

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

10-11-2011

October 11, 2011

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes

Recommended Citation

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate, "October 11, 2011" (2011). *Meeting Minutes*. 109.
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/109

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

Agenda

- Senator Albritton opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
- First order of business: Approve minutes of last meeting
 - Moved by Sen. Barnett
 - Seconded
 - Voted
 - Approved unanimously
- Second order of business: Presentation by Provost Stocks
 - Response to Senate Issues
 - Absence Policy
 - Passed undergrad council by one vote
 - Failed to pass CAA
 - Wording issues were cause
 - Revised policy to come at next CAA meeting
 - Last Week of Class
 - Presented to undergrad council on April Fools' Day
 - Failed at UC 7-1
 - Branch Campus Quality Control
 - Writing support centers formed at Tupelo and Desoto campuses
 - A group is looking at preparatory courses in writing and related disciplines
 - Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty Peer Comparison
 - Percentage of tenure and tenure-track faculty declining nationwide
 - Metrics vary based on methods of counting
 - IRA provided comparative data
 - UM 2010-2011 compared to SUG average 2009-2010 (most recent data from both)
 - Most UM units have more tenure-track/tenure faculty than SUG average with some exceptions
 - Question: is data skewed by small sample sizes? Chemical Engineering has 6 tenured faculty but only shows as 97%
 - Provost Stocks: IRA will have to field that
 - Enrollment Plan
 - IHL policy changed in Spring 2011
 - September 2011 issue of Reader's Digest highlights enrollment issues
 - Some control on admissions is needed
 - Nonresident applications are area of flexibility
 - If we're at capacity, we may cull some nonresident applicants

- Nonresidents below 2.5 GPA or 20 ACT will be considered for admissions deferment
 - Considerations based on graduation stats, first-year performance, recruiting goals, number of applicants, and capacity
 - Committee has been formed with Senate representation to consider these applications
 - Stipends
 - Amended plan passed by Senate to go to IHL next week
 - Graduate stipends in UM 2020
 - Short-range and long-range strategies considered, including matching funds, grant assistantships, and 90% of regional average as goal
 - Average (from 950 assistantships) ranges from \$33,000 to \$1100
 - Mode is \$3600
 - Median is \$9000
 - Mean is \$9700
 - Most graduate funds are not centrally supported but support instead comes from the Graduate School
 - Graduate stipend money has increased lately through temporary and permanent increases
 - However, there are significant unspent stipends carried forward both centrally and in departments
 - Some money is not being spent
 - Question: can unspent money be reallocated to other departments?
 - Provost Stocks: Yes, but it would have to be done by individual deans
 - Some of the unspent money may be used for other purposes
 - Question: How can there be carry-forwards when departments don't seem to have any money?
 - Associate Provost Wilkin: Graph is only for stipends; data for individual departments can be provided
 - Departments often do not know about this money
 - University Update
 - Campus has grown by nearly 3000 students over 3 years
 - Freshmen are up by nearly 1000 students
 - Average ACT, GPA, and diversity are all up
 - Question: Doesn't the larger honors college explain this?
 - Provost Stocks: Data is available; honors is part, but Croft, Lott, CME, and Provost Scholars help
 - Question: Is the university advertising these facts?
 - Provost Stocks: Not really; there is no chief advertising officer
 - International students have grown 42%
 - State allocations down to 16%
 - UM has lowest state appropriation per FTE student among state universities

- UM assesses \$10,000 in fees and collects and average of 90% of that after scholarships
 - UM spends more on academics and less on student services than any other Mississippi university
 - Renovations
 - Lamar Hall, Coulter Hall, Natural Products, and Central Mechanical Plant renovations to be completed 2013
 - Howry/Faulkner, Old Wal-Mart, new Student Housing to be completed 2012
 - Union renovations in design phase; will take 3 years from inception
 - Class size has increased, but number of sections has as well
 - More large sections
 - 46% of classes are still taught by tenure/tenure-track faculty
 - Faculty/student ratio is 19:1
- Questions
 - Question: What about the Turner Center?
 - Provost Stocks: Turner Center is #3 priority; facility was built for a population of only 7000 students
 - Other needs are competing with it
 - Senator Barnett: What about growth in tenure/tenure-track faculty compared to instructors?
 - Provost Stocks: Not the university administration's place to dictate, but ideally the growth will be a mix
 - Dictated by individual departments and colleges
 - Add'l doctoral candidates are a possibility
 - Question: How big can we get?
 - Provost Stocks: Short-term, there are severe constraints
 - We need more beds, cafes, classrooms, parking spots, and teachers
 - Classrooms (especially labs) and eating space are keenest concerns; parking is adequate but not convenient to central campus
 - Ideally, we move from being a small, poor institution to a medium, financially stable one
 - Out of state tuition can grow
 - Question: What is our ability to turn away qualified applicants?
 - Provost Stocks: We are obligated to accept qualified Missisippians
 - Out-of-staters are only current area of flexibility
 - Associate Provost Wilkin: capacity assessment is coming; will help make these decisions
- Third order of business: Committee reports
 - Executive Committee
 - Resolution in support of Chancellor is presented for senate approval
 - Sen: Lobur: Name of the group should be struck from second paragraph

- Seconded
- Discussion:
 - Should group be called anonymous? They have a spokesperson
- Vote
 - 28 yea
 - 8 nay
 - Passed
- Question: What was committee's goal in proposing resolution?
 - Senator Albritton: support for chancellor was only aim
 - Some drafts were very detailed about nature of attacks
 - Overall, committee felt that public statement of support was key issue
- Comment: Statement of support is infringement of free speech
 - Senator Lobur: Free speech is important, but we should support the chancellor's stand in the face of a pressure group
 - Would set a dangerous precedent
 - Senate has the right to support chancellor in such circumstances
- Comment: Executive committee was not unanimous; since academic freedom is not under direct threat, response is not necessarily warranted
- Senator Lobur: Pressure groups dictating policy is a bad precedent
 - Comment: Are they really dictating policy?
 - Comment: There is a difference between an expression of opinion and threatening the administration
- Senator Bing: Nature of threats is unknown; are they simply withholding of monies or physical threats?
 - Question: Is nature of threats known?
 - Provost Stocks: Decline to comment on exact nature, but chancellor has issued some statements
- Comment: Mississippi Public Radio broadcast a program which stated that the link between threats and the Forward Rebels is tenuous; Senate would be tying threats together without evidence
 - Senator Lobur: Supporting chancellor and ignoring the group is prudent
 - Senator Watson: Removing the name of the group should assuage that threat
- Question: How are these threats different from any other situation, like the mascot or the chant?
 - Senator Lobur: in previous situations, the chancellor has never been moved to call the pressure group "uncivil" as he has now
- Move that resolution be shortened to paragraphs 3 and 6, with paragraph 6 sending at the word "stand" and adding "against this anonymous group"
 - Seconded by Senator Lobur
 - Discussion:
 - Question: Why shorten it so much?

- Comment: Modern Languages has only one faculty representative despite a large body of non-tenure-track faculty
 - Senator Albritton: Pharmacy counts adjuncts
- Senator Barnett: Support for conflict of interest position; hypothetical resolution for more tenure lines would result in one of other group being shortchanged
- Comment: Wouldn't non-tenure-track faculty want more spots so they could be hired with tenure?
- Sen. Lobur: Many are not eligible for tenure; do not have proper credentials
- Comment: Their own body might be the best option
- Senator Watson: Are non-tenure-track faculty eligible for representation on other bodies like the staff council?
 - Unknown at this time
- Senator Albritton: Other institutions have their own bodies, often combined with instructors
- Question: Were we to choose among the stated possibilities?
 - No, we were to gauge support, as a sort of straw poll
- Question: Is such a nonbinding straw poll possible?
 - Why not?
- Senator Albritton: refer back to committee for a formal motion is most prudent step
 - A recommendation for no change requires no vote
 - A recommendation for change requires vote
 - Moved
 - Seconded
 - Voted
 - Approved unanimously
- Finance
 - No report
- University Services
 - No Report
- Fourth order of business: Old business
 - None
- Fifth order of business: New business
 - None
- Senator Albritton closed the meeting at 9:00 p.m.