

12-4-2009

## Faculty Senate Minutes - December 4, 2009

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 - December 4, 2009" (2009). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 115.  
[http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes/115](http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/115)

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**  
**Draft—Unapproved Minutes for the Meeting of December 4, 2009**  
**216 Thad Cochran Center**

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

Members Absent: D. Daves, R. Pandey, J.H. Shin

1.0 Call to order

Pres. Evans called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. Contact was made by speakerphone with members on the coast.

2.0 Approval of the agenda

Pres. Evans proposed to add breakout sessions for each college delegation to the senate to discuss appointments to the new University Priorities Committee. The agenda was approved with this addition by voice vote.

3.0 Approval of the minutes

Minutes from the Senate meetings on November 6, 2009 and November 13, 2009 were approved by voice vote.

4.0 Old Business

4.1 Report on member selections for the University Priorities Committee

Pres. Evans reported the following appointments to the University Priorities Committee, Academic Subcommittee:

The Provost gets two appointments, one to co-chair. Assoc. Provost **Bill Powell** is the latter, and Prov. Bob Lyman is waiting on the other.

The Faculty Senate appointed **Tom Lipscomb** from the College of Education and Psychology.

Academic Council appointed **David Beckett**, College of Science and Technology.

Graduate Council appointed **Sharon Rouse**, College of Education and Psychology.

The University Research Council appointed **Kyna Shelley**, College of Education and Psychology

The Gulf Coast appointed **Heather Annulis**, College of Science and Technology

The Council of Chairs had not appointed at their meeting yesterday, but **Tim Rehner**, College of Health, thought it might be him.

The University Libraries appointed **Nancy Kaul**.

Staff Council appointed **Dianne Coleman** as the staff representative.

An undergraduate representative will be appointed by the Student Government Association. J. R. Robinson is the Student Body President.

The Graduate Student Council appointed its president, **Alice Ferguson**, College of Arts and Letters.

That left three choices to be made by the faculty senate to bring college representation into more balance. Senators stressed that committee members are not simply representing their own college but the whole university. Still, three colleges (Arts and Letters, Business, and Health) were not yet represented by faculty members.

Pres. Evans suggested a break for college delegation caucuses. This was done. After 15 minutes, the Senate reconvened to endorse three additional UPC members of the Academic Priorities subcommittee:

**Brigitte Burgess**, College of Business

**Stan Hauer**, College of Arts and Letters

**Steve Oshrin**, College of Health (who also serves on the Responsibility-Centered Management Budget committee, and thus could serve as that liaison).

That left only the provost's second appointment to be made, and Pres. Evans said additional coast representation would be sought [Prov. Lyman later appointed **Tom Lansford**, Arts and Letters from the coast, to this position].

Director of Human Resources Russ Willis has been appointed by the President to head the Non-academic subcommittee.

## 5.0 New Business

Sen. Klinedinst brought a resolution from the AAUP asking the endorsement of it by Faculty Senate. The administration has mentioned, he noted, that more stimulus money could be coming to the state. We need to make our voices heard and ask for that money. He thus asked the Faculty Senate to endorse the following resolution:

-----  
November 20, 2009

### USM-AAUP Resolution on State Budget Cuts

1. We call on the Governor and the legislature to make no cuts to education.
2. We call on the Faculty Senate, administration and legislators to support this resolution.
3. We call on the leadership to organize a statewide meeting of faculty soon.

Quality education in the state is clearly of the highest priority. The state's ability to attract jobs, offer cultural activities and keep the unemployment rate low depends on its ability to offer high quality educational opportunities from kindergarten through the post-graduate level. People with college degrees earn nearly sixty percent of the income in the country and have much lower rates of unemployment (see sources below). Those with a good education not only earn more, pay more taxes, and have lower unemployment, but they are also less likely to need services of the state such as welfare, Medicaid, prisons, unemployment insurance and worker's compensation.

As Thomas Jefferson recognized more than 200 years ago, dollars spent on education have a multiplier impact on local communities, the state, and the nation: "If the children . . . are untaught," Jefferson wrote, "their ignorance and vices will in future life cost us much dearer in their consequences, than it would have done, in their correction, by a good education." Cutting education will immediately cause a loss of jobs across the state and deny citizens access to education. We therefore believe strongly that rainy day funds or

other revenue, including taxes earmarked for education, should be used to maintain this strategic investment in our present and future.

References below:

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/Z/ecstatreport08-09/default.htm>

Value Added

“Higher education’s contribution to an individual’s earning power is well known. The rewards of higher education are one reason why so many families and individuals make sacrifices to obtain a college degree. Data reported by the U.S. Census Bureau show that, on average, a person who had completed a bachelor’s degree earned almost twice the income of a person with only a high school diploma in 2007. Going on to earn a master’s degree raises income again by more than 20 percent, and obtaining a professional degree doubles the salary of a four-year college graduate. While doctoral education typically takes several more years than professional education, the monetary return to the doctoral degree is substantially less. As people increasingly recognize the enormous economic benefits higher education confers, more and more are obtaining college degrees. Between 1997 and 2007, the number of individuals with bachelor’s or higher degrees increased by more than fourteen million and the proportion of individuals with this level of educational attainment rose from a quarter of the population to almost a third. Although we cannot quantify the nonmonetary rewards of higher education, the monetary rewards unquestionably are substantial.

The contributions of college and university faculty to national economic well-being are equally dramatic. Commonly cited indicators of economic health such as unemployment, gross domestic product, and personal income are all affected by national levels of educational attainment. College graduates have unemployment rates substantially below those of individuals with less education—during both economic expansions and recessions. Figure 3 shows December unemployment rates in the United States between 1999 and 2008. During and after the 2001 recession, the unemployment rate of college graduates rose less than that of people with lower levels of educational attainment. And in the current recession, while the unemployment rate of college graduates has increased in line with the overall trend, it remains well below the unemployment rates of individuals with less education. A college degree is not insurance against being unable to find work, but it provides insulation from the pain of an economic downturn. College professors are also responsible for generating an enormous amount of our national income. Census Bureau data indicate that between 1997 and 2007, the proportion of total individual income earned by people with associate’s or higher degrees rose from 49 to 57 percent. Given that individuals with high school diplomas or less are taught by individuals who have earned at least bachelor’s degrees, virtually all of the individual income earned in the United States is tied at least indirectly to the work of college and university faculty—the teachers of the college graduates and the teachers of everyone’s teachers. That is why the secretary of education is correct to argue that we need to increase our investments in higher education—and, we would argue, especially in the faculty members who provide that education.”

Iranzo, Susana, and Giovanni Peri. 2009. “Schooling Externalities, Technology, and Productivity: Theory and Evidence from U.S. States.” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 91: 420–431.

Trostel, Philip A., and Todd M. Gabe. 2007. “Fiscal and Economic Effects of College Attainment.” School of Economics Staff Paper No. 566. Orono, ME: University of Maine.

-----

After the motion and second, discussion followed. Sen. Lipscomb noted the resolution and its support were well done. Sen. Redalje noted that when it came to stimulus funds the governor had chosen not to ask for all that he could have asked for; we need to ask for it this time. Sen. Bristol wondered what kind of public reaction could occur after such a resolution from ordinary taxpayers. Sen. Klinedinst pointed out the deep impact of potentially \$35 million in cuts to the university and statewide cuts for K-12 education would have on the state as well as ourselves. He described one staff member sending a child to stay with another family for the sake of food. Education gives more dollars coming into the state long term—we would be cutting ourselves short not to ask for the money. We have to make the case for why education is crucial, Sen. Klinedinst noted. Sen. Rehner agreed that we have to make the case for higher education—if we stay silent, what will become of the future? We have to have a voice. Sen. D. Davis suggested that we should include a statement noting that we are already working hard to become more strategic and effective with

the resources we have. Pres. Evans asked the senate if it would support the resolution or not; voting now as this is not a senate resolution. The motion to voice support for the resolution carried by voice vote.

## 6.0 Officers' reports

### 6.1 President (Evans)

A legislative forum would be held in the same room on Tuesday, December 8, 2010 at 3:00. Senators, representatives, and IHL Board members living nearby were invited. Pres. Evans would moderate. He asked for some questions that could be prepared in advance. Senators suggested the following questions:

1. What would be your reaction to the resolution made by the USM AAUP Chapter to seek to make no cuts to education?
2. There have been suggestions that the State Retirement System will reduce benefits for retirees in order to meet the budget shortfall. Since the promise of reasonable retirement benefits are viewed by state employees as compensation for relatively low salaries during their working years, can you reassure us that you will protect this obligation of the state to its employees?
3. The Governor has in the past been unsure that he wants to accept some of the stimulus money from the federal government. If more may be passed, should we the state of Mississippi ask for more stimulus money, and go after it to help our state meet needs?
4. Will the state make use of rainy-day funds to help education weather this recession? "It seems like it's raining" . . .
5. What level of priority has the legislature assigned to the USM Cross Creek campus on the Gulf Coast?

Pres. Evans welcomed more questions via email before Tuesday.

The University Direction Committee will give suggestions to the UPC about criteria for evaluating programs and their weights.

The next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate will be January 29; elections of new officers will be held during the May meeting, so be thinking of who might be willing to serve. April 9 will be our meeting on the Gulf Coast.

### 6.2 President-Elect (Davis)

Sen. A. Davis mentioned the university club committee and plans for another open house. Sen. Hauer reported the numbers were good at the gathering held right before Thanksgiving, with 47 people including 17 new ones and many retirees. Sen. A. Davis noted that the Faculty Senate "ning" site was a convenient venue for storing all articles, documents, and discussion regarding the UPC and budget issues. Campus Hub is officially operational now, and allows one to access it with EMPL ID and password once and then have access to email, SOAR, and other university functions. Some senate committee work may eventually move there as it is highly accessible to all senators as eventually part of our routine use of technology.

Sen. A. Davis attended Provost Council to report about the prioritization process and the planned UPC, and heard expressions of anxiety about the process. A clear history of distrust was indicated. Many believe that UPC members would represent only their own interests (whether programs or colleges). We need to be vigilant about that; people need to represent the wider interest of the university. We need to ask, "How do we work together as a community to make this work?" It is not going to be easy for anyone. Ed Kemp of the *Hattiesburg American* wrote an article that did a good job of putting the process out there (it is

available on the “ning” site). A local radio station had reported that USM is doing “some collective belt-tightening.” This good sort of reporting speaks well of us and our organization.

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) -- No report.

7.3 Awards (Brannock) -- No report.

7.4 Constitution and Bylaws (Rehner) -- No report.

Pres. Evans noted that this committee would need to work in tandem with the Elections Committee to make needed changes for voting online, as paper ballots no longer would be used.

7.5 Elections (Burgess)

Sen. Burgess had tested the new election system herself and that created a glitch. The original designer has been out on maternity leave, so there has been lots of waiting on the iTech replacement to do more work on it. After break, we all will test and check for corrections needed and correct candidate lists from each college with the help of all senators.

7.6 Faculty Welfare (Davis) -- No report.

7.7 Research and Grants (McCormick)

Sen. McCormick noted that the Vice President for Research search is ongoing for a key position for the university. The search seeks a candidate ASAP, but VP Cecil Burge has agreed to stay until a replacement is found, though he wants to retire. A solid leader is certainly needed to fill that office. We are “treading water” until then.

7.8 Technology (Bass) – No report.

7.9 University Direction (Davis)

Since the UPC will be working with a very compressed time limit, the committee took up some definition of USM values and mission. Indiana State University took a year and a half to do what we propose to do in 8 months. The committee has worked hard, but in the end the UPC and Academic subcommittee will decide how to apply the timeline and criteria suggestions. This process will be a lot of work for all of us, but if we do this well, we’ll come out better for it.

The process has three independent raters working with each program after criteria are set and program reports are submitted. The UPC subcommittee rates, the deans of each college rate programs in their own college, as does a committee of faculty from each college. There will likely be meetings weekly of the UPC subcommittee and other faculty groups working on this process. Release time and resources may need to be brought to bear to make this happen. Participation is needed from the President on down. We’re not just here to “cut ourselves,” but to have an open process of participation. It is about cuts but also about enhancements when the recession ends. There will be some consolidation and reorganization possible.

Sen. Lipscomb noted that the UPC is set up to continue as standing committee, not just to exist for only this year of cuts.

Sen. A. Davis referred the senators to proposed guidelines for academic and non-academic program prioritization the direction committee had pulled together:

---

**The University of Southern Mississippi  
University Priorities**

## Guidelines for Academic Program Prioritization

Program prioritization is a self-study of academic programs along with supporting non-academic resource programs that reflect upon program offerings in relation to our institutional mission. This process examines the current status of education and research offerings, assesses future potential, and identifies opportunities for program alignment and reinvestment in order provide responsible stewardship of our resources and direction, ensure quality, and to chart the future.

All programs (academic and non-academic funded from all budget resources) will submit a 10-page (maximum) report based on criteria for academic or non-academic programs. Programs should provide both qualitative descriptions and quantitative data as applicable. Some sources of data are suggested below, but programs are encouraged to provide additional data sources where existing internal measures are not available. Programs are encouraged to incorporate material from existing reports used for internal and external evaluation.

Academic program reports will address six areas of review formed from the ten criteria identified by Dickeson (1999): (1) Consistency with University Vision, Mission, Goals, and Priorities; (2) Internal and External Demand; (3) Quality; (4) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency; (5) Potential; and, (6) Additional Information. For each area, programs are encouraged to address areas in their program relative to University functions for teaching, research and services within the areas of general education, research and scholarship, professional certifications and licensures, and synergistic activities. General education includes courses valued as university-wide core knowledge. Research and scholarship includes faculty time and courses designed for the generation, application, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge. Professional programs include degree, certification, and licensure programs preparing students for professional service. Synergistic program activities respond to the contemporary need for institutions of higher learning to examine the way that learning and discovery are carried out in an era of globalization and increasingly complex human relations, providing cutting-edge knowledge to address the variety of challenges facing local, national, and global communities in the 21st century. These programs include courses, faculty time, and resources devoted to bringing together researchers from multiple disciplines, groups, and various funding agencies to address large-scale problems through the integration of the arts, humanities, and social sciences as well as engineering and the physical and biological sciences into multi- and interdisciplinary research teams.

For each area, the University Priorities Committee has provided a list of possible measures of success. These suggested metrics are intended to help guide programs as they prepare their reports, but programs are not compelled to address each term. Ultimately, the University Priorities Committee considers each program to be its own best advocate and that programs should shape their responses to each of the six areas of review to best reflect the successes and goals of their program. Programs are encouraged to draw from previous and existing reports used for internal and external program evaluation processes in preparing their reports. Ultimately, programs selected for enhancement will represent the diverse functions and values cores of The University of Southern Mississippi.

Program reports must be no longer than ten pages long, excluding the cover page. The report should have one-inch margins, use a common san-serif 10-point font (Arial is suggested), be single-spaced, and include six clearly delineated sections corresponding to the six areas of review list above. Footnotes and appendices are not permitted, though narrative relevant raw data, tables, figures, and source material may be incorporated into the body of the report only.

Program reports will include a cover page that lists the program title, department name, college, and the name, email, and telephone of the program's primary contact person. In addition, the University Priorities Committee asks that programs provide a percentage breakdown of the program's functions along the following functional efforts for research, teaching, and service in the following functional areas as described above: (a) general education, (b) research and scholarship, (c) professional programs, and (d) synergistic activities. This breakdown is to be included on the cover page and is considered descriptive. Functional efforts will vary greatly; the list will help the University Priorities Committee to quickly recognize the goals of diverse programs.

Examples of supporting data may include, but is not limited to: publications, presentations, course content, professional development activities, course outcomes, patents, external and internal awards, environment/climate surveys (civility, trust, respect, satisfaction), forum and event attendance, course delivery modes (access), absenteeism/attendance, enrollment, degrees awarded, admissions to graduate programs, demographics (diversity), graduate employment, use of services, field and service learning activities, IRB approval, academic violations, degrees awarded, post-graduate employment, writing-intensive courses, shared governance activity participation, accreditation status, WEAVE content, budgeting, graduate residences (community impact), ticket sales, EEO complaints, access accommodations, six-year graduation rates, multicultural courses, interdisciplinary, multi- and interdisciplinary research, event demographics (age), area of new/renovated facilities, space usage (size), computer usage, distance technologies, classroom technologies, student return rates, course exit examinations, student organization participation, student organized events, licensed and certified graduates, rigorous standards, NSSE senior scores, external partnerships, collaborative learning, local media coverage, Gallup Branding Index, U.S. News Rankings, Forbes University Rankings, national media coverage, web-conference attendance, endowments portfolio, alumni giving, externally funded assistantships, externally funded scholarships, international activities, corporate relationships, volunteer hours, service learning hours, internship hours, applied scholarship hours, partnerships (external, internal), external research funding.

Three copies of the report will be submitted to the University Priorities Committee. The UPC will evaluate one copy and forward the other two copies to college deans and college priorities committees. Once the three independent initial reviews are completed, the University Priorities Committee will consolidate the three evaluations and forward a final recommendation to the University Provost. For a full description of the University Priorities Committee's evaluation guidelines, please visit WEBSITE.

For a list of University resources that provide data that programs may want to include in their reports, please visit WEBSITE. Departments are advised that SOAR and Institutional Research-generated data represent snapshots of your program at a given moment in time, and, as a result, it is essential programs contextualize this data for the committee.

Following program report submissions each of the fifteen (15) members of the University Priorities Academic Committee will be divided into five (5) teams of three (3) serving as a Primary Presenters. Teams will be comprised of representatives from different academic perspectives (general education, research, professional, and synergistic programs). Each team will be given a set of reports (20% of total reports) where they will serve as the Primary Presenters, synthesizing the report for the Committee (strengths, weaknesses, costs, benefits, intangibles, etc.) Each team will receive also a different set of reports (20% of total reports) where they will serve as Secondary Presenters, in turn, presenting their evaluation of the Primary Presenters program reports. After a period of open discussion with the entire Academic Committee, a consensus will be formed. This approach will increase the diversity of perspectives in evaluation, will distribute the workload equitably, and is modeled after proposal review processes of funding agencies.

**The University of Southern Mississippi  
University Priorities**

Cover Page for Academic Program Prioritization Narrative

**Program Title:**

**Department Name:**

**College:**

Please report the approximate time and resources given to the following functions as described in the directions.

General Education	___%
Research/Scholarship	___%
Professional Programs	___%
Synergistic Activities	___%

Programs are encouraged to focus on selected topics identified by Dickeson (1999) that are relevant to the function of the program.

**(A) Consistency with University Mission, Vision, Values, and Priorities 10%**

- History and development of the program
- Expectations
- Origins of initial support
- Adaptations to changing student and community needs
- Maturity of the program
- Program visibility
- Program congruence with university-wide mission, vision, goals and priorities
- Program uniqueness

**(B) External and Internal Demand (15%)**

- National demand (trends)
- Local demand (trends)
- Future demands
- General education responsibility
- New approaches to collaborative learning

**(C) Quality (25%)**

- Faculty and staff
- Percentage of instruction offered by full-time faculty
- Students
- Curriculum
- Adaptability to technology
- Equipment, facilities, and other resources
- Program Outcomes
  - Exemplary performance
  - Student, alumni, and employer satisfaction
  - Licensure and certification examination records
  - Preparation for future scholarship and employment
- Teaching effectiveness
- Research in peer-reviewed publications
- Public service
- External validation of quality
- External peer review of program

**(D) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency (25%)**

- Students served
- Faculty/staff
- Credit hours
- Degrees/certificates
- Services
- Research developed
- Creative efforts produced
- Attendance at events/performances
- Program scope
- Enrollments
- Cross-subsidies (services to other programs)
- Research grants
- Fundraising
- Equipment grants
- Other sources
- Potential revenue
- Community college partnerships
- University-corporate relationships
- Economic development relationships
- Joint ventures/projects
- Operational cost efficiencies
- Needed resources

**(E) Potential (20%)**

- Program development
- Collaborative or cooperative relationships
- Advancing new ideas
- Program delivery
- Emerging trends and research
- Interdisciplinary programs

**(E) Additional Information (5%)**

- How will your program manage a budget responding to a:
  - 5% increase
  - no change
  - 5% reduction
  - 10% reduction

---

**The University of Southern Mississippi  
University Priorities**

Guidelines for Non-Academic Program Prioritization

Program prioritization is a self-study of academic and programs along with supporting resource non-academic programs that reflect upon program offerings in relation to our institutional mission. This process examines the current status of education and research offerings, assesses future potential, and identifies opportunities for program alignment and reinvestment in order provide responsible stewardship of our resources and direction, ensure quality, and to chart the future.

All programs (academic and non-academic funded from all budget resources) will submit a 10-page (maximum) report based on criteria for academic or non-academic programs. Programs should provide both qualitative descriptions and quantitative data as applicable. Some sources of data are suggested below, but programs are encouraged to provide additional data sources where existing internal measures are not available. Programs are encouraged to incorporate material from existing reports used for internal and external evaluation.

Non-academic program reports will address twelve administrative service programs questions as identified by Dickeson (1999):

- What are the main objectives of your unit, and how do you measure success in achieving them?
- What are the services that your unit provides and to which customers (students, faculty, staff, donors, others)?
- List each position in your unit, and briefly describe the responsibilities of each. Include part-time and work-study student hours.
- Do you see needs and demands for services that your unit cannot currently meet? If so, what are they, and how do they relate to the university's mission?
- How could the university help your unit do its job better?
- In what ways does your unit relate to other units of the university, academic and non-academic? For example, what services do you provide to other units? What services do other units provide to you? On what tasks do you collaborate with other offices?
- What skill sets and resources does your unit possess that can be shared with other units?
- Which individuals in your unit are cross-trained and in what areas?
- What resources do you need to improve your services to a superior level?
- What technologies and tools are available to you to provide your services better? What training do you need to be more effective?
- What one thing do you wish you could do differently to improve your effectiveness but have not had the opportunity, time, or resources?
- How do you review and evaluate your department's yearly performance?

For each area, the University Priorities Committee has provided a list of possible measures of success. These suggested metrics are intended to help guide programs as they prepare their reports, but programs are not compelled to address each term. Ultimately, the University Priorities Committee considers each program to be its own best advocate and that programs should shape their responses to each of the six areas of review to best reflect the successes and goals of their program. Programs are encouraged to draw from previous and existing reports used for internal and external program evaluation processes in preparing their reports. Ultimately, programs selected for enhancement will represent the diverse functions and values cores of The University of Southern Mississippi.

Program reports must be no longer than ten pages long, excluding the cover page. The report should have one-inch margins, use a common san-serif 10-point font (Arial is suggested), be single-spaced, and include six clearly delineated sections corresponding to the six areas of review list above. Footnotes and appendices are not permitted, though narrative relevant raw data, tables, figures, and source material may be incorporated into the body of the report only.

Program reports will include a cover page that lists the program title, supervisory unit, and the name, email, and telephone of the program's primary contact person. In addition, the University Priorities Committee asks that programs provide a percentage breakdown of the program's functions along the following functional efforts for research, teaching, and service in the following functional areas as described above: (a) general education, (b) research and scholarship, (c) professional programs, and (d) synergistic activities. (Synergistic programs include courses, faculty time, and resources devoted to bringing together researchers from multiple disciplines, groups, and various funding agencies to address large-scale problems through the integration of the arts, humanities, and social sciences as well as engineering and the physical and biological sciences into multi- and interdisciplinary research teams.) This breakdown is to be included on

the cover page and is considered descriptive. Functional efforts will vary greatly; the list will help the University Priorities Committee to quickly recognize the goals of diverse programs.

Examples of supporting data may include, but are not limited to: publications, presentations, course content, professional development activities, course outcomes, patents, external and internal awards, environment/climate surveys (civility, trust, respect, satisfaction), forum and event attendance, course delivery modes (access), absenteeism/attendance, enrollment, degrees awarded, admissions to graduate programs, demographics (diversity), graduate employment, use of services, field and service learning activities, IRB approval, academic violations, degrees awarded, post-graduate employment, writing-intensive courses, shared governance activity participation, accreditation status, WEAVE content, budgeting, graduate residences (community impact), ticket sales, EEO complaints, access accommodations, six-year graduation rates, multicultural courses, interdisciplinary, multi- and interdisciplinary research, event demographics (age), area of new/renovated facilities, space usage (size), computer usage, distance technologies, classroom technologies, student return rates, course exit examinations, student organization participation, student organized events, licensed and certified graduates, rigorous standards, NSSE senior scores, external partnerships, collaborative learning, local media coverage, Gallup Branding Index, U.S. News Rankings, Forbes University Rankings, national media coverage, web-conference attendance, endowments portfolio, alumni giving, externally funded assistantships, externally funded scholarships, international activities, corporate relationships, volunteer hours, service learning hours, internship hours, applied scholarship hours, partnerships (external, internal), external research funding.

Three copies of the report will be submitted to the University Priorities Committee. The UPC will evaluate one copy and forward the other two copies to college deans and college priorities committees. Once the three independent initial reviews are completed, the University Priorities Committee will consolidate the three evaluations and forward a final recommendation to the University Provost. For a full description of the University Priorities Committee's evaluation guidelines, please visit WEBSITE.

For a list of University resources that provide data that programs may want to include in their reports, please visit WEBSITE. Departments and units are advised that SOAR and Institutional Research-generated data represent snapshots of your program at a given moment in time, and, as a result, it is essential programs contextualize this data for the committee.

Following program report submissions each of the fifteen (15) members of the University Priorities Non-Academic Committee will be divided into five (5) teams of three (3) serving as a Primary Presenters. Teams will be comprised of representatives from different non-academic perspectives. Each team will be given a set of reports (20% of total reports) where they will serve as the Primary Presenters, synthesizing the report for the Committee (strengths, weaknesses, costs, benefits, intangibles, etc.) Each team will receive also a different set of reports (20% of total reports) where they will serve as Secondary Presenters, in turn, presenting their evaluation of the Primary Presenters program reports. After a period of open discussion with the entire Non-Academic Committee, a consensus will be formed. This approach will increase the diversity of perspectives in evaluation, will distribute the workload equitably, and is modeled after proposal review processes of funding agencies.

## **The University of Southern Mississippi University Priorities**

### Cover Page for Non-Academic Program Prioritization Narrative

#### **Program or Unit Title:**

#### **Supervisory Unit, if applicable:**

Please report the approximate time and resources given to the following functions as described in the directions.

General Education            \_\_\_ %  
Research/Scholarship        \_\_\_ %  
Professional Programs        \_\_\_ %  
Synergistic Activities        \_\_\_ %

What are the main objectives of your unit, and how do you measure success in achieving them?

What are the services that your unit provides and to which customers (students, faculty, staff, donors, others)?

- List each position in your unit, and briefly describe the responsibilities of each. Include part-time and work-study student hours.

Do you see needs and demands for services that your unit cannot currently meet? If so, what are they, and how do they relate to the university's mission?

- In what ways does your unit relate to other units of the university, academic and non-academic? For example, what services do you provide to other units? What services do other units provide to you? On what tasks do you collaborate with other offices?

What skill sets and resources does your unit possess that can be shared with other units?

- Which individuals in your unit are cross-trained and in what areas?

How can you provide better services, and what resources are needed?

- What technologies and tools are available to you to provide your services better? What training do you need to be more effective?

What one thing do you wish you could do differently to improve your effectiveness but have not had the opportunity, time, or resources?

- How do you review and evaluate your department's yearly performance?

How will your unit respond to a (a) 5% increase in budget, (b) no budget change, (c) a 5% budget reduction, and (d) a 10% budget reduction?

-----  
Sen. McCormick suggested that "Teaching" should be added as a fifth central and crucial criterion for the academic side—Sen. A. Davis agreed. "Service" was also suggested to be added.

Discussion followed about how programs would be defined—departments, or majors? How would the libraries or iTech fit in—academic or non-academic? Programs in these documents have been defined as any entity to where money flows (or that has a budget). Yet, the UPC will have to make such detailed decisions as how exactly programs will be defined and what category some will fall into. The six areas of review (in the third paragraph) were discussed in that each program would decide how to address those criteria in their reports.

Sen. A. Davis noted that this work had been done not to insist the UPC follow it all, but to give it a starting point rather than letting it have nothing done after the semester break. The UPC, in the end, will have to decide. Pres. Evans noted that time was short as tentative timelines have departments providing these desired reports to the committee by sometime in March.

## 7.10 Other committee and liaison reports

### 7.10.1 Faculty Handbook Committee (Beckett)

The committee will meet next week about assistant or associate deans voting on tenure and promotion decisions. Sen. Beckett thought they should not, although Sen. Bristol noted that one associate dean had claimed that would disenfranchise those people from such decisions in their home departments. Sen. Lipscomb asked if there were any listed qualifications for associate or assistant deans? Sen. Beckett said there were not. But the question of whether they may vote in tenure and promotion decisions comes up every year. It needs to be resolved.

The committee plans to discuss appeals procedures. They are detailed for tenure/tenure track faculty who have been accused of misbehavior, but none are spelled out for those who may have served the university faithfully for years but are subject to budget cuts. No appeal process exists for those cases in the faculty handbook or in IHL bylaws. Complicating this will be the proposed UPC appeal process. This will be worked through to avoid having diverging procedures for the handbook and for UPC.

The committee will also discuss clarifying titles for non-faculty academic staff members.

### 7.10.2 Gulf Coast Faculty Council (Annulis)

Sen. Annulis reported that a search committee has been named for a new coast executive who will report to the university president, led by Joe Paul, Vice President for Student Affairs. She noted that in last years' APG budget cut process faculty members were often not consulted by chairs or deans before they made their recommendations. Sen. Scurfield noted that chairs should seek input from all faculty in a department before submitting its report. Senators and committee members agreed with this.

7.10.3 Academic/Graduate Council (Daves) – No report.

7.10.4 AAUP – done in New Business.

## 8.0 Remarks from the administration

### 8.1 Provost Lyman

Following a ten-minute break, Provost Lyman addressed the senate. He noted that he was also representing President Saunders who was away at a meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

On sabbatical proposals, the provost noted that no instructions were given to deans regarding how many proposals to send forward—one dean chose not to approve all requests, approving only half. The department affected could not handle all applicants out on sabbatical at once. Thus, of 17 names submitted for sabbatical, only 9 came forward with a dean's approval. The committee considered 9, and 8 of those 9 were granted.

On a question about colleges not following a common core; the controversy regarded a dispute in the College of Arts and Letters where the Sociology program is proposing listing the foreign language as an option rather than requiring it. The merging of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Arts left disparities in disciplines and their core education goals. Prov. Lyman said his view was that if the faculty of a college do not agree on common elements, then it is illogical to have a common core. If the faculty could caucus and agree, then a common core could be found, but no college core is needed if they don't agree. The usual choice would be to differentiate between a B. A. and a B. S. degree, with the B. A. degree including the language requirement. Sen. Hauer noted that the B. S. degrees were suspended but not abolished years

ago. Sen. Young noted the problem was how the IHL board counted graduates. Many B. A. programs were deemed to have insufficient numbers. The provost thought those degrees are really “two sides of the same coin” when counting program numbers, and a case could readily be made to protect programs with both types of degrees.

Prov. Lyman said that January is the goal for when the results of appeals of APG budget cuts will be made public. There have been formal oral appeals and written appeals, and these have been discussed. In some cases no real decision has yet been made. Some ad hoc adjustments have been made after more information came forward. Additional negotiations have occurred, leading to the arrangement with economics for five retirements and four moving to the College of Arts and Letters. An agreement was reached with TOE faculty that two of three will move to open positions in a separate program, and the third senior member will stay an extra year. The terminal letters were thus rescinded. Admissions to the TOE degree have been suspended as have the B.S.B.A. degree in Economics and the Master of Arts Education. The Master of Social Work on the Gulf Coast will not be closed, but the schedule will be extended so there are no overlapping cohorts. This will eliminate one position. The Finance/Real Estate program was kept with a new hire due to demand and financial support from the community. Theater and Dance agreed to sacrifice the Southern Arena Theater support to keep costume design and dance positions. The appeal to keep the MIDAS program was successful. The latest list has no actions affecting faculty positions. Less E & G money will go to the campus radio station; the hope is that alternative funding will keep it on the air. The Management Information Systems program will discontinue admissions in January. The numbers were down, and it shared a department with Economics which is now moving to CoAL. One faculty member will retire, two will move to accounting, and another to finance. It was a program with considerable uncertainty; thus it would not be prudent to continue to serve new students. Prov. Lyman agreed with Dean Lance Nail to suspend enrollment while deciding what might be done with that program. Other than these negotiated changes, the cuts on the publicized lists are planned to be made.

Sen. Beckett asked about unfilled positions—do deans get the money for those to redistribute as desired? In normal times, yes, the provost noted. They can hire visiting or adjunct faculty with such funds, or do something else. Currently, they are giving up dollars for budget cuts. Most early cuts came from unfilled positions.

Sen. Young asked about possibility of a tuition increase. Prov. Lyman noted that the IHL may allow universities to set their own tuition. We have thought about a 10% increase for fall, with 5 % each of the next two years, but that might be too high. When we saw that Jackson State, Mississippi State, and Ole Miss stayed below 10% we thought we should, too. We want a strategy that does not disconnect us from State and Ole Miss, staying about \$200 per hour less. Knowing about tuition increases three years in advance would be most helpful to us. The board was trying to be “for the people” keeping tuition the same this year, but now hearing about closing campuses and programs they are rethinking. Sen. McCormick asked why leave dollars on the table; why be \$200 less? This is a marketing strategy, like charging \$19.99. That different first digit may mean more customers. The intention is for us to be very close, Prov. Lyman said.

Sen. Rehner asked if we were in a hiring freeze. “A soft freeze,” replied the provost. Some hirings have been granted. If a program has accommodated the current cut, then we are allowing some but not all hires. We are more stringent about allowing staff hires.

Discussing the coast, Prov. Lyman noted that a redefinition of the retiring Pat Joachim’s position is called for. She was not really an associate provost, and now we have an academic dean there. Most of her responsibilities are non-academic—facilities, public relations; thus this position should report to the President. The timing is poor, but Prov. Lyman said it would be horrible to have such a leadership vacuum on the coast now. The plan is to hire a Vice President for the Gulf Coast. He said plans for Cross Creek campus are “not over” but will likely not come to pass on his watch. More immediate plans are for rebuilding Hardy Hall and Lloyd Hall to fill out a nice campus down there.

Sen. Redalje asked about the situation with graduate assistantships. Prov. Lyman said there had been good response to graduate students becoming residents, but we could do better. We will not require grants to cover graduate assistants, but we need to push all eligible graduate assistants to become residents. The costs of car tags are the main hurdle. Paying \$200 more or so for car tags is a barrier, but that would be better than having to pay out of state tuition.

Prov. Lyman reminded senators of talk from the IHL staff about a system-wide core system—thus an A. A. degree from a community college would mean the core requirements are satisfied automatically upon enrollment at USM. A 30 credit hour IHL core may need consistency from us here—how could we then sustain a 44-hour core? The quality of instruction at a given community college in Mississippi would not be negotiable. Assoc. Provost Bill Powell noted that two studies had found no overall difference in writing skills among transfer versus “native” students, but a third study found that transfer students were weaker on technical writing skills. This would not affect major requirements, however—some desired requirements could be built into majors if the core needed to be adjusted to the state norm.

## 9.0 Adjournment

Following a reminder of the Legislative Forum on Tuesday at 3:00 (if no one shows, the legislators will think “no one cares”), Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:53 pm.

---

Respectfully Submitted,  
John Meyer  
Secretary for Faculty Senate

---

Approved by  
Jeff Evans  
President of Faculty Senate

