Minutes of University of Missouri Intercampus Faculty Council Meeting October 13, 2006

Present: Rex Campbell (UMC), Frank Blum (UMR), Gary Ebersole (UMKC), Tim Farmer (UMSL), Kurt Kosbar (UMR), Jenice Prather-Kinsey (UMC), Frank Schmidt (UMC), Nancy Stancel (UMKC), Teresa Thiel (UMSL) and Richard Wright (UMSL).

Absent: 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; Steve Knorr, Vice President for Legislative Affairs; Steve Graham, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Kandis Smith, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and Debra Noble, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Frank Schmidt, Chair, called the October 13, 2006 meeting of the UM IFC to order at 9:30 AM in 321 Conference Room, University Hall.

Agenda: The agenda was reviewed and approved as distributed.

Minutes: The minutes of IFC Meeting, September 21, 2006 were approved as distributed.

Topics:

Subcommittee Meetings: Schmidt announced that the first hour and fifteen minutes would be in the sub-committees working. At 10:45 each committee chair gave a brief report of their discussions.

1. Subcommittee on Assessment and Accountability
   a. The sub-committee had a brief discussion of administrative reviews
   b. There was a longer discussion of assessment methods including what is current being done including exit interviews, long-term feedback from graduates, and professional certification exams.
   c. The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) test was discussed as a possible instrument. The CLA by testing freshman and seniors attempts to measure value added from the college experience. CLA has advantages and disadvantages.
   d. The University of Wisconsin is using a shortened version of the CLA.
   e. Kandis Smith, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs will provide staff support for the committee.

2. Subcommittee on Faculty Assessment Policies
   a. The amorous relationships policy was discussed in some detail. It was agreed that faculty-student relationships, especially if the
instructor was supervising the student, were not appropriate. However, other types of amorous relationships might be allowed as long as one of the people was not in a supervisory relationship to the other.

b. The faculty leave policies discussion was brief.
c. It is desirable that the best practices of faculty tenure-clock extensions be examined

3. Subcommittee on Administration Policies
   a. There was considerable discussion of the need for decoupling the fees charged at the metropolitan campuses. These fees should allow for three levels at the graduate level
   b. More information was needed on A-21 compliance. It was not clearly understood what the issues were in this topic.
c. E-procurement
d. Decoupling tuition between campuses and between full and part-time students

Discussion of with Senior Vice President Lehmkuhle, Associate Vice President Graham, Assistant Vice President Smith and Assistant Vice President Noble

Formula Funding – There has been some discussion by legislators of the possibility of formula funding in which each higher education institution would receive a set amount per student. This would hurt UM unless provisions were made for students in professional programs, graduate students and other relatively high cost programs.

Program Audits – Vice President Lehmkuhle described the process of audits that all 144 UM program were currently undergoing. Each department/program has the costs per student credit hour computed. If the cost is more than 150% of the national average for the discipline as reported by a Delaware study, the program will be subjected to a detailed audit to determine the reasons for the costs. There may be valid reasons for some of the high cost programs.

A21 – The reason for the emphasis placed upon the A21 effort reports is that the federal agencies are checking to make sure that the amount of funds assigned to personnel on grants is actually being used on the grants.

Discussion with Vice President Knorr

MOHELA – Knorr stated the MOHELA Board had approved the proposed program to allocate $350 million to fund capital projects at various higher education institutions. However, it must be approved by the legislature before it can be funded.

Campus Reports to President Floyd

A comment was made by President Floyd that he had worked with the other presidents of higher education institutions in the state to form a united front on funding needs and other necessities.
UMKC – Ebersole reported the following items:
- The campus was trying to determine if it would be better for the athletes to compete in Division I or Division III. The Division II that they were currently in had not been satisfactory.
- The Vice Chancellor for Finance had resigned.
- The campus was now using a new resources distribution model (RCM).
- The continuing education program was being re-defined.
- There was a strong desire for a decoupling of tuitions. At present the metropolitan campuses cannot compete with the community colleges.

UMR – Kosbar reported:
- The on-going reorganization of the campus continues. Under the new plan, there are no schools or deans.
- As part of the reorganization, there may be some reorganization or combination of departments.
- UMR is discussion the possibilities of a new name. There has been a large amount of discussion without any consensus.
- UMR has dropped the policy of instructors dropping students during the semester for poor performance.

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.
- There was concern about the use of program audits. Some saw them as punitive.
- A climate survey on diversity was being conducted.
- The Faculty Senate had passed a resolution condemning the homophobia comments of a curator.
- The “drag show” had been well attended.

UMC – Campbell reported six items:
- **New Grievance Procedures:** The first complicated cases under the new faculty grievance process are just about to be finished. No unexpectedly, we have found some procedures that may need changing. In general, the process seems to be much improved over the old process. Seven cases have been or are being processed. Not surprisingly, virtually all of the cases involve charges by faculty to their immediate supervisor. The use of an investigative officer insures most or all of the evidences on both sides are made available. The process moves at a steady pace. To be sure, the new process does not remove all controversy.
- **New Undergraduate Degree:** Discussions have started with Provost Foster concerning a new undergraduate degree program in “professional services”
- **NTT Update:** We are working to include representation of NTT faculty on the Faculty Council. While all colleges and schools have been instructed to present a plan for implementing the NTT proposal, not all have done so. We are asking for regular updates on this process.
- **New Extension Director:** A new director of Extension has been named. He is Michael Ouart, currently he is Associate Vice President of the Iowa State Extension.

- **New Grade:** The Faculty Council passed a new Fn grade which is given when a student drops out of class without formally withdrawing. This grade is used only for administrative purposes and will not show on the transcript.

- **Miscellaneous Items:** The following two items concern the campus. There has been no Faculty Council involvement in either.
  - The campus is starting on a major additional to the Student Center. The current center is named Brady Commons. Student research on Thomas Brady found that Dr. Brady had participated in what would be unacceptable behavior today. Some students wanted the name changed, but this was not accepted.
  - For a few days, we had a program started by a fraternity with assistance from some campus organizations to provide free condoms in all men and women’s bathrooms in the dormitories. This was halted for “further study”.

**Discussion with President Floyd**

- President Floyd said the Board of Curators is looking at decoupling fees in order for each campus to be competitive in its market. All campuses must agree to decoupling.
- The information on new NTT policies is getting out at UMKC. He will meet with the provosts the next Friday and issue executive orders on NTT.
- The amorous relations policy will go to the Curators in December.
- He discussed the Spelling commission report on The Future of Higher Education and asked what was being done on the various campuses. Each campus representative briefly reported having some discussions on each campus. Floyd said the Board of Curators will have a discussion of it at the December meeting. There is concern about the provision for tracking students. Continuing concerns for the University are access, affordability and accountability.
- The Presidents of the four-year institutions are working to present a unified budget request for the coming legislative session, and hope to enlist the community colleges as well.

**Continued Discussion with Senior Vice President Lehmkuhle**

Lehmkuhle reported that the RFP was out for background checks of all new faculty who are offered jobs.

The meeting was adjourned by Frank Schmidt, chair, at 2:15 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).1

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.2

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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