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The University of Southern Mississippi
Faculty Senate Minutes
December 10, 1999

Members Present: College of the Arts: Kimberley Davis, DeAnna Douglas, Shellie Nielsen; College of Business Administration: Trellis Green, Scott Magruder, Bob Smith; College of Education and Psychology: Sheila Alber, Jesse Palmer, John Rachal, Lillian Range; College of Health and Human Sciences: Susan Hubble, Michael Forster, Mary Frances Nettles; College of Liberal Arts: Karen Austin, Charles Bolton, Michael Dearmey, David Goff, Linda Dysart Goff, Allan McBride, Kim Herzinger, Alexandra Jaffe, Art Kaul, Stephen Oshrin; College of Science and Technology: Douglas McCaun, Bob Coates, Dean Dunn, Mary Dayne Gregg, Charles Hoyle, Mary Lux, Grayson Rayborn, Lida McDowell; University Libraries: Sherry Laughlin, Karolyn Thompson; College of International and Continuing Education: Mark Miller; Gulf Park: Darlys Alford, J. Pat Smith.

Members Represented by Proxy: College of Business Administration: Ernest King (pr. Scott Magruder); College of Health and Human Sciences: Susan Graham-Kresge (pr. Mary Lux); College of Nursing: Janie Butts (pr. Sybil Harrison), Norma Cuellar (pr. Sybil Harrison); Institute of Marine Science: Steven Lohrenz (pr. Michael Forster).

Members Absent: College of Education and Psychology: Marvin Lannon; College of Science and Technology: David Beckett.

1.0 Call to Order: The business meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.
2.0 Approval of Agenda: The agenda was approved as distributed.
3.0 Approval of Minutes: The minutes were adopted as corrected.
4.0 Executive Committee Reports
   4.1 President's Report: Art Kaul
      **President Horace Fleming Jr. responded to a memorandum from the Faculty Senate President informing him of the current status of the Faculty/Staff Tuition Restoration and Portability of Faculty/Staff Tuition Benefits resolutions among members of the United Faculty Senate Association. President Fleming's November 30, 1999 response stated:

      To implement full waiver of tuition for faculty and staff, it is estimated that this would have cost us in excess of $600,000 in 1998-99, and this would have to be made up by re-directing other funds, primarily program funds or additional salary raise money. I favor full tuition tax waiver for faculty and staff, but we must not suffer losses in salary to cover the costs.
      I do not object to the portability of this benefit. The subject came up once in discussions in the Council of Presidents, but I did not get a clear indication of how it would be regarded. I will pursue this aspect of the issue right away, and I am asking Dr. Lynda Gilbert to be in touch with you to provide current estimates on the full tuition benefit.

   4.2 President's Cabinet, November 29, 1999: Royce Pierce presented copies of the Pedestrian and Bikeway Master Plan. An application to the Mississippi Department of Transportation to cover Phase 1 costs of the $1.26 million has been submitted.

   USM alumnus Jim Borsig, director of the Center for Member Programs for the National League of Cities, was introduced as a candidate for the position of Assistant to the President for Government Relations. USM Public Relations announced on December 9, 1999 that Mr. Borsig had been hired. He will begin his new duties on January 3, 2000.

The Faculty Senate Resolution on Post Tenure Review, adopted at the November 19, 1999 meeting, was distributed to the cabinet.

   **Dean’ Council, December 1, 1999: Post Tenure Review was a topic of discussion. Provost Myron Henry outlined seven points regarding the issue. He subsequently made available to the Faculty Senate President “Thoughts on Post tenure Review at Southern Miss,” which were distributed to the Faculty Senate Membership.

   4.2 President-Elect’s Report: Sherry Laughlin No report.
   4.3 Secretary’s Report: Shellie Nielsen No report.
   4.4 Secretary-Elect’s Report: Michael Forster
      Proxies were announced and an attendance roster was passed.

5.0 Old Business

5.1 Post Tenure Review Policy Resolution from the Academic and Governance Committee, Mary Lux Chair.

Revised versions of the committee's Post Tenure Review Policy proposal were distributed to all Faculty Senators with corrections, changes and/or deletions underlined or crossed through. M. Lux pointed out that if we were to pass this, this is something that we would be taking forward to the administrators that we could support. Ultimately, the President will have the final say. We should not look on this as a legal document as it has not passed through any legal testing. The committee felt that an important factor in this document was that is was a way of strengthening the annual evaluation, but did note that this would be a separate issue.

**M. Forster introduced a resolution from E. Washington, Director of the School of Social Work and A. Stamper, Director of the School of Family and Consumer Sciences ( copies were distributed) as an alternative to the post tenure review policy on the floor. They proposed strengthening the existing process of the annual review and included all faculty, part-time replacement, graduate teaching assistants, tenured faculty, and non tenured faculty in the annual review. J. P. Smith pointed out that we would not have to suspend the rules to vote on this as it could be considered as an amendment by substitution. M. Forster moved and K. Thompson seconded to consider this new resolution an alternative. Discussion: M. Dearmey stated that this resolution was not an alternative to our proposal for several reasons. 1) There is no mechanism in place and no definition of steps or procedures in theirs. 2) Our proposal also does stress faculty development, provides for assessment remediation but doesn't use the term “termination” in the sanctions 3) Our proposal does build on the annual review 4) the idea that training of personnel to conduct the evaluations was questionable. To what extent do you train someone to be fair? It is a matter of fairness and the ability to assess what colleagues are doing. It was also pointed out by S. Laughlin that this “training” area could put up a red flag that we wouldn't want. After being asked if this proposal had been discussed with the Faculty Senators in their units, M. Forster said there had been no discussion other than to request that it be considered. M. Lux pointed out that the proposal had not been reported to her committee and K. Austin, although she saw some good things in it, did not think the board would even consider it. J. Palmer felt it did not add much to the document that we already had on the table. The motion to consider this resolution was defeated.
M. Lux continued the discussion about our proposal. She highlighted several things in the preamble: 1) It stresses the importance of tenure, 2) In the third paragraph it ties the annual evaluation into this process, 3) This is not to be a reevaluation of tenure, 4) The "process should allow substantial due process for all faculty members at all times and that the process should remain under the control of the faculty", and 5) The last paragraph emphasizes faculty development. In the actual proposed policy the trigger was changed back to two years as they originally had it. In item 3, under what a faculty member should submit was their own developmental plan. At the end of item 4, the last sentence was deleted to avoid problems with the committee overriding the departmental's decision. The committee could also adopt the faculty members developmental plan. The comments from the Gulf Coast emphasized the importance of teaching pointing out that if we allow substandard teaching something should be done about it. The committee felt that that would be a departmental function. This document is there when everything else has failed. They did not want to highlight one area more than the other. M. Lux pointed out that those that attended the Gulf Coast forum were really interested and all stressed the teaching aspect. J. P. Smith added that the feeling at the coast forum was that the trigger was too long. It was even suggested that there might be different triggers for the different areas. However, all felt that an unsatisfactory teaching evaluation needed to be addressed immediately with the department personnel committee and chair initiating a developmental plan immediately. B. Smith felt the two year trigger could be a problem with a new chair coming in mid year. A. Jaffe responded to the question asking if the board would go along with the overall unsatisfactory in all three categories. She pointed out that the committee opted to be less specific as to what "overall unsatisfactory" meant. It may not mean that one gets low in all categories. Illness and mitigating circumstances are addressed in #1. Other discussion suggested putting a statement in to "educate the board" stating that substandard performance in an area would be immediately addressed by the chair in a developmental fashion to point out that we are evaluated every year. A. Kaul reiterated that this document ultimately was going to President Fleming who would then craft it for the board. We are trying to guide him with this document. When asked if we had heard from other Faculty Senators on this issue, A. Kaul pointed out that it was talked about at the November meeting with the anticipation that the United Faculty Senate would take some kind of position in January. At that meeting, A. Kaul gave copies of our proposed document, saying that this was what we were thinking about. He didn't think any of the other Faculty Senators had discussed it other than Mississippi Valley who brought it up in September. If we are going to adopt this, he wants Southern Miss to help define the terms for discussion with the State Senate. He pointed out that this would be a position that we could live with. He hopes that each University could shape their own. T. Green asked if all eight presidents then would present separate recommendations. A. Kaul pointed out that when it came up at the Board, the President from Ole Miss asked them to give us time for the institutions to present something. As to presenting a unified front, the Council of Presidents may hash it out and whatever leaves that group will get presented to the IHL. This document will go, if adopted, to the Deans' Council, the Council of Chairs, the Provost and then finally the President.** At this point, J. Pat Smith proposed and M. Lux seconded to amend the wording in the policy to make it clear that we have annual evaluations already. He proposed adding the following in the first paragraph: "Each department will conduct an annual evaluation of all tenured professors. Substandard performance in any area will be addressed in each department's annual evaluation process and may entail faculty development plans and/or impact merit pay awards available during that year." K. Austin suggested to add "continue to" after the "will" in the first sentence and change "professors" to 'faculty'. It was suggested to change "substandard" to "unsatisfactory". It again was pointed out that this document might not be the actual one to go to the IHL Board, that Dr. Fleming would make that decision. The motion regarding the editorial suggestions was defeated. More discussion ensued regarding editorial changes. Upon discussion regarding what "unsatisfactory" was the committee felt the college would determine what that meant. J. Palmer noted that this came out of the Strategic Plan's idea about reevaluation and commented that there probably would be more inconsistency from college to college. **M. Dearmey moved and M. Gregg seconded to amend the document with more editorial changes. After much discussion the proposed changes were to renumber the paragraphs starting with the first paragraph as #1. Then reverse the first and second sentences in #1 so the second sentence was now the first and the first was now the second. It was pointed out that this was not substantive changes just editorial. The motion passed unanimously.

**J. Palmer questioned whether the review committee should act as an appeal committee. J. Palmer moved and D. Dunn seconded that this sentence be struck from the document: "If a majority of the review committee's finding are in agreement with the overall performance rating found in the annual evaluation, a professional development plan will be required." The motion passed unanimously.

**S. Oshrin moved and J. Palmer seconded striking in paragraph 2 "or universities" questioning the feasibility and cost of bringing someone in from another university for the time frame. He wanted it to state that "The members of the committee may come from one's own department of from other departments and colleges within the university." The motion passed.

**More discussion centered around the time frame for the trigger mechanism. M. Forster moved and B. Smith seconded that the trigger time go back to three years from the proposed two years. The motion was defeated with 12 in favor and 20 opposed. The trigger will stay at two years.

** The final vote on the post tenure review preamble and process as had been amended passed with 32 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention. The text of the resolution is available as a link on the post tenure review resolution page on the Senate web site.

6.1 Academic and Governance: Mary Lux

Information on the Post Tenure Review Policy resolution is covered under Old Business.

6.2 Administrative and Faculty Evaluation: Kimberley Davis

No report but the committee would like each Faculty Senator to poll their constituents regarding the process that occurs in their department and college for faculty evaluations. They especially would like to find out how each area handles the evaluations after they are finished, i.e., are they sealed, who sorts them, etc.

6.3 Archives: Shellie Nielsen No report.

6.4 Athletic Liaison: Trellis Green No report.

6.5 Awards: Lillian Range

L. Range noted that she is now a member of a university wide awards committee. She then pointed out that her committee has three awards this year- Teaching, University Service and Professional Service. The University Service and Professional Service awards deadline has been extended to January 21. For anyone nominated, only a vitae is required. All nominations should be put forward to Dr. Hollandsworth by calling in the nominee's name to that office. His secretary will then call the individual nominated and request the vitae. Professional service is in your profession and university service is to the university. These awards have money attached to them. As for the Endowment Awards, the winners have not been notified yet.

6.6 Benefits and Work Environment: John Rachal

The committee submitted two resolutions- one that deals with pressure some nine month faculty are feeling about teaching in the summer and the other that proposes the dissolution of the current salary equity committee. The second resolution deals with the problems connected with compression and long term equity that are not under the responsibilities of the current ad hoc committee. The following resolutions will be voted on at the next meeting.
Resolution on Summer Employment
The Faculty Senate resolves that summer employment for nine month faculty is not a right, but nor is it a requirement. It is understood that summer employment is not guaranteed for those who want it, but it should be equally understood that for those who do not want it, pressure on nine month faculty to teach in the summer violates the employee's contract, and therefore any form of punishment for not teaching in the summer is unacceptable.

Resolution on the Dissolution of the Current Salary Equity Committee
The Faculty Senate Resolves:
Given that the current ad hoc Salary Equity Committee (a) is not elected by faculty; (b) is not a standing university committee; (c) is gravely limited in its narrow charge of determining whether the distribution of the preceding year's raises was fair; (d) offers false hope to faculty who are appealing what they may consider long term inequities; and (e) falsely implies that the university has a comprehensive process for salary equity appeals, the Faculty Senate therefore urges the abolition of this committee.

6.7 Constitution and Bylaws: Allan McBride  No report.
6.8 Elections: Steven Lohrenz  M. Gregg reported that the committee is in motion preparing for the upcoming elections.
6.9 Environment (ad hoc): Dick Convill  No report.
6.10 Faculty Development: Karolyn Thompson  No report.
6.11 Technology: Dean Dunn  No report.
6.12 University Club: Kim Herzinger  No report.
6.13 Transportation Committee: Bill Scarborough  At the last meeting on November 24, the committee supports and approves the Faculty Senate's resolution calling for the enforcement of parking regulations. The problem is that there are no ticket writers. At the November 29 cabinet meeting, the Pedestrian and Bike plan was put forward by Vice President Gilbert. The gated lot, the assigned parking, and the price of fines and decals was set aside for further study. During the holidays they will be paving the lot west of the Theatre and Dance Building. The lot north of the Liberal Arts Building will be rezoned to a Zone 4 and 32 parking meters will be installed. In regards to the Senate's concern about directions to get to the Science areas on the other side of campus, B. Scarborough brought it up at this November meeting. It was suggested to formulate some directions to give to the guard at the entrance of campus that could be handed out. On other matters, the committee has requested that the city put pedestrian crossings on 4th Street, the architects for the Student Life project and the Commons have been selected, and the pedestrian bridge over Hardy Street is waiting for Mississippi Department of Transportation approval. It should be started in the spring. B. Scarborough's final point was that we just don't have enough ticket writers on campus. He plans to move on this next. The committee will have to go to Vice President Gilbert to get allocation through the police so that they can hire more ticket writers. At the moment, there are only one to two individuals writing tickets. Some faculty members are now writing tickets. John Rachal is one of them. He went and complained, got deputized and they gave him ticket books. Some faculty in the HP&R are also doing this between the HP&R Building and the Old Gym. If you want to be deputized, go to Cecil Wilson and complain. B. Scarborough pointed out that this was just a stop gap measure, and that they hope to hire more ticket writers. In answer to the question about parking meters in front of Owings-McQuagge, B. Scarborough did not feel they would go there initially until they tear down the Hartwig Arena Theater and make that a gravel parking lot.
6.15 Faculty Handbook Task Force: David Goff  No report.
7.0 New Business
7.1 M. Dayne Gregg had a colleague ask her to bring up the memo from the USM Post Office regarding the changes for metered mail. The individual was questioning that if the USM Post Office is a branch of the United States Post Office, why can't things be mailed here that can be mailed at the 40th street Post Office?
8.0 Announcements
9.0 Adjournment  The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Shellie C. Nielsen, Faculty Senate Secretary