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The University of Southern Mississippi  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
May 3, 2002  
Union Hall of Honors  
2:00 p.m.

Members Present:  
College of the Arts:  K. Davis, D. Douglas.  
College of Business:  D. Duhon, T. Green.  
College of Int’l & Continuing Education:  M. Miller.  
College of Nursing:  E. Harrison.  
College of Marine Sciences:  J. Lytle.  

Members Represented by Proxy:  
College of the Arts:  S. Nielsen (A. Wallace).  
College of Business:  R. Smith (J. Rachal).  
College of Education & Psychology:  S. Alber (J. Palmer).  
College of Liberal Arts:  D. Goff (A. Kaul).  
College of Nursing:  K. Masters (E. Harrison).  
University Libraries:  S. Laughlin (T. Graham).

Members Absent:  
College of Liberal Arts:  M. Dearmey, K. Greene.  
College of Science & Technology:  C. Hoyle.

1.0 Call to Order:  
2:00 p.m.

2.0 Approval of Agenda:  
S. Hubble requested that 7.2 under New Business be eliminated.  
MOVED to approve agenda, D. Cabana.  
Seconded, A. Wallace.  
PASSED to approve.

3.0 Approval of Minutes:  
J. Palmer:  Under 5.0, delete “Don’t” from 3rd paragraph and under 4.1, 4th line change “cuts” to “increases.”  
MOVED to approve minutes, D. Cabana.  
SECONDED, J. Rachal.  
PASSED to approve minutes of April meeting.

4.0 Officer’s Reports:  

4.1 President’s Report:  
Susan Hubble:  Don Cabana and I met with Dr. Thames on his first day in office.  
We told him that we wanted the faculty to continue to have representation in the budget process.  
He reported that he will maintain the current cabinet structure.  
Dr. Thames indicated that he wants faculty senate support.  
He intends to establish a Master Teacher designation.  
The President also reemphasized his commitment to faculty salary increases.  
We discussed the possibility of having monthly meetings with the faculty senate officers.  
The meeting was brief, but good.  
We hope to maintain open communication about our priorities as a faculty senate with the President.

At the May meeting of IHL Board, the HB 1148 was discussed.  
This bill designates a means for faculty retirement buyout.  
Each institution can respond as they wish in applying this option.

J. Olmi:  Is it unfounded that there will be forced retirements?

S. Hubble:  The buyouts must be funded by each institution.  
There was an article in the newspaper quoting an Ole Miss administrator as to whether these buyouts would really lead to savings.  
The buyouts could be
paid incrementally over a period of time. Institutions would then be free to use the salary savings for other purposes or to replace faculty with entry level faculty members. Nothing is really clear at this time. The title of the bill is 2 pages long and there are 35 pages of text.

J.Olmi: Is there something else about the legislation that caps the time?

S.Hubble: I think there is a cap (window of time which extends for two years). We plan to have another meeting with

The President about the academic calendar.

M.Miller: Is there any new discussion about who will be the next provost?

S.Hubble: No. I can ask for a time table on that.

D. Cabana: It will come. It may be several months. He doesn’t seem to be in a hurry.

4.2 President-Elect’s Report: D. Cabana: None.

4.3 Secretary’s Report: Darlys Alford: None

4.4 Secretary-Elect’s Report: Toby Graham: See PROXIES above.

5.0 Committee Reports: Yearly Summaries

5.1 Academic and Governance: Kate Greene, Chair, None

5.2 Administrative & Faculty Evaluations: Elizabeth Harrison and Julia Lytle. There is a campus-wide committee on student evaluations and Julia and I are both on that committee. We learned from the evaluation of administrators that next year it will be essential to have faculty peel-off names to protect confidentiality. Also, there were some deans who did not understand the instructions completely.

J. Lytle: We discussed the evaluation of associate assistant deans. Our recommendation is that assistant deans be eliminated. We also recommend that only those defined in the faculty handbook as qualified to participate in department governance be included in the evaluation of administrators.

S. Hubble: Do you wish to present these changes as a motion?

J.Palmer: I move that we accept the committee’s recommendations. MOVED, J. Palmer. SECONDED, E. Harrison.

S.Hubble: Do you want to take these two changes as a package?

J.Lytle: That would be easier.

J. Palmer: We are not changing anything by defining eligibility by what is designated in the handbook. We don’t need a resolution for that.

B. Scarborough: Do you mean tenure-track faculty, rather than tenured faculty?

S. Hubble: Doesn’t the handbook use the terminology “core of instruction.”
M. Forster: Yes. The correct term is “core of instruction” in referring to eligibility for department governance.

S. Hubble: Let’s amend the resolution to read, “Core of Instruction.”

J. Palmer: There is some discussion about whether visiting professors are considered part of the “core of instruction.”

S. Oshrin: We might want to include instructors, any permanent faculty.

S. Hubble: Full-time members of the core of instruction would cover instructors, too.

S. Naghshpour: Not all instructors are included.

A. Wallace: Let’s use the faculty handbook language.

JP. Smith: I move that we divide the resolution. MOVED to divide the resolution, JP. Smith. SECONDED, D.

Duhon. PASSED to divide the resolution.

Duhon: The part of the resolution that has to deal with assistant deans needs some more work. Can we refer it back to the committee?

JP. Smith: What do you want the committee to do?

J. Palmer: Call the question.

S. Hubble: We are voting on the following resolution: Based on our discussion regarding faculty evaluation of assistant/associate deans in the April Faculty Senate meeting, the Administration and Faculty Evaluations Committee recommends that the evaluation of assistant/associate deans be dropped from our annual faculty evaluation except when assistance in administering such an evaluation is requested by a dean. Is there any other discussion? VOTE, The motion is PASSED.

D. Duhon: Our committee is going to ask the university to do away with the students teaching evaluations as a way to deal with grade inflation. This is a discussion taking place in the larger university committee on teaching evaluations.

5.3 Awards: Bob Smith: J. Rachal: A report is being sent by Bob Smith.

5.4 Faculty Welfare: J. Meyer: Last year the committee passed six resolutions that are summarized on the handout submitted for the senate’s review. The scope of our activities maybe keeps us even with the many accomplishments of last year’s committee. The proposed changes to the academic calendar are now in the hands of the provost and I just heard that the calendar committee for the university has been reconvened. Finally, note that our proposal regarding the extension of free classes to faculty spouses has some support from the Human resource person, Russ Willis.

5.5 Government Relations: Trellis Green. J. Palmer: You have the report to read. If you have any questions, I would be willing to answer them.

S. Hubble: Are there any questions? Hearing none, we thank you for your report.
5.6 Technology: Jim Miller: There is an action item in front of you. I passed this out at the last meeting. When we use the internet from the university we have a “shared resource.” Anyone who misuses the system may jeopardize all of us. In working through the earlier drafts of the document, especially concerning academic freedom, Lee Gore made several changes. The university will evaluate to see if any problem situation should be turned over to authorities. Lee Gore stated that if an activity is against the law, it must be turned over to the authorities. I would like to have Faculty Senate support this document. I feel pretty good about it.

D. Dunn: Under rights of the university (p. 3), the university has the authority to take over any computer for any purpose. The department has to pay to provide these machines, yet there is no stipulation about the costs of replacement here.

B. Coates: We found out that that is the way it is with state property. We discussed some specific problems and Lee Gore made it clear that the university has authority over all its equipment.

M. Henry: Who is the university? Anyone could come in and seize the computer? Is there any process for getting information about why this is happening?

D. Dunn: In our department, the military provided computers to do a contract but the computers have university number on them. Does this mean that the university can take these computers, too?

M. Miller: If a computer is used in an illegal manner, it will be confiscated to make sure that the evidence is not destroyed.

D. Cabana: If the university seizes a computer and there has been something illegal what are the person’s rights? In the prisons, we had a specific policy about this.

G. Rayborn: I would be surprised if there is any way to change this. I suspect that the administration will not allow any variation from this.

M. Henry: I would want to know what I am being accused of.

B. Coates: If you have your own computer in your office, you have rights over what is on it.

S. Naghshpour: Let them prove that there is something illegal.

M. Miller: I think that the reason that they had us review it is so that we would not be blindsided by it when it become official policy.

M. Hall: It says it is unacceptable for us to use computers for any personal gain. Does that eliminate the use of e-mail for messages with our families and friends?

M. Miller: The intent is to insure that university resources are not used for personal profits and that private businesses not be expected to compete with those which have the advantage of using state-provided equipment.

S. Oshrin: What about if our students were asked to review pictures that the attorney general might find objectionable?

J. Miller: What we understood was that persons who are conducting legitimate research should have approval for this research and then there would be no surprises since clearance would be obtained through the university.
S. Oshrin: Nursing students could, for example, need to look at pictures of women with breast cancer.

A. Kaul: In defining unacceptable use, would this preclude research on pornography? There are some legitimate reasons to study this question.

K. Davis: I pay for internet at home. Here, I do not keep my correspondence for business that is related to my creative work because I get paid for these.

S. Naghshpour: But, after the fact, it could be a problem.

D. Cabana: Would CJ students studying pornography be limited from looking at evidence on the internet related to this topic. What should be the limit?

B. Scarborough: I think that this is clearly written and these hypothetical problems are making a mountain out of a molehill.

B. Coates: We took several things off this list and the intent was not to limit academic freedom. What this is about is conducting illegal activity or running a business from a university office. It was intended to explain what is illegal. We even talked about things that were questionable and accepted that in certain disciplines these topics are appropriate.

A. Wallace: There are conflicts between law and university policy. It is not always clear.

J. Rachal: Collecting illegal pornography without legitimate academic purpose is clearly illegal.

J. Miller: OTR has not been heavy-handed. This document provides the means for having conversations with the faculty about what is academically meaningful.

JP. Smith: Maybe we need the addition of the phrase “with the authorization of the President” when a computer is confiscated.

B. Coates: There was a desire to be able to disconnect a computer if there was some kind of criminal act going on without having to contact the President.

JP. Smith: How long does it take to call the President?

J. Miller: As part of this process, there has been a 24-hour number set up. During Christmas, we got a message that a computer on campus was being used to attack a computer in Michigan. We had to scramble. I have had to talk to the FBI several times with in light of our connections with Stennis and other government agencies.

M. Hall: Please give us the number that is 24-hour. I have had to contact the FBI about a message that was a banking scam just recently.

M. Miller: I have been encouraging the university for years to come up with a number.

M. Henry: I would feel more comfortable on the issue of computer confiscation with the word “justifiable.”

B. Coates: Lee Gore said that we have to define justifiable and that it can lead to delays that would be a problem in some cases.
M. Miller: I don’t want to spend too much time on this one issue. Could we continue this discussion at a later time?

S. Hubble: All those in favor of tabling this please indicate by saying yea. VOTED to table with Yea vote.

D. Dunn: One more suggestion. Since most of the OTR is technically at the help desk, we need a person dedicated to web.

S. Hubble: This is a long document and we need to review it carefully.

5.7 **AAUP:** Bill Scarborough: We held a general meeting yesterday afternoon. We appointed committees on tenure and academic freedom. We also drafted a letter to Pres. Thames asking him to meet with the executive committee. We are working on the wording of it now. We are concerned about share our thoughts on the candidates for provost. The meeting will be our last meeting till fall. We are also drawing up an account of the Presidential selection to forward to the national office. If there is a problem, we may ask for their assistance in addressing the procedures used.

J. Olmi: Is it appropriate to save spot for the AAUP.

S. Hubble: The committees are designated, but the president can create standing committees as needed. I have included the AAUP.

5.8 **Transportation:** Bill Scarborough: We met again 4/29 and finalized the new zones necessitated by the construction. The Chain Parking lot will remain commuter designated. The Charcoal Room lot will be fac/staff and the lot by Bond will also be zoned fac/staff. On the west side of the campus, the natatorium lot will be fac/staff. We are having to give up the theater lot; 60-80 spaces north of the nursing building will be converted for our use. That will help.

D. Cabana: We need to let the guard shack person know that they should stop passing out visitor passes like water.

B. Scarborough: They tried to ask why visitors were needing these passes and there was outcry from deans and others whose friends were detained with questions.

S. Hubble: Maybe legitimate IDs should be given to keep track of visitors.

B. Scarborough: We hope that Thames will be more receptive to our concerns about parking. He said that he would be.

K. Davis: We could require those expecting visitors to give a list of these names or hand out passes ahead of time.

G. Rayborn: This is done at Tulane.

PJ. Smith: Everybody pays to park on campus at many universities.

B. Scarborough: There should be a central place to get parking passes. We have these little white tags and we passed a resolution concerning them. Anyone who wants a white tag has to come before the transportation committee at the beginning of the year. Visitor passes and special passes are to be carefully controlled. There is a problem with 50 faculty hang tags that have been stolen.

J. Rachal: I am glad that Bill and Shelby are “tight.” What can you do about the status of the roads?
B. Scarborough: Many of the roads are supposed to be maintained by the city.

M. Forster: Isn’t there some polymer product that permanently would solve this problem. Odorless, too.

B. Scarborough: Just to review, 128 fac/staff spaces are being lost in the liberal arts lot and these will be added north of nursing.

5.9 University Faculty Handbook: Michael Forster/David Goff. This is a standing university committee. We have met religiously this year –even this morning. Gary Springer is helping with wording that makes the Handbook more understandable. So we are in the process of cleaning up the language and combining chapters. A few things have to be finished and it will be put on the website when it is ready. Because we have legal counsel, the VPs, and other top ranking officials of the university, it is believed that we will not have to go back and get approvals from these people again. Chapter 13 on grievances is still not complete at this time.

5.10 UFSA: Art Kaul: I can report that the resolution to set up a task force to study Presidential searches has gone forward through UFSA. I think I see some traction here and perhaps we will come together to make joint proposal to the board. I would recommend to the president-elect that we appoint a 5-member (not over 7) mostly facsen members and some AAUP to the task force.

6.0 Old Business. None

7.0 New Business

7.1 Election Committee: Don Cabana: Election of President-Elect and Secretary-Elect for 2002-2003.

D. Cabana: There are two candidates for each position. Would the faculty senate like to hear from the candidates? Are you willing?

D. Dunn: Point of order. We should get nominations from the floor first.

Cabana: Are there any more nominations? Hearing none, let’s hear from the candidates.

Myron Henry: It is an honor to be nominated. I have reflected on what I have been observing in the faculty senate and I have seen some progress on the issue of shared governance. It continues to be the top issue. What would I bring to Cabana’s team? Budget knowledge. I am honored to be considered.

James Pat Smith: When I was asked if I would accept this, I decided that if you select me, I will have to have an active executive committee and some conference calling. I like the idea of having a few main goals for the faculty senate and also address emergency calls. I would want the faculty senate to become more politically active in the future.

D. Cabana: Are we prepared to vote?

J. Rachal and J. Lytle distributed ballots for the President-Elect. Dr. Myron Henry was elected.

D. Cabana: Any nominations for Secretary-Elect from the floor? Hearing none, could our candidates speak?

Joe Olmi: No comment.
Kimberley Davis: If chosen I will do my best.

Ballots were distributed and Joe Olmi was elected Secretary-Elect.

D. Cabana: I would like to thank John and his committee for their work in providing us with nominations.

7.2 Year End Party: Directions and comments from Host, Darlys Alford (6:00 pm, 2 Redfern Trail, Petal)

8.0 Announcements:

M. Nettles: We are having a third round of balloting in a few cases for new Faculty Senate members

B. Scarborough: I would like to thank you, Susan Hubble, and give you a round of applause since I will not be at the June meeting. Thank you. (Applause).

S. Hubble: The University Service Award for Excellence has been awarded to Margot Hall and the Professional Service Award for Excellence has been given to Joe Olmi.

D. Cabana: Toby has the schedule of meeting dates for next year posted on the Faculty Senate website.

9.0 Adjournment 3:50 pm.

Year End Reports Submitted: 5/3/2002

1. Administrative and Faculty Evaluations Committee Report for 2001-2002

2. Faculty Welfare Committee Year-End report

3. Government Relations Committee Annual Report

4. Technology Committee (Attachment: University of Southern Mississippi Information Technology Resource Use and Security Policies draft version 4/26/02)