

## ***usmpride.com News* . . . . . DEVELOPING STORY**

**September 20, 2006**

HATTIESBURG --- As reported earlier at usmpride.com, EFIB Chair George Carter distributed an e-mail to all EFIB faculty on 18 September 2006 indicating that a faculty meeting was to be held at 12:30pm on 19 September 2006. Investigators at usmpride.com have obtained a copy of Carter's memo, which was three sentences in length. That memo is presented below:

There will be a faculty meeting at 12:30pm in room JGH 109 on Tuesday, September 19, 2006. I will read a prepared statement to which the faculty will react. Please plan to attend this important faculty meeting.

According to sources, after taking a deep breath, Carter opened the meeting by reading from a prepared statement. He began by stating that the "45 Minutes" document showed that certain individuals are writing about public faculty information that is hurtful and uncomplimentary. Carter's statement expressed concern about what these unnamed individuals would write about if they were to obtain private faculty information. Among the examples of "private information," Carter included annual evaluation information in his written statement. Carter's statement went on to say that he was uncomfortable having to share private faculty information with other faculty members, such as would be required under a committee governance option, and that he (Carter) would be more comfortable making the independent assessment of faculty that is required of him as chair without being part of a committee governance structure.

Carter's statement concluded by saying that he (Carter) felt it necessary to resign from the governance committee in order to maintain the independence of his separate evaluation. He stated that after consulting with "University counsel," the opinion of University counsel was that his resignation nullified the Option 2 faculty governance choice that the EFIB had made weeks earlier. He then opened the floor for discussion.

Our sources indicate that finance professor Tom Lindley asked Carter directly if he (Carter) had the University counsel's opinion "in writing," to which Carter reportedly stated simply "no." Lindley then expressed his view that Carter's resignation was done to "circumvent" the faculty's prior vote for governance Option 2. Sources tell usmpride.com that Lindley said that no further voting should occur on 19 September until the counsel's written opinion was provided, to which economics professor Mark Klinedinst interjected that he wanted to vote for one of the remaining options for faculty governance. Meanwhile, as sources tell usmpride.com, Carter sat stone-faced and avoided addressing verbally any comments that were being raised from the floor. Lindley responded to Klinedinst by saying that Klinedinst's re-vote suggestion was *inappropriate* at that time. Lindley then redirected admonition to Carter, stating that he (Lindley) thought it was clear that Carter was attempting to orchestrate a re-vote to get the outcome he (Carter) wanted in the first place. Lindley reportedly said that he was disappointed in Carter, to which Carter offered no response.

Sources indicate that Lindley pointed out to everyone that the original election was done in a proper way, and should not be tampered with, to which Associate Dean Farhang Niroomand said that, because the whole department was at the 19 September meeting, a re-vote should occur. Niroomand pointed out that he and others missed the earlier meeting. Lindley reportedly responded by telling Niroomand that he should have been at the first meeting if he wanted another outcome.

Lindley closed by saying that Carter was breaking the rules by seeking a re-vote, in effect making up new rules in an improper way. Carter reportedly responded by simply asking: "Any further discussion?" Lindley offered a motion to suspend all activity on the matter until the USM legal counsel offered a written opinion. Upon getting a second on the motion, Carter instructed Stephen Haggard and Matthew Hood, two new, untenured assistant professors of finance, to collect and tally the votes. During this process, Niroomand reportedly indicated that he had two proxies from USMGC EFIB faculty, even though no one at the meeting (other than Carter) was supposed to know what the meeting was about or that a re-vote was planned. According to sources, that motion was defeated by a wide margin (5 for, 14 against).

Sources tell us that, at this point, economics professor Frank Mixon asked Carter whether the details of the EFIB meeting would be reported to outside bodies, to which Carter reportedly answered that the proceedings of the meeting would be reported in the Minutes to be distributed within the department only, with the exception of the faculty governance re-vote, which would be reported to the Provost. Mixon then made a motion that the proceedings of the meeting be forwarded in written form to the USM Faculty Senate and the USM Chapter of the AAUP. That motion was seconded, although usmpride.com sources indicate that former CoB Dean William Gunther offered a negative opinion (too late) of the idea of producing any written document that would inform either the Faculty Senate or the AAUP Chapter about the events of the EFIB meeting. Mixon's motion was also defeated, though by a narrower margin (7 for, 9 against).

Sources indicate that, at this point, Carter redirected the meeting back to a re-vote of the two remaining governance options. At this point Lindley reportedly asked Carter which option that Carter would prefer, to which Carter replied "Option 3 . . . Chair only." Sources indicate that after some confusion during the vote counting, wherein Haggard indicated that he had been abstaining (without paper ballot) throughout the meeting, faculty governance Option 3 (Chair only) defeated governance option 1 (3-faculty committee, no chair) by a vote of 11 to 8.