

Chair's Report: Final Report

MU Faculty Council for University Policy

July 30, 2015

School of Medicine Fact-Finding Committee

In the summer of 2014, the Faculty Council Executive Committee issued this public statement: "Numerous issues have been brought forth by our colleagues in the School of Medicine that appear to limit both the shared governance and research productivity of the faculty in the School. Members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council therefore recommend that you appoint a fact-finding committee that examines these issues and related facts and barriers and provides a report to the Council on these matters."

As a response to this recommendation, a committee was appointed to include Art Jago (Chair), Carlos Wexler, Cheryl Heesch, and Satish Nair. The committee charge was "to determine the factors that may have had a negative effect on shared governance, research productivity, and/or work environment in the School of Medicine." The committee engaged in a thorough fact-finding effort that culminated in a 55-page document entitled, "Report of the Fact-Finding Committee Examining the Organizational Culture of the School of Medicine."

The report was shared with Faculty Council in February 2015. Its key findings are as follows (pasted from the report):

"When we examine the SOM academic enterprise, the committee finds justifiable concerns with each of the three areas of our charge:

"Shared Governance: Although faculty in basic sciences departments largely voiced satisfaction with the leadership at the department level, the same was not true in all clinical departments. The committee found multiple instances where clinical department/division leadership was perceived as lacking research competence and being autocratic, intimidating, and, in some cases, vindictive/retaliatory. Indeed, a senior administrator admitted to this committee that there were problems with some chairs but that 'they are now gone.' However, we found that the problem persists in some departments. Faculty involvement in the faculty recruitment process was perceived as being inadequate in some cases. For instance, it is not clear whether faculty input, including input into mentoring plans, precede the recruitment of tenure track faculty in clinical departments. Finally, lack of faculty input in setting and implementing tenure criteria was a serious concern.

"Research productivity: MU ranks 91st among 138 medical schools receiving NIH funding; in the bottom half of schools in Missouri and adjacent states; and in the bottom half of schools in the Southeastern Conference. Tenured/tenure track faculty have a per capita publication rate of

2.21 articles per year in journals having a median impact factor of 3.3. Total per capita research expenditures (both internal and external funds, direct and indirect costs) attributable to research active TT/NTT faculty is \$126,514 per year. Yearly PhD production is 0.23 per tenure track faculty. Compared to clinical departments, the performance of faculty in basic science departments was significantly higher on all research indices. We note that MU leadership has recently implemented several initiatives with the goal of raising the university's ranking within the Association of American Universities (AAU). The overall perception of the university administration is that improvements in research metrics in the School of Medicine are especially vital to accomplishing this institutional goal.

“Work environment: SOM is perceived to be administratively top-heavy. Some associate deans are not perceived to be helpful, especially with junior faculty. Some department chairs are untenured, are perceived to have minimal scholarly credentials, and believed to inappropriately play a role in the tenure decisions of junior faculty. Lack of mentorship has been a significant problem in SOM; junior faculty feel uninformed of tenure expectations and requirements. Important to seemingly all faculty are inequities in the compensation systems: research faculty believe that they are being insufficiently recognized for their institutional contributions and that they are disproportionately carrying the research load when compared to their tenured clinical counterparts; faculty having primarily clinical responsibilities feel that they are being ‘taxed’ to support the salaries of the research faculty whose academic activities are perceived as not contributing to the day to day ‘work’ of the organization.

“In contrast to the problems we identify within SOM, the committee concludes this report with an acknowledgment that tremendous advances have occurred in several areas of the medical enterprise and with MU in general. Serious issues persist, but the future holds very promising potential for SOM; its interdisciplinary reciprocal relationships with other parts of campus; its national prominence; and its contributions to the State of Missouri and service to the broadly defined local community.”

The report concluded with recommendations. The report was forwarded to the Chancellor, Provost, and new Dean of the School of Medicine, and follow-up meetings were held with the above administrators. The report was also shared with faculty in the School of Medicine and posted on the MU Faculty Council website.

The Chair of Faculty Council received two “reports on the report,” one confidential and one for limited circulation. These reports were from two senior faculty members in the School of Medicine who enjoy reputations of high integrity and lengthy records of productivity at the University of Missouri. Both colleagues considered the report to be excellent but limited in its description of the serious allegations.

The MU Faculty Council also considered the report excellent and is optimistic that the new dean will implement change in the School of Medicine to address concerns raised in this report.

Review of Vice Provost of University Extension

In the summer of 2014, Faculty Council received numerous requests to facilitate a review of the Vice Provost of Extension. Unlike Deans, the Vice Provost of Extension does not undergo regular reviews by the faculty and had not been reviewed as such in eight years. A review survey was prepared under the leadership of William Wiebold and issued electronically from the Interim Provost. Review respondents included the following four sectors of University Extension:

- Faculty (colleagues with “Professor” in their titles and located on campus)
- Staff (support colleagues in Extension)
- Regional Specialists (MU educators located throughout the state of Missouri)
- Extension Councils (citizen support groups located in each county)

The review was unfavorable, and responses from 3 of the 4 sectors above were negative. The Vice Provost resigned in May 2015. After consulting with faculty, the Chancellor appointed Dr. Tom Henderson as Interim Vice Provost. A search committee is currently being formed to replace the former Vice Provost of Extension.

ACCORD (Ad hoc Campus Committee on Raise Distribution)

In 2014, MU rewarded faculty with mid-year and above-normal compensation in two raise periods. These special raises were intended for those faculty members deemed to be excelling in productivity. A Faculty Council committee was formed and given the following charge: 1) to describe the distribution of raises given in 2014 – 2015 by percentage and dollar amount by division, and 2) to report on the attitude of faculty members toward the raises and on their understanding of the process. Members included Bill Lamberson (chair), Robin Kruse, Sudarshan Loyalka, Stephen Montgomery-Smith, Karen Piper, and William Wiebold.

This committee received full cooperation from university administration, who provided the committee with all data required to complete the charges above. In April 2015, the committee issued a 68-page report, which contained processes for determining raise distribution, survey responses from the faculty, and data for each academic unit (college or school) broken down by TT and NTT. The report included the following Executive Summary.

“The Faculty Council appointed a six person faculty committee and charged it with describing the distribution of raises given in 2014 – 2015 by percentage and dollar amount by division, and reporting on the attitude of faculty members toward the raises and on their understanding of the process. The committee used a three step process: 1) reviewed, analyzed and described 2014-2015 faculty raises; 2) surveyed deans on the process used to fund and allocate regular merit raises and on their opinion of the effect of variation in regular merit raises on morale; and 3) surveyed the faculty on their understanding of and attitudes toward the raise process. Both regular and special merit raises varied by academic unit. Overall, 86.5% of faculty members received some raise, and the percentages receiving raises ranged from 72.2% in the College of

Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources to 98.5% in the School of Health Professions. Median regular merit raises across academic units ranged from less than 1% to more than 2%. The percentage of faculty members receiving a special merit raise ranged from 9% in Medicine and the School of Health Professions (no end of year special merit raises were awarded in the School of Health Professions) to 36% in Human Environmental Sciences and Nursing. Responses to the faculty survey indicated that faculty morale was damaged by the raise process; however, there were strong differences of opinion on issues of fairness and morale depending on whether individuals received a special merit raise. Deans generally stated that overall lack of resources was as much or more damaging to morale than the special merit raise process. This view is supported by the fact that the median regular merit raise by academic unit had a strong effect on response to the morale statements, thus morale was not solely affected by whether the respondent received a special merit raise. There was general support among faculty of AAU membership; however, nearly 50% of those who did not receive a special merit raise were neutral or disagreed that it is important that MU stay in the AAU. The committee concludes that full transparency, well pre-defined performance metrics consistent with effort allocation, and equity among academic units in future raise processes are important to avoid further damage to faculty morale, and that leadership should undertake an educational effort to justify the importance of AAU membership.”

The report was shared with the Provost, Chancellor, and Faculty Council. It was also posted on the Faculty Council website and discussed with the above administration in follow-up meetings. It remains unclear whether or not this raise distribution practice will be modified in coming years.

Library Mold

600,000+ books and documents of the MU Library became infected with mold in Subtera, the underground storage facility. The Faculty Council Executive Committee formed an ad hoc committee to monitor the situation, with a primary interest in the remediation policy and process. The ad hoc committee included Mark Ashbaugh (chair), Dan Hooley (initial chair), Dennis Trout, John Zemke, Kerby Miller, Jeanne Mihail, Noah Heringman, and Stamatis Dostoglou.

Faculty Council and the ad hoc committee were informed of a protocol for salvage or destruction of all mold-infested books. The protocol had been proposed by the Director of Libraries and agreed upon by the faculty. However, the protocol was not followed, and many thousands of books were destroyed without informing the faculty.

Over a period of months, the ad hoc committee attempted to rectify the inconsistencies between the proposed protocol and the actual practice. In February 2015, the committee wrote the Chair of Faculty Council a letter with the following comments:

“Acting Provost Ken Dean delivered Director Cogswell's ‘Chronology of MU Libraries Mold Incident’ to the Ad Hoc Committee on January 29, 2015. The Ad Hoc Committee met on January 31, 2015 to review the document and can now report the following.

“We find that the ‘Chronology of MU Libraries Mold Incident’ simply does not respond to the requests that we articulated in our letter to you of December 12, 2014. In that letter we drew attention to Director Cogswell's failure to honor promises made to us in our initial meeting with him on March 14, 2014. In the matter of the destruction of mold infected books in particular, faculty members have been deprived of any determinative role despite assurances then made and documented in our letter of December 12. In our opinion, Director Cogswell's report confirms a pattern of disregard for the legitimate interests and role of Faculty in governance of the Library.

“For this reason, we have lost confidence in Director Cogswell's judgment and we urge Faculty Council either to request an immediate point-by-point accounting of this matter or to consider proposing a vote of no confidence in the Director of Libraries. Furthermore, we urge Faculty Council to take measures to ensure that Faculty have an effective voice in all future decisions regarding the Library collections and their maintenance.”

In the June 2015, the Director of Libraries stepped aside and shifted his efforts to a preparing for the centennial celebration of the MU Libraries. The Provost appointed Ann Riley as Interim Director. A search committee to replace the Director has not yet been formed.

Title IX

In February 2014, ESPN aired a story of a Mizzou student who was alleged to have experienced a sexual assault. Among many aspects, the story stated shortcomings in the university's failure to report the allegation to the Title IX Coordinator.

The story was aired “between Chancellors,” as Steve Owens was completing his role as Interim Chancellor, and as the new Chancellor, Bowen Loftin, was scheduled to take office the following Monday. In this gap, the university response was managed by Tim Wolfe, President of the University of Missouri System.

President Wolfe retained the firm, NCHERM, consultants to help develop new Title IX policies and rules for the four-campus system. In April of 2014, President Wolfe issued Executive Order (EO) 40, which required all university employees to function as “mandatory reporters.” This EO was issued with no input from faculty. It was criticized by the faculty but largely accepted for the sake of urgency. Criticisms included lack of training, training modules that were both inferior and partly inaccessible, and no consideration of faculty confidants. Shortcomings in training have been addressed, and other faculty concerns will be considered when the new rules are reviewed.

In the summer of 2014, President Wolfe issued EO41, which laid out a process for handling student violations. This EO was issued with limited faculty input. UM System agreed to allow faculty to serve on hearing panels and provided training to serve. Areas of concern have been the compulsion of witnesses and the extent of “advisor” (attorney) participation during hearings. Another area of concern, needing clarification, is the vetting of faculty who serve on these panels.

In February 2015, after extensive collaboration with the Intercampus Faculty Council and discussions within MU Faculty Council, including special meetings held over the winter, President Wolfe proposed a revision of the CRR to address faculty hearings. The revision was passed by the Board of Curators. The revision contained a clause to permit amendments with consensus, anticipating that both faculty and administration would find amendments to be warranted. An in-depth review and further revision will occur 18 months after the rule change was implemented.

On April 7, MU Faculty Council hosted Gina Maisto-Smith and Leslie Gomez of the Pepper Hamilton Law Firm in Philadelphia, PA; both are attorneys reputed to be Title IX experts with significant experience in evaluation of new Title IX policies on college campuses. Maisto-Smith and Gomez were requested to function objectively, as their client would not be administration, faculty, or any particular group on campus. Their purpose here was to provide an independent, third-party response to faculty concerns about the new CRR. Of all the concerns expressed by the MU faculty, Maisto-Smith and Gomez focused on the role and extent of attorney participation in the process. Maisto-Smith and Gomez did not recommend attorneys speaking during the hearing panels. However, they did recommend “beefing up” the attorney representation in the overall process. Their advice was to “frontload” the process by allowing attorneys to become more involved during the investigative phase, albeit after the initial interview of the complainant.

Race Relations

On December 1, 2014, the Chancellor held a listening session, moderated by Earnest Perry, Associate Professor of Journalism, in response to the police shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri. Several members of Council were present at the listening session and heard painful accounts of students being discriminated against because of their race. These members became convinced that the faculty must do more to address race-related problems at Mizzou.

In February 2015, the following resolution was introduced by Berkley Hudson, Professor of Journalism, and passed unanimously by Faculty Council.

“Tragic events that highlighted racial violence and continued mistrust surrounding the events in Ferguson, Missouri and across the country spurred Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin in December 2014 to host a “listening session” as a place for the University of Missouri community, especially students, to voice to their experiences about those occurrences.

“That session prompted an outpouring of feelings and made clear that the racial and social turmoil in Ferguson, and deaths in New York City and Cleveland, Ohio, are not the only things concerning students. They spoke about their own experiences with racial discrimination in Missouri and across the country, but principally they focused on the MU campus. Students of color aggressively voiced their displeasure with what they see as a climate of exclusion and disrespect at MU. Student leaders representing a range of groups proposed to the Chancellor a list of changes to foster a more racially and ethnically inclusive environment.

“Faculty Council commends the Chancellor for promoting dialogue about this difficult issue and recognizes that more such outreach is needed. The Council supports the Chancellor as he continues to expand his leadership efforts and to allocate the human and financial resources necessary to affect the positive cultural change that is required for everyone to feel safe, respected, and welcome at MU. Faculty Council recognizes that the Chancellor will need faculty support for the necessary accountability and incentives to be put in place.

“The Faculty Council further condemns all acts and expressions of intolerant attitudes, whether individual or institutional, violating the Mizzou core values of Respect, Discovery, Responsibility, and Excellence.”

Berkley Hudson worked with the Chair to form a committee to address this problem. Formation of this committee involved interviewing many students, staff, and faculty members. On April 23, names of colleagues proposed for this committee were vetted in closed session of Faculty Council. The committee membership includes students (Jonathan Butler, Corie Wilkins), Staff (Stephanie Hernandez), and faculty (Laine Young-Walker, Michael Middleton, Daryl Smith, Camila Manrique, Raymond Massey, Stephen Montgomery-Smith, Leigh Neier, Berkley Hudson, Craig Roberts). The committee is chaired by Berkley Hudson.

The Race Relations Committee has been meeting for less than 2 months. Under the leadership of Berkley Hudson, the committee has developed a way forward, which includes the plan below.

Date	Activity and Goal
Summer 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee meets regularly to learn the specifics and magnitude of the race issue at Mizzou
Fall 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each committee member understands and can describe perspectives of both the minority and the majority • Committee begins communicating with the “ring of liaisons”
Winter 2015-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee develops tools to educate faculty regarding the specifics and magnitude of the race issue at Mizzou
Winter 2015-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee presents these tools to Faculty Council for action TBD

Other Activities

Other Faculty Council activities for 2014-15 can be found in the brief reports submitted by the committee chairs. These reports deal with issues in fiscal affairs, student affairs, faculty affairs, academic affairs, and diversity enhancement.

Respectfully Submitted,
 Craig Roberts, Chair of MU Faculty Council for University Policy, 2014-15