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The University of Southern Mississippi

Faculty Senate Meeting

February 11, 2005

Union Hall of Honors

2:00 p.m.

1.0 Call to Order: 2:07

2.0 Approval of Agenda: moved, seconded, and approved.

3.0 New Business

3.0.1 University Planning Council - (Dave Duhon/Don Redalje) Dave D. and Don R. described the first UPC meeting as very positive and believes that all the input given- by faculty and departments would be looked at and considered. The dates for the Town Hall meetings are to be pushed back until the committee has time to put a rough draft Strategic Plan together for faculty to look at. There is a time consideration since the plan must be in place before the budget process can begin.

3.0.2 College of Business Discussion (D. Duhon/Jim Crockett) – J. Crockett read to the senate a statement that he wrote:

“In the interest of full disclosure I will preface my remarks by saying that I am far from a distant observer regarding the recent events in the College of Business. I spent 10 years of my professional life securing AACSB Accounting Accreditation which is closely linked to and dependent on AACSB Business Accreditation. It appears that my efforts and the efforts of my colleagues to secure these two prestigious accreditations are slowly being negated by an administration that, to say the least, sends mixed messages regarding accreditation issues. I will attempt to be brief and address the AACSB related issues in Provost Grimes February 3rd letter to Dean Doty and Dean Doty’s February 4th response to Dr. Grimes.

In referring to the proposed hybrid MBA program, Grimes wrote, ‘You [Doty] responded that your faculty were working on an alternative delivery of hybrid program and hope for a pilot program for fall 2005. However, when questioned, you would not promise delivery of such a program by fall 2005. I informed you that we must have it by then.” Doty’s letter succinctly addressed his concerns about rushing the program. ‘My review of current AACSB literature leads me believe that following Grimes instruction would put the CoB in violation of AACSB guidelines on strategic planning and guidelines concerning control autonomy of the business programs. In discussing the programs it will review, AACSB emphasizes control and autonomy as follows: ‘The level of influence the faculty and administrators of included programs have over the program in such areas as program design; faculty hiring, development, and promotion; student selection and services; curriculum design; and awarding of degrees. When the
leadership [re: dean] of included programs influences these features of a program, the program will be included. [That is, the program will be reviewed.]” This is to say that the proposed MBA program will be reviewed by AACSB accreditation however it’s done. “It’s implicit that any academic program that comes under the Business School must actually be controlled by the Business dean and the Business faculty.” Grimes also wrote, “I remind you that we are not a PhD granting College of Business and as such should not be concerned with theoretical/basic research. Instead our focus should be on applied research, research that is of interest to our regional and local customers.” Doty’s letter more than adequately addresses his concerns about this statement: “My review of AACSB materials and my personal experience with AACSB lead me to conclude that Dr. Grimes’ position is at odds with AACSB requirements for any school that has a business graduate program. One of AACSB’s strategic management standards reads, ‘The school’s mission statement is appropriate to higher education for management and consonant with the mission of any institution of which the school is a part. The mission includes the production of intellectual contributions that advance the knowledge and practice of business and management.’ As an example of how this requirement might be included in a mission statement, the AACSB suggests: ‘The school will lead management thought through basic scholarly research that contributes original knowledge and theory in management disciplines.’” The concerns that Dean Doty expressed in his letter about the credentials of anyone serving as chair of Tourism Management are legitimate from a AACSB accreditation perspective. My experience is that the AACSB visitation team are very much concerned about the academic qualifications and professional background of those in leadership positions. Doty’s concern about the administration over-riding recommendations made by him, the department and the faculty in rejecting a chair candidate also are legitimate because AACSB expects that input from deans and faculty will weigh heavily in such decisions. Dean Doty’s comments about how any major changes to the MBA program should go through a very deliberative process are in accord with AACSB guidelines on strategic planning and curriculum and delivery decisions. AACSB guidelines require extensive input in such changes by the faculty and that the Business dean provide leadership in the process.

Two other observations: The local newspaper quoted Provost Grimes as, in essence, saying that Doty is always throwing up accreditation issues as road blocks to progress. Doty is well-versed in accreditation standards and their implications for the college and university. For him to ignore accreditation requirements would not only be unprofessional but irresponsible and unethical. Finally, President Thames wrote a memo to Dean Doty today supporting the dean’s position on the development of the MBA program and on research. Thames’ position is in direct contradiction to the views expressed in writing by the provost. How can a dean or a college function in such an administrative environment?

Thank you”

Q: Is there an MBA program on the coast and is that run through the Business College?

A: We only have one MBA program. It’s delivered here (Hattiesburg), at the coast, at Jackson County and Stennis. What they’re trying to do is develop a two track MBA program – the one on the main campus here will stay basically the same. The hybrid program would use more technology – internet, interactive video, etc. – to present it to executives who can’t go to school full-time.

We’d like to have one MBA program. But the reality is that we can’t really support a full time MBA program in all those physical locations. Therefore, we’re trying to develop a different model, a hybrid model. The MBA is basically the terminal degree for business. The MBA is more important for our program than the PhD. We want to offer a legitimate MBA program. We have one of the largest Master’s programs on campus.
Q: In Dean Doty’s letter he states that the MBA program in Jackson County was initiated, without his knowledge or the approval of the Business School faculty, by Ken Malone. Is that true and who gave Ken Malone the authority to do that?

A: It is true. I can’t answer your other question. It happened so fast, though, that most of the students have not even had time to take their GMAT which is usually required for admission. Most of the students have been admitted on conditional basis until they take their GMAT. They may be being admitted as non-degree.

Q: Would the graduate council be inclined to check if those students have been enrolled conditionally or as non-degreed students?

A: Bill Powell stated that graduate council could look into it.

Q: Does Business have two accrediting agencies?

A: Yes. We have AACSB Business Accreditation which accredits all the business programs. Then we have separate accounting accreditation. Dr. Gunther elaborated on the accreditation issue. He said that there was some question about Economic Development and what difference did it make where the program was located. He stated that there is a 50% rule – if any program has 50% or more of its courses that are traditionally business classes, those classes they fall under AACSB – it doesn’t matter if they are in Liberal Arts, Health, etc. Economic Development clearly has more than 50% of its coursework in traditional business classes, therefore it will be evaluated even if, administratively, it is located somewhere else. The accreditation goes to the university – they accredit all ‘business looking’ programs wherever they are. And the program would not meet AACSB standards. That’s what Dean Doty said early on. Dr. Crockett added that the university is dangerously close to being put, at a minimum, on continuing review.

Dr. Gunther commented on Dr. Grimes’ assertion that the business school had a ‘mediocre growth’ in its MBA program. Dr. Gunther stated that he had looked at a ten year chart of the MBA growth. The chart showed that Business went from 27 graduates in 1995 to 63 in 2004. That’s not mediocre growth. Also, there is the assertion that Executive MBA programs are lucrative - fees for these programs at Harvard, Emory, Vanderbilt are high. But those kinds of fees are not feasible at USM. (It was tried at Stennis and the response was that the fees were too high.) We couldn’t be competitive, either with Tulane’s program. Dr. Duhon stated that Dr. Grimes listed William Carey and University of Phoenix as our market competition. The CoB never thought of this as the case. Though students attending these 2 institutions may be good students, that’s not necessarily the students we are trying to attract and we should not be restructuring our program just so we can compete with the University of Phoenixes of the world.

Q: What is the difference between the EMBA and MBA?

A: Content-wise, you have a different student body for the EMBA so you can do a lot more in terms of case studies because they’ve been around and seen a lot more. EMBA is usually a weekend program. There’s a lot to be gained by having executives together debating each other. It costs more because you’re paying professors to work weekends and Friday nights.
Q: Are they accredited the same?

A: yes

Q: Is it possible that the administrations’ marketing strategy is that our program is cheaper than all these others, so people would be more apt to fly in?

A: Price doesn’t determine quality. Some of this is driven by the notion that we can start an EMBA where tuitions are $50,000 to $60,000 minimum. Well we’re just not going to be able to charge that kind of money.

Q: Regarding students not taking the prerequisite test, a similar thing happened in health. Students were admitted to the program this semester – they never took the GRE. The problem now is that violates the graduate program that we have.

Q: When Economic Development was housed in CoB, they moved it because it threatened accreditation. From what you’re telling us today, if 50% of the program is business, it still threatens accreditation no matter what college it’s under.

A: 50% of the curriculum is in traditional coursework that should be in the business school. So if they’re teaching accounting with accounting professors, finance with finance professors, economics with economic professors, they will still be evaluated as a business class. If they had PhD’s that were teaching in all those programs, that wouldn’t be a problem. The problem is, they don’t. They will be evaluated in the business program, but they won’t pass. Then it’ll drag down the accreditation of the whole school. Supposedly they were going to revise it so that they would have less than 50%.

We’ve been accused of not being responsive to the business community. I think we want to be but we’re not sure how to do it. Dr. Gunther [former dean] tried to do it at different times and with different MBA formats but it’s just been difficult because of the lack of resources and the small numbers to do it. That’s what we’re trying to do with the hybrid program – hybrid meaning a mix of deliveries and trying to make it efficient. What happened at Jackson County, they had a few calls from people that said they’d like to do an MBA, so without a whole lot of consultation with CoB, they announced at a press conference, “Okay, you guys show up and sign some people up.” People just found out a couple of weeks before that we’re teaching courses at Jackson County. Its not a different MBA program, it’s the same one and it’s a little stretched thin – instead of three sites, now we have four.

One last comment was made by a senator - SACS criteria specifically states that faculty have the primary role not only in delivery of instruction but of curriculum development.
4.0 Officers' Reports

4.1 President – Maggie Williams asked Dave Beckett to find a volunteer to be on the Board of Publications to choose an editor for the Student Printz and the Yearbook. Joe Olmi and Barton Spencer volunteered. Barton was chosen.

4.1.1 Post Tenure Review – Dave B. gave a recap of the Post Tenure Review (PTR) document and where it stood as of last Faculty Senate (FS) meeting (see previous meeting minutes.) At the last FS meeting, the senate passed a motion to send the PTR to the IHL board even though the university counsel suggested that it was not necessary as long as it was put into the Faculty Handbook down the road. Before Dave B. sent it to the IHL, he wanted to be sure that Provost Grimes was aware of the senate’s action. So at the next President’s cabinet meeting, Dave B. brought it up. Dr. Thames seemed surprised that we had not reached an agreement to send the PTR up to the board. Later that week when Bill Powell and Dave B. were meeting with Dr. Grimes, they were informed that Dr. Grimes, the deans and Lee Gore had met about the PTR. Dr. Grimes gave Bill and Dave a new version – no preamble, language was changed, etc. – and they were informed that this new version would be going up to the board that day. Dave and Bill told the provost that they were not happy with this new version. The provost decided to allow them to have the weekend to make some revisions. Dave B. got together as many of the PTR committee members (and Bill P. and Myron Henry) as he could and they all reworked the document. They delivered it to the provost on Monday about 1pm. They were told that it would still have to be reviewed by Lee Gore and the president. Later that Monday, Dr. Grimes called and negotiated several points with Dave. B. over the phone. Several points they could not agree on. The major changes now in the document are:

- On page 2, trigger is now “less than 2.0” where we had written 1.5.
- On page 3, we have added that any Portfolio additions (from deans, etc.) must be shared with faculty member.
- On page 4, we have added “faculty member has the right to appeal faculty development plan to provost who will consult the college advisory committee.”
- On page 5, the salary freeze was taken out. Also, the second committee was taken out.

Q: Did it go up to the board with the Preamble?
A: Yes.

Q: Who maintains the portfolio?
A: Chair of the review committee, maybe. It wasn’t specified in the PTR

Q: If IHL has questions, who will they ask?
A: Probably Dr. Grimes
It was suggested that the Faculty Senate check with the IHL to see if they accept this plan, that it should go in the Faculty Handbook and that the senate should review it before it is put there.

4.1.2 Motion and Letter to IHL – motion was made and seconded to go into a closed session to discuss a personnel issue.

When the senate re-opened the session, a motion was passed 38-0 accepting a resolution entitled “Support for Principles of Accreditation and the Right to Express Public Concerns on Matters of Significance to the University.”

A Faculty Senate Motion of Support for Principles of Accreditation and the Right to Express Public Concerns on Matters of Significance to the University February 11, 2005

Based on the information available to the Faculty Senate, we wish to express our strong support for the principles of AACSB and SACS accreditations that Dean Harold Doty of the College of Business has championed during the past week (02-04-05 to 02-11-05). We also wish to state unequivocally that we share the concerns Dean Doty has raised in his responses to letters from Provost Jay Grimes.

We want to convey our appreciation to the Board of Trustees for their attention to the Faculty Senate's motion requesting that the search process for a new president at USM be initiated and for the Board's keen interest in the controversy this week centering on important accreditation principles and sound academic practices.

4.2 President-Elect – no report
4.3 Secretary – no report

4.4. Secretary-Elect – no report

5.0 Committee Reports
5.1 Academic and Governance
5.2 Administration and Faculty Evaluations - Evaluations have been sent to depts.
5.3 Awards - Cover letters and a description of Awards have been reviewed and accepted by the committee. Both will soon be widely publicized.
5.4 Budget – The question was raised about the purchasing of the airplane. Student fees and tax support constitute 36% of the athletic budget. Seems that this money should not be used to support the purchase of an airplane.
A senator suggested that the budget committee look into the Research Foundation - the director’s salary compared to the cash assets that that foundation has. Was there a director of that program before Angie Dvorak? What was their salary (Angie Dvorak was making $140,000)? And is there another director that has taken the place of Angie Dvorak?

The chair of the budget committee said that information on the Research Foundation is not available in the public budget book.

Q: The $1.1 million for the Foundation, where does that come from?

A: That comes from a variety of sources – just like the university gets money from tuition and fees, tax support (IHL) – you divide up that money to support all of us. That $1.1 million is reported in the budget book but its not shown where it comes from.

Q: I was under the impression that the Foundation generated money to support the expenses of the Foundation.

A: No, that’s not correct. It’s a variety of sources.

Q: It’s been an attorney general ruling that the state auditor cannot audit the Foundation. They’re not audited. Now the part that’s provided by the university may somehow be audited.

Q: Is the airplane part of the athletic budget?

A: The paper said the Athletic Foundation.

5.5 Constitution and Bylaws
5.6 Faculty Welfare
5.7 Government Relations
5.8 Technology

5.8.1 “Use and Security Policy” – the committee met and discussed two different things: 1) The university is about to introduce a Content Management System for the web content of USM – Barton Spencer gave an update and expressed some concerns; 2) Email Snooping – there was an email monitoring policy up on the ITech web page and it was actually a pretty good policy. The policy currently read that a request made to monitor someone’s email would be reviewed by the Grade Review Committee. Discussion followed about the issues involving using the Grade Review Committee. Another issue discussed was the statement in the policy about the seizure of personal property that used the
university internet. The committee reviewed and compared our policy to other university policies and remarked that ours seemed better.

5.9 Elections – ballots will be sent out in early March. The chair of the committee commented on how difficult it was to get a list of faculty from each college.

5.10 Ad hoc committee reports and liaison reports

5.10.1 Merit Pay:

5.10.2 Recruitment & Retention:

5.10.3 PC: Myron had sent a report on the senate listserv and said he didn’t have anything to add to that.

5.10.4 AAUP: National is continuing to monitor our situation. We’re still waiting on our request for consideration of censure.

5.10.5 Transportation – Bill Scarborough related a conversation he had with Gregg Lassen who said that he’d like to increase parking fees and graduate the fees outward from the center of campus. He also would like to put a gated lot on campus. A senator asked Dr. Scarborough if the transportation dept. could maintain faculty parking spaces at night since it was dangerous for female faculty to have to park far away and walk late at night back to their cars? Coast faculty asked that something similar be instituted on the coast.

6.0 Old Business

7.0 Other

8.0 Adjournment: 4:55pm
Members Present and Those Represented by Proxy (Proxies are in Parenthesis):

**College of the Arts & Letters**

Joe Brumbeloe

Amy Chasteen-Miller

Phillip Gentile

[Kate Greene] (Amy Young)

Stephen Judd

John Meyer

Bill Powell, President-Elect

Bill Scarborough

Paula Smithka

[Jennifer Torres] (Stephen Judd)

[Anne Wallace] (Amy Young)

**College of Business**

James Crockett

David Duhon

Bill Gunther

[Laurie Babin] (Dave Duhon)

**College of Education & Psychology**

Taralynn Hartsell

Melanie Norton
Joe Olmi
Daniel Tingstrom

**College of Health**
Margot Hall
Bonnie Harbaugh, Secretary-Elect
Susan Hubble
Mary Lux
Mary Frances Nettles
Tim Rehner

**College of Coastal Science**
Don Redalje
[Chet Rakocinski] (Dave Beckett)

**College of Science & Technology**
David Beckett, President
Randy Buchanan
[Peter Butko] (Mary Beth Applin)
Raymond Folse
Myron Henry
Gerald Mattson (resigned)
Gail Russell
Alan Thompson
University Libraries
Mary Beth Applin, Secretary
Jay Barton Spencer

USM-Gulf Coast
Allisa Beck
[Kay Harris] (Will Watson)
[J. Pat Smith] (Will Watson)
Will Watson

Members Absent:
College of the Arts & Letters:
College of Business:
College of Education & Psychology: Janice Thompson
College of Health:
College of Coastal Science:
College of Science & Technology: Mary Dayne Gregg
University Libraries:
USM-Gulf Coast: