Faculty Senate Minutes - September 21, 2001

USM Faculty Senate
The University of Southern Mississippi
Faculty Senate Meeting
September 21, 2001
Union Hall of Honors
2:00 p.m.


Members Represented by Proxy: College of Liberal Arts: D. Cabana (A. Kaul), D. Goff (A. Kaul). College of Education & Psychology: S. Alber (J. Rachal). USM-Gulf Coast: S. Naghshpour (P. Smith). Several members who had to leave the meeting at 3:00 left written notice of proxy assignment, but no votes were taken after 3:00 so the proxies took no action.


1.0 Call to Order by Pres. Hubble at 2:03 pm

2.0 President Hubble: Added two items to the agenda-- 7.3, Transportation committee report; and 7.4, Resolution by J. Palmer regarding "In God We Trust." Art Kaul's report on UFSA in the President’s report.

VOTE: Approval of Agenda (Moved--Hall, Seconded--Duhon)

3.0 VOTE: Approval of Minutes (Moved--Lytle, Seconded--Miller)

4.0 Forum

Ms. Susan Hollandsworth, University Development: Capital Campaign

This is the first time for us to address faculty. (Literature handed out). We are asking you to ask others to support USM through gifts. We (Univ. Dev) met with Staff Council earlier to ask for their support. We are not asking for specific dollar amounts. We understand that this is a pretty brazen thing to do in light of no raises and in light of other important causes like those originating from last week’s events. What is important is that you participate. Consider taking up as new business today a motion that would support me or Susan Hubble going to other faculty to ask them to participate in the campaign in any way they want--in any amount. We are required to send in a report to show our university participation. It is not one of our official goals, but I think it is easy to achieve. One of the good things since this summer is that Dr. Lucas is going out into the community to solicit support from constituents. For us to go out into the community and tell about our participation here is a very strong statement. Just to give you an idea--and I am assuming everybody has committed to memory the campaign priorities-- they are scholarship, athletics, faculty and staff development, the Gulf Coast campuses, the libraries and technology. And there are dollars that are falling into the “other” category just because there are donors who wish to make specific gifts. This pie chart shows that there has been $12 M given to faculty and staff since July 1997 through this August. That’s pretty impressive when you think of all the dollars that have come in. Right now we are at $63,783,039.00, when taken at face value--the way that most institutions report these gifts. One last
plug--the founders society brochure--this explains how people can leave donations in their will. Notice Founders Society Plaque downstairs in the Union. It is these windfalls that have put some universities on the map. Are there any questions about what I am asking here today--for all faculty to participate? (No response). Does it seem doable?

B. Scarborough: No. I appreciate what you are doing, but you can’t ask staff members, for example, to give from their own pockets when they are barely getting by. There have been no raises in three years. Others, perhaps.

S. Hollandsworth: Well, if today you could lend support to our approaching others, then that would help. Consider that. Thank you.

Pres. Hubble: Let us break from Robert’s Rules for a moment. What Susan has asked me to do is write a letter of support on behalf of the Faculty Senate. Would there be any strong objections? (No response). I will proceed with such a letter.

Pres. Hubble: Our next speakers are Candy Santell (Director of OTR), Lynn Harper, and Eddie Williams. Lynn and Eddie are the authors of the technology grant that will put money into classroom technology. I have asked them to come and explain the grant and how we can have a role in deciding how that money is allocated.

E. Williams: It’s always good to have a little money--you can make friends very fast. Lynn Harper and I have been working on this grant for a while. This is our third attempt. This is a Title III grant through the Department of Education. There are about 35 of these grants awarded throughout the U.S. Very highly competitive--you pretty much have to have a perfect score on the application. We holed up for spring break to write the 370-page grant and we got funding. There are 35 grants awarded this year, a total of about $70M. Our portion of this is $1.78M over five years. It is written by the Dept of Ed guidelines. You have a handout that lists the activities of the Grant. First, the Major Projects or Goals:. Two major activities of this grant. I will talk about the first one, then Lynn will speak on the second one. First activity for the first year is to purchase equipment for academic programs --we had to use the planning document that was already in place here at the university. We used the Strategic Plan and the technology survey that you filled out last fall. We linked goals of the grant to goals of the university.

The Strategic Plan calls for technology to be developed in the “highly visible” programs. Maurine Ryan is heading up the committee to make recommendations so you may want to have input to that committee. During the first year we will be identifying specific classrooms and classroom needs (for technology). In the second year we will actually get into the implementation of equipment in the classrooms. We’ll also be purchasing what we call 10 configurations in our learner pool of equipment. We’ve always had a pool of equipment that we have loaned out to classrooms for teaching purposes. The first year there will be 10 of these configurations purchased and in years after we will purchase more. In the second year we will purchase permanent equipment for classrooms. Over the life of the grant we will have approximately $1M for equipment. That gives you an idea of what you will see during the first year of the grant. Lynn will now talk about the faculty development part of the grant.

L. Harper: We have been working on faculty development for some time already in addition to what all the colleges and departments are doing under the umbrella of the expanding excellence group--which has been focused on technology applications and training. When we started thinking about what we could do to help you incorporate technology into your classrooms and into the curriculum, we realized we would need money to do this. We know that we are not the best people to decide how to incorporate technology into the classroom so there are two specialists who will be hired as part of the grant to help--an instructional designer who will help faculty incorporate technology into teaching. The second person will be a full time trainer. If you want to develop some specialized material, this second person will help you develop these materials. The university has committed to opening a faculty technology assistance lab and we don’t know when we will break out the champagne for this, but it will happen. These two people will be housed in that
One thing that came out of the faculty technology survey was that there was no incentive for faculty to use more technology in teaching. We considered this and there will be some small stipends for faculty. We will establish mentorships that are technology related. Some cash or money for equipment (if the faculty prefers) will be provided for specific classroom projects and then the person would mentor another faculty member. That’s the kind of incentive we built into the grant. One thing that you can look forward to is that we will be surveying you again and again. I think we got the grant because of the assessment component. They looked at that and concluded that we really cared to know about how successful these changes were. This has been a really long story to tell you that there are neat things happening.

E. Lundin: Do we know where the center will be established?

L. Harper: What is now the Gunn Materials Center in the Owings-McQuage. Gunn will be placed in the library. Space allocation committee has given us that space.

E. Harrison: Will you ask faculty to write proposals?

L. Harper: Committee led by M. Ryan will develop these specific goals using the Strategic Planning document. The “highly visible” programs mentioned in the planning document have not really been identified so the committee will do this. Please inform your dean if you would like to be on that committee.

E. Williams: We are not an academic program at OTR. We won’t be making those decisions.

L. Harper: Although the grant has come to OTR, it is very much about teaching an learning and you know more about that than we do at our office.

J. Palmer: I am glad to see that the Strategic Planning Document has been used in this way. The people who worked on that document spent lots of time on it.

M. Miller: Overall, is this focused on undergraduate programs?

L. Harper: About half of the money must go to “highly visible undergraduate programs,” but half goes to those that are not in that category.

M. Forster: Are you already writing the grants to go on beyond 2006?

L. Harper: We’re here looking for help on that!!

E. Williams: I’ve already got spring break covered. We’re going to send Lynn out to Lowe’s to get duck tape.

L. Harper: That’s for me to put over my mouth. Think if we had this whole room full of people working on it.

Pres. Hubble: Thank you for coming. We know how much effort it takes to get external funding.

5.0 Executive Committee Reports

5.1 President’s Report: Susan Hubble
I think you have read about events this summer in the newspaper [regarding President Fleming’s resignation]--some of it was actually accurate. Let’s go on with more recent events-- yesterday’s IHL Board Meeting. After some discussion there was a decision to proceed with CICE building, Student Life Center, and Polymer Science renovations. I think that that is just another phase of the contracts. Second item concerning USM was the Programs Productivity review. The board reviewed the critical mass numbers for all academic programs--845 statewide. We will be involved in whatever is defined as a Department or a school. The review is mandated by the state on a regular basis. The Board staff recommended and the Board passed a review based on four criteria: 1) student demand, 2) curricular support service, 3) alignment with university mission, and 4) statewide work force. The initial triggers were based on the first two criteria. From those triggers they have identified High, Moderate, and Low Productivity programs. At the undergraduate level, LOW student demand is 15:1, students:faculty. LOW curricular support is less than 225 credit hours generated by a faculty member in a year. HIGH productivity is greater than 20:1 (student demand) and 405 or greater credit hours generated per faculty member (curricular support). At Master’s Level, they look at graduation rates: LOW is 3 or fewer over five years average. Doctoral Level: LOW is 1.5 graduates over five year average. So the impact at USM is that out of approximately 43 undergraduate programs, 9 have been triggered as low productivity. We have 20 at the Master’s level and 6 at the Doctoral level. These numbers are not disproportional to other institutions. We need to take these numbers with a grain of salt. This may be new programs that need more time to develop or they may be a programs that have a master’s of arts and a master’s of science and for calculation purposes were treated as separate programs. The timeline: Dr. Griffin has forwarded this information to the deans and the process will be discussed at next week’s Deans Council. Discussions with board will be February, early 2002. Only those targeted programs will be discussed and there will not be a campus wide review.

J. Lytle: Do we know what programs?

Pres. Hubble: The deans learned this yesterday. Discussion has been delayed until the Board had voted yesterday.

J. Rachal and others: Asked for clarification, repetition of numbers given above.

Pres. Hubble: In my discussions with Griffin, it seemed as though a closer look at targeted programs will show that there are really very few problems.

P. Smith: Is it one or the other criterias for a trigger?

Pres. Hubble: It is one or the other. If one is triggered then you look at the other which may be all right and that would mean that the program is doing OK.

J. Olmi: Student to faculty ratio considered at grad programs?

Pres. Hubble: No, just graduation rates.

M. Forster: Is this anything more than a routine review?

Pres. Hubble: I think it is routine and Board needs to do this before going to the legislature. They need to show that they are being good stewards of the state appropriation. The second item is the presidential search. Virginia Shanteau Newton is the chair. The Board has hired a consultant with the Cornferry firm in Dallas and the consultant has a good record of placing university presidents: Texas A&M, Ohio State, U of Illinios, U of Texas, Ole Miss and Mississippi State. The chair of the university committee will be Andy Griffin. Griffin will have input into the university advisory committee--recommendations will be made to the Board. That should happen in the next month. He should make these recommendations at next Board meeting. I spoke with Ms. Newton--she is concerned about fairness. I think we are lucky to have her
overseeing this process. She seems interested in our input. I stressed to her that I felt that the makeup of the committee needed to strongly represent on-campus constituency groups more than off-campus groups. I will reinforce that concept.

K. Green: This consultant is making $150,000 the other search-consulting group is being paid differently. Do you know why the difference?

Pres. Hubble: No.

B. Scarbourough: Could you tell Shanteau-Newton that we should not be limited to presidents and provosts as candidates. I think that in the past it has led to us having a very weak pool to choose from. Maybe a big dean from an Ivy League school would have more to offer.

M. Miller: I agree with that. We want to have someone up and coming, someone who is ready to be innovative, not someone looking to retire.

M. Dearmey: What did you mean about constituency on campus?

Pres. Hubble: Rather than off campus groups from the community.

M. Dearmey: I don’t think all on-campus groups should be equally represented. The faculty is the core of the university. There is a new strategic planning committee being formed and the faculty should have the bulk of the say. I feel strongly about that.

Pres. Hubble: I would like to welcome two new members: Rosalba Esperragoza Scott (K. Austin) and Dr. Anne Wallace (G. Stringer) who will be completing terms for colleagues. K. Austin has taken partial retirement and G. Stringer felt that his spouse’s appointment as a Dean might be perceived as a conflict of interest. I have just talked to Don Cabana -- he has spent most of the last month in the hospital. He has had a pacemaker implanted and he sends thanks to you for your best wishes.

A. Kaul: The University Faculty Senates Association passed four resolutions (9/20/01). The first concerned a request for Governor, Lt. Governor, and legislature to commit to provide a 4% salary increase to faculty and staff next year. The second was a request for accurate and fair representation of Mississippi population on the IHL. The third resolution was designed to establish a systematic process of evaluating university presidents. (Full resolution was distributed). The fourth resolution proposed setting up joint meetings between the UFSA and the IHL Board twice a year to discuss those issues that are of common concern.

Pres. Hubble: Art and Sherry are our representative and it looks like they will be busy.

S. Laughlin: It was a very productive meeting. The IHL representation resolution looked pretty shaky at first, but Art talked them through it and it ended at a good place.

Pres. Hubble: Are you still the president of the UFSA, Art?

Kaul: Yes, this is my last year.

5.2 President-elect Report. Don Cabana, absent

5.3 Secretary’s Report: Darlys Alford; Announced Proxies (see above)

5.4 Secretary Elect’s Report: Toby Graham, absent.
6.0 Old Business, none.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Standing Committee Organizational Meetings. Pres. Hubble: Called on committees to meet for 15 minutes for personal introductions and planning for year’s goals.

7.2 Possible Spring Meeting at USM-GC. D. Alford suggested that the March Faculty Senate Meeting be held at USM-GC and that it include a tour of the new buildings, which will be completed by that time. She presented this as a motion, Olmi seconded. VOTE: Approved March meeting on the coast.

7.3 Transportation Committee

B. Scarborough: Transportation is back under Joe Paul and Wilson, former police chief. He reports to Eddie Holloway. Enforcement this fall began on day one in faculty lots only. Twice as many ticketers are employed this year and in our area it is much better already. A new building will create some problems this year. Booting: after three tickets, booted, and to get car, must pay for tickets. Speech and Hearing, places were changed from student to faculty and a crosswalk and flashing lights were installed at new dormitory. Visitor passes are being issued. No progress on the gated lot.

Olmi, Palmer, Oshrin, and several other senators made specific suggestions to the committee through Scarborough

M. Dearmey: AAUP during last year we had a call for a campus-wide AAUP. Two meetings were well attended so we now have a chapter. We will have an AAUP chapter meeting and elect officers in October. Greg Brian went to a workshop on how members can lobby legislators. Tinkering around on the computer I found that there is an organization called Association of Governing Boards. IHL belongs to this organization and they have guidelines they must follow. The organization tries to get member Boards to abide by these standards. The selection of president should never be imposed. Faculty should have strong input. Rumors that I have heard are horrific. AGB has documents in print. I will see what is in these documents. I’ll bet the IHL has copies and I want to be sure that they live up to the guidelines [for President’s search]. I would rather have a very creative dean than someone from Pearl River Junior College.

7.4 Resolution on a national motto.

J. Palmer: Introduced proposed resolution that had been distributed to all members. He suggested that senators review the resolution and come for discussion and vote at next meeting. The motto “In God We Trust” is required to be displayed in public schools. The proposal would establish this policy in the university classrooms.

8.0 Announcements

Pres. Hubble: For those who are missing a place card, we will be getting the nameplates.

M. Hall: At a curriculum meeting of faculty in Science and Technology, I was asked to say that there are a lot of instances where classes were supposed to be capped. Other people outside the department override the number without contacting the department for approval. It is a problem in labs where there is limited space for students to safely be accommodated.

Pres. Hubble I will refer that to the technology committee. In PeopleSoft they will want specific examples. We could ask Gail Russell in Geology for examples and these problems can be tracked down. Direct information to Jim Miller
J. Olmi: Our students are having severe problems with financial aid. Some students do not have enough money to eat while they are waiting for their financial aid to arrive.

B. Coates: Students are getting their classes dropped because financial aid is late.

J. Olmi: Losing documents, losing applications, losing tuition waivers are all problems. Address changes are not getting made in some cases. Those are just four examples.

A. Wallace: My daughter had to go again and again to get the 50% reduction due dependents. We finally found someone who helped us.

S. Laughlin: I need that name; I am having that problem, too.

K. Greene: There will be a forum on the WTC attack. Wednesday, Stout Hall, 7:00pm. USM Mail gives details.

B. Scarborough: Student problem is coming up. They are going to have to pay 10 cents for everything they have to download. Maybe the technology committee could take this up.

S. Laughlin: It is the OTR labs.

Scarborough: I would like a rationale for charging the students that much.

D. Douglas: When we have classes in those labs, will we have to pay? No Response.

9.0 Adjournment  3:51 pm