

TigerTalk



Volume 1, Issue 1

April 2001

Special points of interest:

- Post Tenure Review
- Academic Grievance Process
- Annual AAUP Spring Conference

Inside this issue:

<i>Faculty Governance at MU</i>	1
<i>It Could Happen to You</i>	1
<i>Post Tenure Review: Neither Benign nor Inevitable</i>	2
<i>The MU Academic Grievance Debacle</i>	3
<i>Anatomy of the Destruction of a Health Care</i>	3
<i>Post Tenure Review: The Next Chapter</i>	4

FACULTY GOVERNANCE AT MU

Sudarshan Loyalka, PhD
President, MU AAUP Chapter
Curators' Professor of Nuclear Engineering

The Curators of the University of Missouri have provided MU faculty with advisory, shared and primary authority via University policies on many matters in order to facilitate shared faculty governance on the MU campus. For example, in the matter of curriculum, the faculty has the "primary" authority. In matters of tenure and promotion and of the professional standing of individual faculty, the criteria to be evaluated are also the prerogative of the faculty. Yet, these and many areas of faculty involvement are under threat at MU.

Regulation 310.020 states, " the Board recognizes that matters relating to faculty status are primarily a faculty responsibility. Recommendations in matters of appointment, reappointment, nonreappointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal shall be by the appropriate faculty through established procedures, followed by action by administrative officers, with final determination by the appointing authority." In professional assessment, the faculty therefore has the primary role, but MU seeks to abrogate faculty involvement.

The roles of the faculty in all areas of faculty governance have been progressively

compromised, either because of a lack of faculty vigilance or as the result of a series of overly aggressive and assertive administrations. MU is not unique in this respect however, as real faculty governance has been superseded by a shadow governance on many campuses (see Martin Snyder, AAUP Footnotes, Fall 2000).

The shadow governance at MU has come in particular focus because of recurrent difficulties with the status and basic rights for non-regular faculty, with promotion and tenure criteria and their applications, and in the hiring of faculty and administrators.

The paralysis and corruption of the grievance policies have effectively shutdown all avenues for redress within the University system. Your faculty representatives, the UM Faculty Council, have recently requested intervention by National AAUP as the only realistic option to restore due process in the grievance procedures.

Despite an eloquent opposition of post-tenure review by Curator Hugh Stephenson, a retired professor from the Medical School, the administration has succeeded in importing and imposing on this fine institution a needless and intimidatory policy that is a favorite of third-rate institutions, and a pariah to most distinguished institutions of higher learning in the USA.

We at MU AAUP believe that it is an ap-

(Continued on page 6)

IT COULD HAPPEN TO YOU

Editorial

The Administration at the University of Missouri-Columbia has systematically eroded its faculty rights and its faculty participation in governance. Over the last 15 years, the number of tenure-track positions has decreased by approximately 500 while non-tenure track positions have increased by about 1000. Despite almost static total faculty numbers, administration has increased in size by 600%.

Of particular concern is that non-tenure track faculty have few if any rights. This University insists that our non-regular faculty are employed entirely at will, vulnerable to the whim of any ad-

(Continued on page 5)

THE MU POST TENURE REVIEW : NEITHER BENIGN NOR INEVITABLE

Patricia Brodsky, PhD
University of Missouri-Kansas City

We have repeatedly been told that the reason for creating a post tenure review policy is to forestall a more draconian one that President Pacheco fears will be imposed on us by the legislature. The story is that the Administration doesn't want it but is being forced into it. Steve Lehmkuhle declared in a Senate meeting on Oct. 17 that the policy was a "political necessity." President Pacheco, in an article in the October Spectrum (Oct. 2000) claimed "a national trend toward some sort of accountability."

These claims are disingenuous at best, and in some cases simply untrue. Missouri legislator, Bob Hilgeman, who is a member of the House Higher Education Committee, told an AAUP officer at UMSL that the subject of post-tenure review had NEVER been raised in his committee. Another legislator told her that post-tenure review has never been discussed at any length in the Missouri House. There has been no campaign, no legislation proposed. Thus the putative pressure from the Missouri legislature does not exist.

Nor does the "outside pressure" come from the Curators. In an article from the Missouri Tribune of October 12, Pierrette J. Shields quotes Hugh Stephenson, President of the Curators, as saying that he had yet to be convinced that the policy was necessary, and that he was "wary of anything that might erode [the tenure] system." The article quotes Stephenson as saying that "tenure is important to a strong university...and [that] he does not want to endanger it."

Where then is the pressure coming from? The Spectrum article declared that Pacheco "reaffirmed his commitment to a post-tenure review process." Post-tenure review was one of his projects at the University of Arizona. President Pacheco is using scare tactics to stampede the faculty into accepting his agenda. According to the Spectrum article, faculty offers "allowed professors to offer suggestions on how best to design a ... policy." But neither the forums nor the appointed faculty task force

were given the option of simply rejecting post-tenure review. Eddie Adelstein, a member of the post-tenure review committee itself, stated in the Tribune that Pacheco's "requiring faculty members to develop the proposal was manipulative ... [and] gives a false sense of approval."

The institution of tenure, or job security, was developed in order to guarantee academic freedom. Academic freedom reinforces the First Amendment rights to free expression, press, and assembly, and the Fourteenth Amendment right to due process. It protects the faculty's right to express itself freely in teaching, research, discussion of university policy, and public statements, as well as the right to fair procedures evaluating faculty status, complaints, and grievances. Tenure and academic freedom guarantee the right to speak out and to defend oneself WITHOUT FEAR OF REPRISALS. The weakening or elimination of tenure is intended to weaken or eliminate free expression and due process by making faculty vulnerable to retaliation. Under the tenure system faculty already are accountable as professionals --to their students, their academic disciplines, and the general public. The tenure system already provides for disciplinary action and dismissal of faculty. But it also requires that severe disciplinary action be the exception, based on bona fide and genuinely severe deficiencies, infractions, and exigencies.

Post-tenure review is actually a punitive process. It reverses tenure system principles by making what should be exceptional procedures the rule, and by establishing overly broad and vague criteria for disciplinary action. It casts a pall of suspicion over the qualifications of the entire faculty, who have already undergone strict evaluation by the tenure process. It places all faculty at risk by subjecting them to the threat of ceaseless bureaucratic harassment, intimidation, and ideological control. Academic freedom was established to preclude the imposition of this sort of environment.

What President Pacheco embraces as a "national trend" is in fact a widespread attempt to undermine and destroy the tenure system. A recent
(Continued on page 4)

Tiger Talk

*A newsletter of the University of
 Missouri-Columbia AAUP Chapter
 AAUP MU Chapter Officers*

President

*Sudarshan K. Loyalka, Ph.D.
 Nuclear Engineering
 882-3568
 LoyalkaS@missouri.edu*

Vice President

*Herbert K.. Tillema, Ph.D.
 Political Science
 882-3777
 TillemaH@missouri.edu*

Secretary

*Mark A. Prelas, Ph.D.
 Nuclear Engineering
 882-3568
 PrelasM@missouri.edu*

Treasurer

*Louis Holroyd, Ph.D.
 Physics, Retired
 442-6688
 Hholroyd@tranquility.net*

*AAUP Homepage
 AAUP@AAUP.org*

*Missouri AAUP Homepage
 Hometown.aol.com/moaaup/*

*This newsletter and the opinions expressed
 therein are not necessarily those of the
 American Association of University Professors*

THE MU ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE DEBACLE

Non-tenured faculty. Name withheld in the absence of academic freedom

We have the good fortune to work with a learned Faculty in an intellectual and academic environment. We presume the University must therefore be a high-minded, enlightened employer, fostering and supporting the missions of teaching, research, and service. The "fair and equitable" resolution of problems by a "prompt and efficient" procedure is presumed, pursuant to hallowed regulations that must exist somewhere. But when arbitrary, discriminative, or vindictive breach of Regulation occurs, the reality that you find is disturbing. Regulation 370.010, Academic Grievance Procedures, determines the resolution of your problem, and the Administration is batting roughly 39/39 during Richard Wallace's tenure as Chancellor.

Where we're coming from

In 1970, MU expelled several tenured professors for their involvement in the

Peace Movement. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sanctioned the action and placed the University of Missouri on academic probation. Standing was not restored until 1980, as the result of an agreement with AAUP to incorporate the AAUP recommendations on faculty governance into the UM governing regulations. Regrettably, the UM administrative culture undermined the purpose of the agreement, and piecemeal accrual of additional Board Regulation in 1981, 1985, and 1999 failed to halt fundamental faculty dissatisfaction.

Extensive administrative malfeasance contrary to Regulation remains unchecked in the Schools of Engineering, Medicine, Agriculture, and Arts and Sciences, and in the Nuclear Reactor. Within the last 2 years, four faculty members have been forced out of the University by the deliberate administrative ploy of delaying or suppressing the

grievance process to run out terminal contracts.

Where we are in 2001

In March 2001, Faculty Council finally responded after many months of unsatisfactory discussion with the Chancellor, and passed, almost unanimously, a resolution requesting the direct intervention of Washington AAUP in the otherwise insoluble problems of the MU grievance procedures. Such action by a university faculty representative body is almost unprecedented.

Interminable procedural delays, endemic administrative rule violations, and the absence of Administration accountability are charged by the Faculty. The punitive abuse of grievances is alleged by the Administration, although without evidence, and there is certainly resentment in Jesse Hall over the time

(Continued on page 6)

ANATOMY OF THE DESTRUCTION OF A HEALTH CARE ENTERPRISE

Ed Adelstein, MD, DVM Professor of Pathology

In 1990 the MU University Hospital under its Director, Bob Smith, was so successful that Boone Hospital formed an ill-advised alliance with St. Louis hospital-based corporations as they felt that they might not be able to compete against University Hospital, the then market-leader and center of medical excellence.

Lester Bryant was selected as Dean in 1989, although the search committee did not recommend him. Later, he agreed to give the University President, Dr. Kiesler, a yearly subsidy of \$M4 from hospital profits. He was made Dean and Director of the Hospital with control of both hospital and medical school monies. Bob Smith was not encouraged to stay and, although there were several strong candidates for his job, the Dean choose an internal candidate who would be compliant. He thus acquired unfettered access to controlling medical center funds which he used to develop his own ambitious plans, and ultimately to subsidize several failing

departments, the majority of whose leadership he had appointed.

Strongly supported by Dr. Kiesler, he was politically untouchable and attempts to criticize him resulted in termination of the complainant. He picked several chairmen with limited administrative skills who were unstintingly loyal to his positions. As the fortunes of their departments collapsed, several became defensive and mean spirited and systematically undermined the most competent and the most committed physicians. This was facilitated because many physicians were hired on clinical track appointments and a few on probationary tenure-track, who could be intimidated or fired without cause; others left frustrated. During this period, we lost numerous outstanding young physicians who would have comprised the seed corn of the future. Many excellent physicians, by then embittered, moved over to Boone Hospital which has now become enormously successful. Lester Bryant also initiated the purchase of regional primary care practices that the University had no experience in

running. Since we were unable to motivate and bill efficiently, we have now returned several of these practices to the previous principals with substantial, unrevealed losses. He poured enormous amounts of money into bricks and mortar and only increased our debt. A one-sided arrangement was made with Capital Regional Hospital. His successors also initiated the purchase of Columbia Regional Hospital for \$M34.5 largely to prevent its acquisition by Boone Hospital. Apparently, this purchase was carried out without a coherent plan as to how this hospital would integrate with the University.

In spite of numerous attempts to review the unilateral actions of Lester Bryant, he received the unwavering administrative support of the University. All this has occurred without faculty consultation. This is the fatal flaw of the system. No matter how poor the administrative leadership at any level, there is never accountability or oversight. MU will defend every administrative action,

(Continued on page 7)

Post Tenure Review: Neither Benign nor Inevitable (continued from page 2)

issue of *Academe*, the AAUP magazine, states: "the rise of the 'accountability movement' ... is the chief characteristic of the "managerial university," which "weakens tenure and erodes faculty autonomy" (*Academe*, May/June 2000, p. 23-24), and post tenure review often replaces the "positive incentives of raises."

Tenure is already under attack at UMKC from several other directions. For example, Dean Michael Reed of the Dental School is replacing tenured faculty with contingent, non-tenure track instructors in ever-increasing numbers, reports Chris Cumming, Chair of Diagnostic Science. The push toward distance learning and the virtual university have been shown at other institutions to be a direct threat to the tenure system. Post-tenure review, replacing tenure-track lines with contingent positions, and eliminating full-time tenured jobs altogether in the virtual university are three prongs of a coordinated campaign to weaken and eventually destroy the tenure system and academic freedom.

As benign as the present post-tenure review draft document may appear, it is a wedge that opens the way to future abuses. According to Faculty Chair Russell Zguta, faculty at UM Columbia declared in a resolution passed October 25: "In order to preserve the academic vitality of the University of Missouri-

(Continued on page 6)

POST-TENURE REVIEW: THE NEXT CHAPTER

At the January 19th Curators' meeting on the Columbia Campus, President Pacheco presented for discussion the Post-Tenure Review document created by a four-campus committee (see *University Spectrum*, January 2001). This document had been roundly rejected by the MU faculty in two separate votes, but was not allowed to be voted on at UMKC.

In the discussion period, Curator Hugh Stephenson, who had earlier gone on record as opposed to the principle of post-tenure review, made an eloquent defence of academic freedom and tenure. He asserted that the proposal, officially titled "Procedures for Review of Faculty Performance," was "redundant," because the University already had a system of annual review of faculty in place.

Curator Beckett, who along with Stephenson voted against the proposal, asked Professor Edward Adelstein of UM-Columbia to comment. Professor Adelstein, despite his membership on the committee which drafted the document, nevertheless remained strongly opposed to its adoption. Curator Beckett expressed unease about rushing a decision at this meeting and suggested that the faculty be given more time to react to the proposal. Soon after, however, the Curators voted 7 to 2 in favor of adopting the document, with implementation scheduled for fall of 2001.

Patricia Brodsky, PhD
University of Missouri-Kansas City

The *Spectrum* article claims that because the "criteria and procedures for dismissal for cause were unchanged, the new policy does not create a new avenue to dismiss faculty with tenure." But the document does contain the option that, given two years of unsatisfactory progress at the "professional development plan" stage, "the faculty member be considered for dismissal of (sic) cause proceedings."

Crucially, "cause" is not specifically defined, either in the post-tenure review document or under Dismissal for Cause in the UMKC bylaws. The bylaws discuss procedures for dismissal for cause, but not the charges leading to them. Tenure regulations, section 310.020 C1 of the bylaws, do specify causes for dismissal that "may include but are not limited to ... conviction of a felony or other crime involving moral turpitude, ... severe research misconduct, academic irresponsibility or other default of academic integrity,... willful misrepresentation,... [and] sexual harassment or racial, gender, or other discriminatory practices..."

While such specific causes appear fairly straightforward and reasonable, the section of the tenure regulations most likely to be invoked in cases of post-tenure review is also one of the vaguest. It reads, "Professional incom-

University of Missouri-Columbia
AAUP Chapter

Annual Meeting
April 19, 2001

4:30 pm, Room 145, First Floor
William Stringer Wing, Eckles Hall

(same building as Buck's Ice Cream, Opposite Veterinary School)

All Welcome: Faculty and Graduate Students

petence in the performance of academic responsibilities. Intentional and habitual neglect of duty in the performance of academic responsibilities, provided that a written warning and a reasonable opportunity to correct the behavior have been given." In addition, as Agapito Mendoza, Vice Provost for Affirmative Action, advised me, "cause" in practice is frequently defined by the University lawyers in dismissal proceedings on a case by case basis.

Given this power of the administration to define causes ad hoc, and the vagueness of written university policies on dismissal for cause, the assertion that the post-tenure review document does not "create a new avenue to dismiss faculty with tenure" may be technically accurate but offers no grounds for reassurance. In fact, the document simply perpetuates a policy and a practice which, in its overly broad and vague range of operation, contains an invitation to arbitrariness and abuse. The process will be of little benefit to the faculty; rather it has real potential for intimidation. The prospect of undergoing what amounts to a mini-tenure review every five years can have a chilling effect on innovative, unorthodox, or unpopular expression, teaching, and research, the very things tenure was invented to protect. In addition, despite an appearance of broad faculty involvement in evaluation and judgment, the review process is weighted toward the administration. A negative five-year evaluation is triggered not by a peer evaluation but by the chair. Likewise, once a faculty member's five year record is deemed unsatisfactory, and a professional development plan has been mandated, "progress" is evaluated for three years by the chair alone; there is no peer review at this stage. Thus an inappropriate amount of power resides in the hands of a department chair or unit administrator. Finally, Post-Tenure Review and the Professional Development Plan are involuntary processes. Concerning the imposition of a Professional Development Plan, the document explicitly states that the faculty member "may not appeal."

At the very least, the post-tenure review process will be time-consuming and redundant, since chairs and P & T committees will have seen all the data already during the standard yearly reviews. Early in each Winter Semester, faculty at UMKC prepare detailed descriptions of their academic activities, in the form of the annual Faculty Activity

Report. This questionnaire elicits data about every aspect of our professional lives during the past year, and is used as a basis for decisions on retention, promotion, and salary raises, the rewards or sanctions each of us will receive.

If faculty members are falling behind in some area, they should by all means receive the benefit of constructive advice from their chair and colleagues. But this can already be done under the present system. We do not need a complex, bureaucratic, juggernaut of a document that can easily be misused for personal or political reasons. Faculty dismissing these concerns as exaggerated are referred to any number of articles in recent issues of *Academe* or *The Chronicle of Higher Education* detailing numerous arbitrary outrages perpetrated on faculty by university and college administrations. Doubters are also encouraged to attend the conference, "Education for Democracy: Fighting the Corporate Takeover" on March 3 at UMKC to learn about outrages close to home.

In light of the Curators' decision, the faculty of all the UM campuses need to come together to resist the imposition of this policy and this document, and if possible to achieve its repeal. To acquiesce without demur would be to accept another dangerous step toward disempowerment of the faculty and a grave threat to everyone's academic freedom.

Published with permission from The Faculty Advocate 1:3, 2001: newsletter of the University of Missouri-Kansas City AAUP Chapter.

It Could Happen to You (continued from page 1)

administrator. MU recognizes the absence of rights for non-regular faculty, but refuses to even discuss the issue until September 2002.

Meanwhile, the Administration has also increasingly denied tenure-track faculty the basic right to due process. This has been most evident in tenure application, the academic grievance processes, and in nonrenewals. The fundamental problem is that an expedient administrative culture has arisen that defends absolutely any administrative decision on a reflex basis, however misplaced.

Most faculty are unaware of these facts. For others, such events remain someone else's problems, until unexpectedly they also suffer arbitrary administrative consideration.

What would you do if you were an internationally respected scholar in a career non-tenure-track earning position, had been grant-funded over 20 years with a new grant, had generated considerable additional income for your department and were then fired, without cause, because of a personality difference between you and your new supervisor? Your supervisor then (allegedly) slanders you causing you to lose several job prospects. You find yourself in a position where you have no recourse but to legal action. The University has deep pockets and purposively implements a strategy to bankrupt you. Can this really happen? Absolutely! Not only is this scenario possible, but your supervisor can then attempt to take over your research grant.

If you are on the tenure-track, you might think that none of this could happen to you, for you have guaranteed rights to due process and academic freedom enshrined in the University Rules and Regulations. You would be wrong! In fact, you would find that your supervisor could indeed take over your grant and could prevent your access to the tenure process without consulting the faculty promotion and tenure committee of either your Department or School, and without consulting your Dean. You then find that your supervisor sabotages the offer of an endowed Chair by (allegedly) slandering you. When you seek to regain your reputation using the faculty irresponsibility process, the University suppresses it. The grievance process is first denied, and then fails to meet in the year of your terminal appointment. A campaign of pretextual justification is condoned in an attempt to justify the malfeasance. Characteristically, when you seek injunctive relief through the legal system, you experience obfuscation, meretricious claims, and deliberate procrastination. Impossible you might think! Unfortunately this is happening to our colleagues.

Such unforeseen difficulties can now happen to any one of us. The university world that we have known is changing. In this new supposed "corporate" environment, poor management can adopt the arbitrary principles of "hardball," and remain unaccountable to anyone. It is simply unacceptable.

The MU Academic Grievance Debacle (continued from page 3)

commitments entailed by the increasing grievances.

It would appear self-evident that the most effective way to reduce the number of grievances would be to reduce their causes. Unfortunately, the MU administrative culture has been to disregard the long-established principle that "a Faculty should monitor its own members" - in such areas as faculty status, annual assessment, faculty irresponsibility, and academic grievance - in direct contravention of the AAUP agreement. Some administrative malfeasance is too serious for the grievance process and in these cases the Administration must retain accountability and accept responsibility for its own. But MU prefers in all circumstances to hide within the fog of its grievance process and engage in a one-sided battle of attrition.

370.010 arranges for the administrator who is the subject of the grievance to avoid facing the charge(s). Instead, the Chancellor appoints a Respondent to represent the University interests. The Respondent is usually either the Dean of the School or a senior campus administrator, ensuring that most witnesses, and possibly Grievance Committee members, are subject to intimidation by their senior administrator. Administrative action concerning the grievant is further compromised by this obvious conflict of interest.

The Regulations stipulate a campus Academic Grievance Officer as the appropriate authority to establish due process and timeliness, but Chancellor Wallace has failed to make this appointment. A maximum of 6 months is stated as the time limit, but the mean duration is greater than 12 months. One current grievance is 4-years old, another has only just begun after 24 months, and another hasn't begun in 18 months. Regulation 370.010 F.3 provides for proceeding to the next step (of 3) if timeliness is not observed, but this statutory obligation is ignored. Considerable time is wasted by compulsory informal resolution that has had minimal historical success. This period encourages only a leisurely and conspiratorial attitude among grievor, respondent, and University Legal Council.

The Hearing Committee investigations

are held in camera which sounds equitable, except that this secrecy has only encouraged unintentional error and administrative chicanery. Due process must be seen to be done. Problems discovered have included: incomplete and inadequate communication of the charges to the hearing committee; partial consideration of charges; deliberate suppression of evidence by a hearing committee chair; misinformation and lying by respondents; intervention by University legal counsel (no role permitted in 370.010); failure to allow grievants the opportunity to "state their positions and to present witnesses and/or evidence;" and failure of the hearing committee to document its deliberations and conclusions. Finally, the Chancellor has refused to accept any criticism of his administrators and has reversed all judgments favorable to the grievant. President Pacheco has ignored almost all formal appeals.

The Mel George Committee recently proposed changes to 370.010. A useful framework of procedural rules for conduct of the hearing committee was proposed. The remainder of the proposals betrayed an institutional desire only to ratchet further illicit control over the academic grievance procedure, and revealed no serious interest in fixing it.

Where we should be going

The administrative culture that supports malfeasance by Chairs and Deans, irrespective of the facts, must cease if MU is to prosper. Cynicism breeds contempt. A crisis has arisen in faculty governance with Faculty Council's call for AAUP intervention and the de facto statement of no confidence in the Administration. Hope for responsible change probably does rest upon the possibility of a formal AAUP investigation.

There is no good substitute for the provision of sound grievance procedures honestly conducted. Confidence has to be restored. Binding arbitration is an alternative, but would have to depend on a formal external agency where an understanding of university affairs may be wanting. As the present grievance rules have been undermined by the ambient administrative culture, and particularly by the baleful hegemony that University Legal Counsel enjoys over faculty affairs, the greatest single improvement could be achieved by responsible and equitable management from Jesse Hall.

The Hearing Committees do need a procedural framework. Concerns over due process, equity, and timeliness, or of con-

stitutional, statutory, or customary interpretation, could be undertaken on a single issue basis by a standing Committee of Parliamentarians. This new entity would be appointed through Faculty Council and by the faculty of individual schools and provide a source of binding, independent decision-making. A specific Remediation Hearing should be held following any supportive decision of a Hearing Committee. Finally the Chancellor and the President must honor their constitutional roles in 370.010, and with fairness.

Faculty Governance at MU (continued from page 1)

appropriate time to develop a newsletter in which to give faculty the opportunity to share their views of critical issues on the campus. We are inspired in this respect by our colleagues at UMKC; we share Pat Brodsky's detailed analysis of the post-tenure review controversy with our readers. We also address the MU grievance debacle and the MU Health Care problems in this issue. We welcome your comments and articles, and we will publish them in the newsletter periodically. We will be even more pleased if one of our experienced readers would volunteer as editor.

There has never been a more important time to join the American Association of University Professors and the AAUP local chapter to help protect your future.

Post Tenure Review: Neither Benign nor Inevitable (continued from page 4)

Columbia the faculty respectfully requests that the Board of Curators refrain from implementing any form of post-tenure review on this campus." Nor is the only alternative to retain the present review system in use at UMKC, Chancellor's Memorandum #77. The UMKC faculty should take steps to rid ourselves of the current policy, and refuse any system-wide or other proposals that threaten tenure and the rights and freedoms it protects.

Published with permission from *The Faculty Advocate* 1:2, 2001: newsletter of the University of Missouri-Kansas City AAUP Chapter.

Anatomy of the Destruction of a Health Care Enterprise (continued from page 3)

however egregious. The Faculty Council of the Medical School initiated a faculty survey of the Chairmen (2000) and the results revealed, with only a few exceptions, lack of confidence in the Chairs and plummeting morale. No actions have been taken regarding this report in 6 months, despite the rapidly deteriorating situation.

It is not surprising that we went from a hospital with profits of \$M20 to one now projected to lose \$M20 - 30 per year. Since Dean Bryant left, and we named an auditorium after him, it became increasingly clear that we are a failing institution, both fiscally and intellectually.

Patients cannot gain access, and many of the best doctors and nurses have left or been fired. There is now a measurable reduction in patient care quality. The information science group with a staff of 250 employees cannot consistently generate a timely or accurate bill.

The University under President Pacheco hired Dr. Dan Winship, retired Dean of the Loyola University School of Medicine, in an attempt to save the institution. Dr. Winship has worked hard but perhaps did not perceive the depth of the problems. He has lobbied the legislature for additional funds for indigent care, but may get little support with this dysfunctional hospital operation. A great deal of pressure was placed on him to stop the financial loss. The issues of hospital leadership, patient access, quality of care, and billing demand major structural and cultural solutions. He hired an outside consulting team from Johnson and Johnson for \$M1.4, plus expenses, largely to review process. They recommended changes to reduce costs across the board, but little action regarding the major hospital operational failures has been taken.

These actions have only exacerbated the problems. In order to save money at the Ellis Fishel Hospital, Dr. Winship agreed to move the inpatient service to the University Hospital and essentially destroyed a potentially strong regional cancer center. He has not paid

enough attention to faculty. Physicians and nurses continue to leave at an alarming rate. Morale is at its lowest point ever. Excellent registered nurses have been terminated and replaced by temporary nurses at higher prices or by less qualified licensed practitioner nurses at lower rates. Even the hospital cafeteria was closed to relatives and staff at 2:30 p.m. creating a sense of institutional failure; a decision now reversed.

A great deal of time and energy has gone into forming private sector and hospital affiliations that fail historically. Some of our most profitable services have been moved to Capital Regional Hospital or to Columbia Regional Hospital - decisions which syphoned off considerable revenue into the private sector with losses accruing to the University Hospital and to University Physicians. This latter decision is perceived by the faculty as a face-saving arrangement so that medical school and university administrators evade responsibility for the ill-advised purchase of a money-losing operation.

It often appears that no one is actually running the Hospital. A walnut curtain surrounds upper management and they are rarely seen around the building. Accounts receivable are around \$M160 million, at least twice what they should be, with huge amounts written off as time-expired. Few concrete achievements have been obtained after 2-years of turmoil and the decayed institutional culture remains intact. The only fix that makes sense for this institution is to reverse the many mistakes that have occurred in the past, one mistake at a time.

It is possible that as faculty we show insufficient patience. However, the great majority of faculty and staff find little to encourage optimism. Even the hiring of a new Dean has failed to reassure us of future success. Recently, there have been further falls in patient numbers as a result of the lack of specialty physicians, difficult access, inconsistent care, and inability to generate an accurate and timely bill.

It is not surprising then, that interest has resurfaced at high administrative levels within the University to sell the hospital to a private corporation. Tenet Healthcare Corporation once again is believed to be a strong candidate. Such action would allow the books to

be forever closed. Moreover, the long-term stability of these hospital management groups is poor, and we would simply exchange one set of problems for another, and the second set we cannot ever control. There is no doubt that competent management can fix this hospital.

Major University institutions are difficult to build, and relatively easy to destroy. If the present leadership cannot reverse the situation, then effective leadership must be brought in. The University of Missouri Hospital is too important to the citizens of the State of Missouri to just sell it. University Hospital can and must be restored as a first class hospital and academic institution. As faculty, we need to restore administrative responsibility and faculty governance. This is a caring profession and physician leadership has to be restored at University Hospital.

AAUP CHAPTER, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

President AAUP Chapter
E2433 Engineering Building East
Columbia, MO 65211

Phone: 573-882-3568
Fax: 573-884-4801
Email: loyalkas@missouri.edu

AAUP Annual Spring Conference Meeting

Saturday, April 28

Holliday Inn Select, Columbia, Missouri

"The Present and the Future of the Profession: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, Adjunct and Graduate Student Faculty"

Our April 28 meeting in Columbia should accomplish two kinds of work: it should be an important day of understanding and discussion, in which we place "on the table" all the types of appointments and professional working conditions in which Missouri faculty teach and do scholarship. AAUP members should make a concerted effort to find and reach out to your local networks of non-tenure-track, adjunct and graduate school faculty. All MU faculty are very welcome

\$15.00 reservation includes lunch

American Association of University Professors
1012 Fourteenth Street, NW, Suite #500
Washington, DC 20005
1-800-424-2973

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zipcode _____
This address is my home work address
Daytime Telephone (____) _____
E-mail address _____
Institution _____
Academic Field and Rank _____
Tenured? _____

Full-Time: Teacher/researcher or similar academic appointment at an accredited college or university?

Entrant: Nontenured faculty, new to AAUP. (Limits: Four years at 50% *Full-Time* dues rate)?

Part-Time: Faculty receiving no more than 50% of the salary of a full-time faculty member?

Joint: Couples in the full time category may enroll a 2nd member at the joint rate?

Associate: Primarily Administrative Duties?

Graduate: Persons enrolled as graduate students at an institution (5 year limit.)?

Public: Public supporters not eligible for any of the above?

MISSOURI

National & Conference Dues (Mandatory)

\$134 Full-Time, \$101 Public, Associate, \$ 68 Entrant, Joint, \$ 35 Part-Time, \$ 10 Graduate

Integrated Chapter Dues (Optional)

\$ 5 U of Missouri-Columbia

\$ _____ National* & Conference Dues

\$ _____ Chapter Dues