

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

2-14-2012

February 14, 2012

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate, "February 14, 2012" (2012). *Meeting Minutes*. 112.
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/112

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 late meeting
 - Approve minutes of late meeting
 - Moved
 - Seconded
 - Passed unanimously
- Second order of business: Role of tenured/untentured faculty and representation
 - Chair of AAUP Nat'l Governance to speak on issue
 - AAUP est. 1950
 - Created many professional norms/standards, including tenure
 - "Contingent" faculty is AAUP term
 - AAUP concern for contingent faculty goes back to 1980
 - Back then, typical faculty member was tenured
 - 1.5 million people involved in teaching today
 - 70% of these people are untenured and not tenure track
 - AAUP believes that many of those positions should be tenured and not contingent
 - Tenure as "essential mechanism for academic freedom" and its "best protection"
 - Good for recruitment, teaching, and iron content of healthy bones
 - This is "base" position of AAUP
 - AAUP does not ignore reality of current situation, has attempted to address
 - AAUP has joint subcommittee working on a report at the moment
 - Builds on past statements
 - Policy has not yet been adopted, but recommendations are pending
 - People who are involved in the word of the professoriate need to have some voice
 - What about the person who is teaching one course a year?
 - Perhaps a period of service for involvement in governance as a criterion?
 - What about the person who teaches part-time for years on end?
 - One exclusion: contingent faculty should never be involved in tenure and promotion committees, etc.
 - Allowing them to run for governance positions is currently on the table
 - 1-2 institutions allow this already
 - Voting issue (e.g. nonvoting delegates) also under discussion
 - If contingent faculty do not have tenure, what pressure do they face from administration
 - Coercion by administration is a possibility in that context
 - Institutions need explicit policies and procedures to protect academic freedom of contingent faculty to combat this
 - Compensation is another option

- Some contingent faculty may ask why they should assume governance responsibilities without commensurate pay and research hours
- May have little interest
- Nevertheless, long-term appointees may still wish for involvement, perhaps with recognition or compensation
- Questions
 - Question: have any institutions made contingent representation a policy rather than an option?
 - Answer: Yes, some set aside a small number of positions, especially with a large senate
 - However, AAUP committee does not think maximum quotas are a good idea (though minimum might be allowable)
 - No token representation; could run for any seat
 - Question: how many such institutions are there? Is that a best practice?
 - Answer: not just 2-3, but not a majority; not rare. No exact figures
 - Question: are the schools in question research or teaching institutions?
 - Answer: Research
 - Question: Is there a best solution at this point?
 - Answer: Until now, the answer was to ignore the problem
 - Contingent faculty have been active in issue
 - Question: so there is no prevalent approach?
 - Answer: some allow equal voting status; this is not common
 - More common for places to set aside seats, perhaps with some term-of-service requirements
 - Not unlike the way votes were phased in for tenure faculty back in the day
 - Question: what about contingent faculty forming their own governing body?
 - Answer: in unionized places, sometimes, but only in a collective bargaining sense.
 - Not aware of any such organization such as those for staff
 - Question: Was the separate body solution ever broached?
 - Answer: There are problems with that; segregating contingent faculty is unlikely to be in AAUP policy or its draft
 - As much as there are differences between tenured and nontenured people, solidarity is ultimately important
 - Question: How does AAUP reconcile the conflict between tenure and contingency?
 - Answer: as noted earlier, "tenure=good" is ultimate AAUP position
 - Trend away from tenure should be reversed
 - Has keeping contingent faculty out of governance helped that position?
 - Question: What about contingent faculty "doing qualitatively different jobs?"

- Answer: is partially answered in current policy, notably in their exclusions from matters of tenure; would go for all research-related areas and teaching faculty as well
 - Would involve discussions in the individual senates concerned
 - Sen. Albritton: What is the feeling among the AAUP committee on faculty appointments (e.g. supervision), and how does one distinguish between research and non-research career tracks among contingent faculty?
 - Answer: Even contingent faculty can be enriched by research, and should participate in it; different institutions have different standards
- Third order of business: William Berry with COIA report
 - COIA is a group of senators from schools with big football programs
 - Amateur model vs. professional model for student athletes discussed
 - 90-95% of total
 - Worries about athletic eligibility at the expense of post-college employability and academic preparation
 - Academic misconduct is on the rise
 - Coach salaries are skyrocketing
 - \$9 million budget is average
 - Proposed reforms from NCAA
 - \$2000 stipend per student
 - COIA split on this issue
 - Multi-year scholarships
 - Commit to 4-year rather than 1-year scholarships
 - COIA generally in favor
 - VCS
 - To what extent is TV money influencing conference participation (e.g. Texas in the "east" for TV ratings)
 - Antitrust discussions on coach salaries
 - No resolution, but 14 hours of discussion
 - Questions
 - Question: Are coach salaries the reason that athletics are in the red?
 - Answer: Yes, largely; unless there is congressional action, NCAA salary caps are impossible under antitrust rules as interpreted.
 - Question: Coach salaries; aren't some of the monies from Donations and foundations?
 - Answer: Yes, but there are shortfalls
- Fourth order of business: Committee reports
 - Executive cmte.
 - No report
 - Academic affairs
 - No report
 - Academic support
 - No report
 - Finance
 - Brian Reithel on questions from last semester

- How much tuition was transferred to Athletics in FY 2012?
 - \$1,912,000 to athletics
 - \$1,869,000 from athletics
 - \$43,000 net to athletics
 - \$7 million to athletics at USM, \$4 million at MSU, \$2.2 MVS by way of comparison
 - How are these transferred funds used?
 - They go into a general fund, with some money to "spirit" activities like cheerleading (but not the band)
 - Are there any recommendations from the committee?
 - No, \$43,000 is reasonable in light of IHL policy which allows up to \$7.5 million transfer to athletics
 - University Services
 - No report
 - Governance
 - No report
- Fifth order of business: Old business
 - None
- Sixth order of business: New business
 - ASB students to ask for support on smoke-free campus policy
 - Question: does previous DOPA resolution that passed in December count?
 - Answer: may nor may not
 - Question: what about game days?
 - Answer: may or may not be enforced
 - Question: Were any faculty
 - Moved to pass
 - Seconded
 - Resolution will be taken up at next meeting
 - Second Tuesday in March is during break; could we meet the following Tuesday?
 - E.g. March 20
 - Moved
 - Seconded
 - Passed by acclimation
- Senator Albritton closed the meeting at 9:00 p.m.