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May Meeting (continuation on June 20, 2003)

Union Hall of Honors

2:00 p.m.

Members Present: College of the Arts: Kimberly Davis, Tony Lewis, Shellie Nielsen; College of Business: College of Education & Psychology: Taralynn Hartsell, Joe Olmi, John Rachal; College of Health & Human Sciences: Susan Hubble, Mary Frances Nettles; College of International and Continuing Education: College of Liberal Arts: Susan Malone, John Meyer, Bill Scarborough; College of Marine Science: Julia Lytle; College of Nursing: Kathleen Masters; College of Science & Technology: David Beckett, Peter Butko, Ray Folse; University Libraries: USM-Gulf Coast: Darlys Alford, Kathy Davis, Shadad Naghshpour

Members Represented by Proxy: College of the Arts: College of Business: David Duhon (Susan Malone); College of Education & Psychology: Jesse Palmer (J. Olmi); College of Health & Human Sciences: Joyous Bethel (M. Forster); College of International and Continuing Education: Mark Miller (J. Olmi); College of Liberal Arts: Jerry Matson (Susan Malone), Phil Gentile (Amy Chasteen Miller), Amy Young (Jerold Waltman), Melanie J. Norton (Mary Beth Applin); College of Marine Science: College of Nursing: Anna Brock (K. Masters) College of Science & Technology: Mary Dayne Gregg (Mary Lux), G. Russell (Denis Wiesenburg), Margot Hall (Mary Lux) USM-Gulf Coast: Kathy Davis (Pat Smith)

Members Absent: College of the Arts: College of Business: James Crocket, Trellis Green; College of Education & Psychology: Ed Lundin; College of Health & Human Sciences: Susan Graham-Kresge; College of International and Continuing Education: College of Liberal Arts: Don Cabana, Michael Dearnemy, Lisa Nored Stephen Oshrin; College of Marine Science: College of Nursing: College of Science & Technology: Bob Coates, Maria Cobb, Gerald Mattson; University Libraries: USM-Gulf Coast:

May Meeting

(Reconvened at 2:00)

[Myron: Our first order of business is to continue the recessed May meeting and then adjourn the May meeting and continue with the June meeting. Before I do that I want to welcome everybody and hope that you have had a good summer. Our main agenda from the carryover of May is the election of officers. We actually had a pseudo nominating committee, meaning myself, Toby, and Joe. We have a slate of nominees]
to present. It is not an extensive slate, but it is a good slate. I checked with the Constitution regarding nominations from the floor. I’ve asked colleagues to nominate these Senators from the floor. Let me just say who the slate consists of. (Myron goes on to present the slate of nominees.) The nominators and voters are those May Senators because this is a continuation of the May meeting. With that I will formally open the floor for nominations. Nominations are offered for each position alphabetically beginning with President-Elect of the Senate followed by the Secretary-Elect position.]

8.0 Election of Officers

8.1 President-elect

8.1.1 Nominees:

8.1.1.1 Darlys Alford: nominated by Kimberly Davis, seconded by John Meyer

8.1.1.1.1 Before making statements regarding the nomination, Dr. Alford expressed appreciation at being nominated. Alford briefly offered her platform for president-elect; “improved information/data gathering to present the causes of the Faculty Senate and staff in an effort to gain support and to educate them (others) as well as ourselves about the problems as they are. We, as the Faculty Senate, should model what we expect from the Administration, (i.e. respect for diversity, open communication). This is a critical testing time for the Senate. This will allow us to gain more power during these difficult times.”

8.1.1.2 David Beckett: nominated by Ray Folse, seconded by Peter Butko

8.1.1.2.1 Offered remarks for his possible election. Expressed his honor at serving on the Faculty Senate and even more so at being nominated. Things that we (the Senate) could do better in terms: never miss a meeting with the Administration and validation of the information passed on at the meetings with the Administration (having all four officers in attendance). The Senate should represent the full Faculty Senate and not the views of just the officers (a President versus President situation). Furthermore, non-tenured faculty members should not be placed in the position of Faculty Senate President. They would operate from a position of weakness. Dr. Beckett followed with information regarding his professional qualifications. He characterized himself as “analytical, straight forward, and very competitive.”

8.1.1.3 Nominations from floor closed

[Myron offered that a Senator could proxy for only two other Senators. After a few moments, Myron acknowledges those Senators who have served in the Senate and who will not be returning, as their terms have expired. Applause offered by all other Senators. Statements of appreciation
offered by Kimberly Davis related to her experiences on the Senate.]

8.1.4 David Beckett elected Faculty Senate President-Elect

8.2 Secretary

8.2.1 Nominees:

8.2.1.1 Susan Malone nominated by Susan Hubble, seconded by Shellie Nielsen

8.2.1.2 Nominations from floor closed

8.2.1.3 Susan Malone elected Senate Secretary-Elect

9.0 Adjournment at (2:25 p.m.); moved by Olmi, second by Malone. Passed by acclamation.
The University of Southern Mississippi

Faculty Senate Meeting

June 20, 2003

Union Hall of Honors

2:26 p.m.

Members Present: College of the Arts: Kimberly Davis, Tony Lewis, Shellie Nielsen; College of Business: College of Education & Psychology: Taralynn Hartsell, Joe Olmi, John Rachal; College of Health & Human Sciences: Susan Hubble, Mary Frances Nettles; College of International and Continuing Education: College of Liberal Arts: Susan Malone, John Meyer, Bill Scarborough; College of Marine Science: Julia Lytle; College of Nursing: Kathleen Masters; College of Science & Technology: David Beckett, Peter Butko, Ray Folse, Gerald Mattson; University Libraries: USM-Gulf Coast: Darlys Alford, Kathy Davis, Shadad Naghshpour

Members Represented by Proxy: College of the Arts: College of Business: David Duhon (Susan Malone); College of Education & Psychology: Jesse Palmer (J. Olmi); College of Health & Human Sciences: Joyous Bethel (M. Forster); College of International and Continuing Education: Mark Miller (J. Olmi); College of Liberal Arts: Jerry Matson (Susan Malone), Phil Gentile (Amy Chasteen Miller), Amy Young (Jerold Waltman), Melanie J. Norton (Mary Beth Applin); College of Marine Science: College of Nursing: Anna Brock (K. Masters) College of Science & Technology: Mary Dayne Gregg (Mary Lux), G. Russell (Denis Wiesenburg), Margot Hall (Mary Lux) USM-Gulf Coast: Kathy Davis (Pat Smith)

Members Absent: College of the Arts: College of Business: James Crocket, Trellis Green; College of Education & Psychology: Ed Lundin; College of Health & Human Sciences: Susan Graham-Kresge; College of International and Continuing Education: College of Liberal Arts: Don Cabana, Michael Dearney, Lisa Nored, Stephen Oshrin; College of Marine Science: College of Nursing: College of Science & Technology: Bob Coates, Maria Cobb;

1.0 Call to Order (2:26 p.m.)

[Joe Olmi referred to the meeting packet that was passed out to the Senators after the meeting was called to order and preceding the approval of the agenda.]

2.0 Approval of Agenda D. Alford: moved; J. Olmi: second; Vote: passed
3.0 Officers’ Reports

3.1 President’s Report:  Myron Henry

Myron: reported regarding the meetings with the two meetings he had with the Administration. “The meetings were at times spirited. They were good meetings and, at times, I would describe them as animated. But, they were still constructive in that context. I put on the table all the issues that you say in the second email (again, the fourth category, faculty status for librarians, communication in general, the technology security document, the Faculty Activity Report as we know it now, and the Handbook. The spirit was as much on the budget as it was on any of the items. I sent an email out a long time ago in the fall that was kind of a cursory analysis as to whether there were savings at the vice president’s level and above. It wasn’t clear that there was based on the data that were available. We had a spirited discussion about that, and it was clear that we needed to move on (in the discussion) so we could get to some of the other topics. It was dropped so we could move on. But, otherwise the discussion was respectful. In the second meeting, and I’ll ask Joe to comment on as well, we put all those issues back on the table; the FAR, and what I want to say here is that, as you read in the email, we will want to put together a committee of three people, three Senators, an ad hoc committee of three Senators and three from the administration to look at that Faculty Activity Report. There is going to be an electronic Faculty Activity Report; the question is how can we make it much better and serve purposes well without compromising so many of the things that you all expressed concerns about. We will have one semester to try to manage that. If we can do that, then we will have the opportunity for at least a lot of improvements in the Faculty Activity Report. So, that is where we are on that. I must say that both Joe and I tried to persuade the Provost and President to not send some of you the letter that you received (to those who failed to fill out their FAR report). I have to also say that there was an opportunity for good will that was lost a little bit in the last sentence of the letter that some of you did receive; an opportunity for good will and moving forward and looking together at an electronic faculty activity report. I wish it had been different. I was actually a little bit surprised at the last sentence. If you are frowning and don’t know what the last sentence was, let me just share it with you. Myron goes on to read several sentences of the letter sent to those who failed to fill out the FAR and expressed consternation at the sentiment expressed within. Myron continues. I sent my FAR in and attached electronically the evaluation that my Chair did, then I have the material that I submitted to him. Then I went to the comments box and put in my comments. Some of you have asked me for my recommendation. I don’t recommend how you respond. I would not do that. But, my response is very brief, and then I attached the other documentation, because if anybody said that well he did not share with us what he is doing or previous evaluations, I wanted to make sure that was there. So, that was my approach. But, I would not advise any of you, other than to share that approach with you.

Bill Scarborough: Did you get one of those letters?

Myron: No I did not. So, I think I satisfied the bare minimum not to get the letter. Obviously, I have one that one of my colleagues shared with me. Some did not submit a FAR at all. Now, there were not sent to some who were very brief. I can attest to that first hand. But, anyway, the committee of three and three for the fall semester will start in the early fall and conclude by the end of fall. I think there is potential to improve this instrument and really ask the questions and think of who should see it and things of that sort. If you are interested in serving on that, Joe will talk a little later about committees assignments, including ad hoc committees. And, I took the liberty of asking Steven Judd to serve on it.

Darlys: Was there any discussion of qualitative teaching issues?
Myron: Yes, there was. In fact I pointed out to the President again, and I think this was in my email to you, that during the meeting when the President said that no one raised any issues that I had raised that issue straight away. Joe had raised the issue of quality of teaching space. So, we know both those issues were raised; we were all there. And the President acknowledged that I had done that. I don’t know why they stated otherwise. Joe, do you want to say anything else on that?

Joe Olmi: Yes, I sent you the email in response to that; that there were two issues that were brought up at that meeting.

Myron: That is all that we can say. We definitely got the word straight away, we thought we had agreement that there won’t be a fourth category per se. The fourth category (economic development) would be folded into the other three. That is what I said in my email and that departments, colleges, and schools would evaluate or take a look at economic development, but in the context of your department. But the recent open memo that came out had that fourth category written right down there next to the other three. We will be asking the President about that again. We thought we had a clear understanding there; no fourth category, but departments would be advised in their context to look at economic development under the major three. That’s where we are, and I hope we are no where else on that thing at this point. The faculty handbook; a committee, you read that in the President’s email. It is all accurate. There is a process in the foreword of the current faculty handbook on how revisions will take place. The President of the Senate is on that. The President of the University nominates another faculty member to serve on it. You can go to the foreword of the faculty handbook and see the other designated members. It departs a little bit from the last couple of times that we revised the faculty handbook in that we started there before and faculty were added to it; sometimes a few others were added. But, always some more faculty were added during, I think, the last two efforts. The Faculty Handbook Committee is back in place. What I intend to do is ask a handful of you to serve to advise me on the faculty handbook as a member of the Committee. That is supposed to be fast paced, but we want to do it right at the same time. Haven’t seen a draft; don’t know what our attorney friend has done.

Michael Forster: Myron, what exactly is the charge of the committee?

Myron: The Committee will seek input, will propose revisions, and I will ask that at first if it looks in pretty good shape, it will go back to the Faculty Senate for a look see, and will go to the Dean’s and Chairs as well. That will be in the fall semester, but the work of the Committee, the President hopes will be concluded as we enter the fall semester so that input can then be sought on the product.

Michael Forster: So, will you be examining the existing handbook or the handbook that has been written by Hanberry?

Myron: I will be taking a good look at the work that you and others did for proposed revisions to the extent that it is available to me and look at that and see that in the context of what Hanberry has apparently drafted. And then be sure that we try to have features that are relevant to faculty and important to faculty and, in fact, certainly give faculty the rights that are in the current faculty handbook; that none of that is compromised; that would be my purpose. Suggestions? You play a leadership role here.

Michael Forster: The Committee is being convened to essentially rubber stamp the draft?

Myron: I probably won’t be a rubber stamp.

Michael Forster: You’re one vote.
Myron: I’m one vote, but we have a voice. We have a voice when all of us speak together. And, I’ll just say it straight away, I’m not happy with this and here is where you can make some changes, and I just hope that a lot of faculty member there if that turns out to be the case. Other comments on that? Well, we better move along. Communication, well we talked about communication a lot. Faculty status for USM librarians, we were assured that is not coming back. Technology security document, I worked, next to Steven Judd, there is probably no one who took this issue on as often. We haven’t made any progress with this, pure and simple. We haven’t made any progress. [Myron referred to the AAUP document that provides guidelines to “just cause” for invading a faculty member’s office and ceasing his/her computer.] So, we haven’t made any progress; doesn’t mean we should quite, but we haven’t made any progress.

John Rachal: When it [security draft statement] states faculty, does it mean faculty only?

Myron: No, it means all university employees is my understanding. But I think there is a way to do this in a way that is more respectful and consistent with the values of Academe. That is as far as I have gone with the conversation; that position. Anybody else care to offer comments?

Steven Judd: I just want to add I do regard this as a high water issue.

Shadad Naghshpour: Does that right to seize go beyond the computer?

Myron: The only thing that we are discussing the Technology Security document. I would prefer not to go too much further with this, in fact, because I don’t know what the answers would be? Again, to reinforce what Steven has said. So many of you have intellectual property that you have created on your computers, if they walked out of your office with your computer, those creative ideas that you have that are on your C-drive will they come back to you the same way?

Shadad Naghshpour: If I purchase and put a hard drive in a university computer, can that be confiscated?

Myron: We are not sure. We did not pursue this thoroughly. That is all I will say at this point. Amy?

Amy Young: Not only that, I have information that I have gathered ethnographically that is sensitive that my subjects do not want out there. It is okay if I have the data, but if somebody else gets it, it violates the rule. So, it is a little bit more complex than who has access to your intellectual property. There are ethical issues.

Myron: That’s a superb point. Not only is your work compromised; you may compromise understandings with clients or subjects. That’s challenging, too. We’ll take a couple of more, and then we will want to move on.

Bonnie Harbaugh: The history of computer seizure is so that an employee is not able to sabotage the unit. In effect that is not real effective because those people who have that in mind will go home and do the same things from their computers if they have the right path code. There are two issues here: the Administration’s need to prevent damage to the system, separate from don’t burgle my property while you do that.

Myron: Okay, I saw one other hand up here.

Amal Khoury: (Inaudible)

Alan Thompson: That’s exactly what I was going to assert. I have to submit assurances to the
protection of human subjects. I would be surprised if the President is not astute to pick up on this. There is an argument that this policy jeopardizes our credibility with federal funding agencies.

**Myron:** Maybe this is the important point that we should make with the Administration, only that argument of confidentiality with human subjects and that point of view. But, we still haven’t made any progress, and that is the bottom line on this issue. I know it is common that new incoming presidents often give speeches. I’m not giving one, but I do want to read something. It is only twenty pages long (laughter), so bear with me. As you may know and if you read the listserv all of you know that Roy Klumb of the Board had some interesting words to share about Faculty Senators in general and me in particular. Goes on to mention his response and that it was not what was totally written. I recently wrote a letter to the editor that appeared in the paper today. As you know, a newspaper has the liberty to edit any letter and did so with my letter. It looked a little choppy when I finally read it. I just want to read two paragraphs that were not included in full. [Myron went on to read the paragraphs that were altered.] Two parts of his letter were missing/altered. His comments were not about my service, but about your [the Senate’s] service and the service of all faculty to students. The message that we [faculty] are not there for students [that was suggested by Mr. Klumb] is not true. I am disappointed in the way it came out, but, on the other hand, that is okay. I will send that [the letter] over the listserv for your review as a whole. I want to thank Ray Folse for his invaluable service (with regard to his letters to the editor). Others of you have provided service as well. That’s the end of the President’s report. I should mention one other thing. We (representing of the Senate) also gave Toby (the Senate’s outgoing Secretary) a good sendoff. I also personally delivered Dr. Cabana his plaque thanking him for his service to the Senate. You are aware that he has had problems with his health. We certainly wish him well. End of Myron’s report.

**3.2 Secretary’s Report: Joe Olmi**

**Olmi:** Very briefly, I have the committee sheets that you will be asked to sign volunteering for committee work. We have done this every year [sign up sheets for committee work]. You can do this voluntarily or involuntarily (laughter in the audience). This is your chance to choose what you wish to do; otherwise you leave it to the officers to do it for you. There is a listing of the committees in you packet. I will place the sign-up sheets in the back of the room on the piano for you to sign at the end of this meeting. Elections is an ad hoc committee. I’m not sure why considering that we engage in elections every year. We may want to entertain making it a standing committee of the Senate. It is the only ad hoc committee that I have that has a sign-up sheet. I attended the May IHL meeting in Jackson. It was a quick meeting. The only substantive issue that seemed to be addressed was the requested fee increase on the part of the students at Mississippi State University. It appeared that the request would be denied based on my observations, and, in fact, it was rejected by the IHL. The public meeting was rather brief, and then the IHL went into executive session. Additional comments were made by Kenton McNeese (President of the Staff Council). Additionally, Olmi reported on proxies.

**John Rachal:** (Based on the comments of Kenton regarding new networking technology.) I heard comments about the new technology. This new company had a hacker come into the university to see if he could hack his way into our system. He did so easily. Apparently, we are quite vulnerable.

**Kathy Davis:** I’m not sure that this will make you feel better, but my husband who works in the field indicated that it is easy to do so if someone wanted.

**Joe Olmi:** We will also be in the process of getting the Senate listserv and web page up to date between now and the next meeting of the Senate. Our newly elected colleague is techno-savvy,
and I will hopefully be working with her (Susan Malone) in getting this done. I will be learning as I go and will be having people teach me as well.

**Michael Forster:** Are there any other meetings scheduled with the President?

**Myron:** Yes, July 2. We intend to have an agenda and meeting with the President the week before our regularly scheduled Senate meetings. We will continue to meet and labor our points.

**Joe Olmi:** I will be letting you (the Senate) know of that meeting schedule as well. The meetings that were missed by the officers of the Senate last year were meetings that we were not apprised of by Don. If we didn’t attend a meeting, it is because we did not know a meeting was happening. We were not shirking our duties as officers of the Senate.

### 4.0 Committee Reports

#### 4.1 AAUP: Bill Scarborough

**Bill Scarborough:** I will let Mike Forester communicate about the upcoming AAUP meeting taking place tomorrow (June 21st) in Jackson.

**Mike Forster:** We will be talking primarily about conference development. (Changed tape in machine at this time).

**Bill Scarborough:** In the local chapter, Frank Glamser is the incoming President. We will be attempting to have a meeting this coming week. New officers will be meeting informally during the summer. There is no other meeting that I am aware of to date. We will keep you informed if anything happens.

#### 4.2 Faculty Welfare: John Meyer

**John Meyer:** I wanted to take time to briefly to make you aware of an important issue on this campus for faculty and staff. Mediation is an important issue to all faculty. This is a means whereby faculty can have mediation services available to them to resolve a conflict rather than pursuing legal means. This initiative is an attempt to have a third party come into a situation and reach agreement as to the resolution of a conflict. [John referred to the mediation brochure that he passed out that is available through the University.] This summer they are looking for nominees for those who would be good listeners who would enjoy this. What we want are mediators from all areas of campus, faculty and staff. You can apply for participation or can nominate someone to serve in the role. One of the nicest things about this is the training. This training could cost you about a thousand dollars. We are bringing a trainer to the campus this fall to provide training. If you are interested, please be aware of this service. That is what is happening with mediation.

**Michael Forster:** What will the training consist of?

**John Meyer:** The training will last about 12 hours over two days. There will be role playing with problems.

**John Rachal:** No cost or obligations?
**John Meyer:** You will be called upon in cases that seek mediation.

**Myron:** Thank you, John. If you have interest in this we hope it would contribute to the overall welfare of faculty and staff. If you have an interest, see John. Senior Administrative Evaluations, Kimberly, this went to every Faculty Senator. You (referring to Senators) have a form for three different evaluations, President and Provosts.

**Kimberly Davis:** No, you have two forms.

### 4.3 Senior Administrative Evaluation: Kimberly Davis

**Myron:** Recall from the May meeting, at the next meeting we will approve the May minutes as well as the June minutes. Recall from the May meeting, though, that we did agree as the Senate in May that there would be an evaluation of the President and Provosts, and it would be held in September; but people wanted more time, understandably, to have the tool to ask the right questions. We weren’t prepared to vote on the specific tool that the Committee, that Kimberly, presented when we were down at Ocean Springs. So, this is the work of the Committee continuing from that meeting, if I am recalling it correctly. With that, I defer to Kimberly.

**Kimberly Davis:** Dr. Davis referred to the process and form examples that were mailed to all Senators. We had the forms, but did not have the full process. What we do have to fill in are the dates and the new Committee Chair. The Committee agreed that it would be done by September 15 rather than the Monday after Labor Day, because we thought it was a little more precise to put it that way. We need to decide to whom these evaluations will go. It cannot go to Dr. J. T. Johnson because his office is in the Administration Building. We will have to determine to whom the evaluations will go, then give them to Dr. Johnson. He (Dr. Johnson) agreed to tabulate the returns for us. [Dr. Davis passed out additional copies of the form.] We made revisions to the document trying to make it as brief as possible, but still ended up with a number of questions.

**Myron:** Anything else, Kimberly?

**Kimberly Davis:** No, you may notice grammatical errors. I found those and corrected them in these other copies. If anyone would like, I have a couple of extras. The form is still long, but it was necessary to cover all the issues that we wanted to cover.

**Bill Scarborough:** To whom will the results be made known? As I understand it here the evaluation of the Provosts will be sent to the President, right? The evaluation of the President will be sent to the head of the IHL Board. Will anybody else know what the results were? If not, then, I think this is a waste of time. Are we going to know what the results are, anybody here?

**Kimberly Davis:** Provosts will be made available to the President, and the President will be made known to the [IHL] Board.

**Ray Fols:** We should try to stick to the guidelines of the evaluation process, in terms of who has access to the evaluation results. We are following the procedure for all administrative evaluations. Sticking with the procedure, evaluations go to your superior.

**Bill Scarborough:** I think we are being naïve if we think that any negative result will influence either the President or the IHL Board. I think it is a waste of time.

**Myron:** I think Bill has a good point here about accountability back to the faculty and the Faculty
Senate without at the same time making this a press item; the question is one of how do we share accountability to those who, in fact, designed the instrument and implemented the process. I don’t have an answer to that. Do I want my student evaluations shared with all of you; maybe, maybe not? But, accountability has to be a two-way street, top to bottom, bottom to top. The question is how we share accountability in terms of the use of this instrument and the information thereof that might suggest room for improvement or other approaches. I don’t have any answer for that, Bill.

**Michael Forster:** I think it is inappropriate to share this information with others, but think that it is important to share with the IHL. If there is criticism by the faculty of the President, the IHL should know that. Whether they act on that at all ever; they should still know it. AAUP has an instrument that is used to assess the faculty perceptions of shared governance at an institution.

**Myron:** Whether there is an accountability factor or not with this specific form, I think that it does send a message that evaluation is important at every level.

**Alan Thompson:** I’m not sure that, in terms of providing meaningful feedback, I have a basis for evaluating the President’s performance. I would say that to many of the items I would have to say “does not apply.” I agree with Dr. Scarborough that nothing meaningful would come from this process because most of the responses would simply be “not applicable.”

**Myron:** That may be, but, if there were sort of global questions if you will. Some of these are very specific, but if there were global questions among these. The thing that would worry me though is that if only VP and Deans were evaluating the President, they work directly for the President. Where is the accountability back to the level of the operation?

**Kimberly Davis:** There may be.

**Ray Folse:** I think we are confusing several different issues. The AAUP is not representing the faculty by being elected. I am representing others who elected me in the system. The system says every level is evaluated according to a certain process. Just because I don’t like a certain situation today, I’m not going to go destroy the process or violate the standards of the process. If we don’t do the process because we don’t like some element, then I think that may work against us.

**Myron:** Also, the current process has provided for faculty to evaluate Deans. I agree with Ray that I think it is important to let those to whom senior officers report have information. The question that we are wrestling with here is what about accountability back to those that they (senior officers) lead and serve. I don’t have an answer for that. I think that the process is worthwhile.

**Kimberly Davis:** The Committee (Senate Administrative Committee) gets a report on the Deans now.

**Darlys Alford:** The Committee does get some feedback.

**Myron:** So, there is already a bit of a process in place.

**Kimberly Davis:** That is why I keep it (evaluation information on the Deans), and it is shared with the President (of the Senate).

**Myron:** There is a somewhat of a closing of the accountability loop in that there are at least a few at a different level who don’t report to the person they are evaluating who have some information.

**David Beckett:** I like to agree with Ray on this. I understand what Dr. Scarborough is saying that the IHL or the President may not care about this. Isn’t fairness the idea at the heart of this
situation? Clearly, our evaluation is not released other than to people directly above us. If we have the evaluations of the Provosts and President, it is clearly of interest to the press. Clearly if we have report on the Deans, or if we would have similar report on the Provosts or President, and it is released to fifty something people, does anyone really think that all fifty people will keep that a big secret? And, it won’t go out to the press? And, what would be the result? I think the result would be that we would be looked at as jumping down into the gutter and taking a cheap shot. I think fairness is the primary issue here, and I think we need to stick to the guidelines that the report goes to the superiors and no one else.

Myron: A couple of more comments here.

Darlys Alford: What we seem to be predicting is that there are going to be some critical comments about what the President is doing. When we entertained the vote of no confidence and went back to our constituents, what we found out was that there are a lot of people who won’t say or don’t have strong feelings about what’s going on and some who think it is great. If we have this information without a clear idea of what is going to the Board, then their perception of us is that we are whining discontents. We need information about what is really going on; how many are really upset about what is going on, and should we make public what that discontent is? We have access to all the people. Let’s go ask them informally. If we know where our people stand, before we start stepping forward and having more and more confusion in this situation, it could potentially work against us.

Denis Wiesenburg: We should focus on the main purpose of evaluation, to improve performance. I don’t see how this will accomplish this. It might give us a score card of what people think. Does anyone think that this will encourage the President or Provosts to do a better job or do thinks differently? I don’t think it has a chance of doing that. I think it has potential to do real harm.

Amal Khoury: (inaudible)

Bill Scarborough: Just to respond to David, our next president. If you conduct this evaluation, and you don’t know the outcome, and it just goes only to the President and the Board, I just think that’s worthless. I don’t see any value to that at all. The Board appointed this guy knowing that 87% of the people who participated in the AAUP poll didn’t want him. It will not influence the Board, and if one thinks it will influence Dr. Thames. This is totally useless if we don’t know the results. You can discretely inform the group (Faculty Senate), and nobody is going to leak anything to the press. That would be counter productive. The AAUP could run its own poll if it wished. I think it is totally useless if we don’t know what the result was. Somebody here needs to know.

Myron: If a very few know, that is consistent with what we currently do with Deans. That information is not released, but, at least, the Deans know someone knows. That has worked well with Deans. I guess the question is one of do faculty have the opportunity to evaluate those who evaluate them, top to bottom? Is there accountability in both directions? I think that is an issue here or is there some other way to have accountability in each direction? The question remains of how do we hold people accountable? I am personally comfortable with the process used to evaluate the Deans because that information does not reach the press, but at the same time knows that there is somebody who is responsibly in charge of the information on behalf of the Faculty Senate conducted the process. I feel comfortable with that, I’m not saying it is the right thing. Alan?

Alan Thompson: I don’t want to belabor the point. I don’t object to accountability or the process. My concern is that, without any specific knowledge of the instrument, many of the items will result in the response of NA (not applicable). My concern with the Board is that they will be wondering what is the concern, what is the big problem down there in Hattiesburg?
David Beckett: I looked at the items and felt that we can respond to each and every item on the instrument. I would think that would be the experience of most of us.

Peter Butko: I would like to agree with Ray. Do we want a poll or evaluation? If we want evaluation, it should not be made public in my opinion. Another thing, this is an evaluation of a president, any president and provosts, not President Thames per se. We should just do it once a year in the spring like we do them all.

Myron: The vote was we would go [with the evaluation] in the September, I believe. We passed it in the earlier May meeting.

Stephen Judd: I agree with Peter that this process is not about the individual.

Myron: I think again that the spirit was that we would do what we have been doing.

Amy Young: I agree, but we can also check with other universities as well.

Myron: Right now, we still need to continue to look at the instrument. It might be a retreat item for further discussion.

Kimberly Davis: We also need to be aware of Dr. Johnson’s time as well.

4.4 Space allocation: Susan Malone for Gerry Mattson

Susan Malone: You should have a copy of a memo dated February 5th addressed to Cynthia Moore, Associate Provost. There was an ad hoc committee formulated to offer recommendations regarding space allocation. That memo is before you. The memo suggests that space be allocated based on people and efforts. Dr. Mattson wanted to be sure that the memo was before the Senate today. It seems that space allocation data are being gathered as we speak.

Joe Olmi: It will put it on the agenda for clarification at the next meeting.

5.0 Old Business:

None noted.

6.0 New Business:

6.1 Faculty Senate Retreat

Myron: The retreat was a good start to the year last year. We feel it will be appropriate to have a retreat. Last year we had it the week before school started. We think it has great value for discussion.
Amal Khoury: My only concern is that is the only time we have off.

Susan Hubble: We would, I think, wish to have it on Wednesday of the week before classes begin.

Myron: Keep in contact with the listserv. We will be apprising you. Moving along, we would also like to thank those of you who are leaving the Senate and welcome the new Senators. You now become official voters. [New senators introduced themselves.]

7.0 Adjournment [3:51 pm.]