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1.0 Call to Order 2:00

2.0 Approval of Agenda: D. Cabana: Add item 8.2 on establishing a new committee on space allocation and utilization. J. Bethel: Would like to ask 4 questions posed by faculty in my college. S. Hubble, move; B. Scarborough, second; passed.

3.0 Approval of Minutes for October meeting; B. Scarborough move; S. Hubble, second; passed
4.0 Forum Speaker: Bradley Bond on General Education Curriculum. Distributed a document comprised of the General Education Curriculum vision statement, mission statement, learning objectives, and curricular categories. These categories are: written and oral communication, basic science and mathematics, global history and culture, aesthetic values, and decision-making and responsibility.

The Strategic Plan called for a new General Education Curriculum. In 1999, Academic Council expanded its standing General Education Committee with three provost appointments and began a major revision of the basic curriculum required of all undergraduate students. It approved a document in May 2002. During the summer President Thames and Provost Grimes asked for a couple of small changes, removing the most costly items. These were the sophomore and junior seminars, which were wisely removed. Two substitute courses replace them. Academic Council approved the modified version on Nov. 4, 2002. That is the document distributed to FS.

D. Becket: When approved?
B. Bond: Nov. 4.

G. Russell: It has been approved?
B. Bond: Yes.

G. Russell: In terms of turning in catalog revisions, we need to know what the college changes are before we can incorporate by department. Can we push the deadline for the undergraduate bulletin back a month?

B. Bond: I raised a version of this question. I pushed as hard as I felt I could on that. Certain changes can be made on the galley proofs.

G. Russell: Once again, people outside of academics controlling academic activities.

D. Duhon: We included the senior capstone course in this as part of the writing component. There is an enrollment cap of 24 students. In our capstone courses we average 35-40.

B. Bond: That's a potential problem, but I don't have an answer to it.

D. Duhon: Are we going to have some slack for a while to do this?

B. Bond: I'm not going to say that.

D. Beckett: Physical and life sciences has been changed to natural sciences. Now a student can take two geography courses to fulfill the requirement. The goal was to give students a breadth of knowledge. Now you can take two astronomy or two geography and you're done with the sciences. That was not the original goal.

B. Bond: This was debated in various public hearings in 2002, and there was a strong sentiment from certain areas of the campus that they need to have the ability to allow their students take either two life sciences or two physical sciences.

D. Beckett: I don't think that because one department doesn't want its students to have to take a physical science is a good reason to abandon the GEC concept.

B. Bond: I would only disagree in saying that it was more than one department.
D. Beckett: My understanding is that a number of departments and colleges are concerned about this, and that they didn't know about the change originally because of a technical problem with the Academic Council Web site.

B. Bond: There was a problem with OTR getting this information on the site, but each Academic Council member had a copy of the document.

D. Beckett: So, is this set in stone? I don't like it to tell you the truth. I find that lots of people in the college don't like it.

J. Crockett: Shouldn't we take this up with the people who represent us on the Academic Council where this originated?

G. Russell: FS is an alternate route for communication.

D. Beckett: Especially since the information is not being disseminated. So where are we in this?

B. Bond: On Sunday afternoon, Dr. Thames approved it as it is written.

G. Russell: Even as of yesterday, we hadn't been informed about this.

B. Bond: There was an email.

G. Russell: It said that Academic Council had approved it, not the provost.

B. Bond: I don't recall those details.

S. Hubble: I understand that you're just the messenger, but as a representative of Health and Human Sciences I need to raise this one more time. Our dean expressed that we were to be innovative and interdisciplinary in coming up with a reduced core. I see things that look a great deal like the 1985 "new" core. We've wasted a lot of time trying to be creative, innovative, and interdisciplinary and having nothing to show for it. Our college feels lost in category five (decision making and responsibility). Considering all of the health-related problems plaguing our society--obesity, drugs, and alcohol--having only one health course among six in a category in which only three hours are required is a disservice to our students.

D. Cabana: How was that decision arrived at to delete the courses to which Susan refers?

B. Bond: In fall 2000, the chairs and deans were asked to submit course proposals. They were to be interdisciplinary, but your college was the only one that did that.

S. Hubble: We're going to miss key information about drugs and alcohol. The core overemphasizes some areas and doesn't do enough in others.

M. Ryan: We started with goals and objectives and let those drive what courses would be included. We adjudicated the courses as they were presented to us. We didn't get as many interdisciplinary courses as I thought that we would. We started with learning objectives rather than starting with categories.

J. Meyer: The speech and communication dept. strongly opposes there being no public speaking courses even though it is emphasized in the core (see oral communication requirement). What standards will faculty use to evaluate the speeches required in capstone and other upper level courses? How will faculty members be trained to teach and evaluate.
B. Bond: I don't know. We've gone through 3 presidents and 4 provosts as we've worked on this, so nailing down the support to do the things required by the report has been difficult. The assumption has been that there will be some training along the way.

J. Meyer: No one has asked us about this. We would have said yes, and been able to point to effective programs around the country, but no one asked us.

R. Folse: You just implied that the changes in upper administration affected the core.

B Bond: No, everyone has generally agreed on the objectives originally set by Dr. Henry. It has been a financial question.

R. Folse: I have yet to hear anyone say anything good about this core. Is is comparable to core at other universities?

B. Bond: M. Dearmey did bring in other cores, but we decided that it would be better to develop one that meets our own needs. There is a wide variety among universities.

J. Mattson: There's not much said about science literacy. We're allowing geography for science. We're going backwards on the science side. I understand that we can incorporate a real science component to geography at USM, but how will we count geography courses coming from Community Colleges? Who will verify that they have a science component?

B. Bond: I would tend to agree that we need more science and math. M. Ryan pushed for this too. As far as Community Colleges, we don't have a way to do that with any subject, do we? I don't think that we'll see many of these geography courses being taught at Community Colleges.

J. Mattson: But they might if it becomes part of the core.

B. Bond: They haven't rushed to offer philosophy courses, even though they're required.

B Scarborough: I count 38 hours. How does this compare with the current core?

B Bond: It's 40-46, so the new core is a reduction.

B. Scarborough: There's no option to take either of the American history surveys for the global category.

B. Bond: Our colleagues [in the history dept.] did not propose it. Some of this has to do with not responding to calls for proposals.

S. Hubble: On Community Colleges, there had been a window for them to catch up and get with the new core. But years later the exceptions continue. Are we going to get guidelines for this window for faculty who do advising?

B. Bond: Yes. The community colleges are aware of this. I gave an hour-long presentation to the academic deans who where conferencing here this summer. I also talked to the academic deans at the Mississippi Association of Colleges meeting in Oxford a month ago. I've been on the phone with a number of them since Sunday. I am in the process of setting up visits. We're also looking at renegotiating some of the points in the articulation agreement. Your synopsis is absolutely right. In history, for example, American history is still allowed to count for the World Civ. sequence.
S. Hubble: At some point we have to follow the core and not make exceptions.

B Bond: Understood.

S. Malone: On the computer requirement, the professors who are responsible for this will miss it. Who is going to make sure they know it, and who's going to hold them accountable?

B Bond: I don't have an answer for you. We may be at the point where we need a director of the general education curriculum.


D. Duhon: We may be missing the point of what Brad's trying to do. This may be an impossible task. We have 300 different majors out there, and everybody wants two of their courses in the core. That's clearly not going to happen given that we want to reduce the core. Every one of these questions has been raised at Academic Council, and we've come up with this and it's been approved. I think that we need to commend Brad and make suggestions for how it can be improved in the future.

B. Bond: This is not my core. All I did was to drive the bus for two years called Expanded General Education Curriculum. I didn't vote on these issues, but was just the typist and tried to keep the process as open and democratic as we could. I think that we did succeed in that. It's not the core that I would have done, but there are lots of voices out there and we tried to accommodate them within the 14 learning objectives.

D. Cabana: I agree with D. Duhon, but with history, how are we supposed to know where we're going if we don't know where we've been. How can we exclude US history? What concerns me more is why it's not in there. It's because there was not a proposal. For such a serious omission, shouldn't Academic Council have told the chair to get it submitted?

B. Bond: It's not required in the old core.

B. Scarborough: But it was an option, and it's nowhere to be seen on this document.

B. Bond: Yes, you've read it correctly.

D. Alford: So, are you done?

B. Bond: Yes, Mary Lux is the chair now.

M. Hall: Mary worked very hard on this, as did the committee. She was on the committee for 2 years, and said that they'd been begging for proposals from the departments, but they didn't come in.

M. Ryan: I would disagree a little bit. I was on the committee the whole time. It wasn't that the departments forgot or were cavalier. The departments were quite strategic about what they wanted in the core under the general constraints that we'd reduce the core. It's not accurate to say we begged but didn't get proposals, but that departments proposed what they thought was appropriate and viable.

Ki. Davis: Foreign Languages are not in here even though they clearly fit.
B. Bond: They didn't submit a proposal.

S. Hubble: We do appreciate the effort of the entire committee. But this is another body in which the faculty voice is heard, and I think that it's important to get this on the record so that we can communicate this to the administration.

B. Bond: I don't question that at all. Thanks for inviting me.

5.0 Officers' Reports

5.1 President's Report: D. Cabana: We were to have Senator King with us, as well, but since the legislature is still in session, we will try to schedule him for a meeting next semester (January, February, or March).

The last IHL Board meeting was relatively brief. They approved payments for various items. There were the usual discussions about budget projections. The governor pointed out at his meeting with us that the 10% figure for cuts is speculative at this time. Much remains for the governor and legislature to reconcile on budget numbers.

Regarding administrative supplements, they do not include retroactively asking people who used to be chairs to return money they received after going back to teaching. This issue is in front of legal staff in regard to grandfathering when/if something is done. I did a 10-minute interview with WDAM last week, of which they showed 30 seconds. I related that were very few faculty who could bring themselves to disagree with the idea that leaving administration and returning to the classroom should not entitle you to bring that salary with you. I did make room for the notion that there should be further discussion regarding chairs, which was omitted from the interview. Chair is the toughest job in the university. Their supplements aren't excessive. This practice has gone on for a number of years. The clip only included part where I said that we had no problem with administrators not taking their supplements back to the classroom. I have been effigized along with the Council of Chairs, so I wanted to set the record straight. Tim Hudson was quoted in the paper out of context, too. The media said to me that a furor had erupted over the metric and the administrative supplements. I said there was much discussion, not furor. There may be a point in time when there is a furor over evaluation, but not now. My view is that as long as lines of communication are open, we can have comprise and accommodations. When those lines aren't open, we may have to pursue by other means. I didn't want to give them a headline.

J. Crockett: No one should suggest that the University break contracts that it has made already. It's illegal and unethical.

D. Cabana: I've tried to make the point that for chairs, there is an implied contract. My understanding is that we're dealing with present chairs, not past ones.

B. Scarborough: There may not be furor, but there is unrest and concern.

D. Cabana: I have expressed concern. I don't want to say that the sky is falling prematurely. If it falls, we will scream loudly.

J. Bethel: For 6 months we've waited to see what would happen, and we just get one outrageous action after another. There is furor in my unit; there is huge concern. When are we going to publicize our concerns?
G. Russell: As a department chair, this whole discussion gives the erroneous assumption that this small supplement serves as compensation for all of the extra time involved.

D. Duohon: How did this come up?

D. Cabana: I was told that it has been IHL policy for a long time now. The IHL Board is trying to bring us in line with what UM and MSU claim to do.

M. Henry: I'm not prepared to accept that it is IHL board policy. I've studied it carefully. Some language suggests it, but other language says that if it's contractual then it should be honored. We're talking about the integrity of a contract. It can be interpreted conveniently in several different ways. C. Nicholson stated that it is the University administration's job to decide this.

M. Hall: I had a contract in hand when I came here. Then they gave me a new amended contract. Unilaterally, the state could reduce my salary by any amount or eliminate my position.

M. Henry: There is that provision in the Board policy. The integrity of the contract is really what's on the table.

D. Alford: We had a chair appointed with no consultation with faculty. That was outrageous to us. The department wrote a letter to VP Williams and the provost on the coast stating their frustration with the action. The response from the provost said that it was his understanding that Dean Hill and VP Williams had consulted with faculty, and they made the decision based on that. Williams said he thought that it was only a interim appointment. So, we just got finger pointing and a general statement supporting consulting faculty in these situations. We have a permanent chair appointed without consultation.

S. Naghshpour: If we're the only university that does this, and if we'd have no problem getting chairs, then there is money where we have so many that are underpaid. The person who misused those funds should be held accountable.

D. Cabana: I would like to find out whether or not this is the policy at UM, MSU, and the other IHL schools. Is there, like M. Henry suggested, some wiggle room for the presidents to exercise some flexibility? I think that the track record is that this flexibility has been overextended, and this should be a concern to faculty. Are we really lumping chairs in as a part of administration? I could argue that chairs are more nearly middle management and should be differentiated.

S. Oshrin: At other universities people negotiate an increase in their salaries, and that becomes a permanent part of their salaries. At USM, chairs get an administrative supplement. But you only retain ten percent of that per year that you remain as chair. So, essentially you're on probation for ten years. If you don't work out, then you're back where you started and don't keep your money. If we're suggesting that we're doing something under the table or improper for our chairs, it's really the other way. The spin on this is wrong. We're doing less rather than more than other universities do for chairs.

J. Rachal: The distinction that D. Cabana just drew between chairs and other administrators seems to be supported by how we treat chairs in FS. We've had many chairs, but not deans. That's a natural dividing line.

M. Hall: [Asked for clarification on the 10% rule.]

S. Oshrin: You get the summer pay that was given at the time you became chair. It's an incentive to stay on as chair. After 10 years, you've earned the entire supplement less the summer pay. If I'm no longer chair then I lose whatever the summer pay was when I began as chair. People need to realize that chairs are 12-month employees, anytime the university isn't officially closed.
M. Hall: If a person stayed 5 years, then could keep 50% of their supplement?

S. Oshrin: If supplement is $1K then after 5 years, get $500, if 6 years, then $600.

H. Hall: Is this true for upper level administrators?

M. Henry: I think that it's in contracts, but I can't be sure if that's true for everyone.

M. Ryan: As a dean I earned out a certain percentage.

M. Henry: It's not like it has been reported. It's not a great sum beyond the base salary. Also, chairs don't come in at a high salary. Going backwards on folks who thought they had an understanding makes me uneasy. Negotiating with new people is another matter.

M. Hall: In some cases it was an incentive to induce people who would sacrifice pursuing what they did in their field.

D. Duhon: Instead of how many people with big salaries, we should ask why aren't there more people with high salaries. Administrators aren't overpaid here.

S. Hubble: In my case, while I gained on my base I lost money on my summer supplement. People won't be able to afford to be administrators. Most chairs are losing money. We need to promote that we need better salaries all around.

S. Oshrin: I could make more money going back to teaching and teaching in the summer. Also, there is a potential problem. Chairs may not continue to be chairs if this policy goes through. There may be a financial burden associated with it.

D. Alford: There are, at many Universities, different ideas about chairs. I've been at a University where they rotated every few years. Here if you don't get along with a chair who is in place for many years it is devastating. Rotating chairs is a good way to promote self-governance.

J. Crockett: Different disciplines have different views on this.

D. Alford: It is dangerous for someone to stay in the chair position for too long.

G. Russell: When I was FS president, I tried to get terms for chairs. That didn't come to pass, but there was a policy for reviews of chairs. There is a periodic reassessment.

B. Scarborough: We do it in History. We meet every three years and decide.

M. Henry: University policy calls for review of chairs every 5 years, but I don't know that it's been implemented.

G. Russell: I haven't heard more about it since S. Doblin left.

D. Cabana: Governor's Meeting: FS Executive Committee met with Governor over lunch before the public brownbag luncheon. He stated that he would come forward with an announcement on a new education initiative. I would have liked a better turnout, but it was fair considering the difficult time of day. It was the only time that we could get him. Someone asked him about tax increases, and it took a split
second to say "no." He discussed long term bond issues to support higher education, $15M a year for 4-year schools and $5M for community colleges. The legislature may not go along with bond issues for anything other than bricks and mortar. He said that governors don't make the budgets, but they do have the dirty work of making the cuts. He did say that faculty should be making their voices heard to the legislature. Hopefully, the governor will be inclined to call a meeting of higher education folks while the legislature is in session. We should get key legislative leaders to come to communicating higher education needs. I would not have the slightest illusion of more money this year. Our message to the governor at the Executive Committee lunch was that the university needs to know that you are the governor of the whole education system, not just K-12. We have been quiet while you addressed K-12, and now we expect him to turn his attention to higher education. The governor was gracious and accommodating. I rather would have had him here at the FS meeting, but he did give us longer than the hour. I reminded him this morning about the higher education meeting, and he confirmed that wants to hold a summit. Anyone who expected a great revelation at the meeting probably has never attended this type of thing before. But it did provide an opportunity to exchange our views.

M Henry: I want to commend Don for arranging this. It was constructive and a healthy conversation.

S. Oshrin: One of the concerns I had was about IHL board representation, and he did respond well to that.

D. Cabana: He did mention that he tried to find USM graduate for the last appointment and couldn't find any. I was asked what I think about the bond issues. I think that it is a refreshing approach. It may not fly, but it's an attempt to do something.

J. Mattson: I feel like this is a university of people, not buildings, so I'm pleased with the bond issue to support people.

5.2 President-Elect's Report: M. Henry: No report.

5.3 Secretary's Report: T. Graham: See proxies, above.

6.0 Committee Reports

6.1 Budget: M. Henry: We had our second meeting, today. We looked at three pieces of information on the macro level of the budget, and asked questions on how to reconcile the information. The information was from past budget books, FY 03 budget plan, a July newspaper article in which the president presented a budget plan, and the president's presentation to FS. The Committee will develop questions to ask the president or his designee. One comment is that we have not had a budget reduction. We've had a reduction in tax support, but increases in tuition and fees. We need to understand this overall dynamic.
6.2 Academic and Governance: D. Duhon: We're looking at the metric. There doesn't seem to be a common understanding among the deans of what they're supposed to be doing. Some are developing a metric for spring, while others are not doing anything. Some don't know what they're going to do. We're not getting a consistent message. We're supposed to meet with the provost after Thanksgiving so we hope to clarify what he thinks is to be done.

S. Nielsen: Will this be a universal metric for all departments?

D. Duhon: That's what we all thought, but only one dean thought that would happen. One said maybe; others said no.

S. Nielsen: I'm getting from my dean that it will be a universal metric. We don't want it.

B. Scarborough: Can you tell us about this, Don?

D. Cabana: We're supposed to be sending something to the provost. The deans seem to be moving toward what they'll do for their individual colleges. Based on conversations with the president, provost, and deans there will not be a one-size-fits-all metric. The Arts have been singled out as an example of the one size doesn't fit all.

B. Scarborough: If this is being done then it should be in consultation with the faculty. Any general points system is unacceptable to me.

G. Russell: Even within one college, one size doesn't fit all.

D. Cabana: Cabinet discussed this a couple of months ago, and the provost said that FS would provide input. It was to be on hold until he hears from FS after the holidays.

D. Duhon: We aren't supposed to be providing a metric.

D. Cabana: No, we don't want to give them an instrument, but we want a voice in how the process is laid out. The provost said that it is on hold until he hears from FS.

J. Rachal: We don't want to collaborate on this by suggesting a points system.

D. Beckett: In COST, we do have a metric, and I don't find it an awful thing. We have had it for a long time. One dean told me that he didn't have one and wasn't planning to develop one. I think that Dr. Thames' emphasis is on accountability, and he wants to see how we're doing. I think we'll each get a number whether we like it or not. I was amused by the bit on WDAM, which suggested that we'd all generate points, and if we earned enough points we'd get a raise. It's like collecting coupons.

D. Alford: The metric is being used to determine whether hiring people is justifiable. For the permission to hire, we had to submit information on the productivity of the individual who previously had held the position. This included, how many people were in the classes, how many grants were being brought in, etc., before someone could be brought in. It is being used to decide whether someone can be hired.

M. Henry: To follow up on D. Beckett, doesn't R. Lochhead's metric speak to whether individual faculty members are under or overpaid?

D. Beckett: I don't know what happens at the college level. The metric is used at the department level.
Ki. Davis: I want to hold on the record what Dr. Lochhead said, what the provost said, what the president said, that we can develop our own system. I hope that they will let us do that.

G. Russell: In COST this was presented to us, and I was ecstatic because we compared so well in terms of cost effectiveness. One week later to the day, I was told that two of my six faculty positions would be eliminated and that the department may be eliminated because there wasn't a critical mass of faculty because of the loss of these two positions.

J. Rachal: I am extremely concerned about a metric with a methodology by which departments are measured by enrollments. I am thinking along the lines of a metric that is associated with individual performance. My chair likes metrics, and we discussed it for research, but opposed if for teaching and service. In terms of research, we insisted on points being bankable from year to year. It is unfair to use a points system without bankable points. B. Scarborough's book is an example, where he works on it for many years without points then gets many points in a single year. There are too many oddities in the publishing industry to not allow a bankable points system.

D. Duhon: The Committee wants to make a statement. Several of the Committee members liked their metric systems, because they did well. But they will oppose a one-size-fits-all approach. No one is sure what Provost Grimes had in mind when he consulted us.

D. Cabana: It's difficult to react to something that is not there to react to, yet. It was never my intention for FS to put on the table an evaluation process. We were to determine what is being done here and at other universities. Then the Committee is to bring this information to FS, and whatever goes forward is something that is the collective will of FS. We're not going to design an instrument, but we must have a voice. I'm going to take the provost at his word that he is waiting to hear from FS.

M. Hall: People are trying to decide where to direct their efforts. I hear from young faculty that they don't want to participate in service or take on additional courses, that they'll be graded on external funding.

D. Cabana: That's why D. Duhon's committee was charged, to have input.

Ki. Davis: We want to have input now, and don't want to wait until the process is in place and then disagree with it.

J.M. Norton: I heard the president say [at his presentation to FS] that he doesn't know what to do, and wants us to tell him. J. Grimes told us the same thing. We were told that there would be evaluation. We need to offer them alternatives; let's participate. If we don't, we deserve what they give us.

D. Cabana: The reason for the December deadline is that time is important.

P. Butko: We should work individually with our department chairs and deans, not through FS.

R. Folse: S. Doblin tried it by department only, and it became competitive internally and destroyed teamwork. No one wanted to do things that didn't earn points. Everybody wanted to score a touchdown, and nobody wanted to block, anymore.

M. Henry: Would it make sense, if the provost is asking, to ask him what our parameters are? Also, if units have an evaluation system, then are these teamwork things counted so that different people can do different things?

Ki. Davis: The scary twist is that we've had input in things in the past, and things went the other way.
D. Cabana: The greater danger is to do nothing.

D. Duhon: The WDAM report suggested that "now we're evaluating people at USM." We've always evaluated people. We shouldn't admit that we haven't evaluated people fairly over the years.

D. Cabana: I emphasized to the Sun Herald that evaluation is a fact of life for us, but none of that appeared.

6.3 AAUP: B. Scarborough: We're also looking into the metric. Most of our newsletter is devoted to our ad hoc committee on this chaired by M. Forster. There are already all kinds of evaluations in place. We're trying to indicate the portions of the Faculty Handbook that cover them. They're discipline specific. Also, we're having a state meeting in Jackson tomorrow at 10 a.m. with people from Washington coming down. We will cover lobbying and shared governance, but not metrics.

6.4 Transportation: B. Scarborough: We met Tuesday. The gated lot is absolutely a done deal. It will cost $30-32K to make the lot west of Hearst a gated lot. We won't oversell it the first year. The cost will be between $130-150/year. We'll open it to students if faculty and staff don't fill it. The great advantage is that you can find a space if you leave campus in the middle of the day. Sidewalk improvements by the practice field will start next week. The west side of Ross Blvd. will be cleared for parking ($56K). They'll pave the Kelley lot this summer ($38K). They will pave the south side of Elam Arms lot ($141K). The students are complaining that on the north side of campus by Nursing, the converted lot isn't filling. They want to change the north line to commuter. The Transportation Department is going to do a study to see if the student complaint is valid.

S. Nielsen: The reason was because many spaces were blocked off for the game and an event going on that night.

6.5 Awards: A. Miller: [Not present. Statement read by D. Cabana]: You were to nominate people for the excellence in teaching, service, and librarianship and grand marshal award. These are due on December 7.

I asked the Awards Committee to explore Faculty Emeritus status to make it more meaningful as requested by the provost's office. If you have comments or suggestions forward them to A. Chasteen Miller.

6.6 Faculty Welfare: J. Meyer: Met last week. On the calendar, our priorities still include having a semester that is a week shorter. This has IHL Board requirement implications. This would bring us in line with most other universities of our type. This would allow increased time for faculty to conduct research and obtain grants. It would give summer students time to work during the breaks.

The two-day fall break to take effect next year was a victory for us. We also would like to not have classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving for safety reasons (students traveling).

Sometimes, new faculty work for 6 weeks before getting their first paycheck. We're trying to find out if we could give them an advance.
Health insurance issues require our attention. We're looking at how it compares with private insurance. Some faculty have switched. Insurance should cover regular checkups, and it would save money in the long run to prevent illnesses or treat them early.

Proposed Resolution: Six-Credit Hour Benefit.

Because:

--a USM-Gulf Coast program of allowing nontraditional students to take three hours of coursework for free has encouraged continued coursework and generated funds for the university.

--faculty and staff have received no raises for more than two years in the face of increasing health plan costs.

--most faculty do not take advantage of the below noted benefit.

--motivating people to take USM courses may draw people in to complete a degree.

We, the Faculty Senate of USM, advocate extending the six-credit-hour per semester coursework benefit enjoyed by faculty and staff members to their spouses.

D. Alford: Is this a one-time benefit?

J. Meyer: No, it extends the existing faculty and staff benefit to spouses.

D. Duhon: Can we allow 9-month faculty to be paid over 12 months? The schoolteachers have this option.

D. Cabana: A vote on the resolution will be on the agenda for the January meeting.

7.0 Old Business
7.1 Technology Security Document: D. Cabana: I raised this with president, and he has removed the objectionable "seize" language. He found it objectionable. It will be replaced with "impound."

M. Henry: Did this cover the "for any reason?"

D. Cabana: I will know on Monday (Cabinet).

8.0 New Business

8.1 January Pay Raise: D. Cabana: The 2% pay raise will go into effect in January. It will be given across the board rather than merit.

8.2 Committee on Space Allocation and Utilization: D. Cabana: We will establish a FS Space Allocation and Utilization Committee. J. Mattson will chair. This is in response to request from the provost office for help in dealing with this issue.

J. Mattson: They have a committee on campus for this, already. They did talk about metrics for who's doing research, and that may factor into decision making.

D. Cabana: I will contact those who will serve with Jerry. There will be some significant issues for this committee to deal with.

University Club: D. Cabana: I have had conversations with the provost and Dr. Thames about a University Club. The president agrees that it would be a good thing to do, and that there is property that he may allow us to have. I will ask a number of you to serve on an advisory committee.

Holiday Party: D. Cabana: I have set aside Dec. 7 at Peck House for a Christmas party for FS and spouses. We can have Unique Catering do something for us, but I'd rather us bring something.

J. Bethel raised two questions posed by faculty from her college:

1. The administration appears to have little regard for traditions of shared governance and dialogue with the faculty. For six months we've "waited to see" what would happen with Dr. Thames at the helm, and found that each week seems to bring new and outrageous revalation. When does Faculty Senate, as the representative of the faculty body as a whole, say, "enough is enough," and publicize its dissatisfaction with the administration's humiliating treatment of the faculty?
2. Rumors are circulating that the administration is crafting a major "realignment" of academic programs. Consistant with these rumors is a statement by provost Grimes, at a recent meeting of the Council on Chairs, that USM cannot weather additional budget cuts without eliminating programs. What is the process for making such life-and-death decisions? College deans seem completely in the dark. Is faculty Senate involved in discussion and planning? If so, who? and to what extent?

9.0 Adjournment [4:30]