MINUTES
Intercampus Faculty Council
May 11, 2005
Submitted by Van Reidhead, IFC Secretary

Attendance:

Present: Rocco Cottone, Chair, Gordon Christensen, Gary Ebersole, Mike Hilgers, Bruce Bubacz, Sudarshan Loyalka, Van Reidhead, Frank Schmidt, Bob Schwartz, Paul Speck, Jakob Waterborg, with President Elson Floyd, Ralph Caruso, Steve Knorr, Steve Graham, Peter Wilden, Deborah Noble, Kandis Smith, Brenda Selman

Agenda Approved
The agenda approved. Neither Ken Hutchinson, nor Nikki Krawitz will be able to join us.

February Minutes
Approved, with editing.

April Minutes
Approved, with editing.

Election of New IFC Chair
Michael Hilgers unanimously elected by UMR’s IFC representatives.

RC announced Teresa Thiel’s election for 05-08 to represent UMSL, assuming RC’s seat.

Bruce Bubacz elected to replace Stuart McAninch at UMKC, assumes seat today.

Curt Kosbar will replace Todd Hubing for UMR.

Agenda for August IFC Retreat
- Non-regular faculty issue, to try to produce a policy in the next year.
- Question, should we standardize administrator review process across campuses, or at least sharing of information to help different campuses in their reviews. Or should we try to build faculty process into the System’s process, to create a 360 degree process?
- Tuition Benefit for retiree families, bring to conclusion.
- Discuss practices to assure that IFC does not overstep its role and that the best and necessary input is gotten from campus committees prior to IFC action.
- Other items to be added.

Government Update
Steve Knorr: This year was a team effort. Thanked IFC for communicating back to campus faculties. UM came together with HE (Higher Education) counterparts to support the Governor’s position. Achieved a unified effort, in Governor’s office, in
preparation meetings, etc. Flat budget is not anyone’s wish, but it was the best possible outcome. Going forward, the need is to build the HE coalition to improve policy makers’ understanding of the importance of HE to the state. The total HE statewide capital appropriation was $8 million but feels like we made headway for the longer term with the Governor.

Gary Ebersole: Please explain Rep. Bearden’s bill to reform HE. Steve, it was aimed at setting standard fee structures. UM efforts have facilitated an evaluation of the costs of research a university vs. colleges, etc. Note, however, that Rep. Bearden wants HE funding restored to its high point, which UM supports. A major issue is the vision of Governor and Legislature is to reduce government, trim it down. How will this affect HE, which attends on a sustained basis to research driven cost-effectiveness.

Bob Schwartz: Should UMR invite Bob May campus? Steve, yes, works through our office.

Paul Speck: On capital appropriations, will there be a time when academic buildings will have support from the state, or are we entering a new world? Steve, we have entered a new world; most legislators have no more than 4 year experience and don’t have a history that knows the duty the state has to such things as buildings. We are working to educate them, but the new model is that we will have to gather private money, put it on the table, and ask the legislature to match it, so that they see the benefit to the state that will be lost if they do not act. It is the reverse of the way we’ve done it historically. Paul: Should we move now, for future? Steve, yes.

Paul reported a memo from Steve Knorr, released during the debate over the University’s budget, calling for a unified full court press, with a role for everyone except the faculty. Was this intentional or an omission? Steve responded that the greatest need is for the faculty to teach and research to the best of its ability and, importantly, to provide opportunities for legislators and policy makers to have focused informational tours on the campuses, to show them what we are doing and to tell the story of our work. He emphasized the importance of, for lack of a better phrase, “show and tell,” on the campuses as part of the education of policy makers.

Gordon Christensen: Will there be a voting student member of the Board of Curators? It appears unlikely.

Gordon asked about the effect of Kansas’s legislation, Kansas HB-35, mandating intelligent design teaching in the classroom, asking if Missouri will be affected. Steve said that the issue came up last year and is unlikely to gain support this year.

Bruce Bubacz asked about the privatization of the U’s research agenda, which is goal of business community in Kansas City. Is it likely to get support? No.

Frank Schmidt asked if the discussion in the Governor’s commission about lumping all of HE institutions into a single system. Where will this go? Steve indicated it is unlikely
to gain broad support. The question for us is whether UM will be delegated parts of the Department of HE’s role.

**Student PeopleSoft System Administrator**
Brenda Selman has been brought in from UMC to coordinate. Brenda’s appointment is a follow-up to the President’s appointment of the four campus IT officers as Associate Vice Presidents, to decentralize decision processes.

Brenda reported that UMR is working to stabilize; UMSL and UMKC working on recruit and admit modules; UMC is trying to normalize data so it goes smoothly when implemented. UM has engaged Cedar Consulting Group to give a third party view on how to get where and what we need. They will have report by end of June.

Frank: Was Cedar hired to respond to the Board’s concerns about PS? Ralph, no; it is independent. The Board wants PS to work, does not want to eliminate it.

Jakob: There was a meeting at UMKC campus level? Brenda, purpose was to assess campus needs and how to achieve those. Cedar is much more people oriented. Among other things, they want to help us identify the showstoppers, the big issues. What’s the timeline? Variable depending on what each campus wants and expects.

Paul: What is relationship between campus taxes and implementation timelines? UMSL wants to go slowly; is that a budget, tax, issue, or is taxing independent of the level of service/implementation? Ralph, UMSL will come on last and benefit most. The fee structure is based on a student credit hour formula. A campus can’t expect to not pay for the process of development. If you go last, you do not get a free ride. You can save on the side of deciding what to implement at the campus level. Brenda, the executive officers for each campus will now be involved in budget decisions and on development of the principles that will guide the process.

Jacob, we have seen increasing campus costs for PS, and there has been no accounting of how this breaks down relative to other IT charges. Ralph said that he would put this on the IFC Retreat Agenda. The costs include far more than PS; they include other necessities. Brenda suggested that it would be good to have some of the Executive Officers there as well.

Steve Graham commented that it is very useful to have Brenda on this task, because she is experienced and has a reputation as a no-nonsense, get it done person. He asked Brenda what she needs from IFC. Brenda responded that IFC could help identify problems and invite her back to update us periodically.

Ralph said that he retiring the end of June, and thanked the group for the role it has played. Rock gave the IFC’s thanks to Ralph for his work with us, and the body responded with applause.

**CRR 320.035 Policies and Procedures on Tenure and Promotion**
Handout that highlights proposed changes to the Rule.
Gordon suggested that the group consider its role on issues such as this in light of its
duties as defined by the campus faculties. The precise role of IFC is not well defined.
There seemed general agreement that this will be taken up in the near future.

Sudarshan Loyalka, with regard to 1.a (c), commented on need for clarity on who
assembles the committee. Jakob Waterborg noted that 1.b, provides some direction.
Sudarshan said that as long as the School or College has procedures in place that
would be sufficient. Jakob said that 1.b establishes that there will be established
departmental or school procedures. Sudarshan suggested language which was
accepted, as follows: insert “in accordance with the department’s established
procedures,” to follow “closely related department.”

Rock directed us back to Gordon’s point. Gordon said that he is concerned that this
super-select group may make policy without needed input. Frank suggested that IFC
use electronic communication to put things out, especially to get feedback from the
appropriate committees. This produced general agreement. Rock suggested it for the
Retreat agenda.

Non-regular Faculty
Handout, Deborah Noble.
Deborah Noble noted that Steve Graham is doing his job and Steve Lehmkuhle’s but
that he is committed to work with us to bring this issue to resolution in the coming year.
She noted that the academic officers would like to see title changes, with Teaching
Professor, etc. titles. She noted, however, that there is some opposition to the use of
the term Professor in titles, for fear of undermining the stature of tenure track titles.
Deborah assured IFC that U-Hall will tread lightly; “This is your issue,” she said.
Deborah explained the handout, which helps conceptualize thinking at this point about
titles. Work will continue in Academic Affairs and come back to IFC at the Retreat.

Jakob expressed concern that we not make a decision about such things as title,
without non-regular input. Frank endorsed this position. There was some support for
the use of the title structure presented in the handout, as explained by Deborah.

Privacy Statement
Handout Policy CRR 110.110
This has been through GC, so recommends that we move it forward if we can. IFC
agreed.

FAS
Handout, Peter Wilden
Are there problems? Jakob reported that people still don’t know what constitutes
appropriate vs. inappropriate use of data. In a program development environment, can
an individual’s data be used to coerce something that she/he has not agreed to? Peter
said that the data entered are no different from what was available from other
documents before. These data will be accessible to any administrative structure for
university use. Jakob argued that the problem arises from program evaluations, where data may be used to put a unit in jeopardy. Gary said that an administrator could use data to leak to others to discredit someone or a unit. Sudarshan raised the question of inappropriate comparative use by a chair, dean, provost, etc. Pete asked if comparative use should be disallowed. Frank suggested that there are areas in which comparative data should be used, versus specific categories of data, e.g. denied grant proposals, which should not be used for legal reasons. Mike Hilgers recommends that FAS have the same protections as personnel files. There should be specific language to protect faculty. Mike discussed the case of students trying to access teacher evaluations, which were protected under personnel file policy. There was general support for this position, that a policy statement should be produced to provide personnel file level of protection.

Gary asked about issues of consistency; what is an article in one unit or campus may not be at another. Pete said that FAS is seen as a faculty data entry system, in which the users define definitions. It is not possible at the FAS administration level to guarantee that category definitions are consistent or even appropriate.

Peter reported on entry level by campus. UMR and UMSL have highest participation, at just fewer than 90% each.

Meeting with President Floyd
CRR 340.090 Development Leave
President Floyd asked IFC for its comment and advice: Does B.3, requiring faculty who take a leave to return to the University for 1 year make sense. Discussion followed. There was consensus that it serves no purpose, is punitive, and should be eliminated.

Paul asked if the same rule would apply to Sabbatical Leave. The President called for CRR 340.070. The language is exactly the same—the same policy. After discussion, there was consensus advisement that the one-year debt clause be eliminated from both policies. President Floyd thanked the members for their advice.

UMKC Report
Jakob: There is contentment with Steve Lehmkuhle as Interim Chancellor, only positive comments have come from the faculty, and credit was given to President Floyd for setting the stage. Discussion centered on the action of some business leaders to assemble a blue ribbon task force to recommend campus issues and governance relationship with the UM System. It was noted that the UMKC faculty and UM System leadership are in full accord on the issue. The need for clarification of the roles of the UMKC Trustees vs. the UM Board of Curators was noted.

UMC Report
Gordon discussed the much improved, and improving, spirit and practices of constructive engagement of faculty governance resulting in a new level of ability to
address substantive issues and to engage the administration constructively. The improvement is dramatic. The search for a Provost was discussed.

**UMR Report**
Mike Hilgers discussed the work of faculty governance during the year, which has focused on strategic planning and how to address the future, given rapid changes at the state level. He identified a number of issues. The faculty will no longer mail out the numerical evaluations of administrators but will make them available on request. Student efforts to establish some policies with teeth in their relations with faculty were identified.

**UMSL Report**
Paul: Amazed at where things have come over past few years at UMSL. The campus has moved into a period of shared governance; e.g. the Budget and Planning Committee, which semester by semester reviews progress in the Action Plan, etc. Many operations, e.g. the Touhill, Cortex, etc., have been openly discussed, with full information, full cooperation, etc. Listed many areas that faculty did not have a voice in, but now does. He noted the caveat that this places great weight on the faculty to do the work. An external administrator has warned about the danger that faculty could end up doing administrators’ work. This problem arises when those serving on committees are not credited by their departments and thus suffer on merit raise evaluations, etc. He noted that departments and deans tend to see the work of faculty in shared governance as a waste of time and of department resources. He appealed that if UM is plans to adopt a shared government system, the top level administration needs to be explicit in the value they assign to this kind of service.

**President Elson Floyd Comments**
Shared governance, said Pres. Floyd, will be part of his legacy, because it is so important. In any conversation he will come down on the side of the faculty, because, he emphasized, “I cannot build a great university of quality without a strong faculty around me.”

President Floyd said that the campus CIO’s needed to be more involved than they are in decisions. All will be at the table when decisions are made and then we will deal with implementation. At the campus level, the CIO has to be at the top leadership table for reasons of IT’s role in all of our academic activities. He indicated that the CIO’s would become Associate Vice Presidents. He aims to achieve significant efficiencies in IT, but to do this the CIO’s will have to be at the table.

He acknowledged the Legislature and Governor for the flat 2006 budget. Only 1 million in new money was added, for dentistry at UMKC. UM System is looking at the costs of Mobius and Morenet, which were significantly cut, to try to achieve scale efficiencies so we can sustain our commitment to these areas. Hospital funding has been restored. There was a slight reduction in Western Historical Society funding. He noted that HE unity was critical and thanked his staff for its leadership.
President Floyd noted the importance of sorting the duties of the UMKC Trustees and the Board of Curators.

The President said that as we go forward with shared governance at UMSL, and on the other campuses, it will be important for the faculty to decide at what point they are involved at a level of management beyond what they want.

**Questions for the President:**
Bruce: How are the Curators reacting to KC governance situation? President: They are taking a wait and see approach. The issue is overdue for resolution and will be resolved this time around.

Gordon: Is there something that other campuses should do about the UMKC situation? Gary noted that for the four campuses, one of the arguments is that central the UM System administration is a duplication and wasteful. IFC may want to talk with faculties about the value of the System for the campuses. Ralph noted that there is little that UM System does in the area of IT services that is duplicated at campus levels. He noted that four campuses use Blackboard; one also uses Web CT. If one campus wanted to use a distinct system, not shared by the other campuses, with System support, this would concern us all, because we would all pay for the decision. Echoing the President, he noted that we have to achieve some economies of scale, and System administered IT is a key area where this can be done.

**Steven Graham, Academic Affairs Issues**
**IFC Retreat Dates**
August 4th and 5th dates set for retreat.

**CRR 20.100**
The policy change approved at the April Meeting was vetted by GC and is ready to go, with the omission of the word “political”, so as to keep a firewall between academic freedom and political policy and activity. Unanimous consent was given for the word change.

**Rocco Cottone**
Rock thanked the members for their work of the year. He noted the work of the Secretary. IFC gave Rocco hearty applause for his leadership.

Adjourned at 2 p.m.