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Attendance:

Election of Officers:
Robert Schwartz called the meeting to order. It was noted the Michael Hilgers, whom had been elected IFC chair, is being replaced by Ralph Wilkerson. A motion was made to elect Ralph Wilkerson IFC chair. Motion passed by acclimation. Ralph is unable to attend Thursday evening meeting, so Bob Schwartz temporarily acted as chair.

Change of Meeting Date:
Katina Volle suggested moving three of the 2005-06 IFC meeting dates as follows:
- Move December 16, 2005 to December 15, 2005
- Move January 18, 2006 to December 20, 2006
- Move March 15, 2006 to March 17, 2006

All suggested date changes were accepted by acclimation.

Welcome:
Steve Graham welcomed group to the new academic year, reviewed visitors who will arrive on Friday, and invited suggestions for topics of discussion for the retreat.

Frank Schmidt suggested we request information from Steve Knorr on the Governor’s commission on higher education. In particular, we should request a summary sheet which had been distributed to others, and suggested we discuss the composition of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education.

Paul Speck raised on issue on how the university handles the new long term care policy, and in particular how it treats registered domestic partners. Some faculty have expressed concern that registered domestic partners were allowed to join the previous long term care policy, but were then denied coverage when the university changed providers. There
is a claim that the new provider (Met Life) would allow domestic partners to join at no cost to the university, but the UM System decided not to offer this benefit. It was noted that the university does not subsidize this benefit, 100% of the cost is covered through employee contributions. There is some question if the faculty who complained had all these facts correct, and if the university had truly changed the policy when it changed providers.

Gary Ebersole suggested we ask Nikki to talk about setting up endowments outside of the UM system. There is pressure to set up accounts where donors want, to keep control of the funds. We need data on this.

Frank Schmidt suggested the university invests endowment funds very conservatively, and asked if this will need to change.

Frank Schmidt raised a question on how the university handles charitable giving through payroll deduction. In particular, who sets the policy on which charities are allowed on the list, and which are excluded?

Rex Campbell stated that there exists a state list of 120 charities which can use payroll deduction, and that a similar federal list exists. Why can’t the university use these, or similar, lists.

Bob Schwartz informed the group that UMR is beginning construction of Toomey Hall, which will likely be financed with a university bond. It is not clear how UMR will service the debt on this bond, other than simply taking it out of the general operating budget. Is this a good thing?

Paul Speck raised a question regarding differential tuition, and how it will play out.

Steve Graham said President Floyd is continuing on a 14 city tour, discussing a tuition guarantee. The initial results show that students and parents are split on the idea. Some like the fixed fees, while others are worried UM may lower standards to meet the financial demands of being unable to raise tuition and fees. Business people are uniformly against the idea. Overall, this does not appear to be a burning issue. Many of the meetings have been sparsely attended.

Paul Speck suggested we discuss if there is wide spread support for differential tuition between campuses.

Frank Schmidt raised a question of access, due to student demographic changes, and tuition changes (increases). Steve Graham pointed out there exists a report to the board of curators addressing this issue, broken out by campus. Steve also suggested we could do a lot with targeted financial aid (on the order of 15 to 30 million dollars). Rex suggested we should get away from diversity, and move more to economic issues on student financial aid. Frank Schmidt suggested we are moving toward higher socio-
economic students, and worried we are not addressing the needs of lower socio-economic students.

Debra Nolte said demographics are turning down in 2010-1012. System wide focus is on recruiting more minorities, first generation students, lower socio-economic students, and then retaining them. There are efforts to start broadening the pipeline down as low as the 3rd and 4th grades. Business and political leaders are concerned and following this.

Bob Schwartz encouraged everyone to read their faculty by-laws.

Rex Campbell suggested we ask John Gardner to talk about his new role as VP for economic development at the system level.

Paul Speck drew a groan when he mentioned “PeopleSoft”. Steve Graham assured him we are working on improving it, and Rex suggested posting a list of frequently asked questions on a web site.

Teresa Thiel pointed out that the grants module is very difficult to use, especially for faculty/departments that use it infrequently. She pointed out this was a cost being passed down to the departments.

Paul Speck asked who comes to IFC to address information technology issues. Steve Graham indicated there will be someone at future meetings (hopefully later this year), but there is no one for now.

Paul Speck asked questions the relationship between the Missouri Association of Faculty Senates and the UM system. Bob Schwartz promised to send e-mail to the group regarding MAFS.

Thursday Meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

**Friday Meeting:**

Called to order at 8:30 AM by Ralph Wilkerson. Ralph reviewed questions which group will ask visitors, based on notes made by others the previous evening, and asked for new concerns.

Rex Campbell asked for a discussion of professional track faculty. There are concerns about different levels of benefits, rights and responsibilities. There are no official system-wide definitions. There is great variability across campuses. Debra Nolte pointed out there is no centralized HR structure for these employees.

Gary Ebersole raised a concern about electronic communications and privacy. UMKC has a campus wide policy on this, but there is no system-wide policy.
Steve Graham suggested we discuss the role of IFC. Paul Schmidt advocates sticking to a discussion/action item approach – with one month discussion times. Rex Campbell suggested electronic voting on issues. Bob Schwartz suggested setting up a list serve, and running discussion boards to prioritize issues of concern.

Bob Schwartz is concerned that the high turn-over rate of IFC representatives causes a lot of history to be lost. Bob suggested IFC generate a report at end of year, documenting why particular decisions had been made in the previous year. Frank Schmidt suggested that each committee generate a report, and that these reports be put in a searchable listserv.

Paul Speck raised questions about the use of the FAS, professional track faculty, tuition for dependents of retirees, and the offering of an 85-and-out retirement incentive.

Steve Graham was asked about executive order 6A. Steve pointed out a problem with the definition of “all faculty” in section d-e. It is unclear what IFC wanted. Was it “all”, or “all tenured”, or “all tenure track”? President Floyd put old wording “all tenured” back in.

Steve Graham pointed out that P&T committees can already request outside input on P&T dossiers. Richard Wright raised a concern that equal-rank faculty should not have a right to submit comments. His concern focused on faculty exercising this right to block/hinder the promotion of a peer.

Frank Schmidt raised a concern about diversity issues, tenured faculty reviewing non-tenure track faculty, and breakthrough researchers not being properly recognized in the P&T process. Steve Graham suggested vetting these issues through P&T committees on the individual campuses.

Peter Wilson raised a concern about how FAS will relate to the personnel file. FAS will be treated as a personnel file, but we should be aware that much of this is already in the public domain. There should be a disclaimer, which should be vetted on the campuses.

Frank Schmidt pointed out that at one time a curator regularly met with IFC, and asked if we should invite them. It was pointed out that they have a standing invitation, but none of the current curators appear interested in meeting with the IFC.

**Steve Knorr:**

Steve distributed a hand out to group, and discussed the background and history of legislators in general. Karl Bearden has a proposal which is moving MO toward a system of educational vouchers for higher education – similar to one in Colorado. Frank Schmidt asked if faculty should take a more active roll in addressing this issue.

Paul asked if it would help to become more active in the MO Association of Faculty Senates. Steve suggested we do so, but admitted he did not have much experience with MAFS.
Steve expressed concern about the CBHE changes, and that it may bias the group away from the UM system.

Steve Knorr discussed how adding a voting student curator to the UM board of curators gets away from the concept of a lay board – and that the current voting curators are resisting that trend.

There was a question regarding differential tuition. Steve suggested that might cause some problems, but primarily deferred the question to Nikki.

**Ken Hutchinson:**

Ken Hutchinson discussed adding a dependent tuition discount plan for retirees, so they would have the same plan as employees. Last year there were 121 dependents of retirees who could have qualified for such a plan, of which only 8 were attending UM schools. This is not a major cost item, and President Floyd is considering going to the board of curators with the request. There were numerous favorable comments from the IFC, but no formal vote was taken on the matter.

Ken discussed extra compensation for academic administrators, and that it would not be allowed for Deans and higher. The concern is that at higher levels, there was a potential conflict-of-interest between the investigators research interests, and administrative responsibilities. Frank asked about partial appointments, to which Ken replied this rule would only apply to individuals with 100% administrative appointments.

Regarding medical benefits – all rates are being re evaluated, to make sure cost/risk match. Premiums for employee only will rise, but all others will drop next year. There will be higher out-of-pocket costs for all plans, and reduced benefits. Co-pays are increasing for all visits, but there is a discussion about eliminating the co-pay for an annual physical.

There were questions regarding domestic partners being disallowed in the long-term care benefit. Ken Hutchinson explained that UM policy has always been that domestic partners are not allowed to enroll in the long-term care program. Under the old plan, one person did enroll a domestic partner as a spouse, and the previous company did not catch it. When the system moved to the new provider, they discovered – and disallowed – the domestic partner to be covered. Ken confirmed that 100% of the cost of the long-term care insurance is covered by the employee, but that the decision to not allow them is a policy set at the board of curators level. Ken Hutchinson pointed out that domestic partners are not considered dependents under other benefits. Paul pointed out that long-term care benefits are already extended to non-dependents – such as parents. Ken conceded that Paul had a point. There was considerable discussion on this matter, from numerous IFC representatives. Ralph Wilkerson suggested putting it on the IFC agenda for the year.
Ken mentioned that the UM retirement plan was under funded when 2% of salaries and wages were contributed to the plan. Currently 6.4% goes to retirement, and it will probably increase to 9% before settling out to 6% as a steady state.

Teresa asked about the rule of 85 (where employees can retire with full benefits if the sum of their years of service, plus age, equals at least 85). Ken said President Floyd generally supports this, but it would require approximately 1% of payroll to fund. Given payroll increases are only about 2% per year, it would be half of the pay raise for a year. Ken pointed out that this rule tends to favor staff over faculty, since staff often has more years of service at a given age.

Paul asked about merging retirement, or medical, plans with the state. Ken said a commission is studying that. The state’s medical plan would require higher premiums, and would cost the university an extra $27 million this year – should they have merged.

**Nikki Krawitz:**

Nikki gave an extensive review of the university budget. Gary asked about the motivation of the relative percentages which each campus receives. Nikki stated this was from historical spending patterns.

There was an extended discussion of House Bill 742, which would implement a type of voucher program for higher education. In some forms, this bill would shift a significant amount of funding from state to private universities. If private schools are eliminated, then the shift would tend to be away from the UM system, toward 2 year schools. We should expect some sort of report from the Bearden commission in January.

Nikki was asked about differential tuition, and she said we are already there. There are substantial fees charged in many programs, which effectively implement differential tuition (although it is not technically called that).

Paul, and others, expressed concern that advertising that low tuition increases – but then implementing much higher fees – could be viewed as a bait-and-switch. Nikki said there is a history of the university raising fees for many years, until they become a substantial cost – at which time they are consolidated into tuition – and the patter repeats. Many people at the university like fees, because they can be targeted at the local level to a specific project or group.

Frank asked about charitable giving, and if new charities can be added. Nikki said the university had a policy for how a charitable group can apply to be added to payroll deduction. There are restrictions on how much the charity can spend on administration that they must be an umbrella organization, and they must be a human/social organization which benefits the local community. Our policy is modeled after one developed in Minnesota. Nikki agreed to supply detailed guidelines upon request.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.