Minutes of IFC Meeting
April 20, 2001

In attendance: Bruce Cutter, Russ Zguta, Jakob Waterborg, Ralph Wilkerson, Don Myers, Lol Barton, Mark Burkholder, Joseph Martinich, Curator Mary James

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

Minutes for the December, January, and February meetings were approved (or re-approved).

1. The meeting began with brief reports from the four campuses regarding the status of the IFC administrator review proposal. UMR has just approved a procedure. The other three campuses have existing procedures in place, but none seem to conform fully with the IFC recommendations.

2. Bruce Cutter gave an update on the status of the General Education Articulation Agreement on the UMC campus. The faculty on that campus will be surveyed in the Fall to get a sense of the faculty regarding the issue.

3. There was discussion regarding changes in the start date of the contract year. There was consensus that IFC should address this issue again with VP Hutchinson later in the meeting, and that it should continue to push for a change that would allow faculty and graduate students to receive their first paycheck of the contract year on August 31.

4. The one remaining issue that was introduced at the Summer retreat that had not yet been discussed by IFC was the need to increase faculty involvement in University service. The discussion was brief and seemed to conclude with the feeling that it is the responsibility of the unit heads to generate this involvement by the faculty.

Steve Lehmkuhle, Paula Short, and Kandis Smith joined the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

5. Kandis Smith presented the current draft of the Intellectual property Rights document. The 4-campus task force has been actively refining the document. The document tries to preserve traditional faculty ownership of intellectual property except in specified cases, such as when substantial University resources are used, or development of the materials are done by several people. When there is potential doubt about ownership, this should be put in writing before the project is started. VP Lehmkuhle stated that the new document/policy, when it is finalized and approved, will replace the current policy. Don Myers suggested that in some circumstances it might be more beneficial for the University to take a cost-free license for use of the materials and to leave copyright ownership with the professor. This would protect the University in its use, but also give faculty the incentive and right to develop derivative works.

VP Lehmkuhle said that he would run the final document through IFC to get campus responses.

6. VP Lehmkuhle then distributed a summary of the 2002-2003 academic calendars for the four
campuses and the UM Video Network courses. He pointed out that some inconsistencies exist, but he felt that the UMKC Fall starting date was the only serious problem that needs to be addressed. (Jakob was asked to pursue resolution of this issue.) He hopes to convince the Board that the schedules (subject to the UMKC start date change) are sufficiently similar that the differences do not present a problem. Especially with multi-campus courses becoming more internet based and asynchronous, there is less necessity for the campus schedules to match the UM Video schedule. It was also pointed out that a large majority of the students taking the video/internet courses work full-time, and do not take a Spring vacation, so there is little need to coordinate Spring break with the campus calendars.

7. Vice-President Lehmkuhle then presented salary data by rank and years of service at UM. On all but the Rolla there was clear evidence that the longer a full professor stays at UM the less he/she is paid on average - i.e., there is a “loyalty tax.” This loyalty tax for full professors was between $500 and $1000 per year of service, depending on campus. The same phenomenon exists for associate professors at UMKC and UMSL, but to a lesser degree than for full professors.

VP Lehmkuhle pointed out that there will be a large turnover of faculty during the next few years (approximately a 40% turnover from 1998 through 2003) due to VERIP, other retirements, and normal attrition. VP Lehmkuhle pointed out that there will be 900 open “continuing” faculty positions in the next few years, plus 400 more enhancement positions to be filled. These data indicate a serious financial problem for UM because new faculty of the same rank would have to be hired at $20,000 to $30,000 more per faculty member than those leaving, and in many cases the new faculty are being hired with lower teaching loads. This problem could get even worse because of a general graying of the faculty and likely faculty shortage. Ralph Wilkerson said that public elementary and secondary schools are facing the same problem of increasing faculty retirements and teacher shortages. Some districts are addressing this by allowing teachers to retire and then rehiring them, possibly on a part-time basis. He suggested that the University consider using this model more extensively.

8. Paula Short gave an update on the New faculty Teaching Scholar Program. It will begin this Fall. Each campus has a coordinator. The program is designed for faculty in their first three years of teaching. Paula hopes to have as many as 100 faculty participating. There will be no cost to the faculty participants or their departments. The focus is to help faculty to build networks, to promote mentoring, and to help faculty develop better teaching methods.

9. The President and VP Hutchinson joined the meeting at noon. The President gave an update on the budget situation. Revenues look soft, and the President predicts that State funding will be relatively flat for the next 2-3 years. UM will move ahead with a 4% salary increase, and he thinks we may be able to move ahead with some capital projects. Two of the three Curator positions have been filled (one has been confirmed and one awaits confirmation by the legislature). The tuition reimbursement lawsuit is still unresolved, although the legislature is moving ahead with a bill to allow explicitly the charging of tuition.

10. In response to a question regarding the reduction in the benefits rate, the President and VP Hutchinson explained that the University’s investments have been producing income at a level
above that which has been planned, so some of that excess income will be directed toward other compensation expenses, which will free up some money to help with salary increases.

11. In response to another question, the President stated that he did not expect to initiate another endowed professor matching program in the near future. He felt the need in the next few years was to increase funding for the core of our programs. Farther into the future we may want to look at a matching endowed professor program, after the core funding has been strengthened.

12. VP Hutchinson was again asked to look into ways to make it possible for faculty and graduate students to receive their first paycheck of the contract year on August 31. Some options include changing the start of the contract year to August 1 or August 15. It was pointed out that this issue is different from one raised by some campuses to have 12-month faculty contracts.

After the departure of President Pacheco and VP Hutchinson, discussion occurred on the following issues.

13. Lol Barton presented copies of a letter he sent to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch with supporting data tables, which showed the State funding per FTE student and per degree awarded for each public university campus in the State. The data indicated that State funding for UMSL was at or near the bottom, being below even the regional colleges.

14. Concerns were raised about the implementation of PeopleSoft regarding course renumbering on the St. Louis campus. VP Lehmkuhle said he would investigate this.

15. In response to a question by Don Myers, VP Lehmkuhle explained a proposal to restructure the way in which patent royalties are shared with faculty. Essentially the proposal is to have the University obtain more patents and to have the faculty member share part of the patenting costs. The hope is that the University will then be able to negotiate higher royalty rates from licensees if the patents are already in place. (Currently, the University often licenses the patent to companies before the patent is obtained, and so a lower royalty is paid because the company must incur the patenting costs.)

The meeting adjourned at 1:54 p.m.