

10-1-2010

Faculty Senate Minutes - October 1, 2010

USM Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

USM Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes - October 1, 2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 134.
http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/134

This 2010/11 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
Approved Minutes for October 1, 2010
Ogletree House, Hattiesburg campus

Members Present and Represented (by proxy): M.A. Adams, H. Annulis (Lunsford), J. Bass (Miller), D. Beckett, J. Brannock, A. Branton, D. Bristol, B. Burgess, J. Burnett, C. Chatham, S. Clark, R. Conville, D. Daves, A. Davis, J. Ding, L. Downey, D. Fletcher, B. George, C. Goggin, A. Haley, T. Hartsell (Wang), S. Hauer, N. Howell, D. Lunsford, M. Lux, K. Masters, D. Masterson, C. McCormick, C. Meyers, S. Oshrin, R. Pandey, S. Piland, C. Rakocinski (Redalje), D. Redalje, T. Rehner, S. Reischman, A. Sevier, K. Shelley, J.H. Shin, D. Tingstrom, J. Wolfe, A. Young

Members Absent: None.

1.0 Call to order (2:00 pm)

There was discussion about the possibility of modifying the agenda. Sen. Hauer asked if under 7.2 the senate could discuss the running of the meeting. Sen. Davis agreed.

Sen. Goggin asked when the status of existing resolutions will be discussed. Sen. Davis stated that the committees will address the resolutions.

Sen. Goggin asked when discussion will take place regarding the budget cuts. Sen. Davis stated that the Budget and RCM committee will talk about these issues.

Motion to approve the agenda with modifications by Sen. Conville. Seconded. Motion carried.

Committee chairs gave an overview of the reports that will follow later in the meeting.

Members break up into committees

2.0 Guest Presentations

2.1 Vice President for Research (2:30 p.m.)

Vice President Denis Wiesenburg discussed his philosophy on what is the purpose of university research. He believes that faculty conduct research to stay at the frontier of their field which helps in better educating students. The purpose is not necessarily based on the amount of money that is awarded. Funding is the means to scholarship and educating students...not the end. The money will follow when someone publishes and graduate students come to the university because they recognize the potential of the programs.

He sees his role as the organizer for research activities on campus to ensure that faculty research is as productive as it can be. He does that with revenues from F and A and recovery with less funding next year because of a decrease in F and A funding going to his department.

One thing he did was to focus activities was to create a top 10 list. This is just a draft of some of his ideas.

1. Expand faculty research to realize external funding in excess of \$100 million.
2. Raise the visibility of university research activities locally and nationally.
3. Create a Center for Undergraduate Research to highlight what we do well.
4. Increase the level of personal contact between faculty and Federal/State program managers to advance understanding faculty research capabilities.
5. Provide increased start-up funds to support new faculty research.
6. Evaluate research investment initiatives to assure they are effectively supporting faculty research activities in all colleges, centers, and institutes.
7. Develop a strategy for major research equipment and facilities development.
8. Improve the grants management process to reduce barriers to research success.
9. Organize the Vice President for Research office to create efficiencies in grants management, acquisition, compliance, and success.
10. Assess the need for a science building for the Hattiesburg campus.

He stated that he will be sending out a lot of information in the future. If anyone has questions about the information, make sure to contact his office for clarification.

Sen. Redalje asked if there is a way that chairs and deans in non-research based colleges can get assistance to help develop research in those areas. VP Wiesenburg stated that all faculty are involved in research, and he hopes that they everyone will become more involved in the proposed Center for Undergraduate Research.

Sen. Beckett asked if there is a possibility of funding senior faculty who may want to start new research. This support would be similar to the start up funds that new faculty receive. Wiesenburg said that he would like to increase productivity and that he would like to look into what equipment and resources we may need to assist with research activities.

Sen. Rehner asked if the proposed science building that Dr. Wiesenburg mentioned is on the master plan. Dr. Wiesenburg stated that the buildings on campus are facing environmental concerns and that new or upgraded buildings are needed for the sciences.

Sen. Conville stated that most colleges do not fit the marine sciences model of research. He was glad that the VP mentioned working with all colleges. Dr. Wiesenburg stated that he wants to cast a wider net because everyone is engaged in research. He has given some money to many of the colleges to assist in research.

2.2 President (3:00 p.m.)

Dr. Saunders mentioned that open enrollment started this week. She emphasized that the increase in deductibles is not a USM human resources decision and that people need to go the Jackson and try to get a better policy rather than taking it out on HR.

Physical plant is working on reducing energy consumption. The funding to make the changes is coming from unused state bond money.

External auditors have been on campus since mid-September and will be here into October. Every IHL campus goes through this process annually.

The sale of the Alberton's building is under way and will take place in October.

Student affairs received a \$500,000 grant to help with retention. Every undergraduate student is being contacted for counseling with tutors and others available to assist those students who may need the help. Sen. Hauer said that several students have made appointments with him because of this program. He emphasized how the efforts are working.

The marquee on Hwy 49 is being updated and should be operational on October 5.

She has been meeting with all faculty departments. She has met with 5 of 44 departments starting with Science and Technology. The concerns being expressed include salaries, undergraduate research, international programming, and graduate waivers.

2.3 Provost (3:15 p.m.)

Sen. Redalje asked about the appeal process. Dr. Lyman stated that the process is in place. There will be two rounds of appeals – department level and personal. After discussion with groups around campus, it has been determined that the appeal board will be a mix of faculty from governance groups and four administrators not from the executive cabinet. Scheduling for the appeals should begin within a week.

Mark Miller asked if there is a process where they could postpone a program saving it from elimination. Dr. Lyman said that this is possible through the appeal process.

Dr. Lyman stated that there are difficulties when trying to figure out the cost of programs. He does anticipate some of the appeals to be successful.

Sen. Meyers asked what basis could be used for a successful program appeal. Dr. Lyman stated that inaccurate information, centrality of the program to the mission, and possible benefits that go beyond the tangibles may be issues that lead to successful appeals.

Sen. Haley asked if it is advisable for the people appealing to identify other areas that could be cut. Dr. Lyman stated that it would be helpful if other possible cuts were identified. Sen. Haley mentioned that it may be difficult to identify possible cuts outside of the unit level due to the lack of budgetary information for other areas. Dr. Lyman said that deans will be active participants in the process of making other cuts if needed. Deans will be looking into alternatives. The hearing will offer up proposals for alternatives. He suggested that the appealing departments may want to discuss the situation with their deans.

A senator from the coast asked when the process will begin. Dr. Lyman said that it was going to be every Monday, but things have changed now. Each program will have two weeks notice. Scheduling should start soon.

Sen. Lunsford asked if the coast will be represented on the appeals committee. Dr. Lyman stated that there will be representation from the coast on the committee.

Sen. Young asked if the governance groups should elect a member to serve on the appeals committee. Dr. Lyman stated that the groups can elect or appoint members.

Sen. Hauer stated that they are working on the spring schedule. He stated that one way to save money is by having larger classes. He asked if there was any way that we could postpone the 2500 word writing

requirement. Dr. Lyman stated that he may be able to consider that in some cases, but he would not want to completely eliminate the requirement. Would like the gen-ed committee to consider the possibility of not requiring the writing requirement for all classes.

Sen. Meyers asked if an appeal will be strengthened if an alternate cut is supplied. Dr. Lyman stated that it may not strengthen it, but it will make the possibility of the appeal easier.

Sen. Rehner asked if the administrators were involved in the budget cuts. Dr. Lyman said they were not involved in the cuts.

Sen. Rehner asked if the appeals are successful could that mean that the academic side cuts could go down. Dr. Lyman stated that he does not think that is definitely the case because the hiring freeze and retirement incentives will probably hit the academic side harder than it will the administrative side. Sen. Rehner asked if \$1 million is reduced from the cut because of successful appeals, would the remaining cuts then fall on the colleges. Dr. Lyman stated that occupied faculty lines will not be touched, but vacant positions may be wiped.

Sen. Conville asked if Dr. Lyman could speak to the place of athletics in the university budget. Dr. Lyman stated that USM is 52nd out of 120 division one teams in terms of university allocation with \$1.7 million in 2008 going to athletics. Many universities give up to \$13 million. He stated that we do not over contribute to athletics. To receive the benefits of dropping athletics, we would need to drop football or other sports to division three. If we drop sports, we get kicked out of Conference USA which cuts money that we have coming in from television revenues and other venues.

Sen. Beckett asked about the article in the *Hattiesburg American* about student fees going to athletics. Dr. Lyman stated that we are maxed out at \$192/student. Our students get free tickets and if put to a vote by the students, it is probable that the students will vote to continue having the money used for athletics (as seen from his past experience with this). Larger schools can charge less because of their size.

3.0 Approval of Agenda (3:30 p.m.)

4.0 Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes with change by Sen. Rehner. Seconded. Motion carried.

5.0 Officer Reports

5.1 President

Sen. Davis stated that the committees are meeting with a lot of people around campus.

5.2 President-elect

5.2.1 Financial Report

Last month, we were in the hole \$240. On 9/16 we had \$4100. We have spent 45% of our money in the first quarter. We need to look into how we plan on funding awards and spending for the rest of the year. Sen. Oshrin stated that he got the room for free. Sen. Davis stated that the audio is free for the day and that she was unaware of the cost for the room.

6.0 Committee Reports

6.1 Academic and Governance (Masters/Redalje/Shelley)

6.1.1 Reports

Sen. Masters gave the report written by Tammy Barry on Academic Council. She stated that Academic Council made a charge to look into academic integrity of online courses. Academic Council and Graduate Council are going to form an adhoc committee to look at this issue.

GEC committee is finalizing the GEC handbook. The periodic review of GEC starts this spring. The GEC committee is also looking at possible changes to the GEC.

Sen. Beckett started off his report on the faculty handbook committee by reiterating that the faculty handbook committee is not a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate and should be independent of the Faculty Senate committees.

He met with Dr. Saunders about assistant and associate deans/provosts voting on tenure and promotion committees. She signed off on the proposal where the assistant/associate deans/provosts must have a minimum of five years as a regular faculty member in the department before becoming an administrator and the person must be invited by a secret ballot vote of the department faculty.

6.1.2 Charges and Current Issues

Sen. Shelley stated that they are addressing two of their charges and would like input from the Faculty Senate. The first issue addresses the concern terminated faculty members may not be awarded promotion or tenure because they are receiving a terminal contract. This is to make sure that the faculty member has tenure and the rank when applying for other jobs. Sen. Bristol stated that this resolution seems limited and that we need to work on a resolution stating that we are against any tenure or tenure track professor being terminated.

The second charge addresses completing the evaluation process. Faculty Senate will develop its own list of priorities for the future with UPC incorporating the suggestions as they see fit. Sen. Haley commented that many of the issues were addressed in the resolution that was passed the previous week. Sen. Fletcher stated that the resolution that passed related to receiving feedback on the process from UPC not a plan on how to assess in the future. Sen. Shelley stated that this discussion relates to the larger issue that was not covered in the former resolution.

Sen. Rehner stated that he and Bill Powell started working on the pros and cons of the UPC process. This document will be presented to the Faculty Senate when completed.

Sen. Fletcher stated that there are no defined priorities coming from the university administration. Bill Powell stated that that UPC is moving in that direction.

6.2 Budget (University) and RCM Model (Adams/Clark)

Sen. Adams stated that they are looking into how the vision of the university and how the budget supports the vision. There is an ongoing effort to continue recruiting for the committee. They are also looking into the athletics budget and the article that was in the *Hattiesburg American*.

Sen. Rehner commented that he was worried that some things may have already moved to the RCM model when no one else has. He also wondered how moving to the RCM Model will impact collegiality with departments hoarding their resources or charging fees.

Sen. Adams stated that the target date is 2013 for the model to be in operation. Sen. Oshrin asked that the PowerPoint from the meeting be sent out. Sen. Branton moved to have the PowerPoint posted to CampusHub and emailed to the Faculty Senate mailing list. Seconded. Motion passed.

6.3 Evaluations and Assessment (Fletcher/Reischman)

No report

6.4 FS Constitution, Bylaws, and Elections (Burgess/Annulis)

No report

6.5 FS Awards (Brannock)

Sen. Brannock reminded senators to encourage their colleagues to submit nominations for the various awards being advertised through the Provost's office.

6.6 Materials and Resources (Branton/Lux)

Sen. Branton talked about the computer exchange program. If you don't return your computer to iTech until after January 15, you will be charged for the computer.

Discussion about the resolution to increase funding to the library to qualify the library for research library status. Sen. McCormack stated that Mississippi libraries should collaborate to save money and achieve research status. Sen. Branton stated that the University of Mississippi and Mississippi State have research status. The libraries around the state do have consortium arrangements with other institutions in the state.

Mark Miller asked where the money will come from. Sen. Branton stated that a small percentage of each grant will go to the library. Sen. Haley asked what the advantages are of being a research library. Sen. Branton stated that it's a measurement of the library and university's commitment to research.

Sen. Rehner stated that maybe we should postpone the resolution. Not a good time to ask for money when people are losing their jobs.

Sen. Haley makes a motion to table the resolution. Seconded. Motion passed.

Sen. Branton proposed a resolution asking the university to support+ an institutional repository. Sen. Beckett asked what an institutional repository is. Sen. Branton stated that it is a database of all research products that come out of the institution. This will include theses, dissertations, and scholarly publications. Copyright and royalties are issues that face the institutional repository. The library is currently looking into vendors who can assist with setting up the repository. Sen. George stated that there are open source products that are free for institutional repositories. The only cost would be for a person to manage it.

6.7 Research and Scholarship (Downey/Masterson)

Sen. Masterson stated that they are still working with VP Denis Wiesenburg on his Top 10 Research list.

6.8 University Relations (Conville/Sevier)

Sen. Conville stated that they will have the first reading of a resolution at the next meeting. Met with Jeff May about connectivity ideas between the coast campus and Hattiesburg.

6.9 University Welfare (Burnett/Haley)

Sen. Haley stated that they are interested in the appeal process. He is concerned about how slowly resolutions are being addressed. He realizes that UPC has done a lot of work and hopes that he UPC will help individuals with appeals, if possible.

7.0 New Business

Sen. Hauer stated his concerns with the meeting format. The group seating at round tables works fine for committee meetings, but it is difficult to see each other or debate. Perhaps we should consider moving back to the Cochran Center. He commented on how we are spending most of our meetings with committee reports when university is in a dire situation with people being given terminal contracts.

Sen. Hauer reported that he was aware that the executive committee is no longer meeting. He asks that the executive committee get together to discuss the past two meetings and determine if the format is working.

Sen. Young asked if the Faculty Senate should vote on a person to represent them on the appeals committee. Sen. Rehner stated that has concerns about the proposed appeals committee. He stated that he would rather the Cabinet stand by their decisions of who is on the cut list.

Brigitte Burgess made a motion to go off the record. Seconded. Motion passed.

Discussion off the record.

Sen. Oshrin made a motion that the Faculty Senate votes on a member for the appeals committee as described by the Provost. Seconded. Motion passed.

Senators Conville, Beckett, and Shelley are nominated. Sen. Conville withdraws his nomination.

Sen. Oshrin made a motion to close nominations. Seconded. Motion passed.

Sen. Beckett was elected to represent the Faculty Senate.

8.0 Adjournment

Sen. Davis made a motion to adjourn. Seconded. Motion passed.