

aaup at Michigan State University

March 2005

<http://www.msu.edu/~aaup>

Good News on MSU Copyright Policy As Long Struggle Nears End

Sheila Teahan, Chapter Executive Committee

Faculty Council unanimously approved a proposed change in MSU's copyright policy 15 February 2005. The University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA) had voted in November 2004 to approve the revision, and its rationale had been approved by UCFA 11 January 2005. As Faculty Council approved the policy, President Lou Anna K. Simon said she supports the proposed revision and will encourage the Board of Trustees to vote for it. The MSU AAUP chapter applauded President Simon's support for the initiative, and shares her view that many faculty find the current policy, with its claim to blanket ownership of faculty research, "offensive." Indeed, more than one hundred and fifty faculty from the colleges Arts & Letters and Social Science sent e-mails in October 2004 criticizing the present policy and approving the proposed

—continued on page 2

DID YOU KNOW...?

that in the last twelve months:

- chapter membership has tripled
- active committees were formed
- a series of chapter meetings was held, and the executive committee met twice monthly

the chapter has helped:

- raise faculty awareness of the possible move of the Medical School
- revive the Academic Senate
- increase faculty input about Arts & Letters "reorganization"
- develop a fair MSU copyright policy
- develop a fair MSU conflict-of-interest policy
- orient new faculty at the fall fair

Your chapter can only do its work with your help. Join now!

—Scott Michaelson, Chapter VP

MSU's AAUP Executive Committee is grateful to Mark F. Smith, AAUP Director of Government Relations, and expert on copyright and intellectual property. Mark has been generously sharing his invaluable expertise with the chapter since 2000.

Where Have All the Tenure-System Professors Gone?

Grover Hudson, Chapter President

The newest threat to tenure is the gradual replacement of tenure-system faculty by *fixed-term*, or *contingent* faculty. According to the 2003 AAUP *Statement on Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession*, "nationally, between 1992 and 1998, the number of full-time non-tenure-track faculty increased by 22.7 percent, while the number of full-time tenure-line faculty increased by less than 1 percent. By 1998, full-time non-tenure-track faculty comprised 28.1 percent of all full-time faculty in U.S. institutions."

At MSU fixed-term faculty are now 31%, an increase of 12% since 1984.

Year	total faculty	TS faculty	TS % total faculty	FT faculty	FT % total faculty	MSU enrollment
1984	2575	2073	81	502	19	40,272
1989	2720	2112	78	608	22	42,866
1994	2629	2038	78	591	22	40,254
1999	2614	1993	76	621	24	43,038
2004	2746	1897	69	849	31	44,836

Although the increased proportion of fixed-term faculty results less from a back-door attack on tenure than from decreased public funding of universities (fixed-term faculty cost less and provide budgetary flexibility), the problem is severe. MSU President Lou Anna K. Simon, as Provost, raised this issue with the MSU University Committee on Faculty Tenure over two years ago, asking the advice of that committee. It is past time for MSU Academic Governance to respond to this alarming trend.

Over the years tenure has been often endangered, usually by direct threats to end it, as expensive and obsolete, and resulting in too much "deadwood." No evidence has validated these claims and, so far, direct threats to tenure have not

—continued on page 2

Campus AAUP Chapter Takes Active Role in Faculty Voice Deliberations

Richard Peterson, Chapter Treasurer

The local AAUP chapter has played an active role in discussions sponsored by the Faculty Voice Committee (FVC) established at last year's Academic Senate meeting and formed this fall by Faculty Council. Its mission is to develop proposals that will lead to an effective role for faculty in academic governance. AAUP researched and provided the FVC with examples of governance from other major universities, and the executive committee met with FVC to urge consideration of the following specific ideas regarding the reform of governance:

1. *Planning*. Institutional reforms should cultivate a collaborative relation between administration and faculty regarding the ongoing evolution of the University. Faculty should be regularly involved in discussions of the directions MSU will take, including matters of institutional structure and academic programs (e.g., areas of research to be cultivated, and forms of educational innovation to be fostered). We believe there should be a standing committee devoted to University planning, and there should be regular involvement of faculty in budget discussions. Here too we suggest a standing committee. Bylaws appropriate to these ends should be drafted.
2. *Assessing MSU's role in society*. The nature of our land grant commitment is a matter for continuing review. Faculty should be more involved in determining MSU's external relations—outreach, service, questions of moral responsibility and academic integrity. A standing faculty committee might serve to focus discussion of these matters.
3. *Personnel*. The faculty must have a more active and substantial role in key personnel decisions, including the choice of president and provost, and meaningful review of key administrators. Such a role is in keeping with the faculty's responsibilities regarding review and retention of faculty colleagues.
4. *Curriculum*. Faculty responsibility for reviewing curriculum should be affirmed and specific faculty approval of curriculum changes should be restored to Faculty Council. Better means for conveying information about curricular change should be developed.
5. *Stimulating faculty participation in governance*. Faculty require better means to information about issues facing MSU (including access to, and independent analysis of, the budget, to be established in the bylaws). Means should be found

—continued on page 2