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The University of Southern Mississippi
Faculty Senate Minutes
April 14, 2000

Members Present: College of the Arts: Kimberley Davis, DeAnna Douglas; College of Education and Psychology: Sheila Alber, Jesse Palmer, John Rachal; College of Health and Human Sciences: Susan Hubble, Michael Forster, Susan Graham-Kresge, Mary Frances Nettles; College of Liberal Arts: Karen Austin, Charles Bolton, David Goff; Allan McBride, Kim Herzinger Art Kaul, Stephen Oshrin; College of Nursing: Norma Cuellar; Institute of Marine Science: Steven Lohrzen; College of Science and Technology: David Beckett, Bob Coates, Dean Dunn, Mary Dayne Gregg, Charles Hoyle, Mary Lux, Lida McDowell; Gulf Park: Darlys Alford, J. Pat Smith; University Libraries: Sherry Laughlin, College of International and Continuing Education: Mark Miller.


Members Absent: College of Business Administration: Ernest King, Scott Magruder; College of Education and Psychology: Marvin Lammon; College of Science and Technology: Douglas McCain, Grayson Rayborn.

1.0 Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.
2.0 Approval of Agenda: The agenda was approved as written.
3.0 Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the March meeting were approved as written.
4.0 Executive Committee Reports

4.1. President’s Report: Art Kaul

** On March 20, 2000, an email message to Dr. Richard R. Millikin, President of the University Faculty Senates Association, expressed the position of the USM Faculty Senate regarding post-tenure review as reflected in the Faculty Senate’s resolution of February 2000 and unanimously reaffirmed on 17 March 2000. In addition, a similar letter to IHL President Ricki Garrett and IHL Commissioner Thomas Layzell was sent on 29 March 2000. Both letters expressed support for a “flexible” post tenure review policy that would “enable individual institutions to develop post-tenure review policies that fit their particular missions and circumstances.” Copies of the letters were distributed to the Faculty Senate.

**President’s Cabinet Meeting, 10 April 2000. The major item of discussion was the projected budget for the next fiscal year. IHL has informed the administration that current projections indicate a $2.54 million appropriation reduction for USM. Also noted was the expectation that health insurance costs would increase. Faculty/staff pay raises will not be forthcoming. Kaul said he reminded the cabinet that in the past 15 years [1985-86 and 1999-2000] faculty have experienced five years of no raises, including three consecutive years of no raises [1989-1991]. Faculty received no raises in three of the past 10 years. In addition, the average annual pay raises during the 1970s was 7.1%, the 1980s was 4.6% and the 1990s was 3.45%. Administrative and faculty searches has been put on "hold" until the fiscal situation becomes clearer. The legislative appropriation for higher education is expected to be known between April 20 and April 30. The USM administration has prepared a study of "Parity Funding Issues" [using IHL data] for the College Board that shows USM as the most productive institution while ranking among the lowest in terms of financial support.

President Fleming expressed concern over the "civil environment" at USM, particularly noting "too many" complaints of sexual harassment [not necessarily "sexual" per se but environmental] as "indicators" of a troublesome environment that undermines equitable and respectful treatment of colleagues. He admonished the cabinet to be especially sensitive to these issues.

**Kaul appointed the following Faculty Senate members to an ad hoc Nominations Committee: Norma Cuellar, Michael Forster, Mary Dayne Gregg and Sherry Laughlin. The committee is expected to recommend nominations at the Faculty Senate’s May 5 meeting. Anyone interested in being a candidate for the office of president-elect or secretary-elect should inform the committee. Nominations from the floor for Faculty Senate offices also may be made at the June meeting.

4.2 President-Elect’s Report: Sherry Laughlin

S. Laughlin attended meetings related to the open associate provost’s position. Two candidates have been interviewed, but the search is currently on hold pending resolution of funding issues. S. Laughlin also coordinated the Senate’s annual “past presidents’ luncheon.” The event was well attended, including both President Fleming and Provost Henry, who spoke primarily about the proposed budget cuts. President Fleming indicated that the university cannot continue to grow without additional resources. Possible future developments include increased tuition and/or capped enrollment. USM’s administration has crafted a case for parity based on IHL data; the data show that USM is most productive in terms of full-time students, but ranks 7th in funding among the eight universities. M. Miller noted the irony that the allocation of funds do not follow a formula, but the proposed budget cuts apparently did.

4.3. Secretary’s Report: Shellie Nielsen No report.

4.4. Secretary-Elect’s Report: Michael Forster

Proxies received were read and an attendance roster was passed.

5.0 Old Business

5.1. M. Miller was allowed the floor to follow-up on his comments about women’s sports during the March meeting, noting that, as feared, news accounts suggested that women’s sports were the cause of the budget deficit in USM athletics. Miller expressed concern that the public relations message getting out is damaging to the university - on the one hand, the Chronicle of Higher Education ranks USM in the bottom 20 schools in spending on women’s sports; on the other hand, we appear to be engaged in “manic spending” on facilities for men’s sports.

5.2. Course Prerequisite Resolution. The resolution remained tabled. K. Austin, noting that concern was expressed at the March meeting regarding the requirements of implementing the resolution, agreed to consult the registrar prior to reconsideration.

5.3. Salary Resolution. J. Rachal read the resolution, a pending motion introduced last month (see March minutes). In light of data showing that USM faculty salaries are losing ground in comparison to MSU and Ole Miss, which in turn has a negative effect on faculty recruitment, selection and retention, the resolution calls upon the administration to seek faculty salary parity as a first priority.

**Discussion: D. Alford asked whether the resolution might be strengthened by substituting the "SREB average" for "parity." M. Miller asked whether the action might appear in opposition to the interests of USM staff, whose situation is worse than that of faculty. J. Rachal reiterated that the resolution focuses on the disparity among the universities, an issue about which we have no staff data. J. Palmer indicated that he
believe it appropriate for the Senate to focus exclusively on faculty, as staff council deals with staff issues. P. Smith commented that a fundamental difference between staff and faculty is that competition for the latter typically takes place in a national market, whereas staff recruitment is more regional in nature. P. Smith endorsed including language relating to the SREB average. D. Hunt cautioned that the figures the resolution considers are means, and can be misleading in their implications. J. Palmer moved to amend the resolution to add the phrase, "and to meet SREB averages." P. Smith seconded. The motion passed unanimously without further discussion. Returning to consideration of the main motion, D. Beckett questioned whether the salary gap might be due to a rash of recent retirements. J. Rachal suggested that a more likely explanation is that other institutions have tapped their endowments to improve faculty salaries. D. Dunn concurred that endowment funds have been used at Ole Miss and State to augment faculty salaries; in contrast, USM has dipped into funds earmarked for faculty salaries to improve staff salaries. Discussion concluded, the resolution was adopted unanimously and the text is available on the Senate web site.

5.4. Faculty Handbook. D. Goff moved that the following 10 non-controversial recommendations be approved:

RECOMMENDATION (5.1): Remove all references to the librarian ranks. These designations no longer exist. This recommendation extends to all references to librarian ranks in all chapters.

RECOMMENDATION (7.1): The specific services described in this section are not equally available at both the Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast campuses. A disclaimer that both clarifies this fact and directs the reader to the specific services available at the Gulf Coast campus is needed.

RECOMMENDATION (7.3): Correct grading options to "WP" or "WF".

RECOMMENDATION (7.4): Hours of operation for libraries (and all instructional support services) should be made available from an online source. Hours, names, and even the phone number and location of these services are subject to change. The handbook should direct the reader to the online source.

RECOMMENDATION (7.6): Revise this section to reflect the existence of the separate Grade Review Council at the Gulf Coast campus and identify any differences in the grade review process at the branch campus.

RECOMMENDATION (9.1): In the last sentence of paragraph, correct typo, changing "outlines" to "outlines."

RECOMMENDATION (10.1): Strike outdated references to librarian ranks.

RECOMMENDATION (10.2): Delete reference to librarian ranks.

RECOMMENDATION (11.1): Delete reference to librarian ranks.

RECOMMENDATION (11.14): The reference to 16.5 is incorrect; it should reference section 17.5.

D. Alford seconded the motion to accept all ten recommendations. Motion passed unanimously without discussion.

D. Goff passed out material from the University of Mississippi faculty handbook concerning academic freedom, termination of untenured faculty, tenure (including appeals), and promotion to additional recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION (6.1): Eliminate the phrase in the section on Academic Freedom and Responsibility which states, "Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing a subject but should not introduce into their teaching controversial matter that has no relation to the subject." M. Miller noted that the phrase has value in preventing the propounding of irrelevant religious or personal views. The recommendation passed on a vote of 29 to 3.

RECOMMENDATION (6.2): In the same section, add to the statement, "It shall be the further responsibility of faculty and staff members of the several institutions to give primary consideration to the intellectual, moral, and spiritual development of the students and to cooperate with faculty, administration, and students in improving the quality, scope, and capacity of the institution within the area of its function and general objectives," the idea of valuing diversity referenced in the university's strategic plan. The recommendation was accepted unanimously.

RECOMMENDATION (6.3): In the same clause quoted above, change "moral and spiritual" to "ethical."

The recommendation was approved on a vote of 29 to 3.

RECOMMENDATION (6.4): Items 1-4 of Chapter VI, section 2, contain a footnote citing the offices of Provost and Vice-President for Research. The paragraph preceding items 1-4 states that USM follows principles developed by three organizations, including AAUP. It is unclear exactly what source is being cited. The footnotes should cite specific documents from these organizations. The recommendation was approved unanimously.

RECOMMENDATION (7.5): The policy on class absences in Chapter VII need clarification. It fails to address excuses from non-university health services, and it does not explain the meaning or significance of any recognized "excuse." Some faculty make no distinction between excused and unexcused absences, essentially ignoring excuses. Discussion: M. Gregg indicated that the purpose of this recommendation is to provide more guidance to Faculty on handling of absences. Lengthy discussion ensued. D. Dunn argued that handling of absences should be left to discretion of instructor; most absences relate to participation in athletics, and blanket policies on absences would contradict NCAA policy. D. Goff noted that discretion is useful in distinguishing between highly motivated and unmotivated students. P. Smith asked if problems have occurred under the current provision. S. Oshrin responded in the affirmative, and stated that additional guidance would be helpful; the university should adopt a policy it will adhere to consistently. D. Alford suggested that the policy might enumerate possible excuses for class absence, but leave the decision to accept an excuse or not to the faculty member. J. Palmer argued that common sense must prevail, as students may miss class for various legitimate reasons. S. Oshrin noted that a significant problem is that of students appealing to the administration to pass a class that the student has barely attended. D. Alford suggested that "excessive" absence is difficult to define. P. Smith noted that syllabi often use qualifying language, that a certain number of absences "may" result in one or another consequence. S. Lohrenz suggested that two distinct issues intertwine - attendance and academic performance. J. Rachal asked whether the Senate wishes to rewrite the policy at this point, or simply request clarification of the policy. D. Goff noted that the Forward to the Handbook states that there is to be a standing committee to review the Handbook and make recommendations for changes to the Provost's office; it is presumably to this committee that the Senate would direct its recommendations, including requests for clarification. President Kaul called the question. The recommendation to request clarification of the class absence policy passed unanimously.

RECOMMENDATION (8.1): The section of Chapter VIII concerning the Institutional Review Board should be amended to reflect responsibility for training faculty, especially new faculty, about Institutional Review Board requirements and procedures. D. Alford underscored the importance of education around federal requirements related to research safeguard given the serious consequences attached to their violation. The recommendation was adopted on a unanimous vote.

RECOMMENDATION (10.3): Section 4.4 of Chapter X, dealing with "Eligible Academic Ranks," should be modified to cover staff personnel holding part-time faculty appointments above the rank of instructor whose positions are not tenure track. The recommendation was adopted on a unanimous vote.

RECOMMENDATION (10.4): The section on "Denial of Tenure" should include a statement of the rights (and limitations on those rights) of a faculty member whom, following denial of tenure, is serving in a terminal contract year. Chapter XI, section 8.3 specifies these rights and their limitations regarding personnel deliberations in departments. S. Oshrin noted that since such individuals are legally still "tenure track," additional language here would be helpful. D. Alford cited the negative impact faculty denied tenure can have on morale. The recommendation was adopted on a unanimous vote. J. Rachal introduced additional concerns regarding this section of the Handbook, citing an unclear standard for tenure. The current language suggests that standards for tenure and promotion are significantly different, and the descriptions of these standards are grossly inadequate. J. Rachal moved that the standard for tenure be expanded and clarified to give advisory committees more
direction. C Bolton seconded the motion.

Discussion: S. Lorenz noted that units will differ on appropriate standards. K. Herzinger requested a reading of the current language, which J. Rachal provided. K. Herzinger stated that the opening sentences are unclear, but recalled that the effort to distinguish between promoting and tenuring was deliberate. An older version of the Handbook included identical criteria for promotion and tenure, which caused problems. K. Austin added that the issue of "collegiality" creates further complexities. S. Oshrin suggested directing each unit to make the criteria for promotion and tenure clear to incoming faculty; historically some units have tended to keep the criteria "close to the chest." J. Rachal argued that the current language regarding tenure suggests that the important factors of teaching, research and service should be ignored. J. Palmer agreed that the document implies that it is easier to gain tenure than to be promoted. J. Rachal reiterated that the motion under consideration does not rewrite the policy, but asks that the standing Faculty Handbook committee deal with the issue. D. Goff noted that the university's strategic plan places more emphasis on methods of evaluation at the unit level and expanded roles for faculty, and offered the friendly amendment that a revision of the policy be addressed in light of the strategic plan. J. Rachal accepted the friendly amendment, which revised the motion to read as follows: "The 'Standard of Evaluation' for tenure deliberation should be clarified with reference to the statements on scholarship from the relevant sections of the Strategic Plan." The motion carried on a unanimous vote.

**RECOMMENDATION (10.5):** Definitions or other clarifications of the terms "malfeasance," "contumacious conduct," and "for cause" should be provided. Discussion centered on the possibility that additional language here would do more harm than good. W. Scarborough and D. Austin urged caution, arguing that vagueness can be an advantage to accused faculty. D. Beckett, R. Coates, and D. Goff suggested that despite the danger, it is still worth clarifying the terms. S. Oshrin observed that it may not be within the university's prerogative to define terms due to board policy. The recommendation was approved on a vote of 19 in favor, 13 opposed.

**RECOMMENDATION REGARDING DISMISSAL OF UNTENURED FACULTY:** D. Goff noted that the Handbook does not address notice of dismissal of untenured faculty, and moved that the Senate recommend incorporation of the following language into Chapter X:

>A nontenured faculty member above the rank of instructor who is not to be continued shall ordinarily be given notice of dismissal not later than three months before the expiration of his or her appointment in the first year of service; not later than six months before the expiration of his or her contract in the second year of service; and not later than twelve months before the expiration of his or her appointment after two or more years of service; nontenured faculty members dismissed for reasons of financial exigencies, termination or reduction of programs, or termination of academic units or administrative units shall be given at least a 30-day notice.

J. Palmer seconded the motion. The recommendation was approved unanimously.

President Kaul suggested that in the interests of moving through the rest of the meeting agenda the Senate delay the remainder of Handbook business until the May meeting. The Senate concurred without requiring a vote.

**6.9 Committee Reports**

**6.1 Academic and Governance: Mary Lux**
M. Lux introduced the following resolution:

"Resource allocation at all levels impact on faculty. As a tenet of shared governance, faculty should participate in budget decisions at all levels - department, college, and university. The Strategic Plan states, 'As a by-product of the current strategic planning process, USM should reassess its annual planning and resource allocation procedures with a goal of sharing more widely throughout the university the necessary information, allocation decisions, and rationales for budget decisions.' Faculty Senate resolves that a faculty member appointed by Faculty Senate be present at any and all university budget hearings."

The resolution will be considered for a vote at the May meeting.

**6.2 Administration and Faculty Evaluations: Kimberley Davis**

K Davis reported attending Deans Council to make the deans aware of the problem of confidentiality of course evaluations. Deans Council created a committee to examine the issue and make recommendations.

**6.3 Archives: Shellei Nielsen**
No report.

**6.4 Athletic Liaison: Trellis Green**
No report.

**6.5 Awards: Lilian Range**
J. Rachal related to the Senate committee chair L. Range's strong call to faculty to make more nominations for awards. D. Alford emphasized informing faculty that nominations are easy to make.

**6.6 Benefits and Work Environment: John Rachal**
No report.

**6.7 Constitution and Bylaws: Allan McBride**
No report.

**6.8 Elections: Steven Rohrenz**
S. Lorenz announced the following election results:

- Arts - K. Davis and S. Nielsen elected.
- Business - Ballot will be reissused due to error.
- Education & Psychology - Run-off.
- Health & Human Sciences - Run-off.
- Institute for Marine Science - Run-off.
- Nursing - S. Harrison elected.
- Science & Technology - M. Cobb and B. Coates elected.
- Libraries - Run-off.
- S. Lorenz thanked S. Hubble and M. Gregg for their assistance in counting ballots. Lorenz also apologized to Dean Doblin of the College of Science and Technology for prior remarks creating the appearance of non-cooperativeness of the College with the election process; on the contrary, the College was quite cooperative.

**6.9 Environment(ad hoc): Dick Conville**
No report.

**6.10 Faculty Development: Karolyn Thompson**
No report.

**6.11 Technology: Dean Dunn**
No report.

**6.12 University Club: Kim Herzinger**
K. Herzinger reported meeting with V.P for Development Redden about fund raising for a university club. V.P. Redden indicated that the Foundation is attempting to address numerous other priorities at this time and is unable to pursue funds for the club; the Foundation will, of course, accept funds that are donated for the purpose of establishing a club. Herzinger stated that consequently new proposals regarding a university club will be based on attempting to secure private funds for a suitable building.

**6.13 Transportation Committee: Bill Scarborough**
W. Scarborough indicated that he will vote against a proposed increase in fees to support building a garage, arguing that a garage, which will cost approximately $8 million, is not yet needed. Rather more effort should be placed on the enforcement of current parking regulations. More ticket writers are needed; at present the university has only four full-time and one part-time ticket writers. (At the moment most of these
individuals are taking time from work and virtually no tickets are being written.) There is a plan to add two more ticket writers, but the budget crisis may undercut the plan. J. Rachal suggested that it is a false economy to forego new ticket writers when writers can raise significant funds. Scarborough stated he will talk to V.P. Gilbert about the matter. Scarborough itemized other changes underway - the Hartwig Theater is coming down and will make room for a new lot. The pedestrian plaza is scheduled to be completed by August. The traffic division will move physically to the ROTC building during the Summer and administratively under V.P. Gilbert. Finally, 20,500 tickets have been written this year, and 500 cars have been towed - both figures are lower than last year's. The number of tickets required for a two is expected to go down from seven to five next year.


6.15 Faculty Handbook Task Force (ad hoc): David Goff (see Old Business 5.2)

6.16 Grievance Policy (ad hoc): Karen Austin

K. Austin provided highlights of a proposal for a faculty grievance policy, which will be considered the May meeting. The proposal follows:

Purpose:
It is the intent of the University of Southern Mississippi to establish a procedure for the fair, orderly, and speedy resolution of disputes that sometimes arise when a faculty member perceives that an unfair act has occurred which leads to an injustice or harm. In order to provide fairness and equity in the work environment, the University has established an internal review procedure that is accessible to all faculty employees. This shall serve as the University procedure for the resolution of job-related complaints and grievances.

Informal Resolution:
 faculty members must bring to the attention of their department chair any work-related problems as soon as possible after they arise. A faculty member who believes a justifiable job-related complaint exists shall take steps to resolve the problem with the department chair. The employee and the department chair shall attempt to resolve the problem at this level.

Should informal attempts at resolution not be satisfactory, the Grievance Process may be utilized. The employee or the department chair may seek the assistance of Human Resources in the use of the Grievance Process. Human Resources will also provide advice on matters of policy interpretation, rights of faculty members and use of the formal Grievance Process.

Records:
The official records of the progress of a grievance and the established time limits are kept by Human Resources. Therefore, a dated copy of the grievance form must be provided to Human Resources each time a section has been completed (faculty member, department chair, or Dean).

Time Limitations:
The grievance procedure sets forth time limits for initiation of action on each step of the procedure. If a grievance is not forwarded by the faculty member within the time allowed in any step, the grievance will be considered discontinued, and no further review will take place. A written grievance which is not answered within the time allowed may be sent on to the next step within the allotted time frame by the faculty member. Human Resources may extend any time limit in the grievance process with the mutual agreement of the parties.

STEP I Grievance Procedure

Dean:

An attempt at informal resolution must take place at the departmental level within ten working days of the occurrence which gave rise to the grievance or when the facts pertaining thereto became known or should have been known to the faculty member. If the problem is not resolved to the satisfaction of the faculty member in the informal resolution stage, the faculty member may then file a formal grievance. The grievance must be in writing, signed by the faculty member and the department chair, and submitted to the appropriate Dean, with a copy to Human Resources and a copy to the department chair, within 5 working days of the meeting with the department chair.

Within 5 working days from receipt of the written grievance, the Dean or his or her designated representative will schedule a meeting with the faculty member, the department chair, and any other individuals the Dean determines will assist in the investigation and resolution of the problem. If possible, the Dean will resolve the problem at this meeting. The meeting shall be held within 15 working days from receipt of the written grievance.
The Dean will provide the employee with a written answer within 5 working days after the completion of this meeting and will forward a copy of the grievance and answer to Human Resources.

**STEP II**
**Hearing:**

If the issue is not resolved in Step I, the grievant may, within 5 working days from receipt of the Step I response, file a written appeal with the Provost. The Provost or other official designated by the Provost will, within 5 working days from receipt of the written appeal, notify the Faculty Grievance Committee that the hearing is necessary. Such hearing shall be held within 15 working days of receipt of the written appeal. At least seven voting members of the Faculty Grievance Committee must be present for the hearing to take place.

**Faculty Grievance Committee:**

The committee shall consist of nine (9) full-time faculty members, one each from the College of The Arts, the College of Business Administration, the College of Education & Psychology, the College of Health & Human Sciences, the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Nursing, the College of Science & Technology, the Library, and the Gulf Park Campus. Members shall be elected by college ballot from a slate of three (3) nominees provided by the Faculty Senate in the Spring Semester, the election to be determined by plurality vote. The Faculty Senate shall determine in advance of the nomination the nominees' willingness to serve on the committee if elected. The members of the committee so elected shall serve three-year staggered terms, with three new members being elected each year. The committee shall hold an initial meeting at the beginning of each Fall Semester to elect its chair for the year. When a grievance is being heard, the committee member from the grievant's academic college or equivalent shall not vote, but may participate in all discussion. The chair of the committee shall vote only in case of a tie. In the event the grievant is from the same unit as the committee chair, a new chair shall be elected for that hearing and for that hearing only.

**Hearing & Deliberation Procedure:**

The hearing will be conducted without restrictions as to the technical rules concerning evidence and burden of proof. It will, however, avail the faculty member the right to present witnesses and other evidence and the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses. Either or both parties to the grievance may have legal counsel present if they so desire, but the role of attorneys is strictly advisory and they may not participate in questioning or discussion. The hearing will be closed and confidential minutes of the proceedings will be made. The hearing will consist of statements by the grievant and any other affected parties, presentation of documentation, and questions from members of the committee. All parties other than the committee members will then be excused, and deliberation and voting will take place.

Upon completion of the hearing, the Committee will have 5 working days in which to make a final decision. The decision of the Committee will be written by the chair in consultation with those committee members present and voting, and the written decision will be signed by all committee members present and voting. Such signatures acknowledge the Committee decision but do not necessarily indicate the individual signatory's concurrence with the decision. The written decision will be sent directly to the grievant, to the Provost, and to the President within 5 working days.

**STEP III**
**Appeal to the President:**

The decision of the Committee is subject to review by the President. The faculty member may submit an appeal to the President, in writing, within 5 working days of receipt of the Committee's decision. The President's decision, together with the reasons therefor, shall be confirmed to the faculty member and to the Committee within 15 working days of receipt of the appeal. Decisions of the President are final. There is no right of appeal to the Board of Trustees.

**Effect of Grievance on Administrative Action and Employee Status:**

Filing a grievance does not delay the effective date of any employment action by the University of Southern Mississippi.

Filing a grievance in and of itself will not jeopardize the grievant’s position, opportunities for advancement, or salary increases.

An employee shall not be coerced by the department or other employees in regard to proceeding with a grievance or appearing as a witness before the Faculty Grievance Committee.

The grievance record will not become part of the faculty member's permanent personnel file.

University of Southern Mississippi policy forbids retaliation against any faculty member based solely upon the faculty member's participation in the grievance procedure.

S. Hubble requested that the timing of the election of members to the proposed Faculty Grievance Committee be considered in discussion. B. Coates asked what types of grievances might come up in addition to salary and sexual harassment. President Kaul noted the possibility of a
reprimand that a faculty member considered inappropriate. M. Gregg added that a faculty member might grieve a finding of the university grade appeal council.

8.0 Announcements There were no announcements.

9.0 Adjournment The meeting was adjourned 4:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Shellie C. Nielsen, Faculty Senate Secretary and Michael Forster, Secretary-Elect.