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Faculty Senate Minutes

September 15, 2000


Members Represented by Proxy: D. Alford (J. Smith), T. Graham (B. Spencer), A. Jaffe (D. Hunt).

Members Absent: S. Graham-Kresge, E. Lundin

1.0 Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 2 p.m. Pres. Laughlin warmly welcomed senators to the new academic year, thanked senators for their response to requests for input on the Faculty Senate listserv, and drew attention to handouts on meetings, the constitution and bylaws, and committee composition and charges.

2.0 Approval of Agenda. Two items were added to the agenda. A report on the University Faculty Senates Association by A. Kaul was added as section 5.16 under Committee Reports; Kaul indicated that he planned to introduce a resolution concerning salaries. Pres. Laughlin added the upcoming faculty meeting on the 25th as 7.1 under New Business.

3.0 Minutes Approval. Minutes of the June meeting were approved as distributed, without additions or corrections.

4.0 Executive Committee Reports

4.1 President’s Report. Pres. Laughlin offered the following report:

IHL BOARD: The meeting on July 20th was just as contentious as earlier IHL Board meetings as reported by Art Kaul. The division seems to be between old board members who want to micromanage every action and newer board members who want to take a more hands-off, broad policy approach. One example of this came during the Academic Affairs Committee meeting where Commissioner Layzell moved to approve a number of things by a unanimous consent agenda (no debate, no discussion). These were things like foreign travel, commencement schedules, personnel action. When one of the board members attempted to pull things out of this group for discussion, she was told by the committee chair that she had been sent copies of this material prior to the board meeting and she should have read it. This kind of dissent continued throughout the day, and when a motion was made to adjourn, there was debate over that—some members wanting to continue discussion and others wanting to curtail discussion. I will be attending the next meeting at Delta State next Thursday for more of the same.

Interdisciplinary Studies Program: One issue of substance was the approval of an Interdisciplinary Studies Program on the Gulf Coast campus, which would give credit for life and professional experiences. In the Deans Council, the Provost expressed concern about rigorous evaluation of portfolios and the quality of evaluators. I’ve discussed this with Frank Glamser, the chair of Academic Council, and they will be looking at this.
**Budget Recommendation:** The IHL has recommended a 4% pay increase for university faculty and staff for next year’s budget.

**FUND RAISING SCHOOL:** On August 15th through 17th, the Development Office and the Vice President for Advancement sponsored a Fund Raising School in preparation for the University’s Comprehensive Campaign, which will probably be launched in February. Although I did not receive an invitation to the Fund Raising School in my capacity as Senate President, I was able to attend as a representative from the Library. During a break between meetings, Bill Pace told me that the Faculty Senate must play a leadership role in this campaign in order for it to be successful. When I get more information about what that role might be, I will pass that along to you. We will most likely invite Bill Pace or Curt Redden to be the forum speaker at one of our meetings at the time the campaign is announced. There was some concern expressed about the scheduling of the Fund Raising School; because it was held the week before fall classes, many department heads were able to attend only sporadically. There will be a 2% tax on gifts made during the Comprehensive Campaign; this tax will go to an unrestricted Development account which will pay the expenses of the campaign.

**CAMPUS MASTER PLANNING COMMITTEE:** The University has hired Lynn Craig, an architect and urban planner, to guide the university through a long range planning process, the purpose of which will be to come up with a plan for the physical environment of the campus. Richard Conville and Glenn Matlack are other faculty members of this committee. We have another meeting scheduled in November and there should be something for the University community to see sometime after that meeting.

**PRESIDENT’S CABINET:**

**Budget:** The University has already planned for a budget reduction that will take place in November. In other words, the cuts we experienced earlier this year should take care of the November reduction. There are concerns about possible cuts in next year’s budgets. President Fleming has said that additional cuts will affect academic quality and will kill any momentum we have. He has said that we must raise faculty and staff salaries and we are looking at tuition increases as a way to do this. We will also be looking at things we should not be doing, at new ways to economize, and at workloads.

**Biweekly Pay:** The biweekly pay issue has taken up most of two Cabinet meetings. The plan is for all employees to be on this payment schedule eventually, although there is no time line for this yet. Exempt 12-month employees will be next, and 9-month faculty will be the last group to be changed. I have had numerous requests from faculty and staff for the Senate to take some action in support of the staff on this issue.

**Commencement:** There is the possibility that the number of commencements will be reduced. The Faculty Senate has voted overwhelmingly to cut the August commencement if such a decision is made.

**Enrollment:** Total enrollment is up about 1%. The College of Business Administration is way up; Health and Human Science is down a little; the Gulf Coast is down.

**DEANS COUNCIL:**

**Carnegie Classification:** The rules for Carnegie Classification of universities have changed. The criterion for the highest level classification is based on having graduates in 15 different CIP codes over three years. The information we first submitted put us in the 2nd tier (Carnegie Research Intensive). We appealed and submitted data that broke our graduates out into additional CIP codes, and we won the appeal. We are now designated Carnegie Research Extensive, the highest classification.

**OFFICERS’ MEETING WITH PROVOST:** The Faculty Senate officers met with the Provost on August 25th. Issues that were discussed include: low faculty morale; technology funding; loss of faculty; positions
to technology; faculty promotions; lack of faculty input in substantive issues; Hattiesburg/Gulf Coast governance issues; possible rewrite of the Faculty Handbook; faculty summer responsibilities. The Provost said that the administration is seeking a $180 tuition increase which would put us at parity with the University of Mississippi and Mississippi State. IHL will be considering a system-wide tuition increase as well. We are asking for our parity increase first so that any system-wide increase will come on top of that.

Comments/questions on the President’s report:

J. Olmi observed that Dr. Fleming’s comments on the budget seem to contradict other statements made to the community.

J. Smith noted regarding the possibility of further budget reduction that there is a clause in faculty contracts, unlike those of public school teachers, that allows midyear salary reductions. Faculty should be on guard.

Regarding the bi-weekly payroll change, D. Cabana asked if there is a justification other than the administration prefers it, apparently based on software needs. Several senators expressed the desire to introduce some sort of resolution on the matter. Pres. Laughlin deferred the issue to discussion under the Benefits and Work Environment committee report.

M. Miller asked whether the amount Lynn Craig (consultant on planning) is being paid is public knowledge. Pres. Laughlin responded that she is not aware of the amount.

W. Scarborough asked about the provost’s pattern of response during the meeting with Senate officer; did there appear to be genuine concern? Pres. indicated that there was concern, but few ‘answers.’

D. Dunn noted that the mood of many on campus is evident in recent talk about holding back on United Way donations this year.

M. Dearmey stated that a great many faculty are unhappy with the administration; the expectation is that the Senate will act. Cuts of faculty positions already made will be virtually impossible to make up. Further cuts in all categories – faculty, tenure-track and part-time, staff – appear to be in the offing. The need for faculty budget officers engaged at every phase of the budget process is clear. Pres. Laughlin responded that the issue of faculty participation in the budget came up in the meeting of officers with the provost; she believes that the Senate can press that point successfully, and further that it is vital that this issue is aired in the meeting of the 25th.

D. Cabana suggested that cuts from faculty and staff in order to fund technology and other administrative priorities are likely to continue until faculty object strenuously.

4.2 President-Elect’s Report. No report.

4.3 Secretary’s Report. M. Forster thanked S. Nielsen (last year’s secretary) for her help in preparing to assume secretarial duties. Forster informed senators that D. Alford, secretary-elect, would manage the Senate listserv; and requested that senators check changes on the Senate website for errors.

4.4 Secretary-Elect’s Report. In D. Alford’s absence, M. Forster read proxies, and passed the meeting attendance roster.

5.0 Committee Reports. Pres. Laughlin invited senators to review the committee charges in the handout distributed.
5.1 **Academic and Governance.** No report. G. Stringer stated that administrative actions pose serious questions related to governance; faculty need data to back up concerns about executive decisions. M. Dearmey recommended analysis of the budget. P. Smith added that it is important to review several years, and not merely a single fiscal year. G. Rayborn observed that we know some things with certainty, notably that 19 faculty positions have been eliminated; academic affairs have 'taken the hit' for technology. G. Stringer said that Pres. Fleming appears to have a plan for the university, but faculty do not know what it is, since they have not been included in decision-making.

A series of comments on technology ensued:

J. Smith: Is the technology reallocation one-time or ongoing?

M. Dearmey: Since we are trying to make up very quickly for a long time in which there were no upgrades of technology, it seems inevitable that we will make heavy outlays for several years.

G. Rayborn: Where is the academic payoff of technology? Classrooms are not benefiting.

T. Green: It is becoming increasingly difficult to get 'old technology' repaired, even though such equipment is still essential.

D. Duheron: Faculty need to be at the table when decisions are made; over the last few years faculty have not been at the table.

Pres. Laughlin: Do we ask that question on the 25th?

D. Duheron: We need a definitive answer. Decisions have been made not to put available monies into faculty, and faculty have not been involved.

M. Miller: Technology issues are complicated and hard to discuss. It is difficult to contradict McGowan’s contentions in Dean's Council meetings that this or that must be changed or the whole system will collapse.

M. Cobb: You never make a one-time investment in technology; rather support must be continuous.

S. Hubble: We need hard facts in hand to make and defend any position we take. I support the idea of conducting a comprehensive study.

G. Stringer: We need a historical study of what has happened since Pres. Fleming’s began his administration. The Academic Governance committee is perhaps best fit to conduct such a study.

Pres. Laughlin directed the Academic Governance committee to undertake the study.

5.2 **Administration and Faculty Evaluations.** Evaluation of top administrators was briefly discussed. The general thrust was that more extensive evaluation is needed. D. Goff asked when five-year evaluations commence and what is the plan for implementation. A. Kaul stated that evaluations are to take place this year, but specifics are unclear. M. Dearmey noted that AAUP guidelines, endorsed by the Association of College and University Boards of Trustees, and the Council on Education, recommends sending annual evaluations of the president and the provost to the board of trustees. Such a practice at USM might exercise a restraining influence on the administration. Pres. Laughlin noted that at present the faculty do not evaluate either the president or the provost. K. Davis added that the evaluation of deans by faculty is irregular. J. Butts recommended further that assistant/associate deans be included in the evaluation process. No actions were proposed at this time.
RESOLUTION ON RETENTION AND DISPOSITION OF RECORDS

The Retention and Disposition Schedule has been prepared by the Faculty Senate Archives Committee in cooperation with the University Archivist to guide the Faculty Senate in determining which of its records should be transferred to University Archives and to establish a timetable for transferal. The intention of the Archives Committee and the University Archivist is to see that non-current records that are necessary for long-range administrative and research purposes are preserved indefinitely for public access in the University Archives, which serves as the institutional memory for the University of Southern Mississippi.

University Archives Authorization

1. The University Archives is established to serve as the repository for university records of historical value and lasting administrative significance, and for personal, professional, and organizational papers documenting the history of the University of Southern Mississippi.

2. Records produced or received in the transaction of university business by an employee, committee, department, or office of the university are property of the university. These records include, but are not limited to, correspondence, memoranda, minutes, reports, files, accounts, publications, photographs, films, tape recordings, artworks, and any other papers, graphic material, or computerized data.

3. The University Archivist may be called upon by any committee, department, or office of the university to advise on records management policies and procedures. Inactive records will be transferred to the custody of the University Archivist, in consultation with the office administrator (or comparable officer).

4. The University Archives operates in accordance with the provisions of the Mississippi Archives and Records Management Act of 1981 (Mississippi Code: Title 25, Chapter 59). The University Archivist serves as the liaison with the Mississippi Department of Archives and History and is charged with the responsibility of seeing that the University of Southern Mississippi complies with the provisions of the Archives and Records Management Act and other related laws governing records management and retention.

5. The University Archives operates in accordance with the provisions of the Mississippi Public Records Act of 1983 (Mississippi Code: Title 25, Chapter 61). A records access policy has been formulated and will be made available to the public upon request.

Access to Archived Records

Transfer of records is only undertaken after records become semi-active and will require only occasional administrative reference. The University Archives will provide routine reference services in regard to records, and arrangements can be made for a Faculty Senate representative to access the records if need be.

Restrictions on access to confidential records may be imposed where open access is in violation of the federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 or the Mississippi Public Records Act of 1983 (See University Archives Statement of Access Policies).

Arrangement of Faculty Senate Records

The Records of the Faculty Senate is a subgroup of the University Archives records group "University Committees." The subgroup is divided into five series identified below.

Records Series with Suggested Retention Schedule
Records that are judged to be of long-term legal, administrative, or historic value are eligible for transfer to the University Archives. These records are of the type that document the origin and creation of fundamental policies, illustrate significant procedures, and document ongoing operations. In regard to the USM Faculty Senate, records identified to have enduring value to the University are divided into the following series:

1. **Presidents' Files**

   Transfer to University Archives upon termination of presidential term of office.

2. **Minutes**

   Transfer two copies to University Archives annually along with any attachments. Other copies may be destroyed after two years.

3. **Committees**

   Review and transfer to archives the minutes, reports, working and supporting papers, and other records of enduring value that document the work of the committees. Transfer non-current records to University Archives annually. Records older than *three years* may be considered non-current.

4. **Budgets**

   Retain current year and two previous years. Transfer non-current records (older than three years) to University Archives annually.

5. **Correspondence**

   Transfer correspondence of enduring value not included in other series.

The resolution will be voted on at the October meeting.

**5.4 Athletic Liaison.** T. Green invited senators to share issues and concerns related to athletics. J Olmi recommended that athletics consider opening parking areas at halftime of various athletic events; at present many parking spots remain unused throughout games, yet they remain restricted. T. Green further asked for three volunteers to assist with a hospitality tent at each of the four home football games, and distributed a signup sheet.

**5.5 Awards.** No report.

**5.6 Benefits and Work Environment.** J. Rachal noted that the committee plans to meet monthly throughout the academic year. **Motion:** Rachal moved a change of committee name to the ‘Faculty Welfare Committee.’ **Second:** W. Scarborough seconded the motion. **Discussion:** J. Rachal explained that the word ‘benefits’ suggests too limited a committee focus. Various comments ensued:

D. Duhon observed that committee names are not prescribed by the Senate constitution, and therefore would seem to be within the chair’s discretion to change without Senate action.

S. Nielsen suggested consideration of the name, ‘Welfare and Work Environment.’

M. Dearmey stated that including ‘salary’ in the committee name might provide the proper emphasis.

Several senators expressed concern that the term ‘welfare’ carries an inevitable stigma.
Pres. Laughlin called for a vote. Motion carried.

Motion: J. Rachal moved that the Senate authorize Pres. Laughlin to write a letter of support for staff opposing the bi-weekly payroll change; the letter will be directed to V.P. Gilbert, with copies to Pres. Fleming and Tracy Townsend. Second: J. Butts seconded the motion. Discussion: J. Rachal explained that it is clear that the bi-weekly payroll decision is extremely unpopular among staff, many of whom will be adversely affected by the change. There is, further, great concern over the process by which the decision was made and how staff have been dealt with. A large number of senators offered comments:

J. Smith: Is there is universal opinion that this is definitely a bad thing over the long run? Perhaps we should support a choice of payroll schedule for current staff.

D. Dunn: Faculty can anticipate that they are next in line for the bi-weekly payroll conversion.

M. Miller: The payroll schedule could be set up to be twice monthly as easily as bi-weekly.

S. Magruder: It appears that PeopleSoft is driving the decision.

T. Green: V.P. Gilbert said as much when she spoke to Senate last academic year.

S. Oshrin: It was argued at the Association of Office Professionals meeting that separate payrolls are very expensive. Uniformity is the expedient business decision.

D. Duhon: In fact it is generally better to get paid more frequently. The issue, however, is the communication and implementation of the decision.

D. Cabana: The state of Florida made a similar payroll shift in the ’70s in two stages, first from monthly to bi-monthly, then to bi-weekly, with staff involvement throughout. As a result, there were no problems of adjustment for employees. By contrast, at USM the matter has been badly handled by the administration. This is not the first occasion of extremely poor communication; we suffered a fiasco over summer pay last year. Perhaps the administration will pay attention when there is a movement of faculty and staff to organize.

G. Rayborn: The Senate should stand shoulder-to-shoulder with staff, who simply cannot wait several paychecks to ‘catch up’ on pay. They deserve unambiguous support.

R. Smith: An annual state-of-the-union address by Pres. Fleming might improve communication. Details of key issues and upcoming actions could be explained in detail.

D. Dunn: It is ironic that 18 months ago the argument was that people could not wait a full month to get paid. Now, people who would rather wait are being forced to get paid every other week.

K. Austin: I think that being paid more frequently is in fact better, but communication on this issue has been horrid. I wish to support the staff without opposing a bi-weekly pay schedule per se.

W. Scarborough: I disagree that more frequent pay is better, since bills typically arrive at the beginning of each month.

D. Duhon: The larger issue is in fact the pathetically low staff salaries.
S. Hubble: A suggestion made at a staff meeting yesterday to stall schedule implementation until March (a three-check month) brought an unclear response, underscoring the communication problem. We need to push for improvement here.

D. Beckett: The administration has admitted that the conversion is primarily a matter of convenience. The decision has been ‘done’ to staff and will eventually be ‘done’ to faculty.

M. Lux: This is a case in which ‘technology’ is not helping us.

J. Olmi: It is not clear how running payroll twice per month is more efficient than doing so only once per month.

S. Oshrin: Twice per month makes it easier to deal with overtime.

D. Dunn: More frequent payrolls do not improve overtime recording; this argument is unconvincing. Moreover, it's unlikely that many staff will receive overtime.

Pres. Laughlin restated the motion and called for a vote. **Motion carried.**

J. Rachal introduced two resolutions to be voted on in October. The first addresses bi-weekly pay for faculty. The second addresses summer employment expectations. The text of each resolution follows:

**RESOLUTION ON BI-WEEKLY PAY**

WHEREAS:

1. Faculty are almost unanimous in their firm opposition to a bi-weekly play plan;
2. No state or federal law dictates that 'exempt from overtime pay' employees such as faculty must be paid on a bi-weekly schedule;
3. The implementation of such a plan will wreak havoc with many faculty's bill payment schedules;

THEREFORE:

Since implementation of such a plan is both injurious to faculty interests and represents administrative inflexibility in the face of near unanimous faculty opposition, faculty senate urges the administration to abandon all present and future plans for such a scheme.

**RESOLUTION ON SUMMER REMUNERATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

WHEREAS:

1. There are departmental, college, and university activities that need to be carried on in the summer just as they are during the rest of the year. Many nine-month faculty who teach in the summer willingly assume some of these activities even though they are not paid to do so. Administrators are examining the possibility of formalizing these additional responsibilities beyond teaching for nine-month faculty who teach in the summer without a change in the pay structure. This amounts to required but unremunerated work and thus an unfair addition of professorial duties. It would also severely exacerbate the unfairness of the current summer payment scheme.

2. Nine-month faculty at USM have for at least twenty years been paid a fixed amount by the course based on rank for summer teaching. In the case of full professors (the example
which will be followed throughout, though the issue applies to all ranks), this has been, in
the last several years, $3,000 per course (with an additional $500 in the last two years for
all faculty teaching nine-hour loads in the summer).

3. Clearly the per course remuneration concept, by definition, means that other, non-
course related tasks are unremunerated.

4. The university seems to wish to have its cake and eat it too, by paying summer faculty
well under half their normal rate of pay, yet expecting them to conduct all of the
responsibilities associated with the nine-month contract. This is so even though they are
specifically being paid by the course in the summer.

5. The mean salary for a full professor at USM for FY 1999-2000 was $71,229 based on
a nine-month contract (Institutional Planning and Analysis data). This represents $7,914
per month during the nine-month contract year. A full professor teaching a full load of
nine hours in the summer earns $3166 per month ($9500 divided by 3). Therefore, the
average full professor teaching full-time in the summer earns in a summer month almost
exactly 40% of what he/she earns per month during the nine-month contract period, even
though he/she is considered full-time in both periods. Put otherwise, the average full
professor takes a 60% pay cut to work full time in the summer, even though the summer
teaching load is actually heavier. When this heavier load factor is considered, the pay cut
is actually 65% (see items 6 and 7 below).

6. Since summer courses are ten weeks as compared to fall and spring courses which are
fifteen weeks, a nine-hour/three course summer load is equivalent to a 13.5 hour/4.5
course load in fall or spring. Thus a “full load” in the summer is in fact an overload.

7. Based on the official twelve hour teaching load during the nine-month contract period,
the average full professor is paid $1,978 per course, per month ($71,229 divided by nine
months, divided by four courses). In the summer the per course, per month amount is
$703 ($9500 divided by three months divided by 4.5 courses) or 35% of the fall and
spring paycheck for the equivalent amount of work, with non-teaching obligations being
implied but not specified or officially required. Again, however, it should be remembered
that many if not most summer faculty perform these non-teaching duties gratis.

8. Our sister institution, Mississippi State, pays 8% of a faculty member's nine-month
salary for each course taught in the summer up to a maximum of four courses, or 32%.
Thus that faculty member, though teaching a higher load, receives approximately the
same paycheck in the summer as in the fall or spring.

9. While there is paperwork associated with summer employment, there is no summer
contract.

10. Most faculty who teach in the summer probably do unremunerated tasks in the
summer out of a sense of commitment to their students. These include but are not limited
to reading doctoral proposals and dissertations, attending defenses, attending Preview,
advising new students, conducting research, reading comprehensive exams, participating
in committee meetings, department meetings, and the various other responsibilities of
being a professor. However, the possibility that summer employees would be compelled
to do these unremunerated tasks as a component of one's "contractual responsibility" (as
one chair has put it) would be seen as even more unfair than the current summer
remuneration system and unacceptably coercive.
11. By common consensus, summer pay at USM has always been exploitative. Full-time summer pay annualized for nine months would equal a salary of $28,500 ($9500 multiplied by three) for a full professor's regular nine-month contract.

12. Summer pay is clearly an issue in both hiring new faculty and losing existing faculty. At least one department on campus lost an existing faculty member to another comparable university where summer remuneration was commensurate with 9-month remuneration; the same department was unable to hire a faculty member from another in-state public institution due to the significant loss in summer pay.

THEREFORE:

Faculty Senate urges the administration to implement the summer pay plan set forth by Faculty Senate in 1997-98 and re-affirmed in 1998-99. This calls for paying summer faculty at a rate commensurate with their nine-month contract salary but divided in thirds based on the number of courses taught. That is, pay each summer course at the rate of 11% of the professor's nine-month salary. Additional duties similar to nine-month duties would therefore be quite naturally expected as a part of faculty's normal rate of pay. In other words, with the exception of part-time summer employees, pay faculty their normal salary and expect of them their normal work responsibilities.

However, given current budgetary constraints, Faculty Senate recognizes the difficulty of an immediate implementation of this plan. Faculty Senate therefore urges the administration to implement the following intermediate plan: Continue to pay faculty at the fixed rate, with a full load still defined as nine hours, but with three hours being released time for non-teaching duties. Thus a full load would be six hours of teaching and three hours other duties. A person could also have either a six hour part-time load teaching six hours with no other responsibilities (somewhat like an adjunct); a six hour part-time load teaching three hours and three hours conducting other duties; or a part-time three hour load either teaching three hours only, or conducting other duties only. Even here, the arrangement is extremely beneficial to the university in that a six hour summer teaching load equates to a 7.5 fall or spring load, or 2.5 courses. Thus the per course, per month pay in the summer for full professors would still be only $1,266 ($9500 divided by three divided by 2.5) as compared to $1,978 during fall and spring months. This still represents only 64% of what the average full professor earns per course during the nine-month contract period based on the official twelve hour load, or, conversely, a 36% pay cut compared to the nine-month contract period.

5.7 Constitution and Bylaws. No report.

5.8 Elections. No report. Pres. Laughlin noted that reapportionment is scheduled for this year.

5.9 Environment. No report. (D. Conville not in attendance.)

5.10 Faculty Development. No report.

5.11 Government Relations. J. Palmer reported as follows:

The committee met with Jim Borsig on August 1, 2000 to discuss how the Faculty Senate could be more actively involved in the legislative process. The committee discussed the possibilities of scheduling a legislative forum in October. Local legislators would be invited to discuss effective lobbying techniques from their perspective and a question and answer session would follow. Mr. Borsig indicated that the IHL 2001-2002 budget requests include a 4% pay raise for faculty next year. Also, the IHL is requesting that all money lost by cuts be reinstated. The Legislative Budget Committee (14 legislators, 7 from the house and 7 from the Senate, the Speaker and the Lt. Governor) began meeting last Tuesday. They will meet most of the month of September to hear budget requests and begin work on the revenue estimates for FY 2002. The IHL will make its presentation to the LBC on September 27, 2000. The next 30 days are significant in the
budget process. At the end of September the revenue estimates for the first quarter of the fiscal year will be tabulated; this provides the first review of the current expenditures and revenues. Also, the Legislative Budget Committee will complete its deliberations and release its proposed budget in late October or early November. The Governor normally releases his proposed budget after the LBC presents a plan. However, Governor Musgrove has already released his proposed plan. Since the Governor's plan is usually ignored by the legislature this may be an attempt by the Governor to have a better bargaining position in the FY 2001-2002 budget discussions. At least it will give him first coverage with the media.

J. Palmer queried senators on a number of related items. First, is there desire to host a legislative reception, and if so, should a reception be co-sponsored with Staff Council and the Student Government Association? The general consensus was that a reception would indeed be worthwhile, and that co-sponsorship is desirable. Next, would senators find a lobbying handbook useful? Again, the consensus was in the affirmative. Finally, how might the committee best serve the faculty? J. Smith suggested selecting a small number of key issues, ideally from the IHL’s package, and lobbying aggressively for them. G. Stringer recommended protesting USM’s unfair treatment in funding; such a protest might extend beyond legislators. D. Goff concurred, noting that Pres. Fleming has begun pushing legislators on the inequity issue at least since last spring. D. Dunn observed that increased enrollments compound the inequitable funding problem.

5.12 Technology. D. Dunn reiterated technology-related concerns expressed by Faculty Senate last year. Technology committees have been dissolved, eliminating opportunities for faculty input. Technology advances are not evident in classrooms; many classrooms in fact lack basic resources. The Office of Technology Resources typically responds to faculty complaints with condescension and boasting about the progress being made. Resources appear to be disappearing down an OTR ‘black hole.’

Departments which previously paid for hardwiring will now need to pay for wireless hookup. Dunn invited M. Cobb to join and perhaps chair the committee, reporting that he is frustrated both personally and professionally. M. Cobb noted that she too sees little classroom benefit to technology developments thus far, citing a new lab that was not outfitted with internet connections. Numerous comments followed:

S. Nielsen concurred that lack of benefit to classroom instruction is a primary concern of faculty in the allocation of resources to technology. Further, departments with inadequate budgets cannot take advantage of technology advances.

S. Oshrin observed that there is a new move to create tech committees in each college, representatives of which meet at the university level, which is intended to provide connection between faculty and OTR.

M. Cobb: The recently distributed OTR survey seems designed primarily to rationalize the existence of OTR itself.

K. Austin: Rumor has it that OTR has a budget line of $20,000 for working lunches related to PeopleSoft installation.

D. Douglas: 100 students in graphic design must share 18 computers, which are used by other majors as well. She herself teaches a computer program, yet had to buy her own computer.

D. Dunn: Concerned faculty should attend the meeting with administration on the 25th and express dissatisfaction.

M. Miller: We should remain focused on the strategic plan, which emphasizes academics. At present academics are being sacrificed for technology, rather than technology serving academics. The question must be how the investment in technology furthers the strategic plan and the university’s mission of teaching, research and service?
5.13 Transportation. W. Scarborough made a number of points:

Scarborough believes that the new campus signs are a good thing, though students do not appear to pay much notice.

Last year the Senate asked the university to start ticketing on day one of classes. Tickets were issued for two days, but in response to student protests all tickets were voided, and those who had already paid tickets were reimbursed. Student Government Association Pres. Nathaniel Anderson stated that he was not aware of Senate position when he protested the ticketing.

Scarborough introduced a resolution condemning administrative disregard of the earlier Senate resolution. Text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON PARKING REGULATION ENFORCEMENT

WHEREAS:

1. There is not now and never has been a stipulation in the USM Traffic and Parking Regulations that students must be accorded a grace period during the first week of each semester;

2. The Senate unanimously approved a resolution last fall requesting that parking violators be ticketed beginning with the first day of classes;

3. The University Transportation Committee unanimously endorsed said resolution;

4. Following a protest from the SGA President, the Administration unilaterally decided to void all tickets issued during the first week of classes this semester;

THEREFORE:

The Senate condemns this blatant disregard for the wishes of the faculty and reiterates its urgent request that parking regulations be enforced from the first day of the next and all subsequent semesters.

This resolution will be voted on at the October meeting.

Parking now is within the administrative scope of V.P. Gilbert, who has stated she is in favor of strong measures to enforce parking regulations, including the end of visitor passes.

Gated lots are now in limbo.

The overhead bridge on Hardy Street will not be built; discussion has turned toward an underground tunnel.

R. Pierce, chair of the university parking committee, is proposing a significant parking fee increase to pay for construction of a garage. Proposed is a faculty fee increase to $100, with $200 for reserved parking; student and staff parking fees would rise to $50. Yet parking rule enforcement is only token at present, due to the limited number of ticket writers. There are never more than four writers, and they are often detailed to other duties. (V.P. Gilbert states that she plans to hire additional ticket writers, and a supervisor.) At the same time, there is strong opposition to allowing faculty to write tickets. Therefore, Scarborough introduced a resolution opposing any major increase in parking fees without additional enforcement. The resolution text follows:
RESOLUTION ON PARKING/TRANSPORTATION FEES

WHEREAS:

1. The faculty received no pay increases this year and budget projections indicate little likelihood of raises in the foreseeable future;

2. Medical co-payments and prescription drug costs continue to rise each year;

3. Enforcement of parking regulations in Zones 4 and 5 is only token at best with little likelihood of improvement in the near future;

THEREFORE:

The Senate emphatically rejects any proposal to increase substantially parking/transportation fees until such time as salary increases are resumed and parking regulations in Zone 4 and 5 lots are rigorously and consistently enforced.

This resolution will be voted on at the next Senate meeting.

5.14 AAUP Liaison. M. Dearmey stated that reports from faculty suggest that the provost turned down people recommended for tenure and/or promotion through every level of review. Moreover, the provost appears to be relying on the judgment of a ‘new’ committee composed of the V.P. for Research, the dean of the graduate school, and himself; the evaluation criteria used by this committee is not clear. Such action is a violation of AAUP policy, and faculty should oppose it.

Pres. Laughlin noted that the provost has stated that seven out of 70 faculty considered for tenure and/or promotion were turned down.

J. Palmer asked about the source of information on cases. M. Dearmey responded that he was told of six cases by the faculty members themselves. J. Palmer urged caution given the confidential nature of the material.

G. Stringer suggested discussion with D. Wheeler, chair of the university tenure and promotion committee, in order to determine facts.

D. Cabana reported that in his own case he met with both Dr. Henry and Dr. Fleming. Their position seems to be that faculty committees never turn anybody down, so it is up to the administration to make the tough calls. Cabana recommended that faculty committees be eliminated if they are not to have standing. Rule changes should be clearly stated and publicized.

M. Dearmey informed the Senate that the administration risks censure by AAUP if faculty committee decisions on tenure and promotion are overturned. Such censure would be a serious ‘disgrace’ to the administration. Dearmey recommended strongly that the administration be challenged on this issue. W. Scarborough commented that history suggests it is not easy to get AAUP involved; unequivocal evidence is needed.

5.15 Faculty Handbook Task Force. D. Goff reported that the provost’s office wants to work on revision of the handbook. M.J. McMahon, the new associate provost, indicated to the Senate executive committee that the 3rd year review in particular needs careful review. As a result, the task force will continue working. Some changes in composition of the task force will be needed due to Senate membership changes.
5.16 University Faculty Senates Association. A. Kaul (Association of Faculty Senates president) noted that the SREB ranking of Mississippi has not changed, and introduced a resolution endorsing an IHL proposal of a three-year commitment of 4% raises each year. Text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON SALARY INCREASES

WHEREAS:

The Faculty Senate of The University of Southern Mississippi recognizes the following historic pattern regarding faculty salaries:

1. The salaries of Mississippi's public four-year college and university faculties have not grown at rates as high as those of all worker & regardless of level of education, over the past 25 years,

2. The faculty of Mississippi's public four-year college and universities have gone without pay raises in five of the past 15 years [on average, one of every three years],

3. Faculty salaries have not grown at rates as high as those of other workers with advanced levels of education over the last 10 years,

4. Average salaries for Mississippi's public four-year college and university faculty ranked No. 12 among the 16 SREB states in 1998-99, reflecting the same rank of a decade earlier.

5. Mississippi's college and university faculty received no salary increase for the 2000-2001 academic year,

6. The cost of living, including rising medical insurance premiums, is increasing at the same time salaries are stagnant, thus, faculty experience an erosion in their salaries,

7. The Mississippi Legislature in the year 2000 committed itself to raising the salaries of public school teachers based on projected revenues,

8. The IHL has recommended to the Legislature 4% pay raises for college and university faculty in each of the next three years;

THEREFORE:

The Faculty Senate of The University of Southern Mississippi:

Endorses the IHL proposal for a legislative commitment of 4% pay raises for college and university faculty in each of the next three years;

Urges the University Faculty Senates Association of Mississippi to endorse and to vigorously support the principle of consistent and equitable annual salary increases for all public four-year college and university faculty;

Urges Gov. Ronnie Musgrove, Lt. Gov. Amv Tuck and the Legislature to provide leadership to assure consistent, equitable and fair annual salary increases for public school teachers and University faculty, including the commitment to raise college and University faculty salaries to the SREB average.

[end of resolution]
D. Dunn **moved** that the rules be suspended so that the resolution could be acted on today. P. Smith **seconded** the motion. **Discussion:** none. Motion to suspend the rules **passed** unanimously. Subsequently, A. Kaul **moved** that the resolution be adopted. J. Rachal **seconded** the motion. **Discussion:** J. Olmi noted that the public school teachers got a commitment to raises only because of pressure placed on the governor and the legislature. A. Kaul stated that it is deeply troubling that we have had so many years without raises. Kaul is urging the state association of faculty senates to take a position on this issue. Motion to adopt the resolution **passed** unanimously.

J. Palmer urged the Senate to stick to ideas and issues, and to avoid personalizing discussions.

**6.0 Old Business.** There was no old business to consider.

**7.0 New Business.**

**7.1 Faculty-Administration Meeting of the 25th.** Pres. Laughlin recommended that given the lateness of the hour, faculty should make suggestions on questions to pose to the administration directly to her. Pres. Laughlin will work with the executive committee to compose questions that will be forwarded to the administration for response.

Pres. Laughlin explained the expected format of the meeting: She will first present each of the five questions followed by administrative response, then moderate an open forum.

W. Scarborough reiterated the ‘big issues’ of technology and its impact on faculty positions and classroom instruction; procedures related to tenure and promotion decisions; and the general sense that we seem to be moving in the wrong direction, stripping faculty of decision making input.

J. Butts asked what sort of answers we are likely to receive. Pres. Laughlin emphasized the importance of having the discussion, though faculty may not find administrative positions to their liking.

D. Dunn suggested posting questions and answers on the faculty senate website.

Other concerns were expressed:

J. Olmi restated concern over poor communication; he has made requests to the provost and the president six months ago that have not even been acknowledged. Also of concern is the possibility that some department heads have intimidated staff around protesting the bi-weekly pay issue.

M. Miller asked about accounting on the strategic plan at this point; is there any accounting?

M. Dearmey expressed concern over the administrative appointment of faculty to committees; according to AAUP guidelines on governance, faculty serving on committees should be elected by faculty according to faculty criteria. In particular, faculty should elect faculty budget officers.

W. Scarborough flagged the continuing expansion of administration. M. Dearmey noted the number of administrators involved in fund-raising. Pres. Fleming pledged to focus on fund-raising; it is not clear why other fund-raisers are necessary.

J. Olmi asked if benefit issues should be raised at the meeting. The general opinion was that benefits are a legislative and not administrative issue.
A question was raised regarding the duties of the new associate provost and their relationship to the duties of the provost. Pres. Laughlin indicated that the Senate may invite both Dr. McMahon and Dr. Henry to speak to the Senate.

8.0 Announcements. No announcements were made.

9.0 Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Michael Forster, Faculty Senate Secretary.