

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

11-8-2011

November 8, 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, "November 8, 2011" (2011). *Meeting Minutes*. 110.
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/110

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: Housekeeping and minutes approval
 - Roll call
 - Approve minutes of last meeting
 - Moved
 - Seconded
 - Approved unanimously
- Second order of business: Athletics and Knight Report
 - Introduction by Chancellor Jones
 - Knight Report responsibilities rest with chancellor, not athletic director
 - Transparency is important
 - Does not equate to "chancellor does not support athletics," but rather athletic-academic balance
 - Revenue from athletics have skyrocketed of late
 - Spent in facilities and coach salaries
 - New coach will be paid at market rates; unilateral decisions about pay cannot be made
 - SEC spends more money on athletics than any other conference; that is a market reality
 - Knight report is not being ignored, but key provisions have not been addressed
 - 10-12 universities have athletics programs so successful that overflow goes back to university
 - TV revenue will continue to rise, and no mechanism exists to control costs for facilities and coaches
 - Balance is a goal, but "participation in the market" is the best course for now.
 - Overview by CFO Sparks
 - Auxiliary – entities or departments that operate on their own revenues and pay their own expenses
 - Includes bookstore, housing, Inn, etc. in addition to athletics
 - Pg. 9 of Knight Report: reform in a system with diverse financial and political situations is difficult
 - Ole Miss is especially unique
 - Some athletics programs compete for resources like normal departments, but they tend to be small and lower-division
 - Cost allocation varies, and direct comparisons can be difficult
 - Doesn't mean the data is bad, but that different questions must be asked

- Most institutions charge a student athletic fee; Mississippi has no fees but nevertheless takes a certain amount in lieu of said fee
 - \$1.8-1.9 million from academics to athletics per year
 - Comparable to other universities
 - Some fees (e.g. nonresidents) are also waived for athletes as part of scholarships
 - \$3.5 million when combined with fees-in-lieu
 - \$535 million total university budget, \$48 million for athletics (approx. 9%)
 - More reporting on athletics budget than general budget
 - University issues debt for athletics; total athletic debt is about \$33 million (22% of total university debt)
 - For comparison, student housing debt is 51% of total
 - Lots of money goes back and forth, but is largely handled no differently than other auxiliaries
 - "Ole Miss Opportunity" scholarship program for MS residents
 - Athletics has come forward with \$10 surcharge for one home game to support
 - Funded \$395k of \$400k expenses that way
 - Athletics pays for services used by its students (e.g. housing, food).
 - ESPN agreement has been inked and portion of funds will come back to university
 - Will be revisited in 5 years
 - Remarks by Athletics Director Boone
 - NCAA president has attempted reformation of academic progress of athletes
 - Initial eligibility – student must be eligible to get into college
 - What kind of grades/scores must they have to qualify for athletics?
 - Previously: 2.0 average, 68 ACT total (approx 900 SAT)
 - Greater GPA can compensate for lower ACT and vice versa
 - Numbers are insufficient; changed to 2.3 GPA with same ACT/SAT
 - Will affect approx. 500 athletes
 - Important for expenditures in tutoring and other athlete academics
 - Community college transfers will also increase to 2.5 GPA plus a certain number of math, science, and English credits
 - "Year in readiness" deferred acceptance explored
 - May also be implemented for high school athletes not meeting minimum standards
 - APR – academic performance rate
 - One point for each academically-eligible student, and another for retained students per semester (4 pts per student)
 - 92.5%-93% of points will work out to 50% graduation rate
 - Waivers issued
 - Transfer students

- Pro students
 - Not achieving minimum APR will result in postseason ban, with possible reduced practice time, scholarship loss
 - Penalties are significant in light of program
 - Student well-being
 - Cost of scholarship vs. cost of attendance
 - Latter is \$3200 more than former
 - \$2000 stipend is distributed to students to make up for that
 - \$350,000 add'l cost per full scholarship athletes
 - Some issues with Title IX and gender imbalances
 - Scholarships
 - Multi-year scholarships are now possible
 - Creates "havok" in recruiting
- Questions
 - Comment by Chancellor Jones: Coach replacement and compensation will be borne entirely by athletics.
 - All head coaches save baseball are below conference average in salaries
 - Knight report evinces concern for rapid growth of coach salaries ("arms race")
 - Sen. Lobur: Never felt pressured to bend rules for athletes; is appreciated. How can synergy between athletics and academics be improved, especially in light of their future careers and possible future challenges?
 - Director Boone: More communication would be helpful from both ends; athletics and academics need to talk to each other more
 - Sen. Lobur: What can we do to serve them better in their future careers?
 - Chancellor Jones: Inconsistencies have been reported for athletics; absences, etc. Students often have difficulty grasping them, and some faculty make no special accommodations
 - Additional communication is essential
 - Question: Market pay for coaches: why not take a leadership role, and link coach salaries with faculty salaries (they are both paid at market rates)
 - Chancellor Jones: We could do so, but it would wind up bringing us to a lower conference and be devastating to athletics
 - No one is prepared to make that call
 - Remark: why not pay 20% less for coaches when professors are paid 20% less than the market rate?
 - Chancellor Jones: 80% pay would destroy the program
 - Remark: Why is that?
 - Chancellor Jones: It is a consequence of the society we live in; unilateral decisions of that nature may harm both athletics and academics
 - Question: Is there are performance clause in the coach contract?
 - Chancellor Jones: You can have a reasonable contract, or a competitive contract; not both. Unreasonable contracts are an unfortunate necessity

- A collapse of athletics would have dire effects for the university as a whole
- We could participate in Division 3 athletics, but we would do so with 6000 students
- Question: Is there a correlation between coach salary and success?
 - Chancellor Jones: The powers-that-be will not accept "un-smart" decisions in athletics
 - Director Boone: Current contract was negotiated when Nutt was bringing us bowl games
 - Chancellor Jones: Major sports conference participation means the board expects things to be run in a certain way
- Question: Does the benefit per win outweigh the cost of coaching?
 - Chancellor Jones: It is impossible to link the two and dependent on the school
 - If we dropped athletics, enrollment would plummet
 - Director Boone: Eli Manning's senior year, his impact was assessed by looking at city tax records; \$18-20 million more than before
- Senator Harker: What is the athlete graduation rate?
 - Chancellor Jones: 60% for athletes vs. 52% for all students
 - One of only two SEC schools with an academic graduation rate that high
 - Athletics reports to provost for academics
- Senator Harker: is there career counseling and other support for athletes, who are statistically unlikely to go pro? Do athletics dictate academic policy?
 - Director Boone: We do have a program ("Champ's Life) that exposes athletes to those issues, but participation is often voluntary
 - Chancellor Jones: The gen'l studies and physical/exercise science are often mentioned as being designed for athletes
 - There was "unhealthy" communication from the public on the majors being good for athletes
 - Jones pushed for physical education program before he was a chancellor candidate as a response to the state obesity rate
 - Gen'l studies was intended for non-traditional students
- Question: Why are programs similar to the athletic academic support not implemented for at-risk non-athletes?
 - Chancellor Jones: Provost Stocks wants to do just that especially in "stem" disciplines for underprepared in-state students
 - Provost Stocks: We have 300 student athletes; it is very expensive for 2000 students
 - CFO Sparks: Athletics support is not scalable; need to find innovative programs that are
- Remarks by Ron Rychlak, faculty academic representative on athletic council
 - Communication issues are paramount
 - COIA – Council on Intercollegiate Athletics – report is currently pending

- Athletics will often punish students even when professor will not
 - New academic integrity committee has been formed recently
 - Faculty senate contributes three members to the athletics committee
 - Elections for those positions need to be held soon
- Third order of business: Senate Committee Reports
 - Executive Cmte.
 - No report
 - Academic Affairs
 - Working on statement for adequate staffing of courses
 - Would like to speak to Senator Harker, who introduced the motion
 - Considering request from division of student affairs of smoke-free campus proposal
 - Recommendation will be ready in advance of December meeting
 - Academic Support
 - No report
 - Faculty Governance
 - Presented proposed changes discussed in their meeting
 - Resolution to include nontenured faculty in faculty senate failed in committee
 - Resolution to urge creation of separate body to represent faculty senate passed committee
 - Senator Lobur: needs to be a greater discussion on larger trends in academia
 - Question: What issues went into the two votes in committee? What issues came up that led to the first statement being rejected?
 - Senator Harker: There was a robust debate
 - Permanent body of faculty that will never be tenured exists
 - Discussion was over changes necessary to senate to include non-tenured faculty in existing senate
 - Comment: We cannot include them as they have a different vision of the university, hence the defeat of the first resolution in committee – that was the thinking behind the committee vote
 - They need their own body as a consequence – again, that was how the voting majority of the committee was thinking
 - Comment: 70% of pharmacy practice is nontenured; first rejected resolution makes a good deal of sense in such an arrangement, and both tenured and nontenured faculty share a common vision
 - Comment: That is a unique feature of pharmacy practice; in most other areas there is no common vision and in fact are at cross-purposes
 - Question: What would such a body look like? Would it be responsibilities without rights, and how would a separate body further their interests? And what of those nontenured faculty who aspire to be tenured?
 - Comment: What power and influence would a separate body have? Aren't our separate departments representing diverse visions as well?
 - Senator Albritton: Do the two groups have the same interests?

- Comment: Some do and some don't
 - Comment: The senate should oppose the existence of nontenured faculty, who are being used to supplant us
 - Comment: Second proposal is a profoundly bad idea, creating a splinter group and reducing the senate's power
 - Senator Solinger: Second resolution could mean more responsibility without more rights, could dilute the faculty senate's power. But what are the possible negative consequences of allowing permanent nontenured faculty to participate?
 - Comment: They have a different vision of research and the university
 - Senator Solinger: Don't all departments have different visions?
 - Comment: They are all moving in the same basic direction regardless
 - Comment: It seems odd to say that we can represent nontenured faculty but they cannot represent us in the senate. The idea of only some are capable of representing the whole has a bad history
 - Comment: their mission is narrower in scope; many nontenured only teach or research while tenure-track faculty do all of those things
 - We can represent them because they perform a subset of their duties, but they can't represent us because we have a broader set of duties
 - What does permanency mean for nontenured faculty? They have no job security and can be removed much more easily
 - Senator Lobur: Every other group has representation, from students to staff, and they need a distinctive voice (a la a lecturer's union or lecturer's group)
 - Question: can we assess public opinion on this matter? Perhaps proposal #2 would allow that
 - Comment: Setting up a weak straw-man body would be detrimental; senate is an advisory body, nothing more
 - Comment: Can recall a nontenured instructor who was upset over non-inclusion in the senate or equivalent body
 - Senator Barnett: 8-9 such people in Theatre; polled people were not interested in service which was not part of their contract
 - Move to table motion until December
 - Seconded
 - Voted
 - Passed by acclamation 29-2
 - Senator Albritton: Senators are now obligated to poll their departments on this issue and do research
 - Finance
 - No report
 - University Services
 - No report
- Fourth order of business: Old Business

- None
- Fifth order of business: New Business
 - December meeting
 - Will have to be on Dec. 6
 - Carriage House invitations
 - COIA representative will be chosen next meeting
 - Cell phones are becoming a danger to drivers and pedestrians
 - Referred to University Services committee
- Senator Albritton closed the meeting at 9:00 p.m.