University of Missouri System
Intercampus Faculty Council

Minutes of the Meeting of November 6, 2002

Members in Attendance: Sudarshan Loyalka, Chairman, MU; Michael Devaney, MU; Eileen Porter, Secretary, MU; Jakob Waterborg, UMKC; Kathleen Schweitzberger, UMKC; Van Reidhead, UMSL; Rocco Cottone, UMSL; Todd Hubing, UMR; and Leonard Koederitz, UMR. Ralph Wilkerson, UMR; Max Skidmore, UMKC; and Lois Pierce, UMSL were unable to attend.

Call to Order: S. Loyalka called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of October 11, 2002 were approved as previously circulated (moved M. Devaney/seconded R. Cottone/consensus).

Review of the Agenda: There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

Agenda Items:

1. The procedure for approval and distribution of the IFC minutes was discussed in the context of recent court rulings. It was decided to post the complete minutes on the IFC website after they are approved. L. Koederitz asked that we talk with VP Lehmkuhle about the circumstances of IFC relative to the Sunshine Law. R. Cottone asked that we request a copy of the law. Later, VP Lehmkuhle noted that he would ask Jim Snider to discuss the Sunshine Law at the December IFC meeting.

2. Concerning the Presidential Search, L. Pierce was unable to attend IFC today, but she sent a report that the Faculty Consultative Committee on Presidential Succession had interviewed candidates on November 1-2. The committee will write its report on November 4, and follow up with a check on references later in the week of November 4. The search is on a fast track, and an announcement is anticipated on November 21 at the Curators’ meeting.

3. With regard to retirement planning beyond VERIP, M. Devaney expressed concern about the nature of the opportunity offered by VERIP and its impact, noting that more consistent and routine retirement opportunities are needed. A combination of number of years of service and age was suggested, such as “85 and out” to avoid the “dive through the open window” approach that can, in effect, work to deplete the retirement fund through the early retirement of many relatively young faculty. L. Koederitz noted that staff employees at UMR have requested the “80 and out” option, as that is what state employees have. S. Loyalka suggested that we invite Ken Hutchinson to comment upon this at the IFC meeting on December 19. R. Cottone suggested that we ask for the cost savings of the three VERIPs.

4. Concerning tuition benefits for faculty dependents, V. Reidhead noted that a number of people have asked that we consider moving forward with this. The pros and cons of this benefit were discussed in view of the university’s current economic situation as well as the need to retain promising faculty. Although it could cost money, it could make money for the university. J. Waterborg noted that it could be appraised as an option campus-by-campus. Other critical factors would be enrollments of specific programs (i.e., it could cost money to offer enrollment in maximum capacity programs) and number of dependents allowed to take advantage of the benefit at any one time. He also noted that
for faculty, this is important, not for themselves but for dependents and the spouse. The UM is the only major public or private institution in the state that does not have such a benefit. S. Loyalka said that he would request an update from VP Ken Hutchinson on this matter at the IFC meeting on December 19.

5. Concerning the potential change to the faculty workload policy in the Collected Rules and Regulations, which is Appendix 2 to the report of the Task Force on Reducing Academic Costs, M. Devaney reported on the resolution passed by the MU Faculty Council. The resolution was to defer any action on changing the workload policy until there had been sufficient dialogue about the matter among faculty on the four campuses, campus administration, and system officers. M. Devaney conveyed the sense of the MU faculty that retaining the current workload policy (310.080, Chapter: Academic Tenure Regulations, Collected Rules & Regulations) would meet the objectives of flexibility and accountability emphasized by VP Lehmkuhle. With regard to inclusion of the number of student credit hours (as well as a number of credits) in the typical faculty instructional load, J. Waterborg noted that having that conversion factor gives a standard for comparing equivalency in the workload. However, he noted that this should be determined on a unit basis rather than the individual faculty member. E. Porter noted that each unit could have its own conversion factor for SCH as part of the unit’s workload policy. S. Loyalka noted that there is a clear role for the faculty governance at each unit in the existing policy; E. Porter noted that this was not clearly stated in the proposed revision. K. Schweitzberger noted that the report of the task force on saving administrative costs had not yet been issued, and that this was another reason to wait to issue the academic cost-savings report. Under the current policy, there are people who are not being held accountable. The current policy was distributed for review. S. Loyalka suggested that the IFC request of VP Lehmkuhle and President Pacheco that we have more time to fully discuss the workload matter. This plan was adopted by consensus.

Discussions with VP Lehmkuhle, Interim Assoc. VP Graham, and Faculty Fellow Prof. Tim Heinsz:

VP Lehmkuhle presented some further data on faculty workload that had been reviewed by the Task Force on Reducing Academic Costs. He also presented information pertaining to workload models in place at several other universities, although he noted that many institutions do not have workload models, and that to his knowledge, no other policies had included student credit hours as a factor. Based on these data, the impact of VERIP, and increased enrollments, there is a need to teach 5% more students with a 5% fewer faculty.

VP Lehmkuhle reported that his plan was to present the Report of the Task Force at the meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee at the Curators’ meeting on November 21. He did not know whether the report would be on the agenda of the Board as an action item. He noted that Board approval would not be required for President Pacheco to change the procedures for program review (as specified in the task force report). However, because the faculty workload model is part of the Collected Rules and Regulations, Board action would be required to change it. After discussing the IFC’s concerns about the proposed changes to the faculty workload model incorporated in Appendix 2 (and ensuing revisions by VP Lehmkuhle), as detailed previously, VP Lehmkuhle recommended that the IFC suggest to President Pacheco that (a) the existing model be retained in the Collected Rules and Regulations and (b) and that he work with the IFC
to draft an Executive Order for the President’s review concerning the **instructional workload only**. The IFC agreed to propose to President Pacheco that the content of this proposed Executive Order would be based upon both VP Lehmkuhle’s recent revision of Appendix 2 and feedback from the IFC as reported to VP Lehmkuhle. There was consensus to discuss this matter with the President.

VP Lehmkuhle invited comments on other aspects of the report. E. Porter raised questions concerning Appendix 1: Program Assessment and Viability Audit, Part 2. b.(Procedures to conduct a program viability audit). She observed the inclusion of a role for the System in submitting names of programs as candidates for viability audits, but she wondered about the absence of an indication that the System would provide information relative to the status of comparable programs on the other campuses, including potential redundancy across campuses. She emphasized that this could be an important role for the System to play; L. Koederitz expressed some reservations about this, noting the preeminence of the role of each campus in this matter. VP Lehmkuhle noted that one of his staff was to be included on each Program Viability Audit (PVA) Committee to provide that perspective; E. Porter urged that the reason for System representation on each PVA committee be documented. E. Porter also asked for rationale concerning the requirement to explore “cooperative programs with other campuses” when a significant program change was recommended, noting that this was not a panacea. VP Lehmkuhle recognized that there was a range of opportunities relative to cooperative activities across campuses, and it was suggested that this range be mentioned. Finally, questions were raised concerning the lack of documented procedures for (a) annual review of suspended programs (up to the documented five-year ceiling for suspension) and (b) follow-up procedures for evaluating programs that (as a result of a program viability audit) had been modified, consolidated with another program, discontinued, or continued with new or continued involvement in cooperative activities.

**Discussions with VP Caruso and VP Krawitz:**
Financial status: The Task Force on Reduction of Administrative Costs is waiting for feedback from the campuses on the “middle” and “pessimistic” budget options, so that they can forecast the implications. They are committed to trying to create the 4% salary pool that is built in to the five-year budget model. Much will depend on the amount of any additional withholdings. There are concerns, too, about funding the additional benefits that will be required. The impact of the financial markets on the retirement fund has not yet been determined.

**People Soft:** VP Caruso and VP Krawitz are looking at simplification of business processes. A task force will be convened to look at the processes outside of the information system, such as PAF’s. Another major issue that they will target is service centers to try to ensure the higher level of competency to “touch the systems” in People Soft than was necessary in a more paper-oriented environment. The grants module implementation will be delayed. UMKC’s implementation was first, then UMSL, then MU in December, and finally UMR in February. VP Krawitz noted that on some campuses, faculty are taking the grants training, and she invited feedback from IFC representatives about the training. If training has not been effective, according to VP Krawitz, the grants module should not “go live.”
Reporting and membership of the Task Force on Reduction of Administrative Costs: J. Waterborg asked whether the task force will produce a report concerning its findings, including People Soft costs and cost savings. VP Caruso noted that the Task Force will continue because the problems will continue, but that the Task Force will issue a report around December 1. S. Loyalka asked whether faculty could be involved in the Administrative Task Force, J. Waterborg urged that the staff be involved, and R. Cottone noted that the voice of the user must be heard. Although VP Krawitz noted that they are soliciting faculty feedback in part through the IFC meeting, IFC members noted that faculty involvement on the task force is important. VP Caruso was receptive to this concern and to the need for involvement of the faculty.

Reduction of Administrative Costs: M. Devaney asked whether a viability audit will be incorporated in the Administrative report that would be comparable to the assessment parameters for program viability included in the Academic Task Force report. VP Caruso noted that the Administrative Task Force did a study of the consolidation of the administrative units with the System and the MU campus, which led to consolidation of ITS services. They have also discussed a similar approach for IR (Institutional Research) and construction. However, VP Caruso and VP Krawitz noted two major problems with further efforts in consolidation. First, as VP Krawitz noted, about 95% of the services provided by the System are not duplicated on the campus level. She gave examples relative to accounting, management of retirement funds, endowments, and the back-end of the payroll process. There is consideration of centralizing the front-end of the payroll; they centralized purchasing, and this saved money. However, when such services are centralized to save funds, the campus has less administrative control, and this is not always appealing at the campus level. Second, as VP Caruso noted, it is very difficult to cost-out System services other than IT, which is both discipline-specific and easily identified by job position. Although IT was the only discipline that they could really cost out, they hope to investigate these matters more fully through the process task force. The System continues to try to abide by the finding of former President Russell’s commission that services should be provided at the campus level if that was best; otherwise, services should be system-based to take advantage of the system-wide synergy.

Call to Order: Following a brief recess for lunch, S. Loyalka convened the afternoon session at 12:30 p.m. President Pacheco and VP Turner joined the meeting for the afternoon session, which was also attended by VP Ron Turner, VP Krawitz, VP Lehmkuhle, and Asst. VP Graham.

Campus Reports: M. Devaney reported for MU. The campus set an all-time record of $140 million in research funding. Faculty Council has been primarily concerned with engaging in dialogue about the report of the Task Force on Reducing Academic Costs. The Faculty Affairs Committee developed a set of guidelines concerning a grievance audit to share with the Chancellor, as well as a draft of a process for program mergers and consolidations, which would move forward to the IFC after further discussion and approval by Faculty Council. Finally, M. Devaney reported on the MU Faculty Council’s resolution concerning the faculty workload model, as previously detailed.

L. Koederitz reported for UMR. As part of the reorganization effort, the Academic Council is being reorganized to make it more flexible. There is also an effort to shift programs into the School of Management to make it more viable. UMR is in transition to starting classes on the
hour; with this change, an extra class period has been added. Faculty have developed a statement on joint appointments. UMR will host the November 21 meeting of the Board of Curators.

K. Schweitzberger noted that UMKC had no report.

V. Reidhead reported for UMSL, where a discussion of chancellor succession is continuing. Faculty agree that the research mission of the campus must be reaffirmed at every opportunity, so that it is viewed as central in all decisions. The Senate’s steering committee has requested that V. Reidhead issue a directive to address the research mission as a priority in the search for an interim chancellor and also that new faculty hires using VERIP savings should be directed to tenure track faculty, instead of non-regular hires. For UMSL faculty, the big concern regarding workload is the impact on carrying out the research mission. The Senate and the Graduate School will sponsor a mentoring program for junior faculty at their request.

Discussions with President Pacheco:

Concerning the Report of the Task Force on Reduction of Academic Costs, the IFC expressed the belief that the current policy on faculty workload afforded certain benefits not incorporated in the proposed revision in these arenas: (a) faculty governance, (b) flexibility, and (c) accountability. It was agreed that (a) the current faculty workload policy would be retained, (b) the President, VP Lehmkuhle, and the IFC would create ideas for an executive order concerning instructional workload, and (c) there would be an enhanced focus on implementing the workload reporting requirements in the existing policy.

Concerning the role of the faculty on the Task Force on the Reduction of Administrative Costs, President Pacheco understood the faculty’s need to be aware of the data being considered and the implications under discussion.

Concerning retirement planning beyond VERIP that would more equitably reward those with years of service, President Pacheco thought that this was a reasonable goal. He noted that other options had been considered before deciding upon each VERIP. The first VERIP was done to infuse new faculty, although the recent VERIP was done for monetary reasons. VP Hutchinson is looking at various options in the event that such a measure is needed again.

With regard to tuition benefits for dependents, President Pacheco noted that such issues are always considered in a statewide context. For instance, questions such as this are asked: What other state employees get such benefits? He suggested that the IFC invite VP Hutchinson to discuss the issue with us in several months. R.Cottone observed that such a benefit could be an excellent retention device for young faculty. President Pacheco affirmed that he shares the deep concern of the IFC and our faculty across the system that the best young faculty will leave the institution due to the financial circumstances. President Pacheco noted that the fundamental message to emphasize is the need for more financial support for higher education.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by S. Loyalka at 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen J. Porter, Secretary