MINUTES
Intercampus Faculty Council Meeting
Friday, April 21, 2017, Telepresence
Approved May 12, 2017

Present were:
IFC Members: Susan Brownell (Chair, UMSL), Mark Fitch (S&T), Viviana Grieco (UMKC), Camila Manrique (MU), Sahra Sedighsarvestani (S&T), Nancy Stancel (UMKC), Keith Stine (UMSL), Pamela Stuerke (UMSL), Ben Trachtenberg (MU), Bill Wiebold (MU), and Jerry Wyckoff (UMKC)
UM System Staff: Steve Graham and Marsha Fischer

The meeting began at 12:35pm.

12:35 – 1:00  IFC Members Discussion
Ben Trachtenberg observed that MU’s Free Speech Policy had just been added to the Business Policies and Practices Manual. It was the work of The Ad Hoc Joint Committee on Protests, Public Spaces, Free Speech and the Press, which was formed in response to the recommendation to put in protections of free speech, made by the University of Missouri System Review Commission appointed by the legislature. It could be that the other campuses will be pressed to do this, too.

IFC discussed questions to be addressed to President Choi and other items to be addressed with him.

1:30 – 2:00  President Choi
President Choi had previously circulated the Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression of the University of Chicago (2014). He asked whether there had been a discussion of freedom of speech at the campus level. S&T and UMSL reported that there had been no discussion on their campuses. UMKC reported that the FIRE (Foundation for Individual Rights in Higher Education) website had found a 10-year old version of their standards on the UMKC website and had painted them in a negative light. The new standards are more permissive. MU reported that on March 18, 2016, the Faculty Council had approved a version of the Chicago document, which was slightly changed to refer to the University of Missouri rather than Chicago. Interim Chancellor Foley had endorsed it.

President Choi requested the IFC and the UM System to endorse the document so that it could serve as principles of operation.

It was moved that, as we have had a discussion at IFC, we will take the Recommended Statement: University of Missouri ‘Commitment to Free Expression’ dated March 8, 2016 back to our respective campuses for discussion and approval. The motion passed unanimously.
IFC asked President Choi about his plan to make sure that politics don’t prevent good ideas from going forward, anticipating the danger that when budget cuts are announced. He stated that he is sharing his thoughts with the Board of Curators, especially the newly-confirmed members, alerting them that when we make difficult decisions, the Curators will be contacted by constituents. He asked of them that they should explain why we made these decisions.

IFC asked about what mechanisms would ensure faculty consultation and shared governance in the budget process. President Choi replied that all of his decisions will go to the Board and to IFC. Decisions should be transparent. By May 12, he will be able to share broader thoughts about the metrics that will be used and the kinds of engagement that the process will entail, although he won’t have the details yet. He provided examples of potential changes on several campuses, such as eliminating leadership positions and putting the savings into more research, eliminating redundancies resulting from Student Affairs being spread across different departments, or reducing the number of spokespeople.

IFC raised the question of who is the watchdog to make sure that on-paper priorities are actually applied in the cuts. They also stated that there will be a need for courage.

The challenge of communicating the value of research was discussed. It was suggested that the UM Research Board could be encouraged to hold a discussion about some of the best practices that are becoming common, such as encouraging researchers to strengthen communication and engagement with the public, or creating supplementary grants designed to strengthen the public engagement aspect of externally-funded grants. Perhaps there are ways that legislators could be engaged in a dialogue about research activities; the Undergraduate Research Day at the Capitol is a successful example. We want to convince them that the University offers solutions to some of our biggest problems.

The chairs of each Faculty Senate/Council provided updates about their respective campuses to President Choi.

Ben Trachtenberg reported that MU is concerned about who will be the Interim Chancellor after May 3. The MU Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee produced a Resolution on Potential Layoffs of Ranked NTT Faculty, which suggested humane principles for handling the layoffs. They would love to hear acknowledgment that would make them feel more respected. Campus administrators could be instructed to consult with faculty members in the budget process – many of them might not be sure how. Perhaps President Choi could tell them or IFC what the best practices are.

Jerry Wyckoff felt this was a great suggestion. At UMKC they hadn’t heard enough about how to prioritize the budget, in part because it was still being worked out at the academic level. If there were more faculty input, people would feel better.

Pamela Stuerke reported that UMSL’s new provost starts on May 1. They are concerned about the budget situation; there is tension within the staff and the NTT faculty. Their process has the Budget and Planning Committee meeting with the administrators next week and again in May. UMSL was recognized with a 2017 Community Development Award from the North County Regional Development Association for its work in Ferguson. Four UMSL business alumni were on the CFO of the Year Awards list for the St. Louis Business Journal – a third of the awardees. Also, UMSL was ranked 5th for adult learners by Best Value Colleges.
Tom Schuman reported that the S&T Budget Task Force is working on putting forward recommendations. Developing a budget with a 12% reduction will be difficult. They are struggling with a better way to incorporate bottom-up faculty feedback. The Interim Chancellor has not spelled out an open forum process; only faculty senators and administrators are involved. The administrative review process was conducted for a few individuals, including Cheryl Schrader. The committee is under motion to present the results to the Interim Chancellor.

2:00 – 2:20 University Relations Update  Steve Knorr

Steve Knorr provided IFC with an update on state and federal legislation, and said that the communications teams are working closely together.

2:20 – 2:40 HR Update  Jill Pollock

Through the Dependent Eligibility Verification process, about 840 dependents were dropped, an annualized cost avoidance of $3.8 million. They are still in the appeals process with 1200 people. In general, the dependents were ineligible because they were no longer legal dependents, or because of divorces and the accompanying legal agreements. The number is consistent with national trends.

They are looking at five different aspects of the UM System tuition assistance program. Segal Actuarial Consultants is looking at how many more students we might get if we improved our benefits.

JP asked advice about sending out an email to faculty requesting those who know they will retire by December 31 to let us know. IFC requested that she pay attention to the effect on staff and NTT faculty.

- JP stated that they would look into adding NTT faculty to the transition assistance program.
- JP will send the email to IFC for review before sending it out.
- It was suggested that it might be better not to use the word “vested” on the website with respect to tuition assistance, because it could be confused with vesting for retirement.

(Marsha Fischer left at this point in the meeting.)

2:40 – 3:00 Policy Guidelines for Annual Performance Review/Post Tenure Review  Susan Brownell

Susan Brownell reminded IFC that the original plan had been to see the CRR through to approval and then return to the White Paper. Assuming that the CRR were approved by the Board on the following Thursday, should there be a follow-up document? The Workload Policy Task Force had followed its report with Policy Guidelines for implementing the workload policy. Should the Post-Tenure Review Task Force do the same for the PTR changes to the CRR? There was confusion about the CRR stating a 3-3 load as the average faculty workload; some administrators were stating that this was the standard workload for TT faculty. There were also administrators who did not want to count all section credits, such as independent readings and labs, but only classroom credits, even though the CRR state that all section credits should be counted. There was confusion about “instructional load” vs. “teaching load.”
Steve Graham will send an email to the Provosts clarifying that the standard teaching load for research-active faculty is 2-2, and that all section credits count in the instructional workload.

It was felt that there was not a clear need for a follow-up document at this time, and that departments would work out how to implement the policy as suited their unique situations. However, IFC members would forward any questions that arise.

3:05 – 3:30  Campus responses to budget reductions  
Ryan Rapp

Campuses are developing their short-term and long-term plans. RR stated that administration and staff will be cut. How to become the best with a small administration? It would be best if we can trim in a way that allows us to put dollars into teaching and research.

➢ It was suggested that the UM System can send out communications when key deadlines have arrived, stating what was done, what the next deadline is, and what will be done by the next deadline.

The question was raised whether staff paid from grants may be given raises when no one else gets one.

 Garnered:
- It can be done, but must be done carefully. The Fed permits increases, but they can’t be only for staff on federal grants, and it mustn’t be the same amount for everyone.

RR stated that in the past, there would be years with no raise in the expectation that future years would bring raises. In the 1980s and 90s state increases outpaced inflation. The current phase is flat or on a downward trend. The situation has changed and as a result we must get away from the mindset of annual cuts with no reward for people who are doing well.

➢ JW requested that RR attend the UMKC faculty meeting on May 20 to give a presentation.

The question of administrative growth was raised – “business as usual” should not continue; there needs to be a real way to trim other sectors besides the academic. Each campus reports data differently, making comparisons difficult.

SG stated, “We have some work we need to do.” He praised RR for his excellent work.

3:30 – 3:50  Preparation for Curators attendance at May 12th IFC Meeting

IFC discussed questions to be raised with Curators Snowden and Phillips at the May meeting.

➢ SB will circulate the questions for further refinement.

3:50 – 3:52 Approval of the Minutes

It was moved that the minutes for the February 24, 2017 meeting be accepted with a factual correction to the UMSL report to the president. The motion passed unanimously.
3:52 – 4:00 Issues for IFC 2017-2018

NTT faculty workload should be taken up by next year’s IFC.

The MU Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee’s Resolution on Potential Layoffs of Ranked NTT Faculty had been sent to President Choi, Interim Chancellor Foley, and Provost Stokes with no response.

➢ It was decided that IFC would vote on it at the May meeting.

4:00 Adjourn

Attachments:
1) Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression of the University of Chicago (2014)
2) Policy Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review – Excerpts from the White Paper and emails
3) Letter from President Choi – Systemwide Budget Guidance