MINUTES
Intercampus Faculty Council
October 6, 2004
Submitted by Van Reidhead, IFC Secretary

Attendance:
Rocco Cottone, Chair, Eddy Adelstein (for Sudarshan Loyalka), Gordon Christensen, Mike Hilgers, Todd Hubing, Van Reidhead, Frank Schmidt, Bob Schwartz, Paul Speck, Jakob Waterborg, Steve Graham, Steve Lehmkuhle, Pete Wilden, joined part of the day by President Elson Floyd, Ken Hutchinson, Board President Mary James.

September Minutes:
Approval moved by Eddy Adelstein, seconded by Jakob Waterborg, and approved.

Agenda:
Discussion items added:
1. UMKC issue on Non-regular Library Faculty (Jakob Waterborg).
2. UMR Technology Fee Issue (Mike Hilgers).
3. IS (Information Services) policy document and the issue of Reasonable Use at UMKC; the policy appears to overstep the CRR (110.005) policy with regard to digital privacy (Jakob Waterborg). Jakob to address with the President.

Discussion items for November Meeting:
4. Conflict of Interest Policy: conflict between protection of the institution at the expense of the individual faculty and staff, for discussion with the President (Paul Speck).

FAS System:
The Faculty Accomplishment System (FAS) was discussed by IFC alone and later with Steve Lehmkuhle. Information was exchanged, some bugs identified, and timelines set. Mike Hilgers identified the need for a problem reporting system, with help for users that would include a mechanism for cataloging problems and making answers available. Steve Lehmkuhle discussed the need to talk about training and also what kind of productivity report we want as the end product. Steve emphasized the need for IFC members to complete input of all of each person’s 1-year data for use to figure this out. It is essential that IFC members complete their input by October 20th. Mike Hilgers stressed the importance of the training element, and all agreed.

Non-Regular Faculty:
Last year the IFC began a conversation with Steve Lehmkuhle about the need to assess, and perhaps reorganize the Fulltime Academic Non-regular Faculty classification system to see if it reflects the actual work that is done by this faculty group. Concern for the issue has grown on IFC this year and is focused primarily by three question sets: first, what is ethical and right with regard to non-regular faculty, in light of the work they perform? Second, what is in the best interest of the University considering its strategic goals and the deployment of this human resource cluster? And
thirdly, are there effective ways to consider reclassifying non-regular faculty, in the whole or in subsets?

The Columbia campus has had these issues under study and plans to release a report of findings later this academic year.

A possibility for clinical faculty would be to create in Columbia a rank system parallel to the tenure track, with rolling contracts. If this is done, should the University as a whole follow suite in other areas with clinical and/or other non-regular fulltime faculty? There is concern that this could undermine tenured positions, resulting in fewer tenure lines. This underscores the critical importance that any new classification system clearly distinguish between the roles of tenure track vs. non-tenure track faculty lines so prevent blurring of work assignments and expectations. For any new system to work, it will be necessary to structure evaluation, reward, and promotion processes to consistently reflect the contract and hiring obligations of the non-tenure vs. tenure tracks. For faculty hired on a clinical track, it is appropriate to evaluate them only on the criteria for that track.

It is important to note that reclassification would not affect adjunct faculty. Under the current system a full-time Academic Non-regular member of the faculty has the same classification as an adjunct faculty member teaching one course at a time.

Members of IFC who have followed this issue feel that we have discussed it as far as we can go and that it is time for System Academic Affairs to put down the elements of a proposal with which to work. There is some opposition to this on IFC, arising from questions of the lack of academic freedom under non-tenure track reclassification scenarios and the integrity constraints this imposes.

Paul Speck pointed out that the trends are running toward more non-regular faculty and asked what UM’s vision and goals are and also what the System and national numbers are. Steve Lehmkuhle has the national data and reported that there are a lot of different models. Many universities now provide 5-year contracts, which are typically renewed, thus providing some security and job stature. Throughout UM we have seen an increase, resulting from two VERIP’s in close succession. Due to the budget crunch following the VERIP’s, system-wide tenure numbers are staying flat, while non-regulars positions are increasing.

Paul Speck suggested that there are two issues: 1) the proper classification, and 2) strategic direction regarding the right mix. This received support from UMC, which had shown reluctance and gained broader support on condition that the strategic plan not set a quota system that would constrain the ability of campuses and units to hire the right mix of tenure track and non-tenure track people to advance the research mission, which emphasizes expensive tenure track hires and the teaching mission, which increasingly relies on non-regular faculty to meet course demands. Lehmkuhle pointed up the demographic fact that due to birth and high school graduation rates, enrollments
will peak in 2008 and decline for sometime thereafter. If we fill all of the current need for faculty with tenure track hires, we will soon be over-loaded.

Steve Lehmkuhle voiced his preference for a system in which non-regular faculty would have many of the same rights as regular faculty.

It was agreed that we should move forward now toward a solution that will provide protections and rights for fulltime faculty now classified as non-regular and to develop and to implement effective strategies for the system and campuses to deal with the changing demographic and market conditions which will affect each campus differently.

IFC then put in place a “Subcommittee on Non-regular Faculty Issues”, to work with Steve Lehmkuhle’s office. The committee was charged to address two levels of the issue: 1) How should the each campus deploy non-regular faculty? And 2) What rights and responsibilities should UM as a whole adopt for the employment of fulltime non-regular faculty? The committee consists of: Jakob Waterborg (UMKC), Paul Speck (UMSL), Mike Hilgers (UMR), and Eddy Adelstein (UMC).

**Rule of 85 Retirement Option (VP Ken Hutchinson, HR)**
Definition: A Rule of 85 Retirement Plan offers full retirement when an employee’s combined age and years of service add up to 85.

Ken Hutchinson said that he and President Floyd are open to the possibility of a Rule of 85 policy, but they are not sure it is the right way to spend our limited money. The system would consume about 1% of the total benefit eligible campus compensation budget, not unmanageable. However, with annual flexible spending limited to the 1-3% range, it becomes substantial.

Additionally, there are a number of factors that suggest against a Rule of 85 Plan. Baby boomers are now beginning to retire, and 76 million of them will, over the next decade, be replaced in the workforce by 46 million workers. This is already being felt nationally and at the state level. The State of Missouri, which had a Rule of 80 policy is now shorthanded and trying to figure out how to retain people who would otherwise retire. Possibilities included phased-in retirements, which, in certain industries, are gaining in popularity. The State has considered a change where the retirement could occur and build up in an individual account, while at the same time allowing the individual to work full time for a period up to five years.

Any new rule must not jeopardize the financial solvency of the current UM retirement fund, which is one of only a few nationally that has a perfect bill of health. UM’s managers have been steadfast in following actuarial advice in determining the contribution requirements, and have never played games with the actuarial assumptions in order to meet other needs. Costs are increasing substantially, as a percentage of payroll, and we do not want to create an imbalance that could jeopardize the plan. UM is not an ERISA plan and therefore does not pay a subscriber tax to the national fund.
(Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation), which is the federal agency that insures pensions. We are independent.

Ken Hutchinson said that at present the Rule of 85 is under consideration, but may continue to be difficult, relative to direct compensation needs, for the reasons stated. Before making a decision, he wants to put long term retirement income adequacy and rising medical plan costs, which are major concerns, along side retirement data to better assess our condition and need.

**Incentive Plans:**
Handout: DRAFT “Principles for the Establishment and Operation of Incentive Compensation Plans.”

This is still a work in progress. The Chief Academic Officers will provide feedback before it goes to final. Once in place the policy will not oblige any campus to implement any incentive plan. Its purpose is to make explicit a set of principles that will guide those incentive plans that are constructed and implemented

The principles would be received more favorably at UMC if the cap in Section C were a hard cap.

Could this be used as a driver to change base salaries? Ken Hutchinson said that at present incentive pay is not included in the benefits formula.

Should we go to a W-2 average to set retirement? Hutchinson responded that historically we have not done so because of its volatility. A person can do things in the last 5 years to increase pay, which gets applied then to the whole career.

But what if we set a limit, say 30% of W-2 above base salary. Even this would need to be closely examined in order not to harm people who take most of their salary from incentives. Ken Hutchinson was interested in examining whether to set a percentage of incentive income, to build into the benefits formula.

Who must approve larger incentive requests? Steve Lehmkuhle, Ken Hutchinson and the President, but there will be a lot of judgment along the way to send the right messages about what is appropriate.

Steve Lehmkuhle emphasized the need for transparency, which this plan has. Though no decision has been made, Lehmkuhle wants it to move on. Between now and the November IFC meeting he will get feedback from the Academic Officers with the intention to finalize a policy, with input from IFC, his own staff, and the Benefits Office.

Can a plan go from a department straight to the President? Steve Lehmkuhle: “No.” It must come up through channels, Dean, Provost, etc.

**Faculty Reports to the President:**
UMC: Gordon Christensen: Support for Brady Deaton’s appointment as Chancellor was due to a new level of trust built by President Floyd with the faculty. Noted the faculty vote to implement the pilot grievance policy. Confirmed that a report has been completed and will be coming forward on non-regular faculty rights and responsibilities. The Chair of Geography has been elected to provide faculty oversight of athletics issues. The Faculty Council has joined the Big 8 coalition for the reform of intercollegiate athletics. The faculty was challenged last year by Chancellor to increase diversity, and work is going forward. Care is being taken to assure effective change and to prevent a window-dressing solution. The faculty is concerned that University faculty and external relations staff are perceived as arrogant and overpaid, with nothing to offer that the community colleges cannot provide.

UMSL: Paul Speck: A committee is in place to recommend (report due by mid-year) procedures for distributing Evening College responsibilities and restructuring centralized advising. Noted that Recruitment and Retention have been identified as the top priority by his Senate administration, because increasing retention is the single best source of income available for immediate change. Several meetings have been organized by the Provost and Senate to address retention and try to get people on the same page. Two meetings at the Chancellor's Residence will discuss ideas having to do with the future of the UMSL: Who we are? Who so we want to become in 15 years? What mission will we serve? Rocco Cottone added that the atmosphere on campus is changing, with much greater transparency and trust.

UMKC: The electronic vote election of IFC representative was judged unfair by faculty, so the election will be redone by traditional method. One year ago the campus started unit-based budgeting, and academic departments were very conservative, leaving strong fund balances. In the process, cross-campus projects, such as the Plant Fund for building were ignored. Now, some of balance will be used to break ground on new construction projects, etc. Set 5% fund balances for individual academic units will not be required but will be managed campus-wide, and existing fund balances will be used to move some needed projects forward. Faculty have been receiving pop-up computer messages informing them that their computers are University property and may not be used for any private purpose. This was the result of a reasonable need to protect against copyright infringements, child porn, etc., but it has become punitive. The campus policy, as stated in the pop-ups, appears to be at odds with UM’s reasonable use policy and the privacy protections provided. UMKC’s campus representatives may need to come back to the President, IFC, and possibly the Board regarding a proper balance in the acceptable use policy. The faculty is preparing for its 5-year evaluation of campus administrators, which will be forwarded to the President. Jakob Waterborg asked President Floyd to clarify how he views evaluations of this kind from faculty.

UMR: Mike Hilgers: Offered thanks to President Floyd for the Way he has organized the Chancellor search. Hilgers spoke forcefully about “strong” faculty dissatisfaction with the abandonment of the UM Strategic Plan process in budget allocation. The faculty went through a complex and strong, competitive strategic initiative process and sent the results forward only to learn that the final budget decision was formula driven,
an outcome they could have produced in an afternoon. UMR faculty asks that in future years we make the process clear, so that less time can be invested if it is to be formula based. At the campus level, the resource allocation process is moving forward, with the Provost’s budget transparent, so that all deans, centers, etc. can see how money is spent. Regarding the UM Strategic Plan, UMR will link specific its plans to the UM plan. In response to decline in foreign student enrollments following 9/11, UMR is looking to offer specific degree programs in India. To help achieve this, the campus has centralized distance programs into a single school. He discussed IT issues of concern to faculty, having to do with budget allocations for distinct, protected purposes losing their protected status through the budgeting process being used on campus. In particular, allocations for student computing needs (the information technology fee) as well as faculty and staff needs (desktop replacement funds) appear to come from unrestricted budget pools and that this is a point of controversy on campus which is under investigation.

**Performance Evaluation:** President Floyd: a UM System plan is now in place for System and campus administrative leadership. However, each campus has its own practices that are important. UMC and UMSL have faculty evaluation methods, though the results have not been shared with him up to this point. He will take into consideration evaluations that he receives from campuses, but these will not be part of his formal evaluations, which are accomplished by his Performance Evaluation. He will not get involved in campus evaluations, which are between faculty and their local leaders, as with UMKC’s question about the 5-year review of its Chancellor.

**Pilot Grievance Process:** The plan was received from UMC, and, pending legal review, President Floyd is inclined to approve it for 3 years.

**UMC Chancellor Appointment:** He recognizes the issues in the selection of the UMC Chancellor and addressing them. Gordon Christensen commented that President Floyd’s openness with the faculty over past year will stand him in good stead dealing with these issues.

**UMR Chancellor Search:** President Floyd said that the 18 person committee will stay at that; he is very comfortable with it.

**UM Strategic Plan:** President Floyd spoke frankly, saying that in the end he allocated the new Strategic Plan money by formula to the campuses, due to lack of support among the chancellors for competition based on strategic goals. Steve Lehmkuhle added the caveat that the money was allocated to the campuses for 3 years, with a list of how it will be spent and the outcomes that must be shown after 3 years. If targets are met, the money will be permanently transferred. The President does not want to see funds allocated without some outcomes shown.

President Floyd believes that we are closer to a strategic allocation process than in past. However, he said that strategic planning has not given us much traction thus far.
Jakob Waterborg asked if new moneys will be strategically allocated in future. President Floyd said that out of last year’s budget request we received 12 million that we did not expect. He allocated the 12 million to 3 areas: scholarships, strategic plan, and closing the UMSL funding gap. He confirmed that he will do it the same way again next year, because if we are serious about Strategic Planning and the direction we need to take, we need to commit to the process of going there. Change will not happen without it.

President Floyd reported on his meeting with the faculty leadership at UMSL. At that meeting he stated two decisions regarding budget: 1) We will always talk about all institutions collectively and will not talk about taking any existing money away from any campus, but 2) with regard to new money the model will be different; we will no longer talk about “equity” but about “funding gaps”, because there are many and we have to be able to think about how to deploy new resources to achieve the strategic ends that will close them. Jakob Waterborg commented that the UMKC faculty will support him in this, because they see what they produced in response to the President’s Strategic Plan request. President Floyd said that the Chancellors do not want it and identified other potential obstacles that could scuttle the plan. He forcefully stressed, however, that if we go back to the old ways, we will not go forward, and it is our need to go forward. President Floyd also announced that he has decided to increase UMR’s share of the strategic initiative money to $500,000. Mike Hilgers commented that faculty will be mainly supportive at UMR.

Frank Schmidt: Will the strategic allocation model affect federal targeted money? President, “No.” Those are secured for specific projects. Frank Schmidt: But will proposals that go forward be vetted by the Strategic Plan? President Floyd said that he wants to know what is going forward, but what is funded depends on what the federal delegation can secure, which has been incredible.

**UMKC Fund Balance:** The UMKC fund balance and the 5% balance rule were discussed with the President.

The President exited at 1:35, along with Board President Mary James, and VP’s Ron Turner and Ken Hutchinson.

**UMKC Library Faculty Non-Regular Workload:**
Rocco Cottone read letter from Kathleen Schweitzerberger regarding the request that the UMKC Library Faculty, and they alone among all non-regular faculty, work with the Provost to produce a workload policy. Eddy Adelstein noted that when a workload policy is promulgated, usually it is punitive. He noted that if there is to be a workload policy, it should apply to all non-regular faculty. Steve Lehmkuhle asked if a productivity report is involved. Jakob Waterborg: “Yes, the Library Faculty do an annual productivity report.” The case under discussion is a mandate for a specific workload policy. Steve clarified that there is no UM System workload policy for non-regular faculty. Their diversity is so great that it would make little sense to try to produce one. Jakob Waterborg: Does this mean there is no System objection to a unit setting a policy.
Steve Lehmkuhle: Correct, but he said he is hesitant to say much, because he is not familiar with the issue. However, he said that workload policies are not very useful. There are better ways to deal with this issue. Steve Lehmkuhle committed to have a conversation with the UMKC Provost.

Rolla Information Technology Fee:
Mike Hilgers asked how policies regulating student computing fee expenditures, plus other IT issues are set. In particular, he wanted to know how instructional Computing (student) fees and funds for faculty replacement computers are spent on other campuses. The funds are separate on the other 3 campuses with each having its own approach to the distribution of these funds that involve cooperation between departments and campus IT operations.