Call to Order

9:30 AM, by IFC President Ralph Wilkerson


Absent: Richard Wright

Agenda and Minutes

Motion to accept agenda – approved on voice vote

Motion to accept January 24, 2006 minutes – approved on voice vote

Administrative Review

A discussion was held were the following topics were discussed:

* Current practices on the 4 UM system campuses

* The need for the IFC, UM System President, and Chancellors to generate a policy statement concerning the importance of having regular faculty review of administrators

* The need to carefully define who will participate in reviews, and how the results will be disseminated

* Forming a subcommittee to review best practices at other universities and propose a policy statement

No formal motions were made during the discussion, and the matter was tabled until the next IFC meeting.

Research Misconduct
The UM system collected rules and regulations are not consistent with federal regulations in this area. It will be necessary to alter them at the March Board of Curators Meeting. A draft of the proposed changes was presented to the IFC.

Concerns were raised over the proposed revision in rule 420.020.4g, which addresses confidentiality when accusations of research misconduct have been raised. The proposed change indicates, in part, that “The University shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts, if requested and as appropriate, to protect or restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct but against whom no finding of research misconduct is made.” Should not have to request the university to do this, it should be automatic.

Some members of IFC believe the person accused of misconduct should not have to request the University take measures to protect and restore their reputation, that such action should be undertaken automatically by the university.

Additional concerns were raised about the precise meaning, and forcefulness, of the phrase “…all reasonable and practical efforts…”. The general consensus of IFC seemed to be that a more forceful phrase was needed.

Additional concerns were raised on rule 420.020.4h, noting that no penalties are imposed on individuals who make false claims of research misconduct.

Suggestions were made that rule 420.020.5b, concerning the use of research data during any investigation. A suggestion was made to change the phrase “…custody may be limited to copies of the data…” be changed to “…custody will be limited to copies of the data…”

Comments were made that the UM system may benefit from a privacy statement. It was pointed out that IFC discussed this earlier in the year, but chose not to act. Some concerns remain, for example - can the UM system consider everything on a computer disk drive as work product - which is subject to search? It may not be reasonable to consider some private communication as “work product” - such as letters of recommendation. There were also concerns that UM system searches of computers, or other records, may impact academic freedom.

No formal motions were made, and the topic was tabled.

**Non Tenure Track Faculty**

A report was presented from the committee studying Non Tenure Track faculty, followed by an extended discussion of the conclusions. A number of changes were proposed.

There was concern expressed that the report only tackles full-time positions - and does not indicate that administrators should try to move existing people into these newly defined positions.
A lively debate was conducted over the meaning and use of the word “essentially”.

The committee agreed to incorporate the suggested changes, and to distribute a revised report.

The discussion was tabled to provide S. Knorr time to address IFC.

**Discussion with S. Knorr**

Lead discussion on the pending sale of MOHELA assets, and other items.

**Discussion with K. Hutchinson**

Briefed IFC on current retirement package, and possible changes.

Currently the UM system has a defined benefit plan for retirees, which includes a post retirement health plan. On average, public AAIA universities contribute just over 10% of payroll to defined contribution plans. There have been some suggestions that the UM System consider switching to a defined contribution plan.

The university has always fully funded the current plan. The trust is currently valued at approximately $2.4 Billion.

The Board of Curators may address this issue at its May meeting.

Currently 8.9% of payroll is going into retirement benefits. This varies due to market volatility, and we are currently at a high water mark. It has been as low as 2.5%. Over the past 10 years, the average has been approximately 5.5% of payroll. Approximately 70% of these assets are in equities, and the university has a investment return goal of 8%.

Switching current employees to a defined contribution plan is problematic, especially for individuals who are over 50 years, have many years of service, and are not ready to retire at the time of the change. Years ago the University of Michigan made such a move.

There is some talk about a plan where the employee may contribute up to 3%, and the university would match the employee contributions. An IFC representative pointed out that this is effectively a pay cut for the employee, unless their base salary was increased to cover their contribution.

There was talk about eliminating the post-employment health plan, noting that most institutions do not offer this type of benefit.

It was pointed out that some of the university plans are more efficient than the equivalent State run plans. For example, the State medical plan would cost the university an extra $30-40 million per year.
President Floyd pointed out that some consider our current retirement benefits generous, but that is necessary given our current salary structure. A reduction in retirement benefits will need to be matched by a corresponding increase in salary, if we expect to maintain the quality of the University.

President Floyd suggested that IFC take a position on this matter, and communicate it with Ken Hutchinson (who can then pass it along to the Board of Curators).

Ken Hutchinson agreed to provide a copy of his Board of Curators presentation, and financial data, to the IFC.

**Campus Reports**

**UMSL**

The faculty senate passed a resolution concerning the use of funds generated by the pending MOHELA sale. The bulk of it should go to capital improvements.

The administration formed a committee to look at the summer program. UMSL now has a year-round operations feasibility studies committee. Year-round operations could start as early as summer of 2007. There are an increasingly large number of year-round students on campus.

There were extensive discussions at the faculty senate meeting regarding retirement benefits.

The administrator review committee suggested some changes in the way the review would be conducted - suggestions which were wholly and dramatically rejected by the senate.

**UMR**

John Gardner visited campus to discuss making economic development a 4th mission of the university. The committee studying this came to the Academic Council with a proposal that economic development be considered in P&T, but that it not have the status of a 4th mission.

The faculty, and Academic Council, are reviewing the draft strategic plan presented by Chancellor Carney.

The faculty and Academic Council are discussing the Chancellor’s plans to eliminate all Deans. The Chancellor has indicated that budget concerns are not driving this change - it is his goal to change the culture of the campus. A draft report is due to the faculty next week.
UMKC

Provost Search: meeting with 3 external, and one internal, candidate. The process is working well and looks very promising.

There is concern about the composition of the search committee for the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences. Currently there are only 2 full professors on the committee - one emeritus and the other only at UMKC since last fall.

Have started the process of elections for campus-wide committee replacements.

The local perception of the pending MOHELA sale asset distribution, is that it favors Columbia over UMKC.

UMC

It’s been a quiet year with respect to substantive issues.

The potential change in retirement benefits is a concern.

The campus is looking at who should be reviewed in the administrative review process.

Opportunities for faculty - Board of Curators communication.. Some faculty feel we have a better story to tell than what’s coming through in the formal presentation to the board. For example, in the benefits discussion some perceive there’s a “slam the faculty” or “let’s try to hurt the faculty” mentality.

There is some concern that we are not speaking with one voice in Jefferson City. Does the hospital or athletic department have their own lobbyists? Are we all on the same page, and speaking with one voice?

President’s Report

Lobbying activities - currently we have consolidated all of our lobbying efforts under S. Knorr. The flagship council was established, and they hired a lobbyist in Jefferson City. Interestingly enough, it is the same lobbyist who represents community colleges. We speak with one voice. UMKC was asked a year ago to forgo having a separate lobbyist, and that has yielded benefits.

All four campuses have concerns about the distribution of assets from the pending sale of MOHELA assets.

The president stated that he looks forward to any ideas IFC has for enhancing communication with the Board of Curators. It is the faculty’s prerogative to present anything they wish at the breakfast meeting with the board.
In response to a question on Non Tenure Track faculty, the president recommended that we stick to having common rules at all four campuses. This may be a challenge, especially because of the way the UMKC School of Medicine is organized (relative to the UMC school). We may not have one policy that fits all, but try to come as close to that as practical.

Regarding tuition: the broad based facilities fee was not well received at the Board of Curators. It was viewed essentially as a tuition increase. Specific fees, which vary by campus and degree program, did not generate negative comments. There are a number of new fees of this type, proposed by UMR.

At the last Board of Curators meeting, the model showed we were facing a $15.8 million increase in fixed benefit costs (medical and retirement). Now it looks like we are closer to only a $7 million increase. It also looks like this will stay low for many years to come (perhaps as many as 5 years). This represents a decrease in benefit costs from 14.9% to 6.54%.

Plan is to argue for 5.8% tuition increase, with only a 3% increase in existing fees. In the past, the fee increases usually matched the tuition increase. There’s some thought that the supplemental fees are quite high now.

The Board of Curators has asked for a presentation on “shared governance”. There will be a one hour presentation on this topic on Thursday afternoon at the next board meeting. One faculty member (senate presidents) from each campus to attend and speak with the board.

**Additional Discussion on Non Tenure Track Faculty**

Subcommittee requests comments from IFC by close of business next Tuesday. There are plans to mail final report out by March 7.

Campuses will need to report back to IFC by October 2006.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Submitted by Kurt Kosbar, IFC Secretary