Minutes of
Intercampus Faculty Council
May 10, 2007
Fireplace Room, Old Alumni Center
Columbia

Attending: Frank Blum, Rex Campbell, Tim Farmer, Kurt Kosbar, Jenice Prather-Kinsey, Frank Schmidt, Robert Schwartz, Nancy Stancel, Teresa Thiel, Richard Wright

Minutes of the April 20, 2007 meeting were approved.

A. Working groups: The subcommittees and reported to the group as a whole:

1. Assessment/accountability. Schwartz stated the variety of faculty attitudes regarding the topic as ranging from “apathy to hostility to excitement.” Factors include the fact that the subject is being pushed by the Dept of Education and business, and that there will be unfunded mandates and costs. Engagement - Time and effort (DEd is underestimating the time required by a factor of 10) Existing studies (eg NSSE) are the data being used? It is unclear how existing data sets (e.g., NSSE) are being used. There is a need to close the loop between the data and the action. One way may be to couple assessment with strategic plans for resource allocation.

PLAN: Submit to campuses at next IFC retreat.

2. Personnel policies. Wright reported that:

a. The policy document regarding NTT faculty is now standardized. No problems have surfaced so far. IFC review is needed for next year.

b. Background checks. The policy originated and was imposed by central administration. IFC may need to monitor the effectiveness and fairness of the policy.

c. Leave policies are now broadly equivalent across campuses. A policy has been drafted and sent to the Academic Officers and Faculty Senates for discussion. There are no comments yet from UMSL faculty; administrators are worried about costs. UMR faculty are conflicted about sabbatical policies, especially financial details which will need to be set up.

3. Administrative policies

a. A21 compliance. There is a need for training; campuses must provide proper documentation.

b. Costs - there is not much progress on containing administrative costs. UM has two revenue sources, state appropriations and tuition. At the moment the state political structure doesn’t want the University to tap either.
B. Discussion with V.P.s Noble, Graham, Lehmkuhle: IFC discussed the Curators’ mandate to reallocate 1% of budget. There was concern that terming the mandate efficiency is inaccurate; the actual effect is cutting programs. Lehmkuhle pointed out that reallocation goes on all the time and that when this was pointed out to the Board, Curator Erdman suggested that these be termed “efficiencies.” Provosts are concerned about how to achieve the financial savings mandated. One possibility is to eliminate degree programs on the books that don’t have students, low enrollment courses, etc. It is not clear how much savings will be realized. Another possibility is how Centers and Institutes are supported from the General Operating budget. Total support is $12-15 m. Are they worth it?

Thiel asked if faculty will see the data, who will decide on cuts, and what input faculty will have. Blum pointed out that some centers provide a substantial return on investment.

Lehmkuhle and Graham provided data on ongoing consolidations. In cases where enrollments were too small, consolidation increased efficiency and quality, while reducing administrative costs. This can also allow replacement of NTT faculty with regular faculty. In regard to Centers, Lehmkuhle reported that the term “Center” applies to a large number of entities, including the Learning Center as well as academic centers. Efficiency is quality over cost. Closing programs doesn’t save bucks, except in the long run.

C. Discussion with V.P. Knorr: Knorr reviewed the results of the 2007 legislative session.

D. Discussion with Interim President Lamb: President Lamb met with the IFC to discuss several topics:

1. SB389 and governance: President Lamb has discussed financial considerations with the Commissioner of Higher Education. The CBHE has broad leeway in allowing tuition to be raised above the CPI, and has a letter clarifying that from Sen. Nodler the sponsor.

2. Land-Grant mission of the University of Missouri: Pres. Lamb reiterated the UM commitment to its Land Grant research mission, and that it is necessary for the State to recognize the benefits of this mission for economic development. Aligned with this concern, he and the Board have initiated discussions about the possibility of a funding formula for higher education that would recognize the differential costs of graduate and professional education, which are primarily carried out within UM.

3. Efficiencies. Pres. Lamb discussed the origin of the Board’s “1% mandate” and that in his view it involves priority-setting as an important component.

4. Campus reports:

UMR: The campus is proceeding with the restructuring of its Academic Council in light of the campus reorganization plan. For example, P&T procedures currently refer to colleges, which no longer exist.
MU: The campus has been addressing the “1% efficiency” mandate. To date over 200 specific suggestions have been received, and will be evaluated for the current fiscal year, and for future years.

UMSL: Important questions are how to find faculty, the question whether campus police need increased firepower, and issue of public safety.

UMKC: Faculty are working on the reallocation mandate, and examining whether the executives of the Senate should receive compensation or release time for their duties.

E. Discussion with V.P. Allen. Allen discussed the issues with “electronic signatures” for grant applications. There are two models. In cases where the University is being legally represented, the signature must follow verified protocols for encryption, authentication, etc. In cases where internal communications are involved, it is possible to simply use emails as effective signatures. This simply requires administrative action, and, e.g., research offices could allow this for grant applications. On the other hand, submission would require a verified e-signature.

F. Continued discussion with V.P.s Lehmkuhle, Noble, Graham: Noble asked how the NTT policy being implemented. She will provide lessons learned, inventory to other campuses. A checklist will be prepared so consistent policies will be adopted. There is an issue regarding funding and entitlement for sabbatical leave. A final policy will be distributed at the retreat.

Lehmkuhle pointed out that UM (all 4 campuses) is under investigation from state attorneys general (including MO A.G. Nixon’s office) re institutional conflicts of interest for student loans. This is related to the MOHELA process.

G. Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m. Schmidt thanked the members for their productive service during the past academic year.

Submitted by

Frank Schmidt