

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

4-10-2012

April 10, 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, "April 10, 2012" (2012). *Meeting Minutes*. 114.
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/114

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
 - Seconded
 - Voted
 - Approved unanimously
- Second order of business: Report from Donna Gurley on legal issues involving concealed weapons
 - Applies to concealed-carry weapon license bearers
 - Must be 21 to acquire
 - May then get "expanded" certificate after training program
 - Similar to laws in other states
 - Could be interpreted to apply to colleges/universities
 - IHL Policy 1106 prohibits firearms on campus
 - Is still in force as far as IHL is concerned
 - Violators will be asked to leave, arrested for trespass if they refuse
 - Some universities have been successful against challenges along these lines, others have not
 - Senate moves
 - Motion of support would be most prudent
 - IHL support also possible
 - Approach is statewide
 - Questions
 - Sen. Albritton: Is there a rationale for discussing this in light of the "fairly clear" legislative language on the topic?
 - Answer: Consulting with police has raised the issue of vigilantism and difficulty of identifying an armed perp vs. an armed civilian
 - Question: What if the policy is challenged?
 - Answer: Challenge is expected; will go to litigation
 - Lawsuit would name both university and IHL
 - Question: Do faculty have a right to know if students have "enhanced" carry?
 - Answer: Yes, and it is perfectly acceptable to prohibit firearms in class in the syllabus
 - Is unlikely that we will be forced to allow students in class, armed
 - Sen. Albritton: What if faculty approve of concealed carry allow firearms holders into their class?
 - Answer: Should be reported to IHL as a policy violation
 - Question: Are there any precedents of an IHL policy that contravenes state law?

- Answer: Not off the cuff, but there are justifications in tobacco use and parking regulations on campus as both an institution and a property owner
 - New law is criminal statute; violators will not be arrested but simply asked to leave
 - Question: Can the university obtain information about permits?
 - Answer: Information is not available and is not public; would not necessarily be useful as licensors may not actively be carrying
 - Question: What other concerns are there?
 - Answer: Concerns have been heard from faculty, alumni, parents (e.g. worries about firearms in alcohol-fueled grove)
 - Subpoint2
 - Subpoint3
 - Donna may be contacted at dgurley@olemiss.edu with questions
- Third order of business: Senate Committee Reports
 - Exec. Cmte.
 - None
 - Finance
 - None
 - University Services
 - None
 - Acad. Support
 - None
- Fourth order of business: Report of Academic Affairs cmte.
 - Issue of concealed weapons
 - Resolution presented to Sen. Solinger at last meeting was passed unanimously; now referred to Senate as a whole for discussion
 - Comment: Should authorized users be mentioned?
 - Comment: Should the fourth, repetitious paragraph be struck?
 - Comment: Third paragraph could be amended to compensate
 - Comment: Fourth Paragraph might be necessary in light of differing language in IHL/university policy
 - Comment: Resolution should stick with the concealed carry and not all weapons as in university policy
 - Comment: Language of Solinger resolution supports IHL policy, not necessarily university policy
 - Friendly amendment: insert "unauthorized" between "by" and "individuals" in paragraph 3
 - No opposition
 - Resolution called to vote
 - Voted
 - 37 yea
 - 1 nay
 - Passed
 - Academic dishonesty
 - Information gathering is ongoing

- Point3
 - Subpoint1
 - Subpoint2
 - Subpoint3
- Point4
 - Subpoint1
 - Subpoint2
 - Subpoint3
- Point5
 - Subpoint1
 - Subpoint2
 - Subpoint3
- Fifth order of business: Report of Governance committee on non-tenure-track faculty representation
 - October resolution passed 6-2
 - Urges creation of separate non-tenure-track faculty body
 - Motion now brought before Senate
 - Discussion
 - Question: could we re-propose the older resolution which Gov'ce considered but rejected?
 - Sen. Albritton: second resolution is currently under consideration
 - Comment: AAUP mentioned solidarity as important and could cite no precedent for a non-tenure-track resolution
 - Move to substitute first, rejected resolution for second
 - Seconded
 - Question: Are we debating the inclusion of non-tenure-track faculty into the Senate?
 - Sen. Albritton: We are debating a change of resolutions, not whether or not it would be adopted
 - Question: How would this upset the balance of the Senate? Would be improper to act on so little information (e.g. apportionment)
 - Comment: These views came up in committee vis a vis non-tenure-track faculty roles, numbers, etc.
 - Question: When determining the number of representative faculty, is tenure and tenure-track faculty the only factor considered in apportionment?
 - Sen. Albritton: Yes; current rules allow a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 3. 1 standard deviation from the mean equals another representative
 - Question: Given those limits, how does including non-tenure-track faculty influence the faculty senate composition?
 - Answer: 32% are non-tenure-track faculty; some departments have non-tenure-track faculty that match or exceed other faculty members (e.g. English), while others have very few.
 - Current resolution "lets the chips fall where they may"

- Comment: We are discussing the issue of non-tenure-track faculty eligibility for senate election along with a separate body (resolution and substitute resolution)
- Comment: Yes, but it would by extension change the composition of the Senate
- Comment: 70% of pharmacy practice faculty are non-tenure-track faculty but have the same basic mission albeit in different proportions
- Comment: Only tenure-track faculty have this commitment in other units
- Sen. Albritton: In the past, full-time research faculty were excluded from the representational count
- Comment: Second resolution better reflects the massive variation among non-tenure-track faculty without imposing one school's views
- Move the question
- Seconded
- 9 yea
- 26 nay
- Fails
- Further discussion on second point
 - Comment: "separate body" should be redefined
 - Sen. Albritton: Would ultimately be up to non-tenure-track faculty to decide form and function
 - Comment: We don't seem to have a clear goal or information
 - Comment: Wouldn't a separate body be separate but unequal?
 - Comment: Seems that non-tenure-track faculty should be taking the initiative rather than us
 - Sen. Albritton: Does the resolution imply that?
 - Comment: It could be interpreted that way
 - Sen. Albritton: Could we perhaps replace "create" with "explore?"
 - Comment: We could also vote it down and let the non-tenure-track faculty take the initiative
 - Comment: The core issue was when non-tenure-track faculty and tenure-track faculty have conflicting interests; the motion before the Senate would press for non-tenure-track faculty representation cleanly and without conflict of interest
 - Sen. Barnett: A concern is that this could be construed as an endorsement of administration policies regarding hiring of non-tenure-track faculty rather than tenure-track faculty; could send the wrong message
 - Comment: As their representatives, we should be acting on behalf of non-tenure-track faculty; if they want more they could do so on their own behalf
 - Sen. Barnett: The senate supporting a body suggested by others is different than taking the lead in its creation and sends a different message
 - Comment: We are still "winging it" here; need more information and longer consideration/deliberation and more data
 - Sen. Albritton: What data do you need?

- Breakdown of number, roles, and perspectives between departments; discussions with non-tenure-track faculty
 - Comment: Many of those discussions have already been had, especially in October
 - Comment: Senate's role is to advise the chancellor; would it be prudent for university administration to have two faculty bodies?
 - Comment: Pharmacy practice feels that such a non-tenure-track faculty body would be inherently unequal (without elaboration)
 - Comment: What if the bodies disagree?
 - Motion to table
 - Seconded
 - 24 yea
 - 9 nay
 - 1 abstention
- Sixth order of business: Old business
 - Resolution of smoke-free vs. tobacco-free
 - Two votes taken; one in December and one in March
 - Resolutions are slightly different; one was for smoke-free (which passed) and the other was for tobacco-free (which failed)
 - Provost has asked for two volunteers to resolve this; one smoker and one non-smoker
 - Bob Brown has volunteered as the non-smoker
 - Michael Barnett has volunteered as the smoker
 - Subpoint3
 - Academic freedom in departments as raised at previous meeting
 - Appears to be issue of assigning courses without faculty consent
 - Would anyone be interested in pursuing the issue? If so, it will be referred to a committee
 - Comments: should be investigated
 - Issue of whether assigning courses without faculty consent constitutes a violation of academic freedom is referred to the gov'ce committee
 - Report for search committee for VC for student affairs
 - 38 applicants narrowed to 4
 - Each will have open question period to address concerns from senate or others
 - Candidates should visit before end of April; watch for announcements from Provost's office for session dates
 - Seventh order of business: New business
 - Faculty senate appointments to standing committees
 - Lists seem inaccurate and out of date
 - List gone over with present senators to indicate whether of not meetings have been held and attended
 - Graduate dean search committee update from Provost Stocks
 - Two acceptable candidates have been approved; process is ongoing
 - Increase in temperature
 - Comment: is IHL policy

- Comment: should be considered
- Sen. Albritton: issue to be referred to academic support committee
- Tenth order to business: Next meeting will be in May before graduation; May 8
- Remember to hold elections for the term beginning August; Sen. Albritton will be retiring and not eligible for reelection
- Senator Albritton closed the meeting at 9:00 p.m.