University of Missouri System
Intercampus Faculty Council

Minutes of the Meeting of December 19, 2002

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

Morning Session: VP Caruso had organized a tour of the E-Mints Program at Parkade Elementary School in Columbia. The tour took place from 9:45 to 11:45 a.m. with IFC members, Chancellor Wallace, Provost Deaton, VP Caruso, and VP Lehmkuhle in attendance, accompanied by staff of More-Net and E-Mints. S. Loyalka later expressed the gratitude of the group to VP Caruso for arranging the very interesting tour.

Luncheon Session: S. Loyalka convened the IFC at 12:00 p.m. VP Ron Turner; VP Nikki Krawitz; VP Steven Lehmkuhle; VP Ken Hutchinson; Asst. VP Steven Graham, Jim Snider, Assistant to the President for Governmental Relations; and Curator Mary James joined the group.

Discussions with Jim Snider:
1. Impact of Recent Court Rulings and the Sunshine Law. Mr. Snider reviewed the history of the 20-year old “open records” law, explaining that it applies to any data file involving the Board of Curators, whether paper or computer-based. Since 1986, the university has refused less than 10 requests for records out of more than 4000 requests. Because the University has been open in granting access to records, the recent court ruling will not change our procedures very much. Mr. Snider noted that there was no need for the IFC to change procedures relative to records. The Board of Curators probably will make the decision as to whether to appeal the ruling. If the pubic policy of the state becomes that all of the university’s meetings are open, then some adjustments will need to be made in the operations of all university entities.

2. Tuition Law Suit. Mr. Snider explained that in 1871, the Missouri legislature enacted legislation governing the use of state funds for salaries of the faculty of the University of Missouri and the requirement that the university would charge only incidental fees and not tuition. The University’s position is that the University has adhered to that stipulation. The current court opinion was that the University has been in violation of the law. M. Devaney asked whether this ruling would affect the university’s bond ratings. VP Krawitz said that the rating agencies are not going to act on this at present; they perceive the University as strong, and they would not consider any action along that line until the matter has been resolved in the courts. Mr. Snider noted that the resolution of this matter could take years. It is likely that the courts would first determine if the University owes anything to former students, and then there would be a second level of court action to determine the nature and scope of the remedy. Hence, any predictions about the outcome of this matter are merely speculative at this time. VP Lehmkuhle addressed the potential
impact on faculty morale in light of the current financial climate. Both he and VP Krawitz encouraged the IFC to discuss the matter with our colleagues in terms of the University’s status overall and its strength in the view of the rating agencies.

3. **The University’s budget.** Mr. Snider noted that there was a public commitment by leaders of both political parties in the General Assembly at the Trustees’ Forum that they will make every effort to minimize the further impact of the state’s budgetary problems on higher education. However, the state’s financial situation will influence the nature of the impact. He believes that we are positioned as well as we can be at present. Mr. Snider noted that President Floyd was very well received during his four hours there. Finally, he reviewed the challenges of orienting legislators to the University in an environment shaped in part by the circumstance of term limits.

**Resolution Honoring President Pacheco:** President Pacheco joined the IFC. On behalf of the IFC and the faculty at all four campuses, S. Loyalka read a resolution honoring President Pacheco. (See attached, Appendix 1). L. Pierce and V. Reidhead had spearheaded the development of the resolution. President Pacheco noted his surprise at this honor, and he thanked the faculty graciously.

**Campus Reports:** M. Devaney reported for MU. MU is the process of initiating a review of all grievances in the last 5 years. The Faculty Council has approved the procedure, and faculty will work on this with the Chancellor. Faculty Council also approved a policy for program mergers and consolidations to ensure due process when there is no loss of tenure-track or tenured faculty. It is likely that this procedure will come to IFC in a future meeting and perhaps will lead to a change in the Collected Rules. Finally, the MU Faculty Council sent a letter to Governor Holden concerning the need to spare the University when further budgetary adjustments are undertaken. The President applauded the effort of the Faculty Council and Chancellor Wallace in addressing the longstanding issues relative to grievances.

L. Koederitz reported for UMR. UMR faculty are currently conducting a review of their administrators; at present, they are deciding how the results of the reviews will be released to involved parties. There is good communication between the Chancellor and the faculty with regard to the ongoing reorganization effort. Recent salary statistics indicate a high starting salary in some engineering areas of about $70,000, in spite of the tough times.

J. Waterborg reported for UMKC. After considerable dialogue, the faculty is in support of the Strategic Plan. There are two candidates for the position of Dean of Biological Sciences. The Faculty Senate reviewed grievance procedures, and they found no concluded that there are no problems from the perspective of the faculty and administration. This review was an opportunity for re-education of all parties about the nature of the grievance process. Finally, they are reconstituting a larger Extended Cabinet for the Chancellor to ensure more open communication with the academic units. The Faculty Senate as a whole will be part of the Extended Cabinet along with students, staff, and community members. The hope is that this will enable more dialogue around the strategic plan and other matters. K. Schweitzberger noted that the library has digitalized a unique set of recordings and compiled it into a collection called “Voices of World War II.” In view of the downward trend in the entry of women into the fields of science and
technology, UMKC will be working with Sally Ride and others to encourage and enable female students in secondary schools to consider such fields.

V. Reidhead reported for UMSL. Faculty and staff have been sharing the experience of the Chancellor’s retirement. President Pacheco named Dr. Don Driemeier yesterday as Interim Chancellor. The faculty’s real concern now is getting on with the search and selection of the permanent Chancellor. V. Reidhead thanked President Pacheco for his efforts in this regard. President Pacheco reported that after extended discussions with UMSL faculty and staff and others, he is developing some criteria for the position at this time, and he will share that with President-Designate Floyd. He is also preparing a list of potential members of the Search Committee. V. Reidhead reported that the Senate recently passed three resolutions, which as a group, underscore the need to have positive communication between faculty and administration. These resolutions pertained to (a) creation of an ad hoc committee on summer salary, (b) delaying the implementation of the People Soft grants module, and (c) devising a plan to elicit faculty input on new programs before new programs are initiated.

Comments by President Pacheco: Concerning the need for enhanced economic support of the University by the State of Missouri, the President acknowledged VP Turner’s leadership and conceptualization of the process for the ongoing statewide dialogue. Averting a collision between higher education and elementary/secondary education is critical. He noted that the bulk of the University’s infrastructure is still in place, but that it will not take much in the way of further budget cuts to erode the infrastructure. He noted that at present, the University would do well simply to maintain the status quo. There are risks of losing key faculty and key programs. A university cannot be successful unless it looks at what is truly needed to fulfill its missions, particularly when it comes to the unique and compelling opportunities for programs at interdisciplinary boundaries. President Pacheco stated that although it was difficult to leave the University during the present circumstances, he has positive feelings about having made some key changes with a continuing impact. He thanked the IFC for the enhanced attention to substance in the discussions over the past five years. President Pacheco concluded this remarks wishing the IFC well. The IFC rose to applaud the President as he left the meeting. The Following the President’s remarks, there was a brief break.

Call to Order: S. Loyalka reconvened the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of November 6, 2002 were approved as previously circulated (moved M. Skidmore/seconded J. Waterborg/consensus). E. Porter will send them to K. Volle to be posted on the IFC website.

Review of the Agenda: There were no changes to the agenda. There were two additions: (a) Publication Restrictions and Contracts, VP Lehmkuhle and (b) Procedures for Feedback on Administrative Reviews, L. Koederitz.

Agenda Items:

1. Retirement Planning Beyond VERIP. Ken Hutchinson, VP for Human Resources, discussed some implications of implementing a “rule of 85.” This option has been a topic of discussion
by faculty and the General Officers. The university would assume an additional liability of $45 million to do this. The issue becomes how to best deploy the percentage involved, which could be 1% or 2%. Does this have a priority over other forms of compensation? This will be a critical issue for discussion and decision. It will be an enormous challenge to implement the 4% salary increase, if in fact there are sufficient funds to do this. The retirement contribution will have to increase considerably because of the downturn in the market. In effect, a 3-4% increase in contributions will be needed to maintain the retirement fund.

2. **Tuition Benefits for Faculty Dependents.** VP Hutchinson noted that this is an enormously popular benefit at many universities. If both a tuition benefit and the “rule of 85” were put in place, there could be a very good return in terms of faculty recruitment and retention. However, the tuition benefit would accrue to only about 45% of the faculty. He believes that a 50% benefit is affordable at about $770,000. But what is the wisest expenditure of the compensation dollar? J. Waterborg noted the downside of VERIP in terms of unpredictable damage to specific units and in relation to the costly remedies that are required. L. Koederitz noted the differential impact of the second VERIP over the first VERIP, and VP Hutchinson noted that the second VERIP was introduced in view of the economic difficulties of the state, in contrast to the first VERIP, which was undertaken to renew the cadre of university faculty. However, VP Lehmkuhle noted that at the time, the other options were even less attractive than VERIP. According to VP Hutchinson, the personal impact is significant; the problem is to avoid forcing a life-decision into a short window. There was dialogue about the immediate impact of instituting a rule of 85, in the event that another major budget cut is enacted. L. Koederitz asked how a mandated across-the-board salary increase would look to the legislature. M. Skidmore suggested (a) that faculty and staff with salaries above a specific level not be subject to a salary increase, (b) that the university implement the tuition benefit program, and (c) that the university implement the rule of 85. He felt that this set of strategies would enhance faculty morale and provide important assistance to faculty and staff with lower incomes who were bearing the increased costs of health insurance with difficulty. R. Cottone said that a salary increase is a message to the faculty that the administration is looking out for them. J. Waterborg wondered whether each campus could make choices about what to do with the funds that would be set aside for the 4% salary increase. VP Lehmkuhle said that they could set it so that the limit of across-the-board pay increase is low, giving the each campus opportunity for variations in merit. M. Devaney noted that any salary increase will come with a political price throughout the state. VP Lehmkuhle noted that the plan for a 4% compensation pool is one of the Board of Curator’s set of financial assumptions, and that such a plan could be made only in light of other budgetary cuts. VP Hutchinson noted that we are borrowing against the future. L. Pierce pointed out that although some of the money could perhaps be used to keep certain faculty, she also noted that there are problems with increasing the students’ fees while giving the faculty a raise. VP Lehmkuhle noted the importance of decoupling decisions about faculty raises and student fee increases. V. Reidhead observed that the tuition benefit has assumed an increasing importance over time among UMSL faculty and staff. K. Schweitzerberger noted that staff members are more apt to leave the University for positions in which the benefits package is more attractive. VP Hutchinson and VP Lehmkuhle thanked the IFC for sharing views on these matters, noting that they had been operating under the assumption that the core compensation package should have more weight than the other potential benefits. M.
Skidmore said that most faculty might understand why a salary raise might not materialize, but few could understand why the University would not be able to enact a tuition benefit for dependents.

3. **Status of the Administrative Cost Reduction Task Force Report.** With regard to reducing administrative costs, VP Caruso said there was little news to report, because most of the work is being done at the campus level. The task force will continue to meet, and it will report to President Floyd. They will continue to work on the processes that need to be redone. He did not believe that the software should or could have been changed without concurrent changes in process and organizational arrangements. Currently, they have taken 120 days out of the implementation cycle for PeopleSoft. The student functional leadership staff members need to be involved in getting the student module implemented in March or April. With regard to processes, he noted the importance of having service centers in place on each campus. For instance, the PAF process needs to be simplified on PeopleSoft. Nearly all processes in Human Resources will need to be reconsidered. Ensuring that these changes are made will be the major focus of the Task Force from now on, with the assistance of the Task Force chaired by VP Krawitz. VP Caruso offered to provide another update to the IFC in February. S. Loyalka agreed that this would be helpful.

With regard to the UMSL Faculty Senate resolution on implementation of the PeopleSoft Grant Module (see attached, Appendix 2), VP Caruso reviewed the adjustments in the training and implementation schedule. VP Lehmkuhle said that UMSL is live on the module at present. Although all efforts were made to anticipate possible problems, other problems will present; they are seeking input to address the issues as quickly as possible. The MU campus has a “swat team” of graduate students that is sent out when PeopleSoft issues arise at the faculty level. L. Pierce noted that some aspects of faculty training had been problematic at UMSL, and she supported the need for more oversight and involvement of the System in this regard. V. Reidhead observed that the experience of implementing PeopleSoft on each campus has likely been different. He suggested that faculty from the other campuses join VP Caruso when he visits UMSL. Noting that articulation with the end-user is very important, he suggested that IFC become a co-sponsor on the new system-level committee pertaining to this matter. However, VP Lehmkuhle, who initiated that committee, noted that its charge is related to reporting issues and that it has several faculty representatives. V. Reidhead suggested that the IFC be involved with the reporting committee if it serves the spirit of the resolution. VP Lehmkuhle will give the IFC the information on the reporting committee that is being developed.

R. Cottone noted that the faculty need specific information about the overall plan for handling the implementation. S. Loyalka noted that if specific examples of different processes could be on the Web, this would be helpful. S. Loyalka suggested that there be seminars across the system on best practices. VP Caruso documented these suggestions, and he affirmed his intent to continue every effort to address and resolve these matters.

4. **Tuition/Educational Fee Related Ruling.** J. Waterborg. This matter was not discussed further due to Mr. Snider’s earlier comments.
5. **Publication Restrictions and Contracts.** VP Lehmkuhle noted that he had been getting requests from faculty to take contracts in which the agency would have authority to review manuscripts and make changes before publication. He believes that such a situation is a great risk to faculty’s academic freedom, and he will not agree to such contracts on behalf of the faculty. He also has evidence that a faculty member has required students to sign waivers restricting their patent rights as a condition of working in that faculty member’s lab. He noted that he could not take particular action on this matter, but he asked IFC representatives to work with their faculty colleagues so that such situations do not arise.

6. **Workload Policy.** E. Porter reported a continuing concern about the emphasis on instructional workload over the workload relative to all missions of the university, as she had outlined previously in a e-mail to the IFC and VP Lehmkuhle. VP Lehmkuhle said that he would forward the final version of the Executive Guideline on Instructional Workload, which President Pacheco had signed recently along with the Executive Guideline for the Program Assessment and Program Viability Audit. Both of these guidelines had emanated from the work of the Task Force on Reducing Academic Costs. With regard to the guideline on instructional workload, the system will be obligated to provide statistical reports on instructional productivity for each college and school by June 1. With regard to the program viability audit, the System will conduct audits of each program on various parameters by March 1. He was aware of ongoing dialogue on the campuses about mergers and consolidations, and in those situations, the Chancellors are not obligated to follow the new guideline. M. Devaney noted that the emphasis on producing data relative to reducing academic costs has been greater than that in the sphere of reducing administrative costs. VP Lehmkuhle noted that cost-cutting actions had been taken relative to administrative issues; he reviewed the consolidation of the procurement process and the combination of the IT services at MU and the System. However, M. Devaney reiterated that no faculty had been or currently are members of that Task Force, and R. Cottone noted that the faculty lack data about the nature and scope of the administrative budget cuts.

7. **Procedures for Feedback on Administrative Reviews.** L. Koederitz inquired about the procedures at the other campuses for providing feedback on administrative reviews. M. Devaney indicated that the MU Faculty Council tabulates results of surveys and prepares a summary of written comments provided by the faculty. The tabulated results and summary are provided to the administrator being reviewed and are shared with the faculty.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by S. Loyalka at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen J. Porter, Secretary
Appendix 1

Appendix 1 to the Minutes of the Meeting of the UM Intercampus Faculty Council

December 19, 2002

WHEREAS, Manuel T. Pacheco served the people of Missouri with distinction as President of the University of Missouri System from August 1, 1997, until December 31, 2002; and,

WHEREAS, Dr. Pacheco demonstrated a strong interest and concern regarding matters relating to faculty issues during his tenure as President; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Pacheco met faithfully and often with the Intercampus Faculty Council, expressing interest in faculty matters on each campus; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Pacheco's commitment to strengthen external funding from the federal government and from other sources, establishing a visible University presence in Washington, D.C. and increasing faculty proposals to non-federal sources, led to significant increases in research funding and infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Pacheco recognized the need to support the development of strong leadership and management skills in faculty leaders and established the President's Academic Leadership Institute to produce such leaders; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Pacheco's determination to provide resources for faculty and staff to resolve grievances before they became formal grievances established Campus Mediators trained to work with grievants; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Pacheco's leadership fostered, throughout the University structure, many innovations that benefited the teaching, research, and service effectiveness of faculty; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Pacheco fostered a culture of communication that opened avenues for discourse among the various decision bodies of the University, providing opportunities for faculty to discuss issues with the Board of Curators, central administrators, and others about matters of concern to the faculty of each campus;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the members of the Intercampus Faculty Council as representatives of the faculty on all four campuses of the University of Missouri, acknowledge his many lasting contributions to the faculty of the University and cause this resolution to be included in the minutes of this meeting and a duly inscribed copy thereof be furnished to Manuel T. Pacheco.
Appendix 2

to the Minutes of the Meeting of the UM Intercampus Faculty Council
December 19, 2002

Resolution on PeopleSoft

Dr. Lawrence Barton introduced Dr. James O’Brien from the Chemistry Department, who presented the following resolution (see attached report).

1. Delay the implementation of the PeopleSoft Grants Management System for Grant writing. In the interim, use the existing Grant Data form, generated using the current process, for entry of the financial details associated with attempts to gain an award.

2. Establish an Intercampus Faculty Council committee to review all aspects of PeopleSoft’s use in the grant writing process.

3. If the Administration insists on the use of the PeopleSoft Grants Management System during this review period, have them deal with submissions of the grant material into the PeopleSoft system. The only requirement of the Faculty should be to provide to the Research Office the currently used grant data form and the proposal in electronic format within a set time limit after the grant has been submitted.

4. Please don’t impose the PeopleSoft disaster in faculty who are trying to improve things for the University by securing external funding.

Approved by the Faculty Senate, UM-St. Louis, December 10, 2002