

5-2-2003

## Faculty Senate Minutes - May 2, 2003

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 2, 2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 44.  
[http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes/44](http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/44)

This 2002/03 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 Meeting**

**May 2, 2003**

**GCRL, Ocean Springs**

**3:00 p.m.**

**Members Present: College of the Arts:** Ki. Davis, T. Lewis **College of Business:** J. Crockett, D. Duhon, T. Green **College of Education & Psychology:** T. Harsell, J. Olmi, J. Palmer, J. Rachal **College of Health & Human Sciences:** J. Bethel **College of Liberal Arts:** S. Malone, J. Meyer, J. Norton **College of Marine Science:** J. Lytle **College of Nursing:** A. Brock **College of Science & Technology:** D. Beckett, P. Butko, B. Coates, R. Folse, M. Hall, M. Henry, J. Mattson, G. Russell **University Libraries:** T. Graham **USM-Gulf Coast:** D. Alford, Ka. Davis, S. Naghshpour, J.P. Smith

**Members Represented by Proxy: College of the Arts:** S. Nielsen (Ki. Davis) **College of Business:** **College of Education & Psychology:** **College of Health & Human Sciences:** S. Graham-Kresge (D. Alford), S. Hubble (T. Graham), M.F. Nettles (M. Henry) **College of International and Continuing Education:** M. Miller (J. Rachal) **College of Liberal Arts:** M. Dearmey (A. Young), P. Gentile (T. Lewis), A. Miller (T. Lewis), S. Oshrin (J. Rachal), B. Scarborough (M. Henry), J. Waltman (A. Young) **College of Nursing:** K. Masters (A. Brock) **USM-Gulf Coast:**

**Members Absent: College of Liberal Arts:** D. Cabana, L. Nored **College of Science & Technology:** M. Cobb

**1.0 Call to Order [3:20]**

**2.0 Forum Speaker:** Vernon Asper: [welcoming remarks] The College of Marine Science is comprised of the Dept. of Coastal Sciences (Ocean Springs), Dept. of Marine Science (Stennis), J.L. Scott Marine Education Center and Aquarium (Biloxi), Center for Ocean and Atmospheric Modeling (Stennis), Center for Fisheries Research and Development (Ocean Springs), Hydrographic Science Research Center (Stennis), Center for Trace Analysis (Stennis), and Gulf Coast Geospatial Center (Ocean Springs).

Academic contributions include M.S. and Ph.D. programs in Marine Science, M.S. in Hydrographic Science, M.S. and Ph.D. in Coastal Sciences, GCRL Summer Field Program, and B.S. in Marine Biology (cooperatively through USM Dept. of Biological Sciences).

State appropriations have declined over past several years, but contracts, grants, and other self-generated funds have increased, so the overall budget has continued to rise [Combined totals: \$11.2M (FY98), \$16.2M (FY99), \$17.2M (FY00), \$20M (FY01), and \$20.6M (FY02). State appropriations: \$4.2M

in FY98 and \$4.1M in FY02.] We have 45 eligible PIs with \$14,823,005 in income in FY02, so that works out to be \$329,400 in grants and contracts per P.I.

Our college is one of those that has been eliminated. I want to be as positive about that as possible. This [funded research] will continue. We are reorganizing ourselves into a School of Ocean and Earth Sciences with 4 academic departments: Coastal Sciences (at GCRL), Marine Science (Stennis), Geology (Hattiesburg), and Geography (Hattiesburg). There are 3 centers under Marine Science: Trace Analysis; Hydrographic Sciences; and Ocean, Earth, and Atmospheric Sciences Modeling. The Gulf Coast Geospatial Center is under Coastal Sciences, and the J.L. Scott Marine Education Center and Aquarium and Center for Fisheries Research and Development are under GCRL. This plan has been approved by stakeholders and submitted to the provost. We are continuing to build our programs and to thrive and prosper.

D. Duhon: How many faculty and students?

V. Asper: We have about 24 tenure-track faculty between 2 departments. The eligible PIs also include a lot of our research faculty. We have non-PhD and PhD faculty who are non-tenure track (20-24). They do a lot of the work and generate money. We have about 200 total personnel counting all of our support staff. We function as a miniature university with our own purchasing department, property, financial affairs. We're integrated into PeopleSoft, but somewhat independent. We have about 80 students (all grad students) divided pretty evenly among the 2 departments.

J. Mattson: Can you say anything about the dean search?

V. Asper: Yes, I am co-chair of the committee, though Gordon Cannon is doing all of the work so I give him the credit. We have 3 candidates coming in: Ed Jarrol (Northeastern), Rex Gandy (Idaho), and Robert Bolla (Youngstown State).

J. Mattson: Are there funding problems? We hear rumors that the salaries are more than the deans are getting currently, and that that might be a problem.

V. Asper: I have no knowledge of that one way or the other. I hope that they will be competitive. In a faculty meeting this morning the question came up of whether it is a real search or whether there is someone already in mind. These are real searches. We have had zero input from the administration, no suggestions, no nominations. As far as we can tell, it is a completely open search. We have 3 outstanding candidates in Science and Technology.

M. Hall: Do you plan on having additional undergraduate programs?

V. Asper: Geology and Geography will bolster our undergraduate numbers. In marine and coastal science probably not, because there is not much you can do with an undergraduate degree in marine science. What we look for in our graduate students is someone with a solid background in biology, chemistry, geology, or math. We'll train those students in the application of their background in the field of marine science. But with our new school, hopefully we will have some undergraduate programs.

M. Hall: I really meant in marine science or oceanography.

V. Asper: Typically not, but we're looking at establishing a program in environmental science. That would be an undergraduate program, perhaps a part of this school and in affiliation with Gulf Park. There are a lot of applications for those degrees on the Coast.

**3.0 Approval of Agenda:** D. Alford: move; J. Olmi: second; Vote: passed

#### **4.0 Approval of Minutes**

For April 11 meeting: [D. Beckett: Change "disfranchise" to "disenfranchise."]

For April 23 meeting: [Remarks on staff attorneys attributed to A. Brock actually made by J. Bethel.] D. Duhon: move; J. Lytle: second; Vote: passed

#### **5.0 Officers' Reports**

**5.1 President-Elect's Report:** M. Henry: D. Cabana resigned effective May 12. I was as surprised as most of you. I have not actually seen a letter of resignation. I read it in the press. We have to regroup and move forward from here as a Senate. It has been a challenging year, and I am sure that for the president [of FS] it has been an exceedingly challenging year.

A. Young: Don didn't talk to you directly?

M. Henry: No, I learned from the press. I did talk to him briefly at a reception. I asked him if there was a way that he could stay for the rest of his term.

A. Young: We don't know why he picked May 12?

M. Henry: I don't know why he picked May 12.

A. Young: Has he resigned as president or from FS?

M. Henry: I know only that he has resigned as president based on what has appeared in the press and what he's said personally. He and I didn't have a long conversation.

G. Mattson: As far as I know, he hasn't withdrawn from being elected.

P. Butko: As I recall, he is still on ballot for the second round of elections.

D. Duhon: It seems to me that there are 2 sides: resignation and acceptance. A person can resign, but it doesn't necessarily have to be accepted. I don't understand what happened. He asked for a few more weeks. We granted it, and then he resigned. Did he not get the message that we said, "Okay, do what you can." I would be in favor of refusing his resignation. He said he wanted 6 more weeks and we're going to give it to him.

J. Palmer: We don't have anything to act on. Contact Don, and have him make the resignation official. There should be some type of letter. That would be standard operating procedure.

A. Young: I would worry about asking him to stay on if this is for health reasons as we've read in the press. What would that get us in terms of working with the administration?

M. Henry: The constitution is clear that if the president is unable to attend that the president-elect acts on his behalf, which I am doing today. We'll try to contact him, but there wasn't that opportunity. Any of you should encourage him to stay to finish his term if that is what you would like.

**5.2 Secretary's Report:** T. Graham: See proxies, above.

**5.3 Secretary-Elect's Report:** J. Olmi: I have sent the schedule to the Union reservations office. We will post the schedule pending their indication of availability for those dates.

G. Mattson: Can we avoid having the room where there is noise from the next room?

J. Olmi: We have either the room with the column or the one with the noise. Neither is perfect.

B. Coates: The Hall of Honors is preferable.

J. Olmi: I have indicated that the Gulf Coast location is yet to be determined.

D. Alford: We have had the GC meeting in April. It is difficult for people to travel this late in the semester.

J. Lytle: This meeting originally was scheduled for April.

J. Olmi: So, I will move the GC meeting to the April meeting.

## **6.0 Committee Reports**

**6.1 AAUP:** A. Young: We had a general meeting on April 22 at which we elected new officers: F. Glamser, president; B. Coates, vice-president; Mark Klinedinst, treasurer; A. Young, secretary; and J. Bethel, membership chair. At large members are D. Alford, N. Kaul, and S. Judd. New officers will take office in fall. The existing officers and incoming officers will meet together through the summer.

**6.2 Administrative Evaluations Committee:** Ki. Davis: [Sample evaluation forms distributed.] At the special Wednesday meeting, FS raised the issue of evaluation of the upper administration. The committee prepared a form to help in the discussion on how we might want to proceed. G. Mattson and I met with J.T. Johnston who handles the evaluation for the deans and chairs. The timing is difficult, since we're at the end of the semester. We would need 60-80% faculty participation to have credible results. We want to evaluate the overall performance over last 12 months. We're not going to stack questions toward our perspective. Subsequent conversations have suggested that we wait until fall to do the evaluation, that faculty may be leaving early. We need to talk to P. Butko about dissemination to of the instrument to faculty. The key is having 60-80% participation for it to be credible. We also have the form that was used 1987-1989. I typed up the questions from the old form and combined them with questions from the new form. The former one got to core of what we're interested in. It addresses all issues. At the bottom of form

has allows participants to indicate their level of confidence in the administrator. J.T. Johnson suggested that we have only 8-10 questions. The former one (1987-1989) had 25. The one we've created for the provost has 24.

D. Alford: We haven't voted to do this. Is this a discussion of the possibility?

Ki. Davis: It came up last week, so we decided to put something together while people still are on campus. If we decide to do it before fall, it has to be done immediately. If we want to wait until fall, then we can reconsider this then. We've prepared a form in the event that you want to move forward with it.

J. Palmer: I think it's too late to try to do this type of evaluation. Also, I agree with J.T. Johnson in that a shorter instrument would be more effective. Some of these items will not be applicable to many. We should have items on which faculty have enough information to form an opinion.

J. Rachal: How does this compare to the one done for Dr. Lucas?

Ki. Davis: It is the same. The only change is in the provosts questions.

J. Rachal: I like that this is something we've done, part of our history, rather than reactive.

A. Young: When I evaluate our dean, there are questions that I can't answer. I don't see it as a problem that I don't have information on every question. The number of questions is similar to the dean evaluation. I don't think it's too long. Would everyone evaluate both provosts? Promotion letters were signed by both provosts.

Ki. Davis: Maybe we should stick to campus by campus.

D. Alford: But that's not how it's going.

R. Folsie: Let's make this clear since we have guests that this has nothing to do with a vote of confidence. Only the person and their superior would get the results. Not the press, and no one else.

J. Crockett: Can we weight this based on how much interaction people have with the particular administrator?

D. Duhon: It's on the form for deans or chairs.

B. Coates: We had this problem with assistant deans. How did we solve that?

D. Duhon: We quit doing it.

D. Beckett: [Weighting based on frequency of interaction] would unnecessarily complicate this. There is a "not applicable/no basis for opinion" option if people think they don't have enough information to make a judgment. I think we should go forward with this. Faculty will be here all next week. We were evaluated; we evaluated the deans. The administration has been in place a year. We should go ahead and evaluate.

J. Bethel: They'll all be here next week. We should proceed.

R. Folsie: How long does it take to get the labels?

P. Butko: If you call in the morning, you can have them in the afternoon. Address labels shouldn't be a problem.

R. Folsie: So, we could send this out Monday afternoon?

J.P. Smith: What is our procedure to make sure that these are used as a normal evaluation that helps people to grow? Our student evaluations are not distributed to the public and are used to help our organization to self-correct. What is the process we followed before for Dr. Lucas and others?

Ki. Davis: The report of the previous committee [1989 FS Administrative Evaluations Committee] indicated that, though there should not be a public announcement of the results, there should be some communication of the overall assessment.

M Henry: If this is a FS evaluation, then one would expect that some portion of the FS would have access to the tabulated information.

Ki Davis: I get the report and return it to the chairs.

M. Henry: So, FS does see tabulated information. Those are the kinds of things (with the resurrection of the evaluation) that we would feel comfortable with in going forward. So, first question: go forward or wait until fall. Second question: do we have to have a process that is manageable quickly or have a process where we have more time to refine?

R. Folsie: I don't understand the purpose of the first question [on the sample form]. You could strike that.

D. Duhon: Did J.T. Johnson say he could do it in a timely way?

Ki. Davis: He could, but would rather wait.

J. Norton: This is commendable, but we have to have a process in place that is not questionable. There should be enough people participating to make it valid and should have all the details of how it is conducted down pat before it is done. With the deans and chairs, there is advance notice so that typed comments can be prepared. I don't see how we can put that kind of process together this fast.

B. Coates: We want to treat it with the same care that we treat the deans evaluation so it doesn't seem reactive or mean-spirited. This is better than the confidence vote. This gives feedback and could be accepted more easily. There are different categories, so they can see exactly what people aren't happy with. We should treat this the exact same as the deans evaluation.

Ki. Davis: This originally came up to counteract the emotionalism of the confidence vote. It would be good to poll our constituencies on how they feel about the evaluation. I have more in favor of going forward in doing something rather than doing nothing.

D. Alford: Part of the deans process is to opt to go to a meeting or send it to J.T. Johnson.

Ki. Davis: We can't send them to J.T. Johnson.

S. Malone: How long have the provosts been in office? Less than 12 months.

M. Henry: We could make a motion to go forward. If it passes, then we could look at timing.

J. Olmi: Let's articulate the process then bring it before FS. Let FS vote on something concrete. Let's know how this will transpire.

A. Young: If we're voting to evaluate, it's not to endorse this form.

M. Henry: We would understand the process when we vote on it. We could decide to move forward, then look at when and what form it would take.

Ki. Davis: [Reading from document, "Faculty and Administrative Evaluation Committee Summary Report to the Faculty Senate, 1988-1989," p. 4, Recommendation 1:] "The perception that faculty evaluations of administrators have no impact is essentially a matter of trust. Since faculty are not informed of the outcome of their evaluation of administrators, it is impossible for them to know whether or not they have an impact. Although we do not recommend that administrators be required to publicize the results of their evaluations to those who have evaluated them, a summary of the evaluations and a statement of why various suggestions are or are not practicable would enhance faculty members confidence that their opinions were taken seriously. Such a response would also allow administrators to inform the faculty of some of the most difficult and least understood aspects of administration, perhaps leading the faculty to develop more realistic expectations of their leaders."

J.P. Smith: It becomes the option of the administrator to discuss the evaluation if they want to.

Ki. Davis: We, as a body, would have the results because we would preside over the process. My question to the committee was who the results would go to. To the IHL Board? The evaluatees' immediate superiors get the results.

R. Folsie: Do we get the results from the deans survey?

Ki. Davis: Not the written comments, but the numbers of those who participated and colleges that participated.

R. Folsie: But you didn't share that with FS, right?

Ki. Davis: No.

D. Beckett: I was hoping we'd proceed along what M. Henry was saying. If we proceed, the results should go to who is being evaluated and to who is above them. The provosts' should go to Thames; Thames' comments should go to IHL. Making this available to the press would be disastrous and wrong. We wouldn't want our own evaluation information released. That would be a cheap shot. If FS does get a copy, it should be put somewhere where no one sees it.

M. Henry: D. Beckett is talking about process. There is no evaluation, unless those who are evaluating see it. It seems to me that some part of FS should see it. Who else sees it is another question.

J. Rachal: Move to proceed with a deliberate and thoughtful evaluation process. In the future, we can decide what the nature of that process will be. I don't think we should do it Monday; there are a lot of ambiguities. S. Malone has pointed out that the provosts haven't even been in office 12 months. If we're doing this as a FS body, then the results are not our business. They are the business of the IHL Board and those being evaluated.

R. Folsie: Substitute motion: evaluate just as we do for deans, and do it in the fall.

D. Alford: second



M Hall: Were there other vice-presidents evaluated during the 80s?

Ki. Davis: Yes, it included the president, vice-president of academic affairs, vice-president for research, the deans, and chairs.

J. Palmer: Does a yes vote adopt this document? I think the committee should come back with a more abbreviated document and with procedures written.

M. Henry: I interpret the motion as that we'll go forward, and do it (to the extent possible) like the deans, but not that this is the final instrument.

D. Beckett: Why can we not have the question: should we go forward or not? If it's yes, then let's vote when.

R. Folsie: I rescind the amendment; let's leave the time off. [Repeating motion:] move that we evaluate upper administrators (president and provosts) according to same guidelines that we are presently evaluating deans and chairs with the instrument and timing to be determined.

D. Alford: Second still holds.

P. Butko: So it would be in January, as with deans.

M. Henry: Leaving the motion with the details to be worked out doesn't necessarily imply that it will be identical to current evaluations.

Ki. Davis: We have procedures in place. It won't be a problem to update these, but it would behoove us to establish what we're going to stick with.

J. P. Smtih: Amend motion: by last day of September we will have put this process forward.

R. Folsie: Withdraw motion; D. Alford: Withdraw second

M. Henry: Let's consider whether we're going forward.

D. Duhon: Can't we refer this back to committee to come up with a process and to report at the first meeting in the fall?

J. Bethel: Move that we evaluate the upper administration.

S. Malone: Second

J.P. Smith: I'm going to vote against this based on the fact that it could happen next week.

S. Naghashpour: We will mislead if the perception is that this is being done for another reason other than a pure evaluation. We didn't evaluate the upper administration when we evaluated the deans. That was our fault. We should wait, and evaluate all at one time.

J. Bethel: Why waste our time talking about the process and timing if ultimately we aren't going to evaluate them? Let's decide whether we're going to evaluate.

Vote: passed

D. Alford: Move that the Administrative Evaluation committee prepare a plan consistent with our existing administrative evaluations.

S. Naghashpour: Second

D. Duhon: When will they do that?

D. Alford: At the June meeting.

Ki. Davis: I don't think there is a problem doing this at a different time from the deans.

D. Beckett: So, we won't be evaluating next week?

M. Henry: That would be my interpretation.

J. Palmer: Does it include looking at the instrument and streamlining?

M. Henry: Yes, the entire process and timing. If this motion passes, then I suggest that each of you examine the form and submit your suggestions to the committee.

J. Olmi: Will the report be circulated before the June meeting?

Ki. Davis: Yes, but not by Internet.

Vote: passed

**6.3 Elections:** P. Butko: We will know results of 2nd round by Wednesday. If no 3rd round is necessary then the results will be reported to the officers by the end of next week.

## **7.0 Old Business**

**7.1 Foreign Language Department Personnel:** S. Malone: We still plan to submit our report to D. Cabana, since he still is president and will need to decide what to do. It seems complicated for M. Henry (as chair of the committee) to submit it to himself.

Joanne Burnett: [from Foreign Languages and Lit. dept.]: We talked about this among ourselves, and we suggest that the report be given to Don, symbolically, then passed back to M. Henry when he takes over the gavel. We don't want it to be lost in the shuffle.

M. Henry: If D. Cabana does not act on it by May 12, then we'll have to deal with it. J. Palmer joined the committee after M. Miller recused himself. Any comments, Jesse?

J. Palmer: We interviewed the provost. We heard the Foreign Language side during our last meeting. All recommendations and comments are based on both sides of the story. I expect that at some point the president will release that to FS. Some of the recommendations will need action possibly by the

Foreign Language department. We dealt with it in executive session, so it would be inappropriate to make further comments.

J. Burnette: We were concerned that this language of personnel matter would be used. As long as the parties involved are informed of the reasoning (and none of us have been informed) then that at least settles something. We want you to know that we have been given no reason.

**7.2 Resolution on Facilitation:** D. Alford: The original resolution presented by the coast delegation (written by J.P. Smith, Ka. Davis, and D. Alford) has been modified to include recommendations from faculty members who attended the Wednesday night meeting last week.

[Read resolution]:

#### A Resolution on Facilitated Conversation Between Selected Members of the Faculty Senate and the Senior Administration

Whereas the Administration has handed down a series of far reaching decisions without soliciting meaningful input,

And whereas, the Faculty Senate has passed a series of resolutions and submitted letters to the Administration stressing the need for more and better communication, meaningful input and participatory governance,

And whereas communication between the Faculty Senate and the Administration is in need of significant improvement,

Be it therefore resolved,

That in the interest of moving the university community toward an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust conducive to the success and well-being of the university,

That the Faculty Senate and President Shelby Thames agree to seek a mutually acceptable facilitator (perhaps with the aid of commissioner of IHL or appropriate national organization) to foster meaningful and constructive dialogue, conflict resolution, healing, and the rebuilding of trust between faculty and the senior administration at the university.

Be it further resolved,

That the administration place a moratorium on the implementation of controversial mandates such as the Faculty Activity Report, the part of the Technology Security Policy dealing with impounding computers in faculty offices for any reason, revisions of the faculty handbook, and the "fourth category" for faculty evaluation.

That the Faculty Senate will designate one representative from each of the five new colleges including the president of the Faculty Senate to engage in facilitated conversations with President Thames and the provosts.

T. Hartsell: Second

G. Mattson: Will there be 2 groups from FS meeting with the president: the officers, then another group?

D. Alford: There would be 5 members with the president of FS representing own college.

G. Mattson: So, the officers will not continue to meet with president?

M. Henry: We would hope that those meetings would continue.

D. Alford: The officers would continue to meet with the president without facilitation.

G. Russell: I would suggest 1 from each of the 5 colleges plus the FS president. What I did when FS president was that each college elected a chair of its delegation and that was to facilitate activities within the college. The dean knew one person to go to who would communicate to the other representatives. It was a good idea and has some relevance here.

J. P. Smith: This is extremely constructive. The central issue is to give Dr. Thames an avenue that is constructive. That avenue is to look for a professional who works with groups that are having difficulties. When we go beyond that, we're distracting from the central concept. We're saying that we have a troubled relationship, and for the sake of the institution can we see if an outsider with special skills can help us construct a pathway. We have covered the items in the preamble to this resolution in other advisory resolutions. The moratorium seems like another resolution. We want to get someone in and start talking about the process. We don't want to load it with too many details.

D. Alford: Can you be specific about the details?

J.P. Smith: Propose to amend by deletion all but 2 paragraphs [beginning "Be it resolved" and ending, "rebuilding of trust between faculty and the senior administration at the university."]

J. Crockett: Second. I think that it would be a hindrance to discussion to say that "we'll talk to you, but first we're going to impose this moratorium."

T. Lewis: One compromise is to take out the word "moratorium." Replace it with "Let the administration facilitate open discussion on controversial mandates . . . ."

J.P. Smith: You would expect a professional to get beyond surface things and get to processes. The best we can hope is to get Dr. Thames to receive this as constructive advice.

S. Naghashpour: We should ask to talk more often, and everything should be on the table, not just controversial issues.

P. Butko: I will vote against this resolution at the request of my constituents. The administration will interpret this in the wrong way, as incendiary. If I could vote for a resolution, it would be more like what S. Naghashpour is saying. We want more communication. We think that the word "facilitation" is inappropriate.

D. Duhon: I'm speaking in favor of the amendment, but not the negative whereas clauses. The part in middle is a positive approach, to open communication. If we want a moratorium, that would be a separate resolution.

J. Palmer: Rather than a resolution, can we make this a proposal to the president to bring about an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust?

D. Alford: On Tuesday, I received the Excellence in University Service award, and I thank you [applause]. I bring that up because it gave me an opportunity to talk with the president. There were 7 recipients. B. Scarborough also won. The president was brave and cordial. After the luncheon, I shook hands with president and said to him that we would bring a proposal for facilitation and that I sincerely hoped he would give it consideration. I related that the change is coming too fast, that we are bombarded with changes, and in the midst of coping with the changes we don't understand his vision. I related that we need to know what that vision is and that we want compassion from him while we're trying to adapt to the changes. He said "I appreciate your comments." In the newspaper, he said that he understands that the change is happening fast. He may be considering it. I am willing to take this resolution to him and say "please, let's get some help in talking to each other."

A. Young: I'm amenable to the amendment, but we do need to clearly suggest that communication has broken down. The core message is more important than whether it is communicated in a resolution or a proposal. The core message is the middle part of the resolution as has been suggested.

D. Duhon: Maybe we should leave in: "And whereas communication between the Faculty Senate and the Administration is in need of significant improvement,"

R. Folsie: I thought that if you are the CEO of an organization, you bring in a facilitator. You don't wait for the factory workers to do it. The leadership should do it.

J. Olmi: What I'm reading in the press indicates that mediation is a non-issue, that it's not going to happen. I agree with the idea J. Palmer had: to send a proposal that we sit down at a meeting. It was said last week that the idea of a mediator was potentially caustic, and I am inclined to agree. This only is a good resolution as long as both sides are open to it.

B. Coates: D. Potter may not do it, but a professional could.

D. Alford: It doesn't have to be D. Potter.

B. Coates: I'm in favor of J.P. Smith's amendment, because it doesn't specify who the facilitator would be.

J. Bethel: It's not the changes, but the process. The president may not be open to it given past performance. I think we should call this what it is: mediation. That is what it is. We're in trouble, and we need help.

M. Henry: This group doesn't have to apologize for saying that communication needs fixing. That's why we had the special meeting.

A. Young: I think that it is significant that we're getting our information from the press. We want them to tell us things, but we also want to communicate our feelings. We need to reiterate this, because it is not happening.

S. Nagashpour: We can't start by making the point that "you're wrong." You can't get facilitation that way.

J.P. Smith: [Reiterated amended resolution]

J. Crockett: Could we strike the phrase in parentheses?

J.P. Smith: I would accept that.

J. Palmer: Grammar issue: "agree to."

R. Folse Take out "agree to."

D. Alford: Take out "therefore"

D. Alford: call

[text of the resolution:]

Be it resolved:

That in the interest of moving the University community toward an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust conducive to the success and well-being of the University,

That the Faculty Senate and President Shelby Thames seek a mutually acceptable facilitator to foster meaningful and constructive dialogue, conflict resolution, healing, and the rebuilding of trust between faculty and the senior administration at the University.

[Resolution also posted at: [resfacilitation03.htm](#)]

Vote on amendment: passed 31-5 by hand vote

Vote on resolution: passed

D. Alford: How is the resolution to be delivered?

M. Henry: D. Cabana delivered them by hand and sent them.

J. Palmer: I delivered them in person.

D. Duhon: Perhaps, we should considering taking D. Alford up on her offer and the president accompany her.

J.P. Smith: What about all of the past presidents?

J. Olmi: What if when this is delivered, [President Thames] wants to come to the table without a facilitator?

D. Alford: I think we insist on a facilitator.

M. Henry: Once it's delivered, one would hope that there would be conversations about it, and facilitation would be agreed to.

G. Russell: I don't see any particular merit in the past presidents doing it. M. Henry, as acting president and president-elect, could go. He is acting as president in D. Cabana's absence.

M. Henry: D. Alford, D. Cabana, and I could deliver it. If Don declines, then Darlys and I could do it.

J. Olmi: We should be very careful. If the president does extend an opportunity to engage in communication [without a facilitator] and we say no, how are we perceived?

M. Henry: This opens a steered conversation. I don't anticipate a response upon delivery, but if there is we should say that we need to talk about the whole resolution. It's a point of communication. We should close no doors to communication, but this is steered, facilitated conversation.

J.P. Smith: We've been trying to give good advice, and it's been received as having a different intention. It's not cooking between us. We need someone from the outside to bring us together. We need a professional.

M. Henry: A facilitator can be more neutral. I've done this on 4 occasions, and this is challenging for the facilitator. The facilitator has to sort through the issues and help both parties understand why the issues are tough and challenging and why the parties are not seeing eye to eye.

D. Alford: Dr. Thames is not comfortable communicating about things that are filled with conflict. It is to his advantage to have some help, so that he does not decide not to talk about these issues. That will make it worse.

## **8.0 New Business**

**8.1 Election of Officers:** M. Henry: We're supposed to elect officers at the May meeting. With the suddenness of Don's leaving, we think it might be best to recess this meeting and restart the May meeting as the first part of the next meeting with the May FS membership. Then we'll adjourn the May meeting (in June) and convene the June meeting with the new membership. My opinion is that we're within the constitution if we recess this meeting and have the current membership elect the officer.

J.P. Smith: Move to stop the clock on the May meeting and start it again at the next meeting.

J. Lytle: second

M. Henry: If any of you want to serve as president-elect or secretary-elect, then please notify one of the current officers (who will serve as the nominating committee). If you would like to nominate someone (who is willing to serve), please submit those names to an officer. We also will take nominations from the floor during the May extension, before the June meeting convenes.

**8.2 Excellence Awards:** J. Rachal: The Awards committee has made its recommendations for the excellence awards. One of the persons recommended was T. Graham for the Librarianship award. For whatever reasons, the offer of that award will not be made, officially. I would like this body to recognize Toby for winning it at least in our eyes [applause].

T. Graham: Thank you. I've gotten more attention for not having won the award than had I won it.

Ka. Davis: Resolution Regarding Dr. Toby Graham:

Whereas, Dr. Toby Graham was nominated and selected by his peers to receive the University Excellence in Librarianship award,

Whereas, Dr. Graham became ineligible to receive this award when he was recruited to build a digital library in the red clay of Georgia, and

Whereas, Dr. Graham has served this Faculty Senate faithfully as Secretary-Elect and Secretary,

Therefore be it resolved, That the Faculty Senate of the University of Southern Mississippi expresses our appreciation and thanks to Toby for his excellent service to the University Libraries, this Faculty Senate, and the University of Southern Mississippi and offer he and Suzanne best wishes at the University of Georgia.

J. Rachal: second

Vote: passed by unanimous consent

T. Graham: Thank you. I would just ask the Awards Committee that this award (which is given every other year) be given next year to a deserving librarian.

T. Lewis: A. Miller will ask for clarification, not only on the Librarianship award, but on what the qualifications are in regard to someone who may be leaving the university, so that they are clear to this body and the university community.

D. Alford: I think we should invite those who received awards to our next FS meeting. We were hidden away in the cafeteria for this. Would you consider inviting them and acknowledging their awards publicly?

D. Duhon: Previously, this was done at convocation.

M. Henry: Thank you for coming to this meeting. This is a marvelous turnout considering competing events and the demands on your time. Thank you, J. Lytle, for arranging for the meeting at GCRL, and please convey our thanks to V. Asper.

We are recessed, until June. [Recess: 5:00 p.m.]