

9-10-2010

## Faculty Senate Minutes - September 10, 2010

USM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes](http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes)

---

### Recommended Citation

USM Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes - September 10, 2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Paper 135.  
[http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_minutes/135](http://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes/135)

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](mailto:Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu).

**The University of Southern Mississippi**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Approved Minutes for September 10, 2010**  
**218 Cochran, Hattiesburg campus**

Members Present and Represented (by proxy): M.A. Adams, H. Annulis, 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, S. Hauer, N. Howell, D. Lunsford, M. Lux, K. Masters, D. Masterson, C. McCormick, C. Meyers, S. Oshrin, R. Pandey, S. Piland, C. Rakocinski, D. Redalje, T. Rehner, S. Reischman, A. Sevier, K. Shelley, J.H. Shin, D. Tingstrom, J. Wolfe, A. Young

Members Absent: None

Visitor: Doug Chambers (Tammy Greer – ex officio)

1.0 Call to order

At a regular meeting of the University of Southern Mississippi Faculty Senate, held in room 218 in the Thad Cochran Center, on Friday afternoon, September 10, 2010, Anita Davis acting as president, and Jennifer Brannock acting as secretary.

2.0 Approval of the agenda

Motion by Sen. Davis. Seconded by Sen. Conville. Motion carried.

3.0 Approval of minutes

Motion to suspend the reading of the minutes and approve minutes by Sen. Redalje. Second by Sen. Young. Motion carried.

4.0 Officers' Reports:

4.1 President

The Faculty Senate President reported on communication avenues for facsen including the dissemination information through committees and CampusHub. Working to communicate with the University community by continuing meetings with President Saunders and Provost Lyman and meeting with the Executive Cabinet.

Discussed standards of committee on committees and impact on FS. Faculty Senate is working on appointing people to committees as needed.

Faculty Senate committees were read and approved for 2010-2011. Appointments to vacant positions on the Faculty Senate were read and approved. Mark Miller is substituting for Joby Bass who is on

sabbatical, Scott Piland is the appointment to Keith Rushing's position, and Kyna Shelley was appointed to fill the position of Tom Lipscomb.

#### **4.2 Vice-president**

The President-elect presented the financial report. Budget is currently -\$420.23. The allocation to Faculty Senate has not been added to the account at this time.

Sen. Young asked if the money from the clickers came from the Faculty Senate account. The money for the clickers was provided from the president's office.

### **5.0 Committee Reports**

#### **5.1 Academic and Governance Committee**

Sen. Redalje addressed the charges that were established at the retreat. The charges are...

1. Establish a plan for continual strategic planning associated with annual review of priorities
2. Address budgetary, administrative, and program differential concerns between the Hattiesburg and coast campuses
3. Assure consistency of quality for all GEC courses credited to USM that are delivered by JC/CC
4. Establish a student-centered learning initiative coordinated with a research center
5. Address salary inequities (compression/other) within colleges and departments

An additional charge has been added to look at the tenure and review process for those who are going through the process this year but have received a terminal contract. Another possible charge is to look at the impact on programs where faculty are choosing the early retirement option and programs where faculty have received terminal contracts.

Members of the committee include: Don Redalje (co-chair), Kyna Shelley (co-chair), Kathy Masters

#### **5.2 Budget (University) and RCM Model Committee**

Sen. Adams stated that they are currently putting together a list of charges.

Members of the committee include: Mary Ann Adams (co-chair), Stanley Clark (co-chair), Amy Young, Tammy Greer (ex-officio), Douglas Chambers (ex-officio)

#### **5.3 Constitution, Bylaws, and Elections Committee**

The committee charges include...

1. Revise By-Laws to include electronic voting system
2. Revise membership to represent program eliminations, consolidations, and reductions
3. Assist with parliamentary procedures of the meetings

Members of the committee include: Brigitte Burgess (co-chair), Heather Annulis (co-chair), Jim Wolfe, Cheryl Goggin, Kyna Shelley, Amy Young, Steve Oshrin

#### **5.4 Evaluation and Assessment Committee**

The committee charges include...

1. Integrate university-wide assessment and evaluation efforts into current and future budget reductions/prioritization processes
2. Systemize university assessment policies, procedures, and practices across all levels to avoid duplication
3. Develop and implement managerial policies supporting academic quality
4. Provide university awards that are aligned with program priorities as defined by program assessments of student outcomes and faculty products
5. Determine who administers evaluations for administrators

Resolution introduced by Sen. Fletcher. The resolution addresses the recent budget reductions and prioritizations. (See Appendix A for resolution text)

Sen. Fletcher moves to suspend the rules to vote on the resolution. Seconded. Motion passes.

Sen. Fletcher emphasizes that the purpose of this resolution is to determine what worked, what didn't work, and where do we go from here. Sen. Haley states that, as the creators of the UPC, the UPC should report back to us regarding the process. Sen. Redalje commented that we should also look at how the process worked at the college level.

Members of the committee include: Desmond Fletcher (co-chair), Stacy Reichman (co-chair), Nancy Howell, Ras Pandy, Kathy Masters

#### **5.5 Materials and Resources Committee**

The committee charges include...

1. Increase support for graduate and faculty research materials to attain status as a Research Library
2. Review effectiveness of faculty computer policies to assure continued support for research and scholarship
3. Engage faculty leadership to continue development and implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan to assure university-wide usage
4. Improve use of library and technology resources to increase potential of externally funded initiatives
5. Increase support for technology supporting graduate and faculty research materials (software and hardware) aligned to programmatic needs
6. Clarify and communicate copyright processes, costs, and protection of intellectual property
7. Establish an institutional repository of research and scholarly publications through open source software and open access journals

8. Establish an institutional repository of research and scholarly publications through open source software and open access journals

Resolution introduced by Sen. Branton. Motion to vote at the next meeting by Sen. Branton. Seconded. Motion passes.

Members of the committee include: Ann Branton (co-chair), Mary Lux (co-chair), Babu George

### **5.6 Research and Scholarship Committee**

The committee charges include...

1. Develop a mentorship program for junior faculty
2. Increase the value of university scholarship through faculty incentives and communications
3. Improve infrastructure to support research and scholarship
4. Identify indicators of research productivity for analysis of university function
5. Create and sustain an academic leadership institute

Resolution introduced by Laura Downey (see Appendix C). Motion to vote at the next meeting by Sen. Masterson. Seconded. Motion passes.

In a discussion later in the meeting, it was brought up that we should vote on the resolution regarding sabbaticals since the due date is in October.

Sen. Goggin introduces and makes a motion for the suspension of the rules to go ahead and vote on the resolution. Seconded. Motion passes to vote on resolution.

Sen. Goggin makes a motion to vote on the resolution. Seconded. Motion passes.

Members of the committee include: Doug Masterson (co-chair), and Laura Downey (co-chair), Ras Pandy, Scott Piland

### **5.7 University Relations Committee**

No report. Charges will be formed over the next month. Sen. Conville stated that the charges are still being formed, and that the committee's first step is to listen and meet with the appropriate people around campus.

Members of the committee include: Richard Conville (co-chair), Amy Sevier (co-chair)

### **5.8 University Welfare Committee**

The committee charges include...

1. Develop a plan of support for personnel impacted by the forecasted FY12 budget reduction
2. Develop a long-term University-wide plan for addressing employee mental health needs and healthy living initiatives (Employee Assistance Program).

3. Initiate a dialogue with administrators and faculty to see if there is interest in University-specific family leave policies, including guidelines for requesting time off and policies concerning tenure.
4. Establish a university-wide discussion concerning policies and practices addressing needs for employee health and welfare
5. Salary equity and early retirement

Sen. Haley introduces a resolution and makes a motion to suspend the rules on voting to vote today because it is a time sensitive proposal (see Appendix D). Seconded. Motion passes.

Motion to accept the resolution by Sen. Conville. Seconded. Motion passes.

Sen. Bristol suggested that section 1a be altered to make the requirements more precise. Sen. Haley spoke that he believes that the resolution should be kept simple to allow the administration to work with it. Resolution kept as presented.

Members of the committee include: Andrew Haley (co-chair), Joanne Burnett (co-chair)

## **6.0 New Business**

### 6.1 New Issues for Committee Considerations

6.1.1 Academic and Governance Committee - No new business.

6.1.2 Awards Committee - No new business.

6.1.3 Budget (University) and RCM Model - No new business.

6.1.4 Constitution, By-laws, and Elections - No new business.

6.1.5 Evaluation and Assessment - No new business.

6.1.6 Materials and Resources -No new business

6.1.7 Research and Scholarship

Sen. Masterson received a draft of the VP for Research's Top 10 list (see Appendix E). Masterson is going to meet with Dr. Wiesenburg to discuss his suggestions and ideas.

Sen. Redalje asked that the committee look into the issue of raises for research faculty.

6.1.8 University Relations - No new business.

6.1.9 University Welfare - No new business.

6.1.10 Other

Sen. Beckett asked if he could give a report on the faculty handbook committee. Sen. Davis stated that the faculty handbook report should go through the academic and governance committee. Sen. Haley made a motion to allow the faculty handbook committee chair to give the report. Seconded. Motion passes.

Sen. Beckett stated that the library Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) is now in place and now runs parallel to academic departments. Most recent copy of the faculty handbook (August 2010) is now online. The separation of the DPC and Tenure and Promotion committees are now listed in the handbook. In a previous administration, these committees were referred to using the same name in the faculty handbook which caused confusion across the university. The DPC now refers to the one or three person evaluation committee at the departmental level and the tenure and promotion committee deals with all tenure/promotion issues.

There have been clarifications as to what chairs can do in the tenure and promotion process. Chairs cannot chair departmental tenure and promotion committees. They cannot vote on tenure and promotion committees because they have the opportunity to write a letter later for the candidates. Chairs may be invited by the faculty to sit-in on the meetings. Chairs in departments where the chair alone acts as the DPC is chosen have in the past been evaluated by the deans. Now, these chairs are evaluated by a three member faculty panel according to teaching, research, and service. Administrative duties are still evaluated by the dean.

The matter of whether assistant and associate deans/provosts should be allowed to vote in tenure and promotion deliberations is still being discussed. A proposal has gone to President Saunders for her approval.

Sen. Oshrin asks if we adjourn prior to the provost's talk, will his comments be included in the official minutes? Asks that we not adjourn if his remarks are not included in the official minutes. Sen. Brannock reminds that Dr. Lyman's comments will not be included in the minutes because of the limitations of the Robert's Rules of Order. Sen. Hauer expressed concern about not having the full minutes available for faculty members on campus. Sen. Oshrin proposes a motion to include content in the minutes this meetings. Seconded. Sen. McCormack states that we may want to keep the minutes brief to allow the provost and president to feel that there may be an honest discussion at the meetings. Sen. Hauer stated that he wanted the provost's comments to be heard by the faculty. Sen. Redalje stated there has to be a better way to provide information than through data dumps. Sen. Haley commented that we should hold the provost, president, and ourselves as faculty senators accountable for our comments and actions as elected officials. Motion passes.

## 7.0 Remarks from Provost Lyman

Dr. Lyman distributed handouts with information on the budget cuts. The materials will be available on the web soon. Some of the information is currently available online.

The provost summarized the first document (see Appendix F for detailed information). Most cuts were from tiers 1-4. If all cuts would have been accepted by the Cabinet, there would have been a savings of \$6 million. The cuts accepted equaled \$1.99 million. The Cabinet also expanded on the UPC suggestions. \$3.9 or 58% of the UPC candidates/recommendations were from academics. Cabinet looked at revenue and enrollment to a greater extent than the UPC did. The Cabinet came up with a

formula to assign a monetary value associated with student enrollment. They came up with \$3500 as the approximate value of a student major costs/savings.

Details of the cuts by tier are found in the document in Appendix F.

The UPC recommended cuts to CISE totaling approximately \$700,000. The Cabinet thought that with teacher education being a core mission of the university and considering the high enrollment of the CISE program that they would not cut this area. The Cabinet chose to expand the cuts to Technology Education. (Additional details in Appendix F)

The Cabinet chose to not implement the recommendations to cut Mass Communications. This was too hard a hit on a department that provides some of the university's most popular majors. (Additional details in Appendix F)

The second document lists the cuts, estimated savings, and UPC tier of the cut. (See Appendix G) The document also includes cuts from the academic administration subcommittee that were adopted.

The third document is the independent input from the deans proposing approximately \$1 million. (See Appendix H for additional information)

Sen. Rehner asked if the deans' recommendations were informed by UPC documents. Dr. Lyman said that he didn't think so. Some deans may have heard talk about proposed cuts, but the UPC documents were not circulated to the deans. Sen. Haley mentioned that the college priorities committee may have been consulted for information.

Dr. Lyman restated that the Cabinet looked at the recommendations with a different eye than the UPC with more of an emphasis on enrollment and revenue. There was also more regard for the preservation of non-academic activities and student life activities.

Sen. Meyers asked about the numbers assigned to the Philosophy MA and the Religion BA (as seen in the document in Appendix F). UPC identified a unique cost for each program. The mechanism for associating the costs needs to be asked of the UPC.

Sen. McCormack stated that he'd read that external funding at USM had dropped from \$100 million to \$65 million. He asked if external funding figured into the UPC formula. Dr. Lyman said that the deans and the UPC took external funding into consideration.

Sen. Pylon asked if in order to cut a person that person must be connected to a program through teaching. Dr. Lyman said that's a good question and could be a possible reason for an appeal.

Sen. Meyers asked if an MA program was reduced, did that mean that people were cut in all cases. Dr. Lyman stated that it means that there was a reduction in costs. He also stated that in many programs positions were lost when MA programs were eliminated.

Sen. Haley asked what were the priorities used by the Cabinet in the process. Dr. Lyman stated that he can speak personally to that. For example, with Technology Education, there are several highly functional programs in Psychology/Education. His thoughts are that USM needs to focus on programs that are high functioning, popular, and push the education programs that we need to get back to as a

core mission of the university. Technology Education is not one of these programs. Need programs that are high functioning and central to the mission of the university.

Sen. Oshrin noted that there are \$6 million in cuts. He asked what strategies the university is considering to make up the additional funds. Dr. Lyman said that there may be a redistribution of some F and A costs to the general fund. Retirement incentive is also being considered. These are not early retirements. The IHL has to approve it, and the position must stay vacant for a year. Furloughs may be used. He doesn't believe in them and thinks that we may have to rely on furloughs which will result in a 4% pay cut.

Sen. Oshrin stated that we are still \$1 million short and that we will have to hire adjuncts to cover retirees. Dr. Lyman stated that none of these figures include adjuncts. The rest of the money will come from a hiring freeze that will primarily impact the non-academic side.

Sen. Oshrin asked if the furloughs will be graduated based on salary especially with staff that make lower salaries. Dr. Lyman stated that the percentage is going to be the same for everyone. Sen. Oshrin asked if the furlough percentages will go higher if we do not meet the required amount of money. Dr. Lyman stated that he has not heard any talk about that. He has heard that if retirements are high, then the furloughs may be lower.

Sen. Tingstrom asked why the university did not offer the retirement plan a year ago like Mississippi State. Dr. Lyman stated that they didn't think the university would have the 50% payment by the needed date.

Sen. Tingstrom stated that Mississippi State, University of Mississippi, and Delta State seem not to be impacted by the cuts like we are. Dr. Lyman said that they are all hurting, but that they are handling the cuts differently because of different opportunities like attrition, enrollment numbers, scholarships, etc. Other colleges are doing poorly like Florida State and LSU. We are not a resource deep university.

Dr. Beckett stated that the university could have done a better job with hires. Geology recently hired two faculty members and, in the recent cuts, a position or two is being lost in the department. Dr. Lyman did not think that was a good example. He said that he receives a lot of petitions to hire and some go through because they are critically needed. He thinks that department chairs need to be trusted in these situations.

Sen. Conville addressed the provost's comment that there was some quality concern in the CISE program. He hopes that the Cabinet and the faculty can create a vision of what USM is going to look like in 5-10 years. There was a time when we had the premier doctorate program in education in the region. He asked the provost what he thinks the new USM will look like. Dr. Lyman said that more students come into more career track programs than they used to because they think they can get a job after graduation. We need to have liberal arts programs, but we also need to look into career track programs. Teaching has become less attractive. The rigorousness of education programs country-wide has been challenged. We need to work to change that preconception. At USM, there is a proliferation of majors that we probably should not have. We need to become more focused in our offerings.

Sen. Meyers asked why Religion is in Tier 4. Dr. Lyman stated that there is high regard for the program by the UPC. Recommended by the Cabinet because of its low enrollment and other issues. Sen. Meyers

asked about the low enrollment. Dr. Lyman responded that low enrollment related to majors. Sen. Meyers stated that there have been sections added to fulfill the demand by students for the courses. Dr. Lyman stated that the sections are in response to the general education criteria which can be changed with religion removed. If we cut the religion courses, we probably won't lose the students taking the courses because they will select other courses to take.

Mark Miller asked what upcoming documents should be expected. Dr. Lyman stated that there should be the raw UPC reports. One is already up on the IR website. Several others will follow. The documents that he gave us will also be posted.

Sen. Burnett asked how the COAL dean number of cuts was the exact number of the cuts that came from the Cabinet. She asked how come COAL received the most cuts for the second year in the row. Dr. Lyman responded that COAL is the largest college and has the most nooks and crannies. In response to the dean's numbers matching the Cabinet's, Dr. Lyman stated that her recommendations probably matched what was sent up by the UPC.

Sen. Rehner asked what the appeal process is, and what the timeline is. Dr. Lyman said that his proposal is due on Monday. There will be personal and program appeals. There are some situations where a swap can occur like last year with economics and theatre/dance. The appeals should start in a couple of weeks to give people and programs time to prepare.

Sen. Conville asked how the cuts from COST and COB were the same when COST is so much larger. Dr. Lyman stated that the UPC ranked the COST programs higher. Much of this may have to do with COST's advantage of external funding opportunities.

Dr. Lyman apologized for the president for not being able to attend. She had a previous engagement. He pointed out that that he does not want any lack of correlation between the UPC's recommendations and the Cabinet's decisions to reflect as disregarding the work of the UPC. They put forth an exhaustive effort. The Cabinet just had a different focus when determining the cuts.

## 8.0 Adjournment

Motion by Sen. Conville. Seconded. Motion carried.

**Appendix A    Resolution from the Evaluation and Assessment Committee**

***University-wide assessment and evaluation efforts with respect to University Priorities Committee (UPC) outcomes***

Whereas, we of the Faculty Senate were instrumental in the establishment of the University Priorities Committee (UPC) and believe that it is our responsibility to assess and improve the prioritization process, and . . .

Whereas, we of the Faculty Senate believe that it is imperative that current and future prioritization processes be integrated with University assessment and evaluation efforts, we . . .

Resolve that the UPC should provide a succinct process evaluation report as an archival resource including but not limited to:

1. Strengths of the process
2. Weaknesses of the process
3. Concerns
4. Observations for improvement

## **Appendix B Resolution from the Faculty Senate Materials and Resources Committee**

Whereas –

The University of Southern Mississippi is a doctoral research extensive institution and confers the doctorate degree, a sustained increase in library materials funding would improve the position of University Libraries for membership in the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL), and attain research library status. All library surveys conducted to determine user satisfaction with University Libraries library collections, provide significant data over the past ten years to support the need for more funding designated in support of faculty and graduate research. Library budgets have been eroding for the past ten years due to budget cuts. Library materials budgets are often an easy target in meeting these mandated budget cuts.

Be it resolved –

That The University of Southern Mississippi support increased sustained funding for University Libraries resource materials to enhance scholarly research by faculty. Charge the USM University Libraries Advisory committee to study the ASERL criteria for membership and make recommendations for necessary increases in library materials budget to meet criteria for research library status. Design a five year timeline and incorporate this goal in the university strategic plan.

**Appendix C     Resolution from the Research and Scholarship Committee**

Sabbatical Leave Policy

Whereas –

The University of Southern Mississippi offers members of its academic staff sabbatical leave for the purpose of professional improvement to assist faculty in promotion of academic rank, to enhance the academic enterprise, and to build the university's scholarly reputation.

This policy is based on regulations prescribed by the Board of Trustees and within the Faculty Handbook (Article 6.2.6). Current budgeting concerns have brought about questions of award for the 2011-12 academic year, even though costs associated with sabbatical leave are absorbed by departments and serve as an investment in the institution's intellectual capital.

Be it resolved –

That The University of Southern Mississippi continue current sabbatical leave policies and procedures based on a ranking and award system determined by the sabbatical review committee in order to further the research and academic purposes of the institution despite concurrent budget reductions.

## **Appendix D Resolution: Welfare Committee Recommendations regarding Dismissed Employees.**

Approved by Committee on September 8, 2010

Whereas, we of the Faculty Senate are deeply grieved by the dismissal of our fellow faculty and staff as part of the ongoing effort to reconcile the University's budget, and . . .

Whereas, we of the Faculty Senate were instrumental in the establishment of the University Priorities Committee (UPC) and feel it is our responsibility to see that the UPC's decisions are fairly and justly administered, we . . .

Therefore, resolve that the University administration, with direction from the University President, should provide guidance and support for all terminated employees. We offer the following recommendations:

### 1. Information

- a. We urge the University President to take the lead in providing clear, precise information to the campus community. We urge the President to work with the University Priorities Committee and University Counsel to provide a full and quick release of the information that lead to the recent dismissals;
- b. We urge the University President to immediately provide clear guidelines in conjunction with the University Priorities Committee on how to appeal the recent budget cuts and dismissals; and
- c. We urge the University President to take the lead in providing resources for current employees facing dismissal as outlined below.

### 2. Services

We believe that the University should publically recommit to services it currently offers dismissed faculty and staff. We remind the University administration that many of the faculty and staff facing dismissal are still working with us and will continue to work with us for the coming year and that this provides us with a unique opportunity to help them as they transition to new jobs and new lives.

- a. Existing Services. The University should remind dismissed employees that the following services are available.
  - i. Affected employees may apply for any open position on campus.
  - ii. Dismissed employees are qualified to apply for unemployment benefits with the Mississippi Department of Employment Security.
  - iii. Dismissed employees can elect to stay on the state's health insurance through COBRA for up to 18 months.
  - iv. Dismissed employees can elect to enroll, free of charge, in academic courses offered by the University (limited to two semesters and one

- summer term beginning with the semester following the notification of layoff, and cannot exceed a full academic load per semester).
- v. Employees are eligible for payment of 240 hours of unused personal leave (this will apply only to faculty who are or were in a position that was eligible for personal leave accruals).
- b. New Services. The University should extend the following services to dismissed employees and their families.
- i. Career Services should provide support for dismissed employees for up to one year after they are dismissed. Career Services is currently informally offering support to dismissed faculty and supports efforts to provide additional resources to faculty.
  - ii. The Counseling Service should provide support for dismissed employees. Currently, the Counseling Service is available only to students. These services should be extended to dismissed faculty and staff and should be provided for up to one year after dismissal.
  - iii. In acknowledgement that downsizing can be stressful for both those who lose their jobs and those who remain, all faculty and staff should have access to the Counseling Service during current academic year.
  - iv. Currently, dismissed employees can elect to enroll, free of charge, in academic courses offered by the University for a year after they are notified of a layoff. This benefit should be extended for an additional year and the revised benefit should be provided to the partners and spouses of dismissed employees.

## **Appendix E**

### **DRAFT**

#### Top Ten Issues for the Office of the Vice President for Research

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.

## Appendix F

### Updated Summary of Executive Cabinet Response to UPC Recommendations

UPC recommended a total of 111 program cuts in Tiers 1-4. These cuts totaled \$6,577,654 and would have eliminated 2,950 currently enrolled student majors and approximately 100 instructional lines. The Executive Cabinet implemented 25% of these cuts (28) for a total savings of \$1,990,850. In addition, the Cabinet implemented other cuts that expanded/modified UPC recommended actions or were not covered in Tiers 1-4 of the UPC recommendation. The resulting savings from these program and other cuts in the academic colleges was \$3,839,949 or 58% of the UPC recommendation.

UPC recommended 52 cuts in Tier 1. Cabinet implemented 18 (35%) of these cuts.

UPC recommended 20 cuts in Tier 2. Cabinet implemented 3 (15%) of these cuts.

UPC recommended 16 cuts in Tier 3. Cabinet implemented 3 (19%) of these cuts.

UPC recommended 23 cuts in Tier 4. Cabinet implemented 4 (17%) of these cuts.

Overall, 64% of the cuts were from Tier 1, 12% from Tier 2, 8% from Tier 3, and 15% from Tier 4. Based on UPC cost figures, 71% of the programs cut by Cabinet had per student major costs/savings greater than \$3500. Although the dollar "value" of a student major is difficult to compute, this figure was used by the Cabinet as a rough threshold figure in determinations of enrollment based financial gain or loss associated with an academic initiative.

The program cuts recommended by UPC and implemented by Cabinet and their per student major cost (as computed by UPC) is as follows:

Tier 1: Philosophy MA \$6262 8 majors

Instructional Technology (BTE) MS \$12,900 1 major

Geology MS \$18,353 1 major

Engineering Tech (ACV) MS \$6533 4 majors

Engineering Tech (CM) MS \$10,591 10 majors

Engineering Tech (LM) MS \$11,708 7 majors

Art BA \$643 55 majors (retain Art BFA)

Art Education BFA \$2074 30 majors (retain Art Ed track in CISE)

German (no majors, est cost of \$163/cr hr, est revenue of \$140/cr hr

Latin/Greek (no majors, est cost of \$90/cr hr, est revenue of \$140/cr hr

Allied Health BS GC \$0 (no costs assigned to initiative) 12 majors

PE Lic MS \$4088 4 majors

Interscholastic Ath Admin MS \$8247 7 majors

Sports & High Performance Materials BS \$7521 8 majors

Sports & Hi Perf Materials MS \$0 (no costs assigned to initiative) 7 majors

Sports & High Performance Materials PhD \$9992 2 majors

Higher Education EdS \$2035 9 majors

Rec & Leisure Management MS \$10,829 2 majors

Tier 2: MIS BSBA \$65,520 5 majors

Psych Nursing MSN \$19,052 4 majors

Instructional Technology (Admin Comm) BS \$1042 42 majors

Tier 3: Allied Health BS \$3634 18 majors

Early Oral Intervention MS \$25,632 7 majors

Rec Admin BS \$3848 11 majors

Tier 4: Religion BA \$7755 19 majors

Education of the Deaf \$13,268 21 majors

Instructional Technology (BTE) BS \$2068 23 majors

Engineering Tech (CS) MS \$0 (no costs assigned to initiative) 12 majors

Tier 5: Marine Science BS (Stennis) not recommended by UPC \$9000 14 majors

The Executive Cabinet deviated significantly from the recommendations of the UPC with regard to CISE and Technology Education. The UPC recommended 16 academic initiative cuts in CISE totaling \$697,991 and impacting 165 student majors and approximately 10 faculty lines. The Cabinet chose instead to expand the three recommended cuts in Technology Education (savings of \$72,516, impacting 66 student majors and 2 faculty) to a complete closure of the Technology Education Department. This substitute action resulted in a savings of approximately \$675,000 rather than the \$697,991 savings resulting from CISE cuts and impacted only 109 student majors and 7 faculty members rather than the 165 majors and 10 faculty members who would be impacted by the CISE cuts.

The Executive Cabinet also chose not to implement 8 academic initiative cuts in Mass Communications. These cuts would have resulted in financial savings of \$1,153,271 and would have impacted 424 student majors and approximately 16 faculty lines. Since there are only 445 student majors in the whole department, this action would have effectively closed the department and several of USM's most popular majors.

In summary, the Executive Cabinet chose to implement only 25% of the academic initiative cuts recommended in Tiers 1-4 of the UPC report. The Cabinet expanded one UPC recommendation, modified several, and included one program cut not included in Tiers 1-4 of the UPC report. The final result was a total reduction in academic programs of \$3,839,949 or less than 60% of the UPC recommendation. The Cabinet reductions eliminated 29 faculty lines (including multi-year instructors) and impacted fewer than 500 student majors, rather than the approximately 100 faculty and 3000 students who would have been affected by full implementation of the UPC recommendations.

9/7/10