MINUTES
Intercampus Faculty Council
November 10, 2004
Submitted by Van Reidhead, Secretary

Attendance:
Rocco Cottone, Chair, Gordon Christensen, Gary Ebersole, Michael Hilgers, Sudarshan Loyalka, Van Reidhead, Frank Schmidt, Robert Schwartz, Paul Speck, Jakob Waterborg, Steven Graham, Stephen Lehmkulhe, Deborah Noble, Peter Wilden, President Elson Floyd, with Ken Hutchinson, Steve Knorr, and Nikki Krawitz joining for the meeting with the President.

Agenda
Approved agenda.

October Minutes
The October 6 Minutes were approved, with deletion of the following section:

Discussion items for November Meeting:

1. 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).

Non-Regular Faculty and Voting Rights at UMKC
Jakob Waterborg: At UMKC it is difficult to figure out which non-regular faculty have campus-wide voting rights. The question was raised whether UMKC be out of step if rights were denied full time research and teaching faculty not on tenure track. St. Louis includes non-regular faculty with 50% or more academic duty. At Rolla there is ambiguity in the by-laws, and not all non-regular faculty have the vote. At Columbia campus-wide voting rights are for ranked faculty only, including instructors.

Discussion, led by UMC faculty, turned to broad questions of full-time non-regular faculty rights and issues relating to tenure. The lack of job security for faculty in this category was noted. The overarching concern, however, is that any action that might be taken to regularize full-time non-regular employment would undermine tenure and the research stature of the University.

The need for accurate data on non-regular faculty was noted, and Gordon Christensen stated his concern over not being unable to acquire data on the ratio of regular to non-regular faculty. Steve Lehmkulhe committed to get these numbers for all campuses.

There was discussion of the low pay scale of adjunct faculty, the need to improve it, and the dependence of some of the campuses on this labor pool. There was a general sense of the body that these issues should be strategically and tactically addressed, for the good of the UM teaching mission.
Intercampus Student Council Issues
It was noted that student governance bodies are lobbying for a student role in faculty hiring decisions, and Steve Lehmkuhle was asked for perspective on the issue. He reported that he and the President have talked with the Intercampus Student Council, which wants to discuss best practices with the IFC and with the Chief Academic Officers. The students believe they have a positive role to play, but he stressed that they do not want to promulgate a policy. At this point, they simply want the conversation.

Steve Lehmkuhle noted that the students are concerned about course evaluation processes and that students do not take them seriously. It was suggested that there ought to be a statement read to classes when evaluations are distributed, to the effect that course evaluation data are actually used in annual evaluations and tenure decisions.

IFC asked Steve Lehmkuhle to arrange for the ISC to meet with us to discuss these issues.

Incentive Compensation Principles
A handout was provided (latest version of the “Principles for the Establishment and Operation of Incentive Compensation Plans”). Pete Wilden noted that the current version incorporates the latest changes resulting from feedback from faculty and the Chief Academic Officers. He went through these with IFC. Gordon identified a UMC faculty contingent that is concerned with aspects of plan. Steve Lehmkuhle asked if he could talk directly with the group, and Gordon assented. Steve noted that the plan has still not been shared with the President that he wants it further ironed out before going to that level.

Paul Speck asked if there was a mechanism to actually shut down an incentive program that is not compliant. Pete pointed up section D.1, which does this. Steve cautioned that while it is possible, under this policy, to pull the plug, that it is hard to do so in mid-stream.

Frank Schmidt raised concern about section D.2, with regard to physicians, all of whom in a unit will sometimes have conflicts of interest, such that it may not be possible to identify anyone without a conflict. Pete Wilden noted that in such cases administrators and others would be used to develop the plan. Plans will require administrative review.

Steve Lehmkuhle emphasized that the principles will apply to all operations of the University, without regard for employment status—full vs. part time, regular vs. non-regular, etc. Paul asked if it would extend to people managing University investments. Steve said that if they have incentivized contracts with us, he believes, “Yes,” but he will inquire of Nikki.

IFC agreed that Steve Lehmkuhle might now move forward to the next level of discussions—provosts, President, chancellors, and then back to IFC, in the event there
are significant changes. Once ready, this will be an Executive Order of the President. Jakob suggested that after a year of experience it might need to be adjusted.

**FAS (Faculty Assessment System)**
Pete Wilden noted that the system has been live since about October 20th. It will be rolled out for use through a process of tests with larger groups. Led by Pete, IFC offered special thanks to Halla for her excellence of service constructing this tool. More work is needed to assure that data output is of the quality desired and a high level of participation is needed by faculty to finalize the system at this high standard.

Gary Ebersole asked who would use data and have access to it. Steve affirmed that it is for official uses only. Steve walked us through a discussion of the possible advantageous uses: reports to Board, Legislature, reports that identify faculty in a specialty areas, e.g. by their publications and grants, and its power to launch conversations quickly, without overlooking key people. He stressed that over the first year, while ironing out bumps, we will figure out some of the applications and also limitations on who should have access and for what purpose.

**Curators Professorships Review**
Following earlier discussions, it was clarified that IFC need not explore appointment and periodic review policies for Curators’ and Distinguished Teaching Professors, because mandates already exist in the current Board policy. The question now is how to implement this. Steve plans to convene a group of faculty in these categories to discuss some parameters for an effective review process.

There is the question about why the two categories have very different names: “Curators” vs. “Distinguished.” Does this signify that we value research more than teaching? We seem to agree that Curators’ is more prestigious. This may disadvantage those with the “Teaching” title when applying for grants, etc. Frank Schmidt, should we have one broad title, Curators’ Professor, with internal subcategories? Steve Lehmkuhle indicated that this is getting at the tenor of discussions to this point. Frank noted that the FAS would provide sufficient information that a Chancellor, alone, would be able to evaluate candidates, thus streamlining appointments. Steve indicated that the problem with this approach is that these are Curators’, not Chancellors’ professors, and consequently we may need a process.

Sudarshan Loyalka identified a problem in that no criteria are defined for earning or retaining these titles. The perception was discussed that these are lifetime appointments, and it was clarified that they are not.

Jakob Waterborg asked if we are worried about a solution that lacks a problem, and it was noted that there are problem cases, of incumbents not fulfilling expectations and thus prohibiting others who are more deserving from gaining such appointments. There was counter sentiment that this may just be part of the price you pay, that there will be loose canons, people who are not good citizens, etc. There was general agreement on
this point. Evaluation model has to be on the basis of measurable indicators, and not to 
fit political/ideological agendas.

Paul Speck suggested that the policy ought to be redrafted to accord with the process, if 
there is to be one, rather than retrofitting the process to the existing document. Steve 
Lehmkuhle was in accord.

**Meeting with President Floyd**

UMKC Report, Jakob Waterborg:
The report focused on ATP policies that had been promulgated without faculty input, 
going questions about fund balances (see CRR 110.005), an upcoming Senate report on the Funding for Excellence program, and a controversial white paper by the Provost on administrative reorganization, which went forward without faculty input, resulting in a call from within the College of Arts and Sciences for a vote of “no confidence” in the Chancellor and the present administration, the vote to be taken the week of November 15.

UMSL Report, Paul Speck:
It was reported that there is now broad faculty agreement with the administration that CORTEX is an appropriate investment, because as a research university UMSL should be invested in laying the groundwork for cutting edge life science research in the St. Louis region. Three faculty are now on the Chancellor’s economic planning committee that oversees plans for the proposed I-70 research park. The Senate has raised questions about the appropriateness of the proposed Wellness Center. Faculty concerns about the sufficiency of the UR staff to meet the requirements of the capital campaign helped establish a new vice chancellor position with responsibility for the campaign, to remerge with the VC for University Relations when the campaign is finished. There is faculty concern about the campaign case statement, which lacks connection to the strategic planning document. The Chancellor has sponsored meetings among the administration and faculty in preparation for the November 12 mission and visioning retreat with the President and vice presidents—“a wonderful event.”

UMC Report, Gordon Christensen:
The faculty is satisfied with the process used by the NCAA to investigate MU athletics, resulting in citations for a number of small infractions. The Faculty Council (FC) has, at the request of the Chancellor, submitted names for the Provost search committee. The campus accreditation visit is over, and it is waiting for the outcome. The FC report on non-regular faculty is nearly ready and will be forthcoming. The FC wants a diversity plan put on a sustained basis to prevent moving from crisis to crisis, as has been the case. Data have been produced showing that the technology transfer effort has not yielded an increase in patents.

UMR Report, Michael Hilgers:
Forbes magazine has ranked the new school of Management and Information Systems in the top 25 nationally, and the campus was awarded the Missouri Enterprises 2004 Entrepreneurship Award. The Chancellor search process will be closed, to protect
candidate confidentiality, and this is unpopular with the faculty. There is now a faculty grievance process in place, with thanks to Steve Graham, who helped craft the procedures. Issues with the Desktop Plan have been satisfactorily resolved. The Faculty Council passed an ATP Committee resolution that mandates a letter to all new faculty hires spelling out key dates and information requirements in the tenure process.

**President Elson Floyd:**
The President expressed thanks for the reports, which indicate the ongoing need to improve shared governance, which he as discussed with IFC since his arrival nearly two years ago. A good sign that progress on communication is being made is that he was aware of most of the issues reported before today.

It is not official, but UMC will get a clean bill of health from North Central, with its best rating, meaning it will be 10 years until the next visit.

President Floyd said that he has been working to promote greater transparency throughout the system at UMKC. He has asked Steve Lehmkuhle to work with the Provosts on the four campuses to review ATP procedures as a whole. He stressed that ATP must be faculty driven; anything other than that will undermine quality.

The President said that he has asked Nikki to look at the fund balance issue to assess whether 5%, vs. some other percentage, is the right figure for UM. He said that no part of the 5% held by campuses will be claimed by or reallocated by the system.

When asked about PeopleSoft, President Floyd recapped discussions and understanding that are reported in minutes from earlier meetings. When asked if a search is underway to replace Ralph Caruso, he said that before moving forward he wants to pause and examine the whole of IT with an eye to efficiencies.

Rocco Cottone asked about the impact of the Proposition 3 Constitutional amendment. Steve Knorr explained that the cost to general revenue will be progressively assessed over a 4-year period to get up to the sustained $40 plus million dollars required. Nikki indicated that this amount will not be decisive for the University, however it will add to our non-recurring revenue problem. In the absence of new revenue or economic growth, it will impact institutions like the University that depend on the state’s general revenue. The K-12 lawsuit has been stayed for 1 year by the Attorney General to give the governor and legislature time to find a solution. The composition of the new legislature, 75% with 2 or few years experience, most with no experience with the University, was recapped and stated by Steve Knorr as an opportunity and a challenge.

Gregory Fitch, whose resumé is in community colleges, is the new Commissioner for Higher Education.

**Program Audit Process**
Based on debriefings, System Academic Affairs is not comfortable with the follow-up to last year’s system-wide program audits. The processes appear to have worked well.
enough, except for the Colleges of Education. This year there will be follow-up on decisions made last year. For the COE’s last year’s process failed to produce the data needed for adequate audits, so the process will be completed this year. This does not constitute a special focus on the COE’s.

Future Agenda Items
Steve Lehmkuhle asked that the question of a common academic calendar be placed on the agenda for IFC discussion in December and discussion with the President in January.