

1-29-2010

## Faculty Senate Minutes - January 29, 2010

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 - January 29, 2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 114.  
[http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes/114](http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/114)

This 2009/10 Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Archive at The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact [Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu](mailto:Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu).

**The University of Southern Mississippi**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Minutes for the Meeting of January 29, 2010**  
**216 Thad Cochran Center**

Members Present and Represented (by proxy): H. Annulis , J. Bass, D. Beckett, J. Brannock, D. Bristol (Annulis), B. Burgess, J. Burnett, D. Daves, A. Davis , D. Davis, J. Evans, D. Fletcher, B. George (Burgess), C. Goggin, T. Gould, A. Haley, S. Hauer, N. Howell, S. Howell, M. Klinedinst (Evans), T. Lipscomb, D. Lunsford, M. Lux, J. McGuire, J. Meyer, C. Meyers, S. Oshrin, R. Pandey, C. Rakocinski, D. Redalje, T. Rehner, S. Reischman , S. Rouse, K. Rushing (Rehner), R. Scurfield (Lunsford), J.H. Shin, D. Tingstrom, T. Welsh, J. Wolfe, A. Young

Members Absent: C. McCormick, B. Spencer

1.0 Call to order

Following evacuation due to a fire alarm, Pres. Evans called the meeting to order at 2:17 pm. Contact was made by speakerphone with members on the coast.

2.0 Approval of the agenda

Pres. Evans proposed to move approval of the minutes to follow after the invited speakers. A Senator also asked about Pres. Jeff Evans' status with the university, which would be part of his report. The agenda was approved with this alteration by voice vote.

4.0 Remarks from the administration

4.1 President Saunders

President Martha Saunders wished all a Happy New Year and conveyed Provost Robert Lyman's regrets—he was at a conference in Vermont.

The Executive Cabinet had discussed the most recent announced cuts in the 2010 budget, which came in at 8.8 % and we had planned for 8 %. Enrollment increase, however, should enable absorbing the cuts without having to go back to departments for more reductions.

The Institutions of Higher Learning Board approved USM's business plan for 2011 and 2012. Commissioner Hank Bounds noted in his remarks that the work of the UPC at Southern Miss is not complete and that the final plan will be somewhat different. The vote on tuition was based on these reports, and that vote successfully provided for a tuition raise.

The proposed revision of IHL policy on informing released faculty members was referred to a committee of Chief Academic Officers after a second vote on the policy was postponed. USM has no plans to change its policy, and according to Van Gillespie, counsel for the IHL Board, any policy passed by the board would include minimums, and universities may certainly keep longer notification periods if desired. Thus, if the board passes a six-month minimum notice for tenured faculty members, USM may retain its 12-month minimum notice. Sen. Beckett remarked that such a policy was still of concern since a different president could then change USM's policy to match the Board's. Pres. Jeff Evans also noted concern that any given president could use the phrasing "lack of funds" to release opposed or disliked faculty members. Pres. Saunders noted that in discussions with the university presidents she, Ole Miss' president and MS State's president seemed to oppose the policy change strongly, but the presidents of the smaller universities were uncertain or mixed in expressed opinions. There will be more discussion of this policy and its language, and the provost will consult with the faculty senate. Commissioner Bounds' intent was to build more flexibility for the presidents, but he is new to higher education. There is time for more deliberation about this policy.

In the research area, three finalists for the VP for Research position will be visiting for interviews starting this month. They are Dr. Denis Wiesenberg of the Univ. of Alaska (once chair of the USM Marine Science Dept.), Dr. Gordon Emslie of Oklahoma State U., and Dr. Timothy Phillips of Texas A & M U.

Under Student Affairs, the parking lot just north of the Chain Technology Building has been used

for visitors to the Thad Cochran Center, but will now be split with half the spaces designated for faculty and staff. At times, the entire lot will be reserved for special event parking, using ropes and personnel. Eventually congestion in that area will be relieved by the parking garage. Sen. Beckett noted that he had heard that tickets were not being given to students, but Sen. Oshrin from service on the Parking Committee noted that indeed students are being issued parking tickets.

The President has been out recruiting high achieving students at regional high schools, including Gulfport, St. Patrick's, McGill-Toolan, Baker, Clinton, and Northwest Rankin. One student has a perfect ACT score, and his choice is apparently down to USM or Rhodes. She said we will beat them on scholarships but there may be other factors in the decision. The deans are following her to these high school students, she said, after a respectable length of time so that we are not harassing them. It is good to establish a presence in these schools with high-achieving students.

Upon examining how some committees have been budgeted, Mary Dayne Gregg conducted an inventory of university committees. Some operated out of one college and became college committees, while others have not met in a long time and most people on them are gone. Of those remaining, many of the same people are on several. It would be good to have a Committee on Committees to make sure that committee charges are clear, that they are working, and that a chair has been appointed. This will be discussed with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, but wanted all to be aware of this idea. Some newer faculty members have mentioned that they would like to play a part if need were found.

## 5.0 Faculty Senate Forum: University Priorities Committee Update

Bill Powell

Assoc. Provost Powell reminded senators that the UPC had been formed in November and first met Dec. 15, working from the outlined proposal approved by the faculty senate, the book on the priority process by Dickeson, and university mission and vision statements already established. Two subcommittees make up the UPC, Academic Services and Administrative Services, and Russ Willis would report on the administrative side.

Russ Willis

Dir. of Human Resources Willis noted the administrative subcommittee had met 5 times since 2010 began and their first task was to determine which programs should be reviewed. Approximately 150 programs had been identified, with some departments having more than one program. The committee has come up with 19 questions to guide each program report, restricted to 10 pages. Attachments may include things like organizational charts and budgets. Programs will be encouraged to prioritize activities, find efficiencies, and find ways to reduce costs. This document was nearly finished. Time for training sessions by Dir. Willis for explanation of the report and its questions for departments would be allowed for before program reports are due.

For some departments, it was uncertain which subcommittee would review their reports—a prime example was the library, as it serves academics but is organized as a service much like many other programs the administrative subcommittee is evaluating. Another such office involved Dean's office staffs. Senators questioned who would make the final decision about who would evaluate such programs, and Willis and Powell said the UPC as a whole would decide, perhaps instituting a third subcommittee with elements of both administrative and academic subcommittee to evaluate those programs.

Sample questions implying categories on the administrative service side included: What is the purpose of the program? What is its history? How has the program changed? How does it help with student enrollment, retention, or success? How could additional revenue be generated? What would you do in the face of a 10 % budget cut? What central functions would be affected by such cuts?

Sen. Fletcher asked about a question about increased funding, and Willis said that due to the current situation and time constraints the group decided not to ask that question now.

Dir. Willis said that his group had agreed on four overall criteria to look at, rather than multiple criteria tied to unique questions. Their criteria are: clarity of purpose, efficiency, opportunities for growth or improvement, and necessity. These four will be weighted equally.

Sen. Burnett wondered if reports could really be done in a month, and Willis noted that is the ideal—a department head will be responsible for these reports, but certainly some will be delegated. Administrative departments have had to do such reports already. For instance, physical plant will actually do four reports based on its areas or programs of focus (including grounds, maintenance, construction, administration). Sen. Redalje said that the month begins when the request goes out, and Willis also said that training would follow well before the one month deadline for reports would

begin. Sen. Hauer, who serves on both subcommittees as liaison, noted that Willis was doing a wonderful job and he was honored to serve.

Bill Powell

Assoc. Prov. Powell said that a website would be up in a few days that would have a lot of information from the UPC and detail its progress. The old APG website is still up, so the UPC needs one. The academic subcommittee has 15 voting members, 8 of whom are current faculty senate members, and 2 past presidents of the faculty senate. There are also 10 nonvoting members, including the deans of each college, the library, graduate school, and honors college. Sen. Tim Rehner was chosen co-chair of the subcommittee. They started with a full-day marathon on Jan. 15 and discussed who we are as a university and the prioritization process. A recent meeting was with the full UPC committee to see a webcast including Robert Dickeson, author of the book that has inspired much of this process. This presentation has been archived, and he is looking to rebroadcast this to a larger university group for insights.

Weekly meetings have begun, with coast members attending with video connection. Discussion has centered on what programs are—starting broadly as “any entity that consumes resources.” We are working on a manageable framework for reports in our time frame. Degrees, emphasis areas, concentrations, and initiatives are being discussed as programs. There is still a need to place programs that are not “fully academic” like the library, research centers, and service areas. Such programs that are difficult to categorize may submit reports based on the administrative subcommittee’s guidelines but may be evaluated by a third subcommittee that includes many from the academic side.

Criteria and layout for program reports are still being discussed. A Part I and Part II have been envisioned, with Part I supplied with data available from the university administration, and Part II contributed by the program’s department. We seek to provide departments a standardized format for reports—and departments should not have to look up university data. Departments will supply a narrative about the numerical data, their history, and fit with the university mission or vision. Crucial to the timeline is the September 1 deadline for notifying faculty whose programs may be cut.

In terms of how many programs are to be accounted for by the academic subcommittee, Powell said 500 or 600—but some can be collapsed together as slight differences in degree sought or concentration area. The graduate school has 258 degree plans, for instance, but many can be collapsed together (as in M. A. vs. M. S. degree, etc.). Sen. Burnett asked if graduate programs would be given priority in terms of looking for more cuts or efficiencies in undergraduate-only programs. Not necessarily, Powell said, as circumstances and disciplines would vary, as would program relationship to the core mission of the university. One clear priority will be to preserve enrollment.

Sen. Rehner noted that he is far more aware of how “big” this place is, complicated by many layers of programs and how they relate to the budget. We will have to balance between seeking priorities and seeking efficiencies or cuts. Lots of data from the university will come to departments with the request for reports. Connecting costs to specific academic initiatives will not always be easy. For instance, if degrees in Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work are offered, what percentage of costs go to each degree?

Sen. Lux asked about discrepancies between department records and university data involving department measures. Powell said there would be opportunity to reconcile such discrepancies, but at some point the data has to be recorded—just like with enrollment, the 10th day of class is chosen, counting those who may drop later and missing those who may add very late.

Sen. Redalje asked whether, given that the Faculty Senate University Direction Committee developed a suggested priorities-based program evaluation template/document that was linked to the university’s mission and vision statements, would that be taken into consideration by the subcommittee? Powell noted that was among several sources of information being consulted. Will academic departments be asked the “What if you are cut 10 %” question, asked Sen. Lux. Powell said the committee had not gotten that far yet; criteria for evaluation and questions for the report were still being discussed. One contributing factor, for instance, could be what percentage of a degree’s credit hours come from outside the department for majors?

Sen. Lux said that we hope UPC members are being good citizens, but those writing the reports will be defending their units. They may describe cuts in such a way as to save their programs. Powell said that such advocacy was to be expected. During last year’s APG process, when deans were asked to put programs in quartiles of rank, lots of “empty things” were given up to the lowest quartile that did not have much real savings. The UPC process will be different in that all programs will have input into this, not just deans. Powell noted that he would like faculty to sign off on program reports, not having just one person

complete them “in a single office.”

Assigning weights to different criteria has yet to be decided, as is how the Graduate School will be evaluated. Powell said it is likely to be evaluated similar to Dean’s office staffs, by a third subcommittee combining administrative and academic elements. Undergraduate admissions may be a similar program.

Sen. Rehner suggested that Commissioner Bounds or the IHL Board will seek to contribute to workforce needs for our state, and may refuse cuts in some programs. If so, smaller programs may have to suffer greatly in proportion. Powell said that external demand would certainly be a criterion invoked.

Sen. Gould asked how many reports there would be and when they would be due. Powell noted that an “umbrella document” for units with several programs would be desirable, as giving the committee 10,000 pages to read is not practical. With the data supplied, actual documents describing programs will likely be less than 10 pages. Powell said he would be pleased if the report request is ready in February. Sen. Rehner said that data needs to be integrated so that departments have it supplied and ready to go. Some initial requests for data may go to all departments, Powell noted, in preparation for the actual document that outlines the report desired from all.

### 3.0 Approval of the minutes

Minutes from the Senate meeting on December 4, 2009 were approved by voice vote.

## 6.0 Officers' reports

### 6.1 President (Evans)

Pres. Evans noted that he had long planned to retire at the end of this academic year, and he is still doing that. He had thought of taking a phased retirement last year but chose not to pursue that. Instead, upon retirement he will be working full time teaching at and helping to establish the College of Osteopathy at William Carey University. He is teaching one course as an adjunct there now (with administration approval). That course ends in two weeks, and he spends on average four hours per week at William Carey. He also has one USM course reassigned time as Faculty Senate President which is useful. He is working with Pres. Elect Anita Davis on the transition. The current senate meets in March, April on the coast, and in May. The new Senate should take over in June. We seek to end the recent custom of holding over the end of the May senate meeting until June.

There was a rally for education funding at the state capitol on Wednesday. Faculty and students from several Mississippi universities appeared and later met with legislators. An article in the *Clarion-Ledger* followed, and Pres. Evans thanked Sen. Klinedinst for his work on pulling together the rally.

The Faculty Senate executive committee sent commissioner Hank Bounds a statement about the proposed policy altering notice given to released tenured and tenure-track faculty members. This was circulated to senators as well. A bill to eliminate tenure was introduced in the MS house of representative, but local representative Toby Barker stated that he expects nothing to come of that.

Pres. Evans and/or Pres. Elect Davis have been attending UPC subcommittee meetings.

Campus visits are planned for the three finalists for Vice President for Research:

Dr. Denis Wiesenberg of the Univ. of Alaska, Feb. 17-20

Dr. Gordon Emslie of Oklahoma State U., Feb. 21-24

Dr. Timothy Phillips of Texas A & M U., Feb. 28 – Mar. 2

Sen. A. Davis said that the committee was impressed with the credentials of these candidates. Pres. Evans also noted that an internal search for Dean of Science and Technology is underway.

Pres. Evans thanked all who are serving on UPC committees.

### 6.2 President-Elect (Davis)

New Campus Hub access: check it out at <http://campushub.usm.edu>

Sen. A. Davis said that Campus Hub will provide access for faculty to SOAR, Blackboard, email, and all university functions. One will not have to go in and out of it and other web spaces. It is an intranet, so we can view and respond to texts and proposals without it being posted in public. She is moving our materials

there from the “ning” site, so all senators should be able to join the senate site (listed on the left side of the screen). This is a great service to see documents ahead of time before meetings.

6.3 Secretary (Meyer) – No report.

6.4 Secretary-Elect (Brannock) – No report.

## 7.0 Committee reports

7.1 Academic and Governance (Redalje) – No report.

7.2 Administration and Faculty Evaluations (Oshrin)

Sen. Oshrin reported that evaluation forms are being sent to senators from each college, and he is talking to deans so that they will make sure they will be distributed to each department. A reminder will go out on campus email, these evaluations are to be filled out in February and turned in early March. Last year these were given out at Academic Council to all the deans, but apparently all did not follow through. Sen. Beckett reported the provost only got evaluations about one dean last year. Sen. Brannock asked how these evaluations would be used by the provost—do they mean something? Sen. Beckett suggested working with the Human Resources office to make sure these take place. Sen. Oshrin said that the provost is given all the results of dean evaluations.

Sen. Oshrin also serves on the Responsibility Centered Management budget committee, which has met. The initial thought was that the new budget model where each college can control its own budget would be started next year, but it will be 2012 before RCM procedures can be implemented. Complicated training and bookkeeping will be required, as is clear from talks with staff at other universities that have implemented this model. It will take years to set the groundwork for this budget model and determine things like accounting methods and a “fair tax” that goes to the administration.

7.3 Awards (Brannock)

Nominations are due Feb. 17 to Susie Plymale in Dr. Cynthia Easterling’s office for University Teaching and Service Awards. Nominations for the Grand Marshal award are due the 19th to the same. Faculty Senate award information will be forthcoming. Sen. Brannock said there is no money allocated for these awards—the recipient will get a plaque. Sen. Oshrin said we could have dollars in the Faculty Senate budget to contribute at least a small amount. About \$1500, Sen. Meyer estimated, and Sen. Brannock noted recent policy notices prohibiting purchase of plaques (or similar “gifts”) with E & G budgets. Sen. A. Davis suggested approaching the USM foundation for award money. The senate could create a foundation account for the purpose of awards. Sen. Redalje suggested senators pitch in some of their own cash for awards, which was not received positively by several. Sen. Burnett agreed that paying “them”—the administration—to reward “us” the faculty, is wrong, but yet a foundation account would let us reward people. Sen. Beckett noted that, in the past, the awards had been sponsored by the office of the president and the faculty senate and half came from faculty senate funds. It is cheap of the administration not to provide money for these awards. We have received mixed answers, Sen. Beckett said, as he heard at times that money was back in for the awards. He is having difficulty getting reimbursed for one plaque for Dr. Scarborough. Sen. Tingstrom said that it is ridiculous that we cannot use faculty senate budgets for plaques. A plaque is considered a gift, though, and E & G funds cannot be spent on gifts. Sen. Brannock said that people are slower about submitting award materials since the financial reward is not there as an incentive. Sen. Lux suggested a designated parking spot for winners.

7.4 Constitution and Bylaws (Rehner)

Pres. Evans noted that changes in the bylaws are needed to provide for elections online rather than by paper ballot.

7.5 Elections (Burgess)

The committee is using January 1 human resources information to make sure of eligibility for candidacy and voting. We will need to do a trial of the first ballot online, to work glitches out.

7.6 Faculty Welfare (Davis) – No report

7.7 Research and Grants (McCormick) – No report

7.8 Technology (Bass) – No report

7.9 University Direction (Davis)

The committee members did a lot of work last semester, focusing on what our mission as a university is. The UPC is welcome to let members help operationalize our mission and how to evaluate contributions of programs to the mission.

## 7.10 Other committee and liaison reports

### 7.10.1 Faculty Handbook Committee (Beckett)

The issue of whether associate and assistant deans and provosts should vote on tenure and promotions is now facing President Saunders, and Sen. Beckett talked with her about the issue. The majority of the committee, as well as faculty senate and other bodies, had expressed that they should not vote. But some feel unjust disenfranchisement as faculty members as a result. Sen. Beckett shared those concerns with the president and she has the policy under consideration.

The question of provost and dean evaluation as faculty members has come up. The faculty handbook says that they are to be evaluated yearly on teaching, research, and service in their capacity as a tenured (or tenure track) faculty member. Some deans have ignored this, and the provost has pointed out that he does not teach at all. How would he be evaluated? Some deans, on the other hand, have taught a course most semesters. The changes would have the administrator meet with the department personnel committee once a year for evaluation. Sen. Redalje asked why the administrator would not meet with the chair, like faculty members do? Sen. Beckett noted that some departments have a chair-only evaluation method, but others have a committee (that may include the chair or not). Sen. A. Davis noted that the handbook does provide that the first step is meeting with the chair to agree on responsibilities and objectives. Sen. Beckett agreed that administrators could meet with the the chair and the department personnel committee. He wanted to avoid the dean sauntering into a chair's office (who reports to that dean), chatting about how things are going, and counting that as the annual evaluation meeting.

Sen. Tingstrom said that faculty do evaluate administrators annually via surveys, but it is hard to imagine evaluating the provost, for instance, on teaching and research. He noted that his department, psychology, did not do any review of Dr. Lyman when he was hired as provost. Sen. Beckett said that according to the policy he should have been reviewed, and such department evaluations would be separate evaluations regarding their faculty role, not their performance as administrators.

Sen. Beckett suggested that when administrators meet with chairs and department personnel committees, at least initially, agreement should be reached about their goals for serving the department, and they can then be evaluated on those. Sen. Lux noted that she has not had the opportunity for such negotiations in her department. Sen. Rakocinski said an ongoing issue in his department has been how to evaluate an administrator—what percentage of accountability is to the department, and how much to the administration? Sen. D. Davis pointed out that this policy evaluates them as faculty members, but the previously discussed policy disenfranchises many on tenure and promotion votes. So are they faculty or not faculty?

Sen. Beckett noted that this policy was in the faculty handbook already, but some paid attention to it and others did not. The proposed changes do clarify the role of the chair and various departmental committees, and further input on administrator evaluation as faculty members is welcome and will be joined with input from the Faculty Handbook Committee. Pres. Evans noted that is not a faculty senate committee, though some think it is. We appoint two members and Sen. Beckett brings its key issues to us for information and approval, and that is appreciated.

The proposed changes currently stand thus:

#### THE DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

8.3.4 Committee Functions. The Departmental Personnel Committee conducts annual performance reviews, **and on the basis of those evaluations, submits to responsible department chairs recommendations for distribution of annual intradepartmental salary adjustments [from “old” Faculty Handbook]**, pre-tenure reviews, promotion proceedings, and tenure deliberations. The committee also makes recommendations to the dean on promotions in academic rank, renewal or non-renewal of employment, dismissal, or termination of employment. Departmental Personnel Committees also evaluate and make recommendations to responsible academic deans on applications from members of the departmental faculty for academic leaves of absence and sabbaticals.

Written reports resulting from annual evaluations conducted by Departmental Personnel Committees may be used by other departmental, college, and University administrative bodies and officers conducting

deliberations regarding the renewal and non-renewal of employment, dismissal from employment, promotion in academic rank, pre-tenure review, and the award of academic tenure.

#### 8.4.2 Review Guidelines.

(d) Department chairs must be evaluated in the categories of research, teaching, and service, but not as administrators. The chairs' supervising administrative officers conduct administrative evaluations. The other members of the Departmental Personnel Committee will evaluate department chairs in the categories of research, teaching, and service. Departmental chairs in departments operating under Option 1 (chair alone) will be evaluated in the categories of research, teaching, and service by the respective college deans or next higher administrative authority. **by a committee made up of the three highest-ranking members of the department. In this case rank is first determined by professorial rank, then time of service to the university.**

### 9.5. DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION PROCEDURES

9.5.2 Departmental Personnel Promotion Committees. Upon receipt of promotion dossiers, department chairs must first confirm the eligibility of applicants for promotion in academic rank and then convene the Departmental Personnel Promotion Committees to consider the qualifications of candidates for promotion. In order to broaden faculty participation in promotion deliberations, the membership of the Departmental Personnel Committee shall be expanded to include all department professors and associate professors during promotion deliberations. However, promotions may be considered only by faculty holding a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered. **Departmental Promotion Committees consist of departmental faculty members holding academic rank equal to, or higher than, that being sought by candidates for promotion. Promotion committees are chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of the committee members. Department chairs cannot serve as chairs of Promotion Committees. Faculty holding appointments within an academic department and serving as University administrative officers in the positions of President, Provost, Vice-President, and dean of the college or director of the school or division in which a department is organized may not sit as members of the Departmental Promotion Committee.**

**The chair of the Promotion Committee should supervise the promotion deliberations. Department chairs should attend the promotion proceedings and act as information sources, but do not supervise the committees and do not vote as members of Promotion Committees (department chairs later prepare their own independent evaluations (see Section 9.5.5).**

When a departmental faculty does not consist of at least three members holding the rank to which an applicant aspires, the dean of the college shall seek the advice of the Departmental Personnel Committee and the chair, and then appoint a sufficient **an additional** number of appropriately-ranked members from the college to constitute a three-person committee Promotion Committee to consider the application.

#### 1. TENURE PROCEEDINGS

9.7.1 Types of Tenure Proceedings. Departmental Personnel Tenure Committees conduct two (2) proceedings relating to academic tenure: pre-tenure review and tenure award deliberations. In order to broaden faculty participation in all tenure proceedings, the membership of the Departmental Personnel Tenure Committee shall include all tenured faculty members within the department, **with the exception of departmental faculty who are also administrators and are listed in Section 9.5.2. The individuals listed in Section 9.5.2 cannot serve as members of Departmental Tenure Committees. Department**

**chairs should attend pre-tenure and tenure deliberations and act as information sources, but do not vote as members of either of these committees and cannot chair them. Pre-tenure and tenure committees are chaired by a member elected by a simple majority vote of the Departmental Tenure Committee. The elected chair of the Departmental Tenure Committee then supervises the pre-tenure or tenure deliberations.**

**When a departmental faculty does not consist of at least three tenured faculty members, the dean of the college shall seek the advice of the Departmental Personnel Committee and the chair, and then appoint an additional number of tenured faculty members from the college to constitute a three-person Tenure Committee to consider the tenure application.**

#### 7.10.2 Gulf Coast Faculty Council (Annulis)

A search committee has been formed for the Gulf Coast Vice President position and candidates will be brought to campus.

#### 7.10.3 Academic/Graduate Council (Daves)

Applications to the university are up, especially graduate applications which are up 22%. A Graduate Research Symposium is planned for the presentation of graduate student research from departments across campus for March 26 here in the Thad Cochran Center. Institutional Research Board training is being planned for all faculty and researchers, in the form of online modules. That will be required shortly. The IHL proposed common textbook policy was discussed by academic council, as well:

<http://www.ihl.state.ms.us/ihl/newsstory.asp?ID=764>

Sen. A. Davis said the new textbook policy could be quite restrictive to us, but there seems to be little that we can do about it. Lower level courses will be required to use the same textbook for three years. Assoc. Prov. Powell said that books will not be chosen for faculty, but the one chosen must be used for three years—two years if there have been major changes or updates in knowledge. Sen. Daves said that if we must accept a community college degree as fulfilling the complete core, we need to embed other important courses into degree programs at our university level.

Academic Council has also been working on assessing the university core courses and the articulation agreement with community colleges. Sen. Beckett and Assoc. Provost Powell noted that midterm grades are now to be reported for all students.

#### 7.10.4 AAUP (Klinedinst)

Pres. Evans read a note from Sen. Klinedinst congratulating those who came out under fair skies from across education levels to rally at the capitol on Wednesday. Two faculty senate presidents were present, eloquent speeches were heard, and an article in the *Clarion Ledger* resulted. Those who attended met with several legislators and suggested ways to get funding from a proposed jobs bill in congress.

#### 7.10.5 Space Utilization and Allocation Committee (Gould)

A whole semester of work has resulted in some plans for university space. Sen. Gould reminded all that he was just the messenger. When Dr. Saunders arrived at the university in 2007, she encountered issues with space. She surveyed chairs in each college, and reinforced a growing list of needs and issues. An office of planning and management was proposed, but given current budget situations it was decided to use SUAC instead. Sen. Gould now has a tape measure at the ready to measure rooms at any time! SUAC has 18 members, serving staggered three year terms. They are appointed by Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors,

Faculty Senate, Academic and Graduate Councils. The new philosophy is to engage in stewardship of space. No one but the university “owns” any space. Stewards will manage all allocation of space. Building liaisons (186 at present) will keep track of space and do inventory annually (responding to questions, Sen. Gould noted this is a separate inventory from the department inventory of equipment and the like). All reassignments of space must go as requests to the SUAC committee, which will make recommendations for the Executive Cabinet. All space must be accounted for at all times. Requests for space must be posted online for 30 days, and a recommendation must be made by the end of that time.

Sen. Young asked about changing offices within a department. Even that change must go through SUAC, Sen. Gould noted. Where do we put people for the 30 days, then, asked Sen. D. Davis. Would there be a budget for tents?

Sen. Fletcher noted this policy was completely at odds with the RCM philosophy of budgets being managed by those who generate the funds . . . such decentralization completely opposes such tight centralization of space allocation. Sen. Rehner noted that, in the past, policy for getting space has been the other extreme—acquiring space had been a completely hidden process. If you knew the right person you could get space.

Sen. Gould said there was resistance to this plan knowing the amount of paperwork that would be required, but in the final decisions it was ignored. The administration wants to be able to account for space. Unit heads are not to have lots of space and simply hoard it. Sen. Haley noted the disincentive to spend to improve space, knowing that it might be poached later on by a central committee. Sen. A. Davis said space should relate to UPC’s issues of priorities and university mission. This is why Dickeson suggested other committees hold off on decisions until university priorities are established.

Sen. Gould also pointed out that if a grant that provided for research space ran out, after the termination date that entity would not keep the space anymore—they would need to vacate within 30 days. The Executive Cabinet would decide about every space on campus. Senators suggested objections to this policy be taken back to the committee, and more consultation with deans and chairs is also needed.

8.0 Old Business -- none

9.0 New Business -- none

10.0 Adjournment

Faculty Senate voted to adjourn at 4:58 pm.

---

Respectfully Submitted,  
John Meyer  
Secretary for Faculty Senate

---

Approved by  
Jeff Evans  
President of Faculty Senate