

5.11 Government Relations. J. Palmer reiterated the committee’s focus on developing and finding sponsorship for a health insurance subsidy bill. S. Laughlin indicated that J. Borsig will speak to the Senate in January on the university’s legislative agenda. J. Smith added that faculty had held a breakfast with seven legislators on the coast, distributing information on parity funding.

5.12 Technology. No report.

5.13 Transportation. W. Scarborough indicated that at the next meeting of the university committee he will raise an issue of parking accommodation for temporarily impaired faculty or staff, based on a case of an injured faculty member referred to him by M. Lux. Currently there is no policy to cover such instances.
Some discussion on this point followed:

D. Dunn stated that a doctor’s note is sufficient to secure a temporary handicapped sticker from the county, allowing access to handicapped parking spaces. D. Duhon argued that the university should issue a temporary permit without requiring medical documentation. S. Hubble said that at one time the university issued a temporary handicapped parking hang tag to cover such cases; perhaps this practice can be reinstated. M. Lux added that in the case she referred to W. Scarborough, public safety personnel were rude to the injured faculty member seeking assistance. D. Dunn suggested sending a message to Eddie Holloway, who has asked for feedback on transportation related issues.

D. Cabana noted that the parking situation is very bad around the Liberal Arts building, and will worsen when new building construction commences. Ticket writers are rarely seen in that part of campus. Perhaps the Senate should resolve to encourage the administration to find the resources needed to hire more ticket writers, perhaps by reprioritizing current resource expenditures. Relations between faculty and students are already strained due to competition for spaces, to the point of confrontations that occur with increasing frequency. Dr. Fleming’s concerns about authorizing faculty to write tickets is understandable, but we have to address this problem. We should enforce the regulations or eliminate all zones and allow open parking. T. Green agreed that students have become quite aggressive in expropriating faculty parking. J. Olmi noted that at some other universities, students with large fines have to work off their fines by writing tickets; the idea seems well worth exploring here. W. Scarborough stated that there is no administrative will to enforce the regulations. A permissive attitude toward student violation of the parking regulations has long been the practice at USM. D. Duhon asked if the privatization of ticket writing has been considered; Ole Miss has taken the privatization route. W. Scarborough responded that to date privatization has not been considered. Pres. Laughlin concluded the discussion, stating that she would invite R. Pierce to speak to the Senate.

5.14 AAUP Liaison. M. Dearmey was not present.

5.15 Faculty Handbook Task Force. D. Goff reported that a compilation of all of last year’s work has been forwarded to M. J. McMahon. She will respond when she gets through it. This material is available for review in Senate minutes, as well as on the Senate's website.

5.16 Association of Faculty Senates. A. Kaul was not present.

6.0 Old Business.

1. Landscape Plan. Pres. Laughlin invited discussion of the landscape plan
introduced by the
Environment Committee at the November Senate meeting.

D. Duhon stated that his impression is that we are losing both green space and parking spaces as more buildings go up. D. Conville responded that indeed the current master plan includes several new planned buildings; if carried out, this plan will further crowd an already crowded campus. A strength of the landscape proposal is the zoning approach, designed to preserve character of the various campus areas, especially the historic center of campus, and to help to counter overcrowding. Also proposed is a greenscape planning committee to help ensure that we preserve the quality living and workspace we want. The proposal is a recommendation that will go to master planning committee, as well as to the provost and president.

D. Dunn moved that the Senate endorse the Landscape Plan. T. Green seconded the motion. Discussion followed:

D. Beckett praised the plan overall while identifying two troubling specifics, first, eliminating certain parking lots given already existing parking problems, and second, the creation of semi-natural areas, which seem to conflict with efforts to improve campus safety. Clearly, transportation and security people need to review this plan if it is to have any chance of implementation. D. Conville responded that the proposal will go to the university master plan committee and will be reviewed thoroughly. The committee is most concerned to preserve the principles of zoning, planting shade trees on the south sides of buildings, etc., rather than this or that specific. There is a continuing conversation about many particular issues. D. Beckett suggested that it might then be best to eliminate specific examples from the proposal. G. Stringer indicated that he serves on the master planning committee and believes that it is premature to go forward with this document as a firm proposal. All the issues included in it are under consideration; before anything is put in place, the plans will be shared. It will not help the process for the Senate to commit itself at this point. It would be better to say we simply forward this draft document as part of the larger discussion. D. Conville acknowledged the distinction between actual endorsement and approval for submission as something to be considered and indicated that the latter would be acceptable to the Environment Committee.

Discussion ensued as to the best parliamentary course – either to vote down the motion on the floor (to endorse the Landscape Plan), or to endorse an amended proposal. D. Alford recommended voting down the motion and developing a more general alternative. Instead, D. Dunn withdrew the original motion, emphasizing that the Senate must have early input to the planning discussion, so that we are not left having to react to decisions after the fact. D. Alford moved that the Faculty
Senate endorse the Environment Committee’s efforts to advocate for the protection of green space on campus. The motion did not receive a second. D. Duhon suggested simply recommending that the Committee submit the plan without an endorsement. D. Beckett proposed striking one passage from the section of the document titled "Zone 2 – Central Park" (p. 3) – everything in the sentence after "buildings" up to the word "rehabilitated." J. Palmer moved to allow the proposal to move forward with endorsement of Faculty Senate with the deletion on p. 3 suggested by D. Beckett. J. Smith seconded the motion, which subsequently passed, with three "no" votes.

7.0 New Business.

J. Olmi asked if the parking guards posted during athletic events could relax restrictions after a certain point in the game, e.g., in the third quarter. T. Green reiterated that he is pursuing the issue now in reference to basketball games. W. Scarborough argued that the parking restrictions should be enforced through to the conclusion of the game.

D. Cabana shared concerns emerging from the Continuing Education Committee. Memoranda from the committee on important issues – including faculty and staff tuition waivers for correspondence courses, and the development and delivery of on-line courses – have been sent to the provost over the course of nearly two years but have received no response. Here again there appears to be a major problem with communication between the administration and the faculty. Cabana recommended inviting S. Pace, director of Continuing Education, to speak to the Senate on issues related to on-line courses.

G. Stringer recommended that in its January meeting the Senate take up the matter of its public positions on critical financial issues, notably on the issue of faculty raises.

8.0 Announcements. No announcements were made.

9.0 Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Michael Forster, Faculty Senate Secretary