Minutes of University of Missouri Intercampus Faculty Council Meeting
September 21, 2006

Present: Rex Campbell (UMC), Gary Ebersole (UMKC), Tim Farmer (UMSL), Kurt Kosbar (UMR), Janice Prather-Kinsey (UMC), Frank Schmidt (UMC), Nancy Stancel (UMKC), Teresa Thiel (UMSL) and Richard Wright (UMSL).
Absent: Frank Blum (UMR), the third person from UMKC has not been elected.
Ex-officio members present and presenting: Elson Floyd, President; Stephen Lehmkuhle, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Ken Hutchinson, Vice President for Human Relations; and Debra Noble, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Frank Schmidt, Chair, called the September 21, 2006 meeting of the UM IFC to order at 9:30 AM.

Agenda: The agenda was reviewed and approved as distributed.

Minutes: The minutes of IFC Retreat, August 1-2, 2006 were approved as distributed.

Announcements: Schmidt announced that Rex Campbell had been appointed secretary.

Topics:
Organization of IFC tasks for 2006 – 2007 Schmidt announced that much of the work of the IFC will be done by committees working via email and conference calls. He stated that there will be three umbrella committees each of which will have several tasks. The committees, their tasks and memberships are as follows

1. Subcommittee on Assessment and Accountability
   a. Definition of assessment
   b. Evaluation of assessment instruments
   c. Assessment and accountability
   d. Best practices for assessment of administrative personnel
   e. Plan of work and liaison with campus faculty senates/councils
   Membership:
   Robert Schwartz (UMR) – chair
   Tim Farmer (UMSL)
   Frank Schmidt (UMC)
   Representative from UMKC to be named

2. Subcommittee on Faculty Assessment Policies
   a. Amorous relationships report – due before December
b. Faculty leave policies

c. Faculty tenure-clock extensions

d. Background checks for faculty

e. Need to have more flexibility in tenure

f. Plan of work and liaison with campus faculty senates/councils

Membership:

Richard Wright (UMSL) – chair
Frank Blum (UMR)
Jenice Prather-Kinsey (UMC)
Nancy Stancel (UMKC)

3. Subcommittee on Administration Policies

a. A-21 compliance

b. E-procurement

c. Decoupling tuition between campuses and between full and part-time students

d. Shared governance especially at UMKC

e. Plan of work and liaison with campus faculty senates/councils

Membership:

Teresa Thiel (UMSL) – Chair
Rex Campbell (UMC)
Gary Ebersole (UMKC)
Kurt Kosbar (UMR)

A discussion of three of the proposed topics followed:

**Background Checks** – some other institutions already do background checks, UM currently does it on some staff. A concern was voiced about the time such checks might take especially when job offers are being made in a competitive environment.

**Administrative Reviews** – the process varies widely among the campuses. UMKC needs work with broader participation. UMSL has no policy concerning administrative reviews. At UMR, a recommendation of best practices on administrative reviews from the IFC might help. In general, the staff and NTT faculty are scared to speak out and participate in the process.

**Faculty Leaves** – President Floyd is recommending that there be only one category for faculty leaves and there might be several subtypes of leaves such as

- Research
- Sabbatical
- Development
- Family
- Other types might be added

**Discussion with Senior Vice President Lehmkuhle and Assistant Vice President Noble**

Schmidt started by congratulating Debra Noble on her new position as Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.
NTT Policies – Noble lead a discussion of the revised NTT policies. She noted that a relatively small number of minor changes from the previously passed version had been made for clarity and legal purposes. She pointed out each of the changes and discussed the reasons for each. Some concern was voiced that the draft was not worded strong enough in the implementation section in order to get the desired changes. Lehmkuhle commented that President Floyd is expected to issue the new policies in the form of Executive Orders. At the end of the discussion, a motion was made and seconded for the approval of the revised NTT policies. The motion passed unanimously. Schmidt communicated this result to President Floyd by letter. The version passed is attached to the end of these minutes.

New Board of Curators Structure – The UM Board of Curators will go to a committee organization in which much of the substantive work will be done. One of those will be Faculty Affairs Committee with the following membership:

- Doug Russell – chair
- Maryon Cairns
- David Wessenger
- Marie Kerford

Lehmkuhle has met with Russell, chair, and discussed several topics including public health care coming up in the general legislative session, faculty communications report, and the program review process. Lehmkuhle noted in talking about the program review process, it is important to protect the privacy of information about individuals.

Faculty Communication Report – Lehmkuhle distributed a brief report on the results of the most recent survey of students. About 10,000 questionnaires were distributed electronically, 2,340 were returned (16% response rate). By far, the most common problem listed by the respondents was the “heavy accent” of some faculty members and teaching assistants (TAs). The TAs were cited as having slightly more problems with accents. Five departments accounted for 80% of the complaints. All campuses now have a first level faculty accent reduction programs. There is a need to add a second level of accent reduction but funds are not available.

Amorous/Nepotism Policies - UM now has a nepotism policy. The President has asked that we consider developing an “Amorous Policy”. A long discussion ensued with one speaker questioning why we should have an amorous policy and not one that included other types of disruptive relationships such as hate. There was general agreement that there should be no amorous relationships between instructors and students.

Discussion with Vice President Ken Hutchison

Medical Benefits – Hutchinson reported that the news concerning medical benefits was good. The earlier projections indicated a need for a 7.5% increase. The current information is that there will be no increase in the costs of medical benefits for the next year. The long term care costs have been lower under the new company now handling the program.
Retirement Benefit Costs – Because of much better performance of the retirement investments, the percentage charged from salaries and wages is expected to go down 2 – 4%. A final decision of the exact amount will be made after October 1, 2006 which is the annual date for evaluating the returns and needs.

Vision Benefits - A new program covering vision costs will be started effective January 1, 2007. This will be a “self-funded” program meaning that the people enrolled in it will pay all costs. The University will not contribute any funds to the program. However, it is expected that the costs to the individuals will be less because of negotiated rates. The expectation is that about 40% of the employees will participate in the program.

Retirees Cost of Living Adjustment – The possibilities of making some COLA for current retirees has been discussed and a final decision will be made after October 1 and would be effective January 1, 2007.

Other Benefits – A change in the federal accountancy rules requires that the amount required for future retirees’ pensions be listed as a liability. The current estimate is that amount is $600 – 700 million. One of the concerns is what, if any, effects this will have on credit ratings. This question has not received a final answer.

Campus Reports to President Floyd
A comment was made to President Floyd that the campuses need more flexibility in establishing tuition costs because of unique situations that each campus has. For example, UMSL has strong competition from local community colleges to the point that they have almost no freshman class. Most students transfer to UMSL after taking some courses from community colleges. UMKC has competition from the University of Kansas and community colleges.

UMC – Campbell reported five items:
- The Spellings Report from the Commission on the Future of Higher Education has been causing considerable discussion amongst the faculty with some voicing concern about federal interference in campus matters.
- The Faculty Council is in the process of changing the grading system by adding the grade FN for students who drop out early of midterm without officially withdrawing. The need for this comes from federal policies regarding loans.
- A new Assistant Provost has been hired to work on improving relations with Community Colleges. A continuing discussion is occurring concerning the imposition two years ago of a requirement that all transfer students have a 2.5 GPA or higher. The Admissions office has indicated that this new requirement has reduced the number of students coming to MU by 200 – 300. Lehmkuhle indicated he supported the 2.5 requirement. Another question is the relative success of transferring students as compared to “native” students.
Campbell distributed a copy of the brief University of Wisconsin-Madison policies for promotion and tenure and the much longer University of Missouri-Columbia regulations with the comment that he thought the UMC regulations needed revising.

The new grievance policies are undergoing the first usage and some minor changes need to be made in the published policies.

UMKC – Ebersole reported that the new administration continues to have changes.

A misleading report labeled the UMKC campus as “racist”. The UMKC Senate will offer a resolution in support of diversity. The topic continues to be a public relation concern.

The campus is working on a policy for reallocation of resources between various units.

Parking continues to remain a difficult problem especially for people who need to move between campuses

A policy of shared governance is being installed.

UMR – Kosbar reported that the campus has a new provost.

The reorganization to a structure in which there are no deans continues.

There have been some changes in the IT department.

A new policy in which students must be notified before they are dropped from a class has been passed.

UMSL – Farmer said that student enrollments are up, but retention remains a problem. He said that many of the new students dropped out before completing.

Parking is a problem for many students

The physical appearance of the campus has improved

The student center is in very poor condition and this may contribute to the low retention

The campus is beginning the process of re-accreditation which will occur in about two years.

The competition from the area community colleges is so great that UMSL has almost no freshman class.

Discussion with President Floyd

President Floyd said the Board of Curators would consider decoupling fees in order for the campus to be competitive in their markets.

The amorous relations policy will go to the Curators in December as a discussion item

He mentioned the improved benefits including the optical care.

The MOHELA situation continues to evolve on an almost daily basis with the latest changes resulting from changes in the MOHELA board. He remained cautiously optimistic about the outcome concerning capital funding from MOHELA.
• He commented that a process was starting to examine the possible consolidation of nuclear engineering at UMC and UMR. There are no time lines for this process and it is only to examine the potential of having the UMR and UMC nuclear reactors work closer together.
• He stated that he thought it would be appropriate for the UM system to have one umbrella faculty leave with sub-types underneath it such as family leave, medical leaves, sabbatical and others.
• A long discussion occurred over the topic of amorous relationships with many of the same points that were made earlier concerning love versus hate, etc.

Continued Discussion with Senior Vice President Lehmkuhle

Lehmkuhle reported that during the last five years there had been an increase of 6,700 new students in the state. The UM system had 6,200 of those for a 15% increase in overall enrollment. Most of the state universities had flat enrollments. The community colleges had a 15% increase during this period.

The meeting was adjourned by Frank Schmidt, chair, at 1:45 PM.
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Introduction and Background
Non-regular faculty members play an increasingly important role at the University of Missouri. While their contributions are significant, their roles and duties vary widely within and across the four campuses. In many cases there are significant inconsistencies in titles, salary, responsibilities and involvement in campus decision-making.

Approximately two years ago, the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) and the four campus chief academic officers began to examine the status of non-regular faculty at the University of Missouri. They identified a number of issues that must be addressed to provide greater consistency in faculty’s roles, the part they play within the University, and ensure that the contributions of non-regular faculty are being appropriately recognized and rewarded.

This concept paper has been prepared by the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs in cooperation with IFC and the campus chief academic officers. It is designed to stimulate the development of best practices for the appointment and retention of non-regular faculty. If endorsed by the President and approved by the campuses, these best practices will likely be incorporated into university and campus policies to reflect the changing nature of the non-regular appointments.

To address these questions, IFC appointed a subcommittee to address the issue of non-regular academic appointments at the University of Missouri. Working with the senior staff in the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and the chief academic officers, they gathered data on the current nature of faculty appointments at the University, surveyed the national literature on this category of faculty, and developed some general guidelines regarding non-regular faculty and their role within the University.

This concept paper addresses two of the three major questions raised by the IFC and the chief academic officers:
- Are there more effective ways to classify non-regular faculty, as a whole or in groups? They focused on titles, classification, and the required human resource infrastructure to support the non-tenure track faculty.
- What are the rights and responsibilities of non-regular faculty members, in light of the work they perform? Here the joint parties’ focus was on shared governance, access to resources, eligibility for awards, performance review criteria and promotion policies.

This paper does not address a third question raised: “What is the appropriate ratio of non-regular faculty to regular (i.e., tenured and tenure track) faculty within each college and on each campus?” It recommends as a best practice that campuses answer this question within the academic unit on a regular basis and revisit this issue as it relates to the strategic plan of the unit and the campus. Thus, it should be discussed by the faculty and recommendations should be made on each campus as part of a broader strategic planning process.

Academic appointments at the University of Missouri currently are divided into two main categories: regular and non-regular. Under the proposed guidelines, regular faculty would be referred to as “tenured and tenure track” faculty, and this group would continue to include
the traditional faculty of the institution. *The suggestions in this proposal will be limited to full-time ranked and unranked non-regular faculty and are not designed to address academic appointments of any other type including but not limited to tenured and tenure track faculty.*

The current non-regular category is too broad and fails to recognize the variety of roles and institutional relationships that characterize different faculty members who fall within this catchall category. It is therefore suggested that non-regular faculty be divided into three groups: (1) full-time, ranked, non-regular faculty (non-tenure track (NTT) faculty); (2) full-time, unranked, non-regular faculty; and (3) part-time, non-regular faculty (adjunct faculty).

It is recommended that the requirements distinguishing between a ranked, full-time non-tenure track faculty member and an unranked, full-time non-tenure track faculty member be made at the campus level. While many of the full-time unranked non-regular titles will not be eliminated, it is implicit in the guidelines of this paper that the individuals that meet the qualifications for NTT faculty would receive an appropriate NTT faculty title as described in the following section. A recommended best practice is to move all non-tenure track faculty members who have primary authority in research, or teaching, or clinical, or extension duties into a ranked NTT position.

The following guidelines apply only to all newly-hired NTT faculty members and to those faculty who will be moved into NTT faculty positions at the time of contract renewal.

---

1 The categories of NTT, unranked, non-regular faculty, and part-time, non-regular faculty include faculty titles related to each. Page 4 of this document lists the faculty titles associated with the NTT group. Titles associated with the unranked, non-regular faculty group include, but are not limited to, instructor, lecturer, senior lecturer, research associate and visiting professor. The title of visiting professor will only be used for those faculty on temporary appointments. Part-time or courtesy appointments will be considered adjunct appointments and includes such titles as adjunct professor, adjunct instructor, etc.

2 All other non-regular faculty members would receive the title of instructor (or equivalent full-time title), adjunct instructor (or equivalent part-time title), or other non-regular academic appointment titles that are not faculty titles (i.e., post doc, resident, etc.).
**Non-Tenure Track Faculty Defined**

There would be four main types of full-time, ranked NTT faculty. They would each have primary responsibility in a single area: teaching, or research, or clinical practice, or extension activities. The titles would identify the area. Within each area, there would be three ranks:

- **Research faculty**
  - Research Professor
  - Associate Research Professor
  - Assistant Research Professor

- **Teaching faculty**
  - Teaching Professor
  - Associate Teaching Professor
  - Assistant Teaching Professor

- **Clinical faculty**
  - Clinical Professor
  - Associate Clinical Professor
  - Assistant Clinical Professor

- **Extension faculty**
  - Extension Professor
  - Associate Extension Professor
  - Assistant Extension Professor

Unlike tenured and tenure track faculty, whose performance is evaluated based on their contribution to research, teaching, and service, the performance of NTT faculty should be judged on the primary responsibility of the non-tenure track appointment as well as related service and professional activities. However, NTT faculty should be expected to be engaged in professional activities pertaining to the primary responsibility defined by the category.

There would be no prohibition for NTT faculty to be involved in multiple duties related to research, teaching, or service. However, decisions regarding hiring, continuation of employment, and evaluation of NTT faculty performance should relate to the primary purpose of their appointment as defined by category and not be based on all three criteria. Only tenured and tenure track faculty should be hired, evaluated, and promoted based on all three criteria.

**CONSIDERATIONS FOR ESTABLISHING GUIDELINES REGARDING NTT FACULTY**

**Nature of the Initial Appointment**

The nature of the initial appointment to a non-tenure track position is important to both the candidate and the department. Therefore the candidate’s primary department should be fully engaged in defining the nature of the non-tenure track academic appointments. Since the candidate would be expected to contribute to the department’s core mission, specific job responsibilities and expectations should be explicitly stated in a written job description developed by the department chair in conjunction with an appropriate department committee.

**Searches for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Members**
Searches for NTT faculty should be conducted on a regional or national basis as appropriate with the involvement of a faculty-based search committee. The expectation is that candidates should be selected using a process somewhat similar to one used for tenure track faculty members with interviews/presentations to division faculty, staff and students, and a full review of candidates’ dossiers. Student feedback is particularly important for all NTT teaching faculty.

Recommendations for hiring decisions remain under the purview of the department chair or dean.

**NTT Faculty Attributes**
The candidate for a NTT academic position should hold an earned doctoral degree, OR the appropriate terminal degree, OR have appropriate professional experience (i.e., teaching, research, clinical or extension) as defined by the faculty of the academic unit. Evidence of the candidate’s abilities should be demonstrated through the candidate's resume, portfolio/dossier, reference letters, and through interviews with department and college faculty members. The candidates should demonstrate potential for excellence in the area of their appointments (e.g., teaching, research, clinical or extension) as well as in the service and professional aspects related to the discipline and the position.

**Clearly Defined Expectations for Each Position**
Specific qualifications for each rank will be determined by the department and/or college with approval by the provost. The workload requirements for NTT faculty members should be spelled out in detail in advance. For teaching appointments, there should be clearly articulated teaching assignments and teaching loads including adjustments made for large classes or courses with multiple sections. Research appointments should spell out the specific roles, duties, grant projects and expectations for future funding. Clinical appointments should clearly articulate the specific roles, responsibilities and performance expectations for delivering clinical services. Extension appointments should describe the specific extension activities and outline relationships with the department.

**Contract Length**
NTT faculty may hold 9- or 12-month academic appointments. Contract lengths could be up to three years with the option of renewing a multiyear contract during the contract period. A recommended best practice is to provide three year contracts whenever feasible for highest qualified, highest performing NTT faculty members.

**Guidelines for Performance Evaluation**
Each academic school or college, with approval from the provost, should develop specific guidelines for the evaluation of performance. These guidelines should reflect the mission and needs of the school, college and university and cover only the single area of the non-tenure track appointment as well as related service and professional activities germane to the single responsibility.

All NTT faculty should be reviewed annually by the appropriate unit supervisor. The standards for performance should be based on specific criteria outlined by the academic
division and agreed to prior to signing the contract. The performance reviews should be a formal, documented process. Annual written evaluations should be provided to all NTT faculty members.

NTT appointees should compile a dossier of their activities, productivity, creativity and professional development to be reviewed on an annual basis. This material could also serve as the foundation for a dossier that would be used during the promotion process.

**Contract Reappointments**

Reappointments and promotions should be based, in part, on the performance expectations communicated at the time of contract by the chair with the concurrence of the dean and the provost.

Decisions to renew contracts should generally be made in advance of the contract end date. Faculty who will not receive a contract renewal should be informed in writing of non-renewal status well in advance of the contract end date. A recommended best practice would be to provide notice at least three months in advance of contract end date unless extenuating circumstances exist.

**Promotion of Non-tenure Track Faculty**

Specified criteria for promotion and description of the process used for promotion in rank should be spelled out by the school or college and approved by the provost in advance of hiring NTT faculty members. The development of specific criteria and guidelines used to determine standards of excellence for promotion purposes should be the responsibility of the faculty of the department/unit that includes the faculty member’s discipline or area of expertise subject to approval by the dean and the provost. Evaluation areas should be consistent with the established academic standards for each discipline. The decision to apply for promotion would be one the NTT faculty member could elect or not; annual reviews should be valuable indicators of the applicant’s readiness for promotion. Promotion of a NTT academic appointment would not carry automatic rewards (apart from change in title) or penalties from the college or school.

Evaluation of the candidate’s application for promotion should focus on the specific area of appointment — teaching, research, clinical or extension — as well as related service and professional activities. Involvement in professional activities related to the position is expected for all NTT academic appointments and should be considered in the evaluation of performance.

In promotion considerations, the total contribution of the faculty member to the mission of the school or college over a sustained period of time should be taken into consideration. This would include comprehensive documentation of the position, including a letter of appointment identifying home department or unit and the initial position description, communications detailing changes in position responsibilities, and any other statements regarding expected performance.
The process for reviewing applications for promotion should be done at the department, college and campus levels. At each level, a committee will be comprised of NTT faculty members at the promotable rank or higher, tenure-track faculty members, and tenured faculty members. The selection process for promotion committees would be determined by policies developed at the respective levels and approved by the provost. Recommendations for promotion will be considered at all levels and decided by the provost.

**Academic Freedom**
Prior to the stated ending date of their term appointments, NTT faculty members have the same academic protections regarding academic freedom as tenured and tenure track faculty.

Accordingly, adequate cause for dismissal prior to the stated ending date of their term appointments must be related directly and substantially to the faculty member's fitness or performance in the professional capacity as teacher, researcher, clinician or extension faculty. More information can be found in CR&R 310.020 and related sections in the campus bylaws.

**Participation in Faculty Governance**
NTT faculty members’ role in faculty governance shall be articulated by the individual campus. The goal is to identify ways for the NTT faculty members to have a voice within their campus, college or school and to be involved in faculty governance where appropriate. It is recommended as a best practice that the campus will define uniform standards of representation.

In some cases NTT faculty involvement and responsibilities in faculty governance would be similar to tenured and tenure track faculty; whereas in other colleges they would have a more limited role. Each college or school shall articulate those roles to fit the academic unit, within the limits of the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations (e.g. only tenured faculty members can vote on tenure decisions).

**Conclusion**
The recommended best practices for NTT faculty at the University of Missouri are designed to inform discussion on the campus, college/school, and academic units at the University. Specific policies and practices should be developed consistent with this framework. In doing so, the University seeks to appropriately recognize the significant contributions of NTT faculty at the University.
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