

11-13-2009

Faculty Senate Minutes - November 13, 2009

USM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes

Recommended Citation

USM Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes - November 13, 2009" (2009). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 116.
http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/116

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.

The University of Southern Mississippi
Faculty Senate
Minutes for the Meeting of November 13, 2009
123 Cook Library

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

Members Absent: D. Daves, T. Gould, J. Shin

Guests: D. Coleman (Staff Council), B. Powell (Office of the Provost)

1.0 Call to order

Pres. Evans called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm.

2.0 Approval of the agenda

Pres. Evans asked to change the agenda so that we would begin with 7.1, President's Report, before returning to Old Business 4.2, Proposal for Selection and Process of the University Priorities Committee. Then all items missed in last week's meeting would be taken up. This altered agenda was approved by voice vote.

3.0 Approval of the minutes

Minutes from the regular Senate meeting on November 6, 2009 were still open to corrections and thus not brought up for approval.

7.0 Officers' report

7.1 President (Evans)

Pres. Evans reported on a discussion with Human Resources Director Russ Willis about receiving paychecks over 12 months rather than 9. He said only a pilot program for doing this was being tried this year, as it runs over two fiscal years. The method should work and be available for faculty who desire this option next year.

Although the law has changed, faculty can still be re-employed as a sort of phased retirement. The complication is that the governing board of any state agency must approve re-employment, and an employee must retire before such approval can be granted. Thus, retirement is a "do it or not" decision before re-employment may be considered. A typical faculty member who retires in June could not be approved by the IHL Board until August, and they cannot teach until October or so anyway. Bottom line is, no paperwork can be filled out for "phased retirement" until after retirement . . .

The search committee for the Vice President for Research position had met twice. Economic Development has been removed from the title and the set of responsibilities. Sen. Davis noted that working on commercialization of university proprietary materials will still fall under the purview of the VP. Pres. Evans noted that all other aspects of what may be considered Economic Development have been moved, for now, to Chad Driscoll, the liaison to the legislature. Such functions may be overseen by the Economic Development office to be in the new Trent Lott Center. Cecil Burge will stay on in his position until a replacement is found. March is the target date. Sen. Redalje asked if the finalists would come to campus for open interviews with faculty. Pres. Evans said that was the plan.

Legislators' Day will be Tuesday, December 8. This year more legislative leaders will be invited, as well as our local delegation and nearby IHL college board members. They would prefer written questions ahead of time from us.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met with President Saunders. She expressed approval of the tentative UPC proposal, including the plan to have all six deans as ex officio members. She was anxious to get the process started. In January she needs to report to the IHL commissioner a plan for cutting the budget, and the UPC process is what she would explain. Pres. Evans noted she gave us the IHL board approved mission statement of the university, which it would not be wise to alter. But the values and strategy statements could be focused upon for specificity.

Regarding UPC, the Provost has appointed Assoc. Provost Bill Powell as co-chair. Academic Council picked Dave Beckett as their representative, and staff council chose Dianne Coleman for the Academic subcommittee.

4.0 Old Business

4.2 Proposal for selection and process of the University Strategic Budget Committee

Pres. Evans asked for further comments about the earlier section of the UPC approved last week. He suggested that the committee and its structure had been approved, but the process was a blueprint that did not have to be followed word for word.

He proceeded to overview the rest of the proposal, section by section, and senators interjected comments and suggested changes:

Proposed University Priorities Committee Plan

V. Program evaluation process.

A. Program Definition - any unit receiving budgetary support.

Programs will be defined and identified by the University Priorities Committee in consultation with the Provost, Vice-President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Research, CFO, and Deans. This definition will allow the committee to identify what will be rated. Dickeson defines programs as any unit receiving budgetary support.

As a further example, Indiana State University describes academic programs as any academic program requiring six or more semester hours, including the following:

- **Majors**
- **Minors requiring six or more hours not offered with a major**
- **Certificates requiring six or more hours not offered with a major**
- **Masters' degrees, with the exception of master's degrees that are embedded within a doctoral program**
- **Specialist's degrees**
- **Doctoral degrees.**

Pres Evans noted that USM's current assessment committee considers academic programs similarly when requesting assessments.

B. University Mission Statements need clarification for use as criteria

The UPC will meet to review university mission statements to clarify which sections of the mission statements are appropriate for use as criteria for program evaluation. The UPC may need to elaborate on the meaning of the university mission statements to provide guidance to units writing reports for program rating. They may seek assistance for this from the President, Provost, Faculty Senate Direction committee, Strategic Enrollment Planning Committee and others. This task alone could take a year so the committee must set limits on the time spent on this task.

Pres. Evans noted that we now have “certified” mission statements from the President, so the main decision is which aspects of the mission and/or strategic plan will be focused upon.

C. Confirming criteria and weights for program ratings.

Each Priorities subcommittee will confirm criteria used in program evaluation. The Academic Priorities (AP) subcommittee will seek evaluation criteria from Academic Council, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate’s University Direction Committee, and the five College Deans following the committee’s review of criteria

Senators noted that the six academic deans would do this, as the university library’s dean would do likewise as well as serving as a non-voting ex-officio member of the UPC.

suggested in listed Section II.B.4 (10 academic) and III.A (13 non-academic) (Dickeson, pg. 50) and found in other University prioritization process (Indiana State University, Minnesota State-Moorhead, Maine, Washington State). The Non-Academic Priorities (NP) subcommittee will also examine the criteria used by Dickeson for non-academic programs (Dickeson, pg. 50) and view other university prioritization criteria and develop its set of criteria for evaluation.

The AP subcommittee will determine weights to apply to each criteria, seeking advice from Academic and Graduate Councils, Senate’s University Direction Committee, and Deans prior to a decision on weights. [As an example, Indiana State’s relative weights include the following:

- *Mission = 9*
- *Demand = 18*
- *Quality = 27*
- *Productivity = 27*
- *Potential = 9*
- *Additional = 5]*

The NP subcommittee will develop its weights to apply to each criteria in consultation with Vice-Presidents and the CFO.

Sen. Hauer noted that “hard data drive out soft data” and, although they were clearly intended as examples, recommended deleting the specific weights as some would be inclined to take them literally. Sen. Redalje suggested that a sample list of criteria would be good. There was such a list earlier in the document, others pointed out. Senators, by voice vote, **moved to delete the bracketed section.**

D. Programs will prepare reports requested by Priorities subcommittees for rating the programs.

1. The Priorities subcommittees will request that each program submit a 10-page (maximum) Program Prioritization Report to answer a set of criteria determined by the Priorities subcommittees. The subcommittees will give guidance as to what type data should be included and what questions should be answered in the 10 page prioritization report. As an example see Indiana State’s Feb 1, 2006 Prioritization Report. Programs will prepare the reports with data from existing

resources such as Institutional Research, departmental records, and external sources for committee review.

2. The subcommittees should request an additional action plan from each program that details how the program will function over the next 3 years with (a) a 5% increase in budget, (b) no budget change, (c) a 5% budget reduction, and (d) a 10% budget reduction. The action plan should be of enough detail to see what and how budgetary items will be modified. The action plan may be needed by the committee to identify additional savings beyond that found by program reviews.

Pres. Evans realized this would be serious work, and much of it would fall on chairs. The report could be 7 or 9 pages or whatever the committee decides, along with guidance for what should be in it. Sen. A. Davis noted that other universities had been very specific about what criteria to address in the reports and tied it to specifics of their mission statements. Pres. Evans noted that budget increases are not out of the question, as Pres. Saunders had pointed this out. The thinking was to make sure departments were thinking about the future, about how they could grow as well as how to avoid being cut. Also, if they were cut, how could they handle it? Could departments be spared and “live with” certain levels of cuts? Further discussion ensued about the definition of “program.” Some departments might have several academic programs. This document defines programs in general as any unit receiving budgetary support. The UPC committee will have to decide, in the end, how wide or narrow “program” is defined in terms of report submission and budgets.

E. Program rating by Priorities subcommittees, Deans, and College committees.

1. The University Priorities Committee will review programs through its two subcommittees; the Academic Priorities Committee and the Non-academic Priorities Committee. Both committees will function separately in rating their respective programs and compiling the results of ratings.

2. For academic programs, the Program Prioritization Report for each program will then be rated on a scale of 1-10 by three different groups – the Academic Priorities subcommittee, the Dean of each college, and a college committee of representative faculty from each college. The Deans and college committees will only rate their college. These ratings will be collected and each criteria will be multiplied by their weighting factor to get a combined rating for each program and an overall score as the sum of the criteria times weight scores for each criteria. The college committees could be college curriculum committees if these are representative faculty or it could be College Advisory Committees (CAC’s) which are representative faculty groups or they may need to be formed in some colleges.

Pres. Evans pointed out that the primary source for these ratings will be the report submitted by the program to the UPC. Also, the Institutional Research office will supply basic data for all programs like budget, cost, majors, and enrollment. Much discussion ensued about the weighting of the three rankings of each program—UPC, dean, and college committee. The deans could feel marginalized with less voice than the UPC, but should not faculty drive this process? Sen. McGuire pointed out the likelihood of hurt feelings if one’s department is rated low. Sen. D. Davis noted that somebody is going to have to make nasty decisions, and who should it be? Others wondered if we should just say to the administration, “you do it?” Then they can take the blame. Sen. A. Davis noted that other universities had made such decisions, using a similar model involving faculty, and had survived and thrived. Sen. Beckett noted that it would be far from the first time that deans and others had rated programs. The ideal was agreed to that **the ratings by the deans and the college committees would feed into the UPC** to influence the program rankings. There is a system of distrust we need to overcome, noted Sen. A. Davis. We have to trust a committee not to be wholly self-interested but to look at the university as a whole.

3. For non-academic programs, their Program Prioritization Reports will be rated by the Non-academic Priorities committee.

4. A final report by the University Priorities Committee will include a prioritized ranking of each program including budget recommendations.

F. Analysis of program ratings for program ranking.

**1. The AP subcommittee will rank all academic programs, using approved criteria and weightings, [within the following quintiles:
Upper 20 Percent: Candidates for enrichment
Next 20 Percent: Retained at higher level of support
Next 20 Percent: Retained at neutral level of support
Next 20 Percent: Retained at lower level of support
*Lowest 20 Percent: Candidates for reduction, phasing out, consolidation]***

Sen. D. Davis asked how quintiles would be obtained from ratings. Pres. Evans said one option would be to sum the varied ratings, but the committee would have to decide. There could be a “correction factor” built in to normalize the “average program” in each college, i. e. some colleges could rate their programs generally higher or lower than others. Sen. Young’s proxy (Kate Greene) pointed out that she objects to the ranking of programs. What about the entire state system? We might rank a program low, but it still could be the best in the state. We should not have “a faculty committee to fire ourselves.” Sen. Lipscomb noted that our decisions should certainly relate to the whole system, but faculty have “hammered” the provost for low faculty representation. Sen. Haley noted that department faculty should responsibly research the state to see how they stand in it, and that even in good budget times mediocre programs may need to be cut to provide more resources to growing outstanding programs. Sen. Redalje said that demand and uniqueness in the state should be criteria included in the report. Sen. George wondered if there could be a category of “temporary suspension” for a program, if funding returned and student demand increased. Sen. Lipscomb suggested that some categories were needed, yet others suggested that quintiles were not needed—why must 20% be slated for reduction? Assoc. Pov. Powell noted that some models do not use percentages or quintiles, but fall into quadrants depending upon how programs meet the criteria. Sen. A. Davis pointed out that this committee is intended to be permanent, working on into the future whatever the budget situation. A 10-page report will not likely be desired every year from every program, but Institutional Research will continue to generate data. By a show of hands (no formal opposition) the senate voted to delete the bracketed section above and replace it with “**in categories of Priority 1 to Priority 5.**” The bracketed sections below were also deleted.

2. The NP subcommittee will rank non-academic administrative programs following guidelines provided by Dickeson (pg. 137-138). [Units will be ranked for reduction in the following by the following percentages of reduction in staff or non-personnel resources: 10%, 20%, 30%, 50%, and 75%. Units may also be ranked for phasing out, consolidation, or elimination.]

3. The UPC will review rankings provided by the subcommittees, providing an overall ranking for academic [(quintile)] and non-academic [(percentile)] programs.

4. The rankings will be published to all university stakeholders.

G. The stakeholders can make recommendations to the subcommittee after initial rankings are published

[For academic programs, colleges can make recommendation to the AP subcommittee through their Dean] suggesting such actions like program consolidation, reorganization, suspension, or elimination. Similarly for non-academic programs, units can make similar recommendations to the NP subcommittee.

The wording of the above paragraph was broadened by retaining “stakeholders” the phrase: **“Stakeholders could make recommendations to the UPC”** in place of the bracketed phrase above, as anyone could ideally make suggestions at this stage, as “protests around the dome” could show!

H. Program appeals process to be determined by the UPC

The UPC must decide when program appeals will occur. Will it be before recommendations are sent to the Provost and President? Will it be after? Will appeals be done by the UPC, an administrative group, or other?

Discussion ensued about the appeals process. Sen. Lipscomb asked if the committee was advisory, should appeals go there or to the final decision-makers? Sen. Redalje suggested that the final recommendations from the UPC should include responses to appeals. There should not be closure to decisions made by the committee before appeals. Pres. Evans noted that IHL board has a formal appeal process, but Sen. Tingstrom noted there should be opportunity to explore with the committee whether its members misinterpreted some data or missed some important factor in the decision. Sen. Scurfield pointed out that alumni and community supporters should be considered stakeholders too and be allowed to express their views. In general, it was thought, an open process would provide for appeals and discussion before the UPC made its recommendations or list final.

I. The UPC prepares recommendations for the Provost and President

The UPC subcommittees will review the rankings, program reports, program action plans, and recommendations from colleges or non-academic units and will make recommendations as to program enhancement, reorganization, reduction, suspension, or elimination. It is possible that the UPC will conduct hearings on the published recommendations and receive input and suggestions for improving and refining ratings and recommendations from Colleges or Deans . The recommendations will include costs of program enhancement or money savings from program reduction or elimination.

VI. Provost and Vice President analysis.

The Provost and Vice Presidents will review rankings provided by the University Priorities Committee rendering independent judgments on a comparative basis. These rankings will be published campus-wide using the approved criteria and weightings along the quintiles or percentages identified. Additionally the Provost and Vice Presidents will recommend efficiencies that may be gained by cooperative and collaborative efforts within the institution.

VII. Administrative Actions – suggestions to consider

A. President and Executive Cabinet Evaluates UPC recommendations.

During the Final Analysis Stage the President and Executive Cabinet will render their judgment of the UPC’s recommendations. A consultant may also review the recommendations and render an independent, third-party judgment on a comparative basis for all programs of the University.

B. UPC consulted again

After the Executive cabinet reviews the UPC recommendations they will communicate their intentions for action to the UPC. The UPC will be given an opportunity to voice possible refinement of the recommendations.

C. Using multiple templates

During an Integration and Synthesis Stage the President and UPC will integrate and synthesize the results of the program prioritization process with those relevant portions of past strategic plans, including Strategic Enrollment Plan, and other relevant information available. All recommendations from the President and the UPC will conform to MS IHL approved statements of role, scope, mission, vision, goals, and values. This synthesized report will constitute the Master Strategic Plan of the University and will be forwarded to the MS IHL for approval.

During the Final Decision Stage the MS IHL will review the Master Strategic Plan and will approve the final plan and implementation schedule.

D. Final Recommendations to Joint Faculty Senate, Academic Council, Graduate Council for advice.

As the three elected representative faculty governance bodies, the Faculty Senate, Academic Council and Graduate Council will be consulted before any recommendation is taken to the IHL board. All these bodies are advisory and this would be the last opportunity for the bodies to advise the President and Provost about proposed actions.

VIII. Ongoing Renewal of Program Prioritization

The UPC will continue into the next years with continued analysis of program priorities. The UPC will determine the mechanism for program updating and replacing committee members. All data generated in the development of the program prioritization process will be electronically stored and periodically updated for use in maintaining an ongoing database for continuing program analysis.

IX Timeline

November 2009 – Committees formed, Mission statement clarified

December 2009 - Determine criteria and weights for evaluations

January 2009 – Report guidelines published to units

February 2010 – Units complete and submit 10 page reports and action plans

March 2010 –

1. College faculty committees, Deans and the Academic Priorities Committee rate academic programs;

2. Non-academic Priorities subcommittee rate non-academic programs/services

April 2010 – program rating and quintile/percentage publication and appellate process begins

May 2010 – Appeal process

June 2010 – UPC recommendations submitted to Provost and President

July 2010 - Executive Cabinet submits recommendations to Joint Faculty Senate, Academic Council, Graduate Council

August 2010- Programs notified of any final programmatic changes.

Sen. Lipscomb moved the approval of the UPC committee plan including the changes discussed, and Sen. Reischman seconded. The motion passed by voice vote with some opposed and abstaining. Pres. Evans suggested the minutes including our discussions should be provided to all committee members, as they would likely struggle with some of these issues themselves.

Following a short recess, Pres. Evans asked for nominations for the Faculty Senate's choice to serve on the UPC. The executive committee wished to nominate Sen. Lipscomb for the post, and entertained nominations from the floor. Some discussion followed of a floor nomination that received no second. Sen. Lipscomb said he was willing and honored to serve and was elected by unanimous voice vote.

7.0 Officers' reports

7.2 President-Elect (Davis)

Sen. Davis serves on the Campus Hub Committee. The Campus Hub is now up and running. It is like Facebook for the university. Some colleges have already put casual information about events up, and faculty senators may migrate to it for discussions instead of using the "ning" site since with the SOAR password one has access to email, university data and functions, information groups, and websites desired.

7.3 Secretary (Meyer) – No report

7.4 Secretary-Elect (Brannock) – No report

8.0 Committee reports

8.1 Academic and Governance (Redalje)

The committee is looking at a plan for viewing collegiality as a factor in tenure and promotion. Sen. Redalje seeks statements from departments as to how they define it or "count" it. A consultant came and presented to administrators on this issue, and he is looking over that material too. Sen. Rehner suggested we ask the provost if he could cover the cost of bringing the consultant back for a wider presentation. Pres. Evans said he would follow up on the question. \

8.2 Administration and Faculty Evaluations (Oshrin) – No report

8.3 Awards (Brannock)

The committee met on Friday and decided on a winner for the HEADWAE award, who will be made public soon. Early next year the Faculty Senate Awards will be publicized and everything is on track for that process. The Excellence in Librarianship Award that had been removed due to a misunderstanding has been formally reinstated.

8.4 Constitution and Bylaws (Rehner) – No report

8.5 Elections (Burgess)

Faculty Senators will soon receive an email on how to access a ballot via SOAR. This is a trial run for full faculty election of senators in the Spring. Listings of the faculty eligible to be candidates may contain errors as the committee does not have a member from every college to double-check these. It should be an easy process and take less than a minute to vote.

8.6 Faculty Welfare (Davis)

Sen. Davis appreciated everybody's work. The committee has looked at ways other universities have assessed interpersonal relationships on campus. One of our own strategic goals is to maintain a climate for academic success, and measures of faculty satisfaction have shown concerns about the way people relate to one another. Mankato State University undertook an interesting study of relationship issues including civility, trust, and bullying. Sen. Davis had a phone conference with the study's two authors, and seeks to enact a deeper study of ourselves that goes beyond the relatively surface satisfaction questionnaires of the past two years.

8.7 Research and Grants (McCormick) – No report

8.8 Technology (Bass) – No report

8.9 University Directions (Davis)

This committee has worked hard, Sen. Davis noted. Results of their brainstorm sessions have been distributed to senators on paper. The two key elements of USM's mission that have emerged include diversity, as we most accurately represent that state's population out of all of the universities, and our geographical position in the state and in the world lend us fitting areas of expertise and populations to serve. A clearer understanding of our vision and mission is necessary, and the committee will play with the vision and mission statements supplied to give the UPC some clear choices and focus.

8.10 Other committee and liaison reports

8.10.1 Faculty Handbook Committee (Beckett)

The committee will meet with Russ Willis about non-faculty academic staff—research professors, artists in residence, professors of practices, and the like. Sen. Beckett was not sure what the purpose of the meeting was intended to be.

Some committee members had suggested the committee needed bylaws. One suggestion involved the nervousness inspired by the idea that the Faculty Handbook could change at any moment, in spite of any changes taking a long drawn-out process. So two dates for change have been agreed to: Feb. 15 for more minor changes and Aug. 1 for and substantive changes. Sen. Beckett pointed out that two times per year has been the normal number of changes recently. A good idea too would be to include notations about recent changes at the start of each new year's edition.

Some Deans had complained that the leadership of the Faculty Handbook Committee does not change. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee appoints two members of the committee, and it could change the chair by not re-appointing one. In a committee of seven members with three faculty, one appointed by the university president, democracy might not be the best way of selecting a chair. Then an associate provost or dean could serve as chair. Sen. Beckett said the chair should be a faculty member, "and I'm holding out on that one."

The Council of Chairs and Faculty Senate have expressed their views on having associate or assistant deans vote on issues of tenure or promotion as they should not. The committee should vote on this matter in December, and Sen. Beckett said he would vote that they cannot vote.

The library has issues with annual review as it is both like and unlike an academic department. After extended negotiations among Sen. Beckett, Pres. Evans, and the provost, the library faculty approved wording of an addition to the Faculty Handbook to provide for their situation. The library faculty voted with a large majority in favor of the new guidelines. Sen. Beckett sought the approval of the faculty senate even though technically not required. Some senators asked what the librarians who voted against it might have not liked, and Sen. Brannock noted that some preferred to be evaluated by a clear superior in the hierarchy rather than potentially by peers. Sen. Rehner noted he had not had time to read the proposal, but Sen. Beckett said it was important to move this along. When the vote was called for, 25 or so voted for approval, with 4 abstaining.

DRAFT

8.3.1 (b) Committee Membership, Libraries. The organization of the University Libraries differs somewhat from the academic colleges in that, although library faculty are directed by a dean, the Libraries do not have departments of department chairs in the same sense as the academic colleges. Nevertheless, the three options for the Libraries' Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) parallel those of the academic colleges. All members of the Libraries' Corps of Instruction with a minimum of three (3) years of service with the University and who hold the rank of associate professor or higher are eligible for committee membership, with the exception of the dean of the Libraries, who is ineligible (see Section 8.3.2). The election of an ad hoc (for annual evaluation purposes only) department chair (see *Note* below) and then the selection of the Departmental Personnel Committee occur at a yearly meeting of the members of the Libraries' Corps of Instruction and are accomplished by means of a secret ballot. Option

1: Authority for all personnel evaluations and recommendations, exclusive of recommendations for pre-tenure review, tenure, and promotion, is vested in an ad hoc chair chosen by mutual agreement between the University Libraries' dean and the Corps of Instruction. The ad hoc chair prepares independent evaluations and recommendations and transmits them to the dean. Option 2: The Committee consists of two members elected by the University Libraries' Corps of Instruction and a third rotating member who shall be the unit head of the library faculty being evaluated. If the unit head is not a member of the Corps or is otherwise ineligible for the DPC, the ad hoc chair will serve as the third member of the committee. The three-member committee elects its chair, selecting from the two members elected from the Corps. The chair of the committee, after obtaining signed concurrence or dissent from each committee member, submits the committee's evaluations and recommendations to the dean. The ad hoc chair does not write separate evaluations or recommendations. Option 3: The Committee consists of three elected members of the Corps of Instruction exclusive of the ad hoc chair. The three-member committee then elects its chair. The chair of the committee, after obtaining signed concurrence or dissent from each committee member, submits the committee's evaluations and recommendations to the dean. The ad hoc chair does not write separate evaluations or recommendations.

Note: Each year the ad hoc department chair is chosen by mutual agreement between the Libraries' dean and the Corps of Instruction using the following process. The dean will provide his/her choice of the ad hoc department chair. The Corps of Instruction will meet and decide by secret ballot whether they approve (a majority vote is necessary for approval). If the nominee provided by the dean fails to obtain approval, the dean will forward another nominee; the Corps of Instruction will meet again and decide whether they approve (majority vote again required). This process will be repeated until the Corps of Instruction approves the dean's nominee. If the dean and the Corps of Instruction are unable to agree on an ad hoc department chair, Option 3 will be employed for that academic year.

8.10.2 Gulf Coast Faculty Council (Annulis)

Sen. Lunsford reported that plans for a Gulf Coast graduate ceremony are under discussion with V. P. Joachim. Heather Annulis has been chosen to serve as the Gulf Coast representative to the UPC.

8.10.3 Academic/Graduate Council (Daves)

Sen. Beckett reported that a plan to have midterm grades reported for all students, rather than only first-year students, had met with his opposition in Academic Council. This was supposed to retain more students, according to Assoc. Prov. Brett Kemker, but he was skeptical. Sen. Hauer noted that only Ds and Fs were to be reported. Others pointed out that all (or most) grades would still have to be figured at midterm to report those.

Sen. Beckett also reported that the General Education Committee is preparing to evaluate all GEC courses by reviewing the last three years of assessment reports on all GEC courses. Starting in the Spring semester these assessment reports will be entered in WEAVE online.

Concerns were expressed about members serving on both Academic and Graduate Councils. Nothing in the bylaws prevents this, and the concern arose when the Graduate Council moved their meeting to the same day as Academic Council in December.

Sen. Rehner noted that the new requests for tracking down "missing" students have flooded into departments without warning or suggestion of what should be done. Who is supposed to call and find all of these people? What should be done with the data? Sen. S. Howell pointed out that progress reports are requested in the form of midterm grades and reports for athletics and other student groups. Why are we providing information multiple times in multiple ways? Pres. Evans noted that communication was still an issue and even Pres. Saunders was "tired of the tail wagging the dog" on these kinds of changes.

8.10.4 AAUP

Questions are being aired about what kind of hearings will be conducted for Technical and Office Education faculty members, Sen. Klinedinst reported. The two younger faculty members found other positions at the university, and the chair will stay on to see students through. The hearing process still

needs to be spelled out more clearly. The organization is also looking at better use of rainy-day funds in the face of budget cuts. AAUP is planning a meeting Friday at 2:00 in 202 LAB to offer a limited time \$15 local affiliate fee.

8.10.5 Campus Master Planning Committee (Applin)

Mary Beth Applin's report was forwarded by email to Senators:

The Master Planning web site is up and running and can be found at <http://edudev.usm.edu/masterfacilityplanning/>. Minutes are updated monthly (and are short) so faculty can easily keep up with things that are being reviewed by the committee.

(Apr 09) Commons – Dr. Conville read to the committee a letter from President Saunders. The letter stated that demolition of the J.B. George Commons building will occur this summer but that funding was unavailable to begin building the academic classroom that was designated for that space and funds would not be available in the near future. Dr. Saunders asked the committee to consider:

- 1) Designating the J.B. George Commons site for the development of a green space area that could be a Centennial Plaza;
- 2) Identifying an alternative location for a general classroom building that will be built at some point in the future.

Action: After lengthy discussion, the committee re-emphasized its commitment to maintaining classroom space as a high priority in the Master Plan but voted unanimously to endorse the president's proposal in toto. The committee has set a 6 month deadline for identifying an appropriate location for a classroom building (October 16th is the deadline).

(Sept 09) Dr. Cynthia Easterling and Bob Pierce introduced a tentative proposal to build a Commons building and plaza with architecture reminiscent of the original "War Memorial" that stood at the entrance of the university where the centennial entrance is now being built. Draft renderings were given to committee members as well as a handout of how the proposal meets the criteria of the Planning Principles.

Action: Motion passed to recommend to the president to accept the concept plans for the Commons site (addition of a building and plaza) as designed by Dwight Weatherford with the caveat that the details are pending.

(Oct. 09) Classroom Building sites

Dr. Conville reviewed with committee members pictures of possible sites [for classroom buildings] and there was discussion in the committee of the whole. A motion was made and seconded to request an inventory of existing and planned classrooms for the following buildings:

- Existing JGH – Business Building,
- New Business Building,
- Existing EHH – Nursing,
- New Nursing Building,
- New Health Building – if data available, and
- Proposed General Classroom Building.

Action: After additional discussion, the motion passed unanimously on a voice vote. Understandings: (1) the Committee's prior commitment to select a site for a classroom building by Oct 15 has been postponed; (2) The classroom inventory, as listed above, and the measurements of two lots (the George Hurst Parking lot and the Commons site) will be completed and presented to the Master Planning committee by Rita Haley-Burkes (Physical Plant) and Cynthia Easterling (Space Utilization and Allocation Committee) in conjunction with Debby Hill (Registrar's Office) at the next meeting. Also, suggestions for classroom needs and sizes will be collected from the Registrar's Office.

(Oct. 09) Incubation Opportunity at Elam

Sid Gonsoulin presented a report and handouts from a Tech Support Team that was established to examine possible incubation opportunities for the Elam Arms site. Sid's report was followed by a discussion in the committee of the whole.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to recommend to the president that the current Master Plan be revised to change the incubation space designation of Elam Arms to hotel space as recommended by the university's Tech Support team. After additional discussion, the motion passed unanimously on a voice vote. Understandings: Before Elam Arms is redesignated, the university must find space for the 2 departments currently located in Elam as required by the Master Plan's Planning Principles.

10.0 Adjournment

Moved and seconded, Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
John Meyer
Secretary for Faculty Senate

Approved by
Jeff Evans
President of Faculty Senate