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The University of Southern Mississippi

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 6, 2006

Cook Library Room 123

2:00 p.m.


1.0 Call to order: 2:15 p.m.

2.0 Approval of minutes: Minutes of the September 8, 2006 minutes were approved.

3.0 Approval of agenda: Agenda was approved with the following change – 4.0 presentation to Dr. Tom Rhea Phillips and Barbara Phillips to be moved until recipients arrived.

4.0 Presentation to Dr. Tom Rhea Phillips and Barbara Phillips. Senate presented an acrylic to Dr. and Mrs. Phillips to express appreciation for their support of Faculty Senate and for hosting five years of the Senate Retreats at their Camp.

5.0 Officers’ Reports

5.1 President: Myron Henry reported on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee’s conversations with Dr. Thames and Dr. Grimes on the following items

5.1.1 Shared Governance Document: A copy of the Academic Freedom and Shared Governance Document was shared with Faculty Senators. Henry noted that the attribution of AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the American Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges now appears as a footnote on the USM Shared Governance Document.

5.1.2 Meetings with Dr. Thames

5.1.2.1 FAR Memo: Henry reported that Dr. Thames stated that he was unaware that an out-of-date FAR memo was included in materials for faculty in Teacher Education. Dr. Joan Exline requested that this memo no longer be included in those materials.
5.1.2.2 Profit and Loss Spreadsheet: Dr. Thames acknowledged that the profit and loss spreadsheet had originated with him to be used by deans to determine if new positions were warranted. Henry reported that Faculty Senate did not believe that the profit and loss spreadsheet was an effective way to evaluate overall productivity. Henry reported that the executive committee believed that the spreadsheet did not account for contributions of faculty in service such as SACS and NCATE or the quality of teaching and research. Henry also reported that the executive committee showed the Dr. Thames a copy of the “Minimum Requirement for Faculty” document that had accompanied the spreadsheet sent a message to faculty that they were expected to show a “profit” and to submit at least one grant proposal each year. Dr. Thames indicated that he had never seen the “Minimum Requirements for Faculty Document” and that it did not originate with him or the provost. Dr. Thames stated that there must have been communication problems and the Faculty Senate executive committee commented that regular meetings with the provost as well as Dr. Thames would probably help.

5.1.2.3 Grant Writing Requirements for New Faculty: Henry reported that the executive committee expressed concern about statements by Dr. Thames at new faculty orientation regarding a requirement that new faculty write at least one grant each year. Dr. Thames responded by saying that he only meant to encourage new faculty to write grant proposals as grants were an important source of income for the university, but that he did not intend his remarks to be considered a requirement.

5.1.2.4 Unwritten Criteria for Promotion and Tenure: Henry reported that Faculty Senate officers expressed concern about hearing that some faculty had been turned down for tenure or promotion due to unwritten criteria such as insufficient economic development (i.e., too little funding from grants). Dr. Thames said he would be willing to have a discussion with any faculty to discuss their particular evaluation. Officers stated that a written justification is necessary so that individuals who had been denied tenure or promotion could have concrete information to either improve performance or to document appeals.

5.1.2.5 Pre-Tenure Review (Third Year Review): Henry reported that Dr. Thames agreed that third year reviews should be developmental and suggest areas for improvement prior to the tenure review. Dr. Thames also stated that departments had the option to recommend non-renewal at third year reviews. Dr. Thames suggested that Faculty Senate take up this discussion with the provost.

5.1.2.6 Ad Astra: A committee of faculty and staff will be looking at scheduling and fostering communication between the registrar and departments and colleges.

5.1.2.7 Space Utilization and Allocation Committee (SUAC): Henry reported that the executive committee again requested that the SUAC website include a statement on the committee’s mission, its minutes and meeting dates.
5.1.2.8 Invitation to the 10/06/06 Faculty Senate Meeting: Henry reported that Dr. Thames has been invited to attend an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

5.1.2.9 Feedback on Commissioner Meredith’s visit

5.1.2.10 Graduate Assistantships (see President-Elect report below)

5.2 President-Elect – Stephen Judd reported that Graduate Council was working on a number of mechanisms that could aid in raising graduate assistantship stipends that would not have such a detrimental effect on some of the graduate programs at USM.

5.3 Secretary: (see items 5.1.2.6 and 5.1.2.7 above reported by Henry)

5.4 Secretary-Elect: no report

6.0 Discussion Items

6.1 Personnel Options: Dr. Henry led the discussion regarding personnel options as currently stated in the Faculty Handbook. The discussion regarded what should happen if the chair/director could not or would not serve with two faculty (option 2), as this seems to limit choices in departments to option 1 (chair only) or option 3 (three faculty excluding the chair). It appears that the Faculty Handbook is not clear what should happen if the chair resigns from option 2.

6.2 Presidential Search Advisory Committee: Dr. Henry led the discussion regarding a proposal (reviewed by Faculty Senators). He reported that the proposal which was signed by the officers of the senate, chairs of graduate and academic councils, chair of the faculty handbook committee, and president of the AAUP had been submitted to Commissioner Meredith who replied that he received the communication but had not responded to the proposal. Two senators commended the officers for formulating the proposal which stressed faculty unencumbered by administrative duties for choice by Commissioner Meredith.

7.0 Committee sign-up, selection of chairs: Discussion and meetings occurred between 2:00 and 2:15 before Dr. Henry called the meeting to order. In addition, M. Henry stated that the senate needed to nominate a representative to serve on the University Planning Council. Don Redalje served last term and agreed to continue serving.

7.1 Ad hoc committee reports and liaison reports

7.1.1 President’s Council: to be determined at the November 2006 meeting

7.1.2 AAUP: announcements of upcoming meetings Oct. 12 and Oct 27

7.1.3 Facility Management Planning Committee: no report

7.1.4 Alternative Learning Committee: Dr. Powell reported that his committee was finalizing a report of recommendations concerning summer pay, overload pay

7.1.5 Distance Education Committee: no report
7.1.6 Faculty Handbook Committee: Faculty Senate voted that Dr. Henry should serve as the Faculty Senate representative and the David Beckett should continue as faculty not currently serving on Faculty Senate.

8.0 New Business: Paula Smithka reported that final ballots are due Oct. 18 and recommended that Faculty Senate by-laws be changed to indicate that the second round determined by simple majority and that would expedite Faculty Senate elections.

9.0 Old Business: none

10.0 Other: none

11.0 Adjournment: adjourned at 4:23 p.m.