University of Missouri System  
Intercampus Faculty Council  

Minutes of the Meeting of January 31, 2003

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; Todd Hubing, UMR; Leonard Koederitz, UMR; and Ralph Wilkerson, UMR.

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

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of December 19, 2002 were approved as previously circulated (moved V. Reidhead / seconded L. Koederitz / consensus). E. Porter will send them to K. Volle for posting on the IFC website.

Review of the Agenda of January 31, 2003: There were no changes to the agenda.

Review of Agenda Items:

1. Tuition Benefits for Faculty Dependents. J. Waterborg noted that this issue is being discussed on the campus level at UMKC, initiated by VP Hutchinson. R. Wilkerson raised questions about the cost. With an anticipated cost if $750,000, the IFC agreed that it was definitely worth pursuing, in view of the perceived benefits.

2. Faculty Salary Raises. Both VP Lehmkuhle and VP Hutchinson had been interested in the views of the IFC at the December meeting that merit plus across the board raises were of interest to the faculty. We will continue this discussion with the Vice Presidents to ensure expression of a variety of views. At both UMKC and UMSL, there has been discussion of 2 – 3% increase rather than a 4% increase. This has been raised in view of the potential need for an increase of 4% in the retirement pool, according to J. Waterborg.

3. Grievance Appeals to the UM President and Timeliness. S. Loyalka had received a letter from a member of the MU faculty, dated 12/31/01, that President Pacheco had sent to that faculty member. President Pacheco had waited one full year to render a decision on the faculty member’s grievance. The timeline of one month for a response, which is specified in the Collected Rules, had not been followed. There are other known instances of such delays on the MU campus. J. Waterborg reported that at UMKC they have not had a problem with timelines. He was not sure about the cases that had been referred up to the system level. L. Pierce noted that timeliness was a critical issue as stated in the Collected Rules. That is, if the President cannot respond in 30 days, she or he is to specify a timeframe for a response and notify the grievant of the timeframe. If there are delays in such matters due to involvement of legal counsel, then the IFC agreed that it is the President’s responsibility to ensure that such delays do not occur, for any reason.
4. **Impact of VERIP and the Stock Market (especially with respect to the impact, in precise figures, on the UM retirement fund).** R. Wilkerson reported that a faculty member had asked him about this matter, particularly in view of the coinciding events of the downturn in the stock market and VERIP 2002. Other IFC members have been asked whether there will be another VERIP in three or five years. L. Pierce suggested that we discuss the Rule of 85 along with this topic. M. Devaney noted that this would be a good time to discuss this matter with President Floyd, noting that that the latest VERIP had been very destructive at MU in terms of faculty workload and morale. L. Koederitz noted that many high-paid faculty had been let go this time, but they had not been replaced. V. Reidhead had heard questions about whether there would be a reduction in the retirement benefit. The system is now funding the largest portion of the retirement benefit. M. Devaney said that the Board of Curators has control of the percentage of the payout.

5. **Faculty Workload Policy.** L. Pierce reported that at UMSL, there had been controversy with regard to interpretation of the recently issued Executive Guideline on Instructional Workload. The clause about the number of credit hours and / or student credit hours had been interpreted as “AND” rather than “OR,” although “or” was the word used in the guideline. K. Schweitzberger noted that UMKC is looking at the Boyer method for workload allocation, which is unit driven. E. Porter pointed out that the first clause of Section 310.080 of the Collected Rules and Regulations is also unit-based. She explained the concern of the MU Faculty Council relative to focusing on gathering data relative to one aspect of instructional workload when the UM System, per Section 310.080, is responsible for collecting and reporting data pertinent to teaching, research, and service. L. Pierce noted that we need to address all aspects of the workload, not just instructional, as did L. Koederitz. M. Skidmore noted that the Executive Guideline was developed for budgetary reasons to ensure that faculty time was appropriately used. R. Cottone addressed the need to review the procedural issues that have arisen and will continue to arise when implementation of the Executive Guideline begins. S. Loyalka noted that if each campus begins interpreting the regulations differently, there would be difficulty. M. Skidmore noted that there was administrative latitude in implementing the policy. J. Waterborg noted that it was not clear when the waiver is actually needed in all cases depending on the nature of the summer load and when the load is assigned.

6. **Reinstitution of University Cabinet.** L. Koederitz had raised this question. S. Loyalka noted that in the Collected Rules, it is stated that the chair of the IFC was to be included in the General Officers’ meetings, representing the faculty. President Pacheco reconstituted the cabinet to exclude the faculty member.

VP K. Hutchinson and VP S. Lehmkuhle joined the meeting at 10 a.m.

7. **National Survey of Student Engagement.** K. Schweitzberger wished to start a discussion of this matter with regard to the students’ differential views of the campuses. She suggested that the group look at the web site of the NSSE. It is directed at undergraduate education at present. They will be developing surveys for graduate and professional programs as well. VP Lehmkuhle developed a survey for graduate students, which is built off the undergraduate NSSE. The NSSE is embedded in the university’s strategic plans.
He suggested that a number of the undergraduate issues on the NSSE do not necessarily translate to graduate education, and he had been concerned about the normative procedures for other measures. He decided to develop a tool so that we might develop our own benchmarks and look at improvement based on our own benchmarks. One of the issues is that of engaging the nontraditional student. In a pilot of the graduate student survey, all four campuses scored well. There is a national movement on PFF Programs – preparing future faculty. The nationwide critique is that graduate programs have an insufficient focus on teacher preparation. Another issue is whether we should be preparing students primarily for careers in Research I institutions. He noted the need for input on the potential changes needed in graduate education. J. Waterborg was not aware of the survey, and none of his students had been aware of it. VP Lehmkuhle invited him to attend the upcoming meeting on this matter. K. Schweitzberger noted that it is difficult to try to work with the undergraduate results with NSSE from the perspective of UMKC only, and that it is important to consider this on a system basis. R. Wilkerson noted that the graduate directors are meeting frequently with the provost at UMR to address some of these issues and to consider best practices, which VP Lehmkuhle reinforced, while emphasizing the need to continue to improve our graduate education.

Discussions with VP Hutchinson and VP Lehmkuhle:

Tuition benefits. VP Hutchinson said that they had done all of the necessary data-gathering to prepare for a decision about this matter. It continues to be a viable program for consideration by the General Officers. No decision has yet been made. He and VP Lehmkuhle shared the IFC’s interest in this matter with the General Officers. J. Waterborg asked about the perceptions of costs to benefits on the part of the General Officers. VP Hutchinson noted that there has been discussion of these matters for some time, but he has noted a more intense interest in the potential of this option vis-à-vis all potential options for the benefit package. R. Wilkerson noted that this was a particular concern for staff, who are worried about how they will send their children to college. The availability of the opportunity for staff in the lower pay ranges is really critical. The calculations provided by VP Hutchinson to the General Officers are based upon a 50% benefit with a 5-year vesting period. Dependent children and spouses were included in the calculations. VP Hutchinson noted that the General Officers had had an excellent discussion on the compensation package of the current cycle, which would begin in Fall, 2003. S. Loyalka inquired as to whether a formal resolution was needed to underscore the IFC’s support of the tuition benefit for dependents and spouses; VP Lehmkuhle suggested that the IFC simply discuss this matter with President Floyd. M. Skidmore noted concern about the provision in health care benefits such that both a dependent, divorced spouse and a dependent, legally separated spouse lose the benefit. M. Skidmore noted that this was a potentially problematic issue for women, in particular. VP Hutchinson will check into this matter.

Retirement Planning Beyond VERIP. M. Devaney inquired about further discussions on the Rule of “X.” VP Hutchinson has some general cost information, which is set at a 0.7 - 0.8 % of payroll to institute such a program. They are looking at a Rule of 85. He cannot rate it as having the same level of interest as the tuition benefit on the part of the General Officers, but it is one option that is under consideration. It would allow for a different level of planning, because it would not cause the same degree of disruption to the institution as a VERIP. In response to L.
Koederitz’s question about the imminence of another VERIP, VP Hutchinson does not anticipate this, although he noted that the most recent VERIP was implemented under an unforeseen situation. Queries about the reasons for the state’s rule of 80 were raised. For various reasons, VP Hutchinson believes that the state’s plan is a little richer than that of UM, and in his opinion, UM cannot afford a rule of 80. M. Skidmore questioned whether the elimination of the SS earnings test has been influential in VERIP decision. However, VP Hutchinson said that they have not found this to be influential.

Concerning the potential depletion of the fund and a lower benefit in the future for employed faculty and staff, VP Hutchinson assured the IFC that this would not happen. The implementation of a VERIP does increase our liability, but the university has a wonderful record of supporting the retirement fund, he noted. The fund does not take all of the hit and all of the gain in one year, but the recent economic situation (VERIP aside) has influenced the need to consider a potential increase in the contribution rate to the retirement fund from payroll. Should we have further devastation to the university’s budget this year and next, will this impact the retirement benefit? The amount that the retirement fund produces or does not produce affects the operating budget. Reduction in benefits is not an option.

The Missouri Senate has expressed an interest in the financial success of VERIP. VP Hutchinson has sent a comprehensive analysis to them, and he will do this periodically. J. Waterborg inquired as to the percentage of the positions remaining unfilled due to VERIP. There is evidence that the enrollment in certain classes is much higher due to VERIP. VP Hutchinson noted that some positions are likely to remain open due to lingering questions and grave concerns about the impending continuation of the crisis. J. Waterborg noted that the potential influx of adjuncts affects the quality of our provision of education. VP Lehmkuhle noted the need for conversation about the necessary number of non-regular faculty and the ways in which they can best be integrated into the unit. Improved integration of the non-regular faculty into the faculty as a whole is a critical issue, and this is perhaps even more problematic at UMSL and UMKC. VP Lehmkuhle asked whether we as an institution more willing to think of longer term contracts for non-regular faculty; this has been done at other universities.

Health Insurance for State Employees. L. Koederitz inquired whether the General Officers had had further conversation relative to the Governor’s comments about improving health insurance benefits for all state employees. According to VP Hutchinson, the two plans (i.e., the university plan and the state plan) are managed differently. If the university were to join the state’s health plan, it would cost each faculty member $1000 more per year for health insurance. He offered to share the differences in premiums for the two plans with the IFC.

Faculty Salary Raises. S. Loyalka invited IFC members to express views on this matter. M. Skidmore suggested a blanket raise with a higher percentage for lower-paid faculty and staff as equity adjustments. L. Koederitz raised a question as to whether the university might look foolish in the eyes of the legislature and the public by giving a raise in this troubled economic period. VP Lehmkuhle noted that any compensation option elected by UM could be criticized from various perspectives. He emphasized that as a “people organization,” we must decide what to do to retain our good people. The compensation package might not be an issue of dollars so much as the mind-set that it creates in persons about the orientation of the university. When one
says, for instance, that there would be a 4% pool for raises, Board of Curators’ policy is such that it is all merit-based. It is a minimum pool. This is often viewed as an across-the-board, cost of living raise, when it is not. (The option of a 2% minimum actually has been discussed, but if that were the case, the average salary increase might be about 3%.) The Board of Curators is encouraging conversation about compensation in a more general sense. VP Lehmkuhle said he now agrees with VP Hutchinson that we cannot separate the decisions about fee increases from decisions about salary increases.

VP Hutchinson noted that the General Officers have also had conversations about how to have the conversation. In view of the economic circumstances, the nature of any action might best be described as “artistic.” The result of any decision would probably be variable across faculty and staff and variable among the campuses of the system. VP Hutchinson inquired as to the IFC’s reaction about the ways in which the budget parameters could be established, noting that any raise pool would come from non-state, self-generated funds. V. Reidhead said that based on his dialogue with UMSL faculty, the perception associated with a 2% pool for raises is considerably better than that associated with a 1% pool. VP Hutchinson added that the tuition benefit would be helpful in enhancing the overall perception among faculty and staff of the university.

The Potential for Impeding Budget Reductions and Accompanying Scenarios. M. Devaney raised questions about how the UM System will handle the impact of any further withholding for this fiscal year. VP Lehmkuhle noted that a 10% cut now is a 20% cut for the remainder of the fiscal year. Such a major cut could have the effect of removing all options for enhancing the compensation package. In response, VP Lehmkuhle noted that the General Officers are revisiting the issue of implementing salary increases for personnel on continuing grants for which such increases have been budgeted. VP Hutchinson and VP Lehmkuhle noted that the university aims to be “as internally consistent and as external competitive as possible.” Fairness is an issue, as some faculty do not have grants. A related issue of importance is whether personnel would lose the higher salary when the grant stops. One could possibly put more salary into the summer term. Paying personnel a lump sum, which J. Waterborg had suggested, might be another way to do it.

In spite of such problems, however, in view of the current climate, VP Lehmkuhle noted that it is important to consider the issue of salary increases on grants. Initially, the General Officers had viewed 100% funded as a requirement for this consideration, but now they are discussing a parameter of 50% grant funding. The complexities associated with establishing and implementing such a parameter were discussed at length. He asked the IFC for opinions on his impression that the number one priority for PI’s was to address salary increases for students, lab staff and post-docs. A grant incentive program is being considered, in which one would get an incentive, if the PI collects the full amount of indirect. Then there would be options for the persons to use that money rather than simply paying themselves. T. Hubing noted that the consulting income of some faculty was important. The establishment of such an incentive program might bring some of the consulting money into the university.

Eligibility for Designation as Distinguished Teaching Professor. M. Skidmore inquired as to whether an associate professor was eligible, and L. Koederitz indicated that the rank of professor was not a necessary criterion. VP Lehmkuhle noted that the emphasis was on research and
scholarship, but that excellence in teaching was also very important. The impact of the candidate upon the institution must be “pervasive,” according to VP Lehmkuhle.

Faculty Workload. S. Loyalka thanked VP Lehmkuhle for his dedication to involving the faculty in dialogue about this matter and about the Executive Guideline for Instructional Workload. S. Loyalka noted that two central issues are of concern to the faculty, explaining that the first pertained to implementation of the Executive Guideline and the second was more philosophical. L. Pierce reviewed the concern she had addressed earlier related to implementation. J. Waterborg noted that the word “and” causes a definite problem at the graduate level. VP Lehmkuhle noted that he could understand the reasons for the confusion on this matter. He said that if an instructor fails to meet either of the criteria, then a waiver is to be sought. However, he noted that the chief academic officers thought that an instructor should meet both criteria to avoid the waiver, because they did not want faculty to meet the standard by teaching one class with 180 students. His intent is for them to be able to monitor the instructional responsibilities in the same way as the other responsibilities. Formerly, we were monitoring only the instructional workload, and they were in a sense buying out their time, but there was no record of that. The waivers are designed to track the reasons for lowered teaching loads. He realizes that this could be perceived as seeking permission to engage in one of the other codified duties of the faculty. They arrived at the number of 180 SCH in conversation with the chief academic officers, and it is hard to know if these numbers are appropriate system-wide. There is not a university-wide norm, and the waiver is to be adjusted at the unit level. If the Vice Chancellor on a particular campus understands the Executive Guideline provisions in one way, then indeed it will be interpreted that way on that campus. The Deans need to be held accountable for lower educational productivity in the units. VP Lehmkuhle is not certain that the word “waiver” was the best choice of words. He will raise issues with the chief academic officers about the implementation of the policy. He emphasized that flexibility was built in. S. Loyalka emphasized the ambiguity in the statement of concern relative to the parameters upon which the waiver is to be granted, and he invited discussion of whether a workload taskforce or sub-committee was needed.

With regard to the philosophical issues inherent in faculty’s concerns about the Executive Guideline and its focus on instructional workload, E. Porter repeated the concerns mentioned earlier (see #5 above). She emphasized the faculty’s need to rely on the System to collect and report “workload data,” as specified in the Collected Rules, noting that faculty want the legislature and the Board of Curators to have information about how faculty carry out the full scope of our responsibilities. She noted that faculty want to tell a positive story about their efforts, rather than reporting the number of instructional waivers.

Luncheon Session: After a very brief recess, S. Loyalka reconvened the IFC at 12:00 p.m. VP Ron Turner; VP Nikki Krawitz, and President Floyd joined the group. President Floyd requested a summary of the salient issues for the faculty on each campus.

Campus Reports: M. Devaney reported for MU. The critical pressing issue is the aftermath of VERIP and the efforts to press forward with the research mission in view of the loss of key faculty The Faculty Council had approved a resolution commending President Floyd’s directive to settle the legal suit between the Kansas City Star and the University of Missouri. M. Devaney read the resolution (see Appendix I), and E. Porter gave a copy to President Floyd.
L. Koederitz reported for UMR. They are concerned with the issues associated with creating a Management and Information School during tight economic times. Faculty are trying to streamline the bylaws, and there has been conversation about this with administration. They are also continuing work on the reorganization effort.

K. Schweitzberger and J. Waterborg reported for UMKC. The budget has been a major issue. The faculty has been very involved in discussion of the vacancy issues due to VERIP. The goals of the Chancellor’s new strategic plan are being discussed. The report from the Danforth Committee is under discussion. The issue of appointments of permanent deans and interim deans is of concern. President Floyd asked whether this was a representational issue. J. Waterborg mentioned that it was an issue of reconciling varying opinions about both content and procedures. It has to do with ongoing dialogue throughout the process in the context of an abbreviated timeline. The Life Sciences Initiative is well underway, and Senator Kit Bond will be announcing new funding for the initiative later today.

V. Reidhead reported for UMSL. The state budget and the aftermath of VERIP are among the key issues. Faculty are appreciating the openness of the style of Interim Chancellor Driemeier. The upcoming search for the Chancellor has been another current concern of the faculty. President Floyd’s mandate is to have a new chancellor on board by July 1. President Floyd noted that he would rely heavily upon the advice of the faculty and staff on the search committee, as he strongly believes in shared governance.

President Floyd thanked each campus for the reports. He affirmed that he is ready to discuss any issue at any time, and he invited IFC members to communicate by e-mail with issues and concerns.

Discussions with President Floyd:

1. **Tuition Benefits for Faculty Dependents.** S. Loyalka noted that discussion of this matter is to be extended to staff as well. J. Waterborg spoke to the issue of retention of our key people. President Floyd asked where the IFC would spot the priority in this matter. Several members said that it would be a number one priority particularly in view of the life cycle of the benefit. It is an issue of special concern to staff. He inquired of the General Officers as to a possible timeframe for implementation. VP Krawitz noted that funds would need to be shifted to pay for it. VP Hutchinson noted that they had done a very good analysis of the costs and benefits in relation to recruitment and retention, and that if such a decision were to be made, implementation in Fall 2003 would be feasible.

2. **Faculty Salary Raises.** M. Skidmore noted the importance of salary raises for those in lower levels of the pay scale. He also reinforced the importance of ensuring raises associated with promotions and noted that monies were needed for competitive retention offers. President Floyd said that a salary pool might be available to each chancellor so each campus could make those judgments relative to merit. He noted that this notion was similar to that raised by M. Skidmore. R. Cottone suggested that we have a raise relative to inflation, inquiring about the feasibility of a 2% salary pool. VP Krawitz emphasized that this would not mean a 2% raise for everyone. President Floyd asked whether a 2%
raise pool and the tuition benefit for dependents would be amenable to staff, and the IFC agreed that it would. J. Waterborg raised the issue of opportunity for the faculty who are on grants to have raises and to reward their staffs. President Floyd has already looked at draft policy in this regard; he believes it is very important to ensure that faculty members have incentives to engage in the competitive grant-writing process. VP Krawitz and VP Lehmkuhle emphasized that all dialogue about compensation is predicated on economic decisions that have yet to be made at the state level.

3. **Grievance Appeals to UM President and Timeliness.** S. Loyalka reviewed the policy governing grievance appeals with regard to the President’s level of review. S. Loyalka reviewed the case he mentioned earlier, noting that this had been a practice over time, and that appeals have been pending in the President’s office for as long as five years. President Floyd inquired as to the number pending at present. VP Lehmkuhle noted that the appeals go to legal counsel and then to the President. President Floyd asked that VP Lehmkuhle inquire about the status of any pending appeals and asked that a letter be written to each person on the list to provide a timeline of perhaps 60 days before a decision was rendered. He expressed regret about this situation.

4. **Faculty Workload Policy.** S. Loyalka reinforced that VP Lehmkuhle had been extremely open to the concerns and issues of faculty as this policy had been developed. There have been implementation issues and there are philosophical issues. President Floyd chose to dissect the matter a bit. Noting that the academy is more dynamic than just teaching, he would prefer not to have the legislature focus on individual teaching loads, but on departmental teaching loads. He inquired as to whether the Executive Guideline had been an initiative of the Curators. VP Lehmkuhle noted that Board policy does recognize the full scope of faculty responsibilities, and that the Executive Guideline had not been an initiative of the Board of Curators. J. Waterborg suggested that we have ongoing discussions in a complementary sense regarding the full range of the workload activities. President Floyd would want the data to be reported on the aggregate, and he does not want to see the process become a de facto evaluation process for faculty. E. Porter reiterated the philosophical issues addressed earlier, noting the statement in the Collected Rules that the System is to report workload data, not just instructional data. She also noted the issue of burden associated with more paperwork for instructional waivers. President Floyd affirmed his intent to communicate to the legislature the complexity of our work. VP Lehmkuhle asked whether the Faculty Accomplishments System (FAS) would be a useful vehicle for such an effort. E. Porter responded in the affirmative, noting that it is not fully operational in all units at MU. However, the FAS is operational at UMR, UMKC, and UMSL. President Floyd encouraged VP Lehmkuhle to look at models in other states, emphasizing the need for the System to tell the entire story of the faculty’s roles. S. Loyalka said that he plans to form a small sub-group of the IFC to do further review of the workload issue. J. Waterborg volunteered to serve.

5. **Reinstitution of University Cabinet.** S. Loyalka explained that the faculty position had been abolished. President Floyd is looking at the overall organizational structure, and he will include that matter on his list of concerns.
Announcements from VP S. Lehmkuhle:

1. PeopleSoft Grants Management Systems. The systems are up live everywhere. A shakeout process is available via weekly conference call. This enables prioritization of the future issues that could arise with the system. He asked the Research Vice-Chancellors to suggest faculty to serve on this group. The challenge here is to balance the conversation between IT staff and the functional users.

2. Life Sciences Week. The event is designed to draw together the key players in life sciences initiative across the UM System. Technology Transfer Showcase will be on March 5, 2003, during Life Sciences Week. S. Loyalka expressed the faculty’s gratitude to VP Lehmkuhle for his role in initiating this project.

3. Homeland Security. VP Lehmkuhle has met with a task force to organize the university’s overall plans for responding to the RFPs that various agencies will issue pertaining to homeland security. Research, safety and compliance, training, and students are the key dimensions. This is an extremely complex issue. Meredith Hay from MU will chair this effort with him. There will be six sub-committees, each focusing on a specific topic. They will try to build a network of faculty around each area. Because the turn-around time of the RFPs could be as little as 6 weeks, we must put teams together to respond quickly. The coordinating committee will enable this communication. S. Loyalka wondered how the faculty would be notified of the opportunities to serve on the sub-committee. VP Lehmkuhle said that there will be a web site and faculty will be asked to provide information if they are willing to participate. L. Pierce raised the question about the new policies in relation to security have affected international students. R. Wilkerson reported a concern about ensuring that graduate advisers do their jobs relative to student immigration status. We will not be aware of changes in student status as quickly as INS might be. Such concerns will be reported directly to INS, being pulled directly from the university’s database. They are discussing the need for annual review of each student to monitor progress.

4. Faculty Teaching Scholars Program. A system-wide event will be held on Feb. 27 at MU. Seventy new faculty members will be coming together for that event. General officers, Curators, and IFC members will be invited. President Floyd will speak. VP Lehmkuhle is pleased about the short-term outcomes of the Faculty Teaching Scholars Program.

Adjournment: S. Loyalka adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen J. Porter, Secretary
RESOLUTION

Praising President Floyd’s Directive
to Settle the Legal Suit by The Kansas City Star
Against the University of Missouri

Whereas, during the current fiscal crisis of the State of Missouri, it is especially important that the University of Missouri reinforce its bonds with the people of Missouri by being worthy of the public trust and by being responsible stewards of the state’s investment, and

Whereas the University of Missouri-Columbia is a public institution of higher education with an internationally recognized School of Journalism, which puts a premium on openness in government, and

Whereas the University of Missouri-Columbia faculty are committed to rational inquiries about issues and open expression of the methods and results of such inquiries, and

Whereas the University of Missouri-Columbia faculty are dedicated to the principles of stimulating open discussion, maintaining open records, and contributing to constructive criticism of governmental affairs, and

Whereas the Faculty Council of the University of Missouri-Columbia maintains that public discourse is the best way to promote public discussion of the welfare, benefits, and achievements of this public institution,
The Faculty Council of the University of Missouri-Columbia hereby commends President Floyd’s directive to settle the legal suit between *The Kansas City Star* and the University of Missouri.