DON'T READ THIS!!

Get your attention, didn't I? Actually, what we do want you to read is Agenda for Action, sent to all Faculty on January 24. The significance of this document is clearly expressed in the cover letter from Chancellor Monroe—"When completed it will serve as a matrix upon which future resource requests and distribution decisions are made." That means money will be allocated to departments according to the priorities established for this campus.

The Faculty Council has established a Task Force to develop an analysis and recommendations. In addition, each and every Faculty member, individually or collectively within their department, should read critically the entire document and forward comments to their Faculty Council representatives, whose names are listed on the back page of this Faculty Forum.

We are suggesting that you read the Agenda for Action from three perspectives. First, how the recommendations will impact the University; second, how it will impact this campus; and third, how it will affect your department or division. It is this last perspective that requires your particular attention. For while many members of the University community have a view of the whole, it is the departmental faculty that see the University working out its missions of teaching, research, and service.

We urge you to take time to not only critique the document as presented but also to express your vision of what the department, division, and campus should be now and in the future. Your comments are needed! This is an opportunity for the Faculty to be proactive.

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting
January 12, 1989

Attendance
The meeting was called to order by Chairman Kimber at 3:40 p.m. in S110 Memorial Union. Twenty-six members were present with W. Fisch substituting for A. Neely. Also in attendance were Vice-President Wallace, Deputy Chancellor Broader, Vice-Provost Chinn and seven members of the task force to respond to the Agenda for Action: Professors Asplund, Bank, Fisch, Lago, Noteboom, Storick, and H. White.

Announcements
Chairman Kimber distributed a revised schedule for Council meetings, with changes made to accommodate the dates for the Board of Curators' meetings.

Professor Warder announced that at the most recent Intercampus Faculty Council meeting, the Council discussed the ethics policy and conflict of interest policy. The next meeting of IPC will be February 9.

Chairman Kimber announced that an Intercampus Staff Advisory Council is being established.

Standing Committee Reports
Academic Freedom and Grievance: Professor Fritzell presented, for discussion, a proposal to establish a task force of 6-8 members to examine the merit and market salary policy in view of the contemporary fiscal environment at this university. The committee recommends that the task force be formed to:
1. Describe variation among departments and colleges in procedures for implementing faculty salary policy, including methods for evaluating merit of faculty performance and determining market conditions.
2. Assess faculty perceptions and beliefs about the current faculty salary policy and its application.
3. Evaluate alternative salary distribution systems as means to support the missions of the University of Missouri within current and anticipated fiscal environments.
4. Recommend possible courses of action for Faculty Council to pursue relative to faculty salary policy and/or its implementation.

Executive Session
The Council went into executive session at 3:50 p.m. to discuss the Agenda for Action.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Billy Cumbie, Recorder

Agenda for Action, the Process

The draft of the document "Agenda for Action" is the result of a process which was begun in January, 1988. The President presented to the Board his perspectives on proposed actions during the next three to four years. The President then appointed ten ad hoc committees to deliberate on the environmental assumptions identified earlier by the Planning Council and to report back to the Planning Council. The committees were constituted by the President with the advice of the Chancellors. The faculty representatives to the ad hoc committees and the Planning Council were recommended by the Chancellors. They were not elected by the Faculty nor
through the Faculty Council.

At the Intercampus Faculty Council’s urging, the Chairmen of the four campus governing bodies were also appointed. John Bauman, appointed to the Planning Council in spring 1988. Drafts of the early ad hoc committee reports were then shared with the Council. The new Council Chair, Gordon Kimber, replaced Prof. Bauman on the Planning Council at the beginning of the Fall semester. To this time, there has been limited faculty involvement in the development of the “Agenda for Action”.

The document which has been distributed to you is essentially the work of Prof. Don Phares, Chair of University Planning Council and Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Budgeting, Planning and Institutional Research at UMSL, and associate vice president for Academic Affairs, Richard Wallace, with, the aid of the UPC, consolidated and amended the work of the 30 committees.

The President has requested that the Chancellor provide him with a “general plan for campus academic program improvements for the next five years and should propose specific program improvements for inclusion in the FY 1991 state appropriations request.” The Chancellor has requested the Faculty Council to forward “collective responses” to him by March 6. An at-the-time undefined “iterative process” will be used to consolidate comments and recommendations for the campus. Following this, another as yet undefined process will be used to make decisions as to recommendations for the University System, including decisions regarding priorities of requests for program improvements among and between campuses. At the Board of Curators meeting January 26-27, 1989 it was discussed that the general officers would eventually make the decision concerning all campus recommendations.

While many departments are developing departmental responses which will go forward to the Chancellor through the Council of Deans, we ask that a copy of those, and any other responses, be directed to the Faculty Council. It is imperative that the Faculty on this campus take a strong position on the Agenda for Action. It is the future of our University that is being determined.

Highlights of the 2-2-89 Faculty Council and Announcement of the 2-10-89 Open Faculty Forum

FACULTY COUNCIL WISHES TO ANNOUNCE AN OPEN FACULTY FORUM, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1989 AT 3:40 P.M. IN THE MEMORIAL UNION AUDITORIUM. THE TOPIC WILL BE THE AGENDA FOR ACTION, AND COUNCIL CHAIRMAN GORDON KIMBER STRONGLY URGES FACULTY TO ATTEND. Now the Highlights...

Chairman Kimber reminded Council members of the significant role the Agenda for Action will play in the future of the campus and university, and the need for faculty to read and respond to this document. Professor Storvick, Chair of the task force appointed by Council to report on the Agenda for Action, said any information from faculty would be helpful and suggested a faculty forum to discuss the document would be useful. Kimber announced he would make arrangements for a forum to be held soon.

Professor Schrader Chair of the Fiscal Affairs Committee, reported on the budget hearing held on January 16, 1989 and announced that the committee would be working closely with Vice Provost Denhardt as the budget request for 1990-91 is developed. He also reported that the ad hoc University Staff Benefits Committee had met and that there is support among the members for seeking improvements in the retirement benefits program.

The Council approved a proposal submitted at the January 12, 1989 meeting by the Academic Freedom and Grievance Committee to establish a task force of 5-8 members to examine the merit and market policy and recommend possible courses of action for Council to pursue relative to faculty salary policy.

Professor Twaddle, Chair of Special Projects Committee, distributed a list of administrators showing their year they should be reviewed and the body charged with conducting the review. The list was not submitted to administrators and Chairs of groups responsible for the reviews, who are to report to the Special Projects Committee what, if any action they are engaged in this year.

At a meeting of a newly formed Chancellor’s Advisory Council February 6, a proposal to establish a “user fee” for faculty and staff who wish to take advantage of the recreational facilities of the university. In relation to this Council approved a resolution, “to urge the Chancellor to reject the proposed fee increase for faculty and staff”. A second resolution was approved by a vote of 15 to 5, in case Chancellor Monroe decides to establish a user fee, to “honor the compromise agreement reached with the staff of Recreation and Intramurals as specified in an exchange of letters with Professor David Goldstein, representing a duly constituted campus committee, and reflected in Goldstein’s letter of December 19 and the Chancellor’s of January 4.” This compromise agreement was for a fee of $20 per semester and $10 for summer.

Professor Hahn reported that the Assessment Policy Committee had been appointed and will be chaired by Professor Michael Frewitt. Professor Zguta announced that the Student Affairs Committee will soon submit a proposal to Council on new admission requirements.

Some of the actions taken by the Board of Curators at the January 23-24 meeting were reviewed by Professor Neely. The Board asked for a report on assessment to be presented at the March 9-10 meeting (Columbia) giving a separate overview of the assessment on the four campuses and a comparison with what is being done at Northeast Missouri State University. The Board also asked for a report at the March meeting from each campus to be made on admission requirements.

Your Opinion, Please

FORUM...a medium of open discussion. FACULTY FORUM...a place where Faculty can air their views on current issues and share ideas with their Council representatives and the Faculty at large.

But it will only work if you participate. Please share with us your views on any issue of concern to the University. We ask that you include your name and department on all correspondence. If you wish to remain anonymous, we will honor your request. Forward your comments to: Faculty Forum, Faculty Council Office, 205 Curtis. We will publish responses to the question in the next issue.

This month’s question: In your opinion, is salary decision making broadly enough based in your department?
Mug Mottos

Paul Harvey may read bumper stickers but real wisdom is found on coffee mugs. Send your favorites to Editor, Faculty Forum, 205 Curtis.

Seen in the offices of Faculty—
- Those that can, teach. Those that can't, do less significant work.
- Working here allows me to afford two of the luxuries I've grown accustomed to—eating and living indoors.