

SUNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SYSTEM SPECTRUM

Panel plans for future needs of libraries

An advisory panel's report to the Board of Curators on library planning recommends the construction of a remote-storage facility in Columbia and changes across all four UM campuses.

UM President George A. Russell created the panel of five nationally recognized experts on university libraries in fall 1993, and the report was submitted to the board at its March 31-April 1 meeting in Kansas City.

The panel recommended that the University develop a remote facility primarily for the storage of UM-Columbia materials, with an initial capacity of 1.5 million to 1.8 million volumes. The facility would be also be used by the State Historical Society of Missouri, and could include engineering and health science materials held jointly with UM-Columbia by UM-Rolla and UM-Kansas City, respectively. The General Assembly is currently considering the University's request for funds for a remote-storage facility.

The space freed in Ellis Library through remote storage should be used to increase user seating capacity, the panel said.

The advisory panel's recommendations were based on an assessment of how quickly electronic publishing would become a factor in UM's need for library space. It concluded that electronic publishing would only slowly begin to affect space needs over the next decade.

The panel also said the current UM five-year plan for integrated technology will be critical to addressing library space needs in the future.

The committee's chairman was Jay Lucker, the director of libraries at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The other members were Bruce Ekstrand, vice chancellor for academic affairs, University of Colorado-Boulder; Malcolm Getz, director of libraries, Vanderbilt University; William Studer, director of libraries, Ohio State University; and Richard West, vice chancellor for business and finance, California State University. □

Curators make improvements to UM retirement benefits plan

The UM Board of Curators March 31 approved pension adjustments for most retirees or their survivors. The pension increases complement a set of earlier changes that improved death benefits for active employees. Both changes were recommended by the UM Retirement and Staff Benefit Committee.

The changes approved by the Board improve the retirement plan in three ways.

First, the new policy will allow 100 percent survivor benefits for spouses of vested employees who die prior to retirement. Such amount will be reduced for employee age and age of the spouse, along with an overall reduction for the joint survivor arrangement.

Prior to the change, in the event of death, the surviving spouse of an active employee received a 50 percent survivor benefit, with commensurate reductions. The survivor of a vested employee was paid twice the employee's annual salary, plus a residual annuity amount if the 50 percent survivor benefit exceeded twice the annual salary. If the employee retired prior to death, he or she could choose a 100 percent survivor's benefit for her or his spouse. In other words, as it was explained by President George Russell, "If you knew when you were going to die, your spouse would be a lot better off if you retired the day before your death."

The cost to the University for the expanded coverage will be modest because additional costs will occur only in connection with the few employees who die accidentally or soon after onset of illness.

The new policy also provides a payout option for surviving spouses. The change will allow the spouse the option of taking the full benefit from the plan as an annuity, rather than a lump-sum payment and, in some cases, a residual annuity.

The second revision eliminated the rule in effect for employees who retired prior to September 1990 that terminated the surviving spouse's pension if he or she remarried. The new policy allows a surviving spouse to continue to receive a pension in the event of remarriage.

Third, in an effort to streamline appeals by faculty and staff, on creditable service determinations or interpretations of the retirement plan, appeals will no longer be

heard by the Board of Curators. As before, an appeal would be made to the Retirement and Staff Benefit Committee. If the employee disagrees with the committee decision, the next and final appeal will be to the University president.

Another major change approved by the curators adjusts retiree pensions effective May 1, 1994.

The University uses a defined pension plan for its employees, which means it has a

Pension adjustments will be considered annually and will be provided on an *ad hoc* basis.

contractual commitment to pay a pension for the length of a retiree's life. The amount is determined using a formula based upon the salary history prior to retirement, number of years of service with the University and age at retirement.

The University does not have a defined formula in the retirement plan to determine cost of living increases. Rather, pension adjustments will be considered annually and will be provided on an *ad hoc* basis.

Significant "catch-up" increases occurred in 1970, 1975 and 1978. From 1980 to 1989, the University followed an *ad hoc* practice of giving annual pension adjustments based on two-thirds of the salary increase provided to all active employees, or the percentage of the Consumer Price Index (CPI), whichever resulted in the lesser adjustment.

The one-time action will adjust pensions based on the lesser of the *cumulative* CPI or two-thirds of the *cumulative* average salary increases given to active staff.

The University has not provided any pension adjustment since 1990 for *all* retirees, and no pensioners who retired after Sept. 1, 1988, have received a pension adjustment.

The amount of pension increase will range from 0 to 19.5 percent. Those who retired from 1966 through August 1974 will not receive a pension adjustment because their accumulated increases since the time of their retirement exceed the new formula. □

McHugh envisions University Extension as model for 21st century

The following is excerpted from a speech given by James L. McHugh, president of the UM Board of Curators, March 25 at the Missouri Extension County Council Leadership Conference in Columbia.

A lot of water has gone under the bridge since Vermont Congressman Justin Morrill sponsored a federal act in 1862 founding land-grant colleges to "teach agriculture and the mechanic arts" and since the 1914 Smith-Lever Act provided for land-grant colleges to extend their teaching off the campus.

Our world leadership in agriculture is the indisputable reminder that education, open to all and focused on learning that applies university research to real economic needs, should not be divorced from federal and state strategies for economic growth.

The land-grant experiment established very early in the public mind the ideal that science and humanities taught in the home and in the fields differs only in facilities and technical range from the teaching of the university classroom.

Whether by design or by accident, we have created a uniquely American institution in University Extension that has the potential to influence the future of this country, possibly more than it has influenced the past.

These councils have a uniquely American dedication to the practical application of knowledge for economic betterment and the improvement of the quality of life in their communities.

We find ourselves today in a world where most of our institutions simply don't work well anymore in the new reality of the global community that is united and served by electronically shared information, face-to-face telecommunications, expert systems and artificial intelligence.

It is a community in which individuals have joined machines in the exchange and creation of knowledge. It is a community that calls for

new, dynamic organizations with the ability to respond quickly to changing conditions, open and focused outward, with information networking redefining institutional jurisdictions.

As telecommunications unite us electronically, regardless of physical location, it is interesting to note that University Extension was the first to perfect remote delivery of information and educational services.

It is ironic that we may have created by accident of history a uniquely American institution, the land-grant extension system, that more appropriately fits and is more easily adapted to the design requirements of this age of information technology than most other organizations.

It is these considerations that qualify the county extension councils as the ideal candidates to lead the integration of telecommunication technology into the culture of the cities and towns across Missouri.

Who is better positioned to determine the needs of a local community than the people who live there.

Who is better positioned to set the community priorities and to define programs to best serve local needs than the people who live there.

Who is better equipped to perfect an electronic delivery system that fits into and serves the community

culture than the people who live there.

The future may be clearer than we think. History has provided us with proven experiences and direction: The Morrill Act gives us a model for an industrial and educational policy that works; the network of extension councils presents us with a model for the new responsive, customer-oriented and customer-driven organizations of the 21st century; and University Extension provides us with the current leadership for our task of redefining the meaning of the land-grant mission in this age of information technology and unprecedented scientific development.

It is comforting to know that in these turbulent but exciting times, our future is securely in the hands of the people who live there. □



James L. McHugh

Russell proposes brainstorming groups

UM President George A. Russell has proposed that groups of faculty, students, staff, and administrators be formed to come up with ideas to improve the University's quality.

Russell mentioned his plans for "continuous improvement groups" at the Board of Curators meeting March 31 in Kansas City.

"We plan to use a model that proved highly successful for a major corporation headquartered in the Midwest," Russell said, referring to Phillips Petroleum. "We are working on ways to include as many students and employees as we can. ... We will beg, borrow, or steal good ideas from others and use them with honor."

Russell told the curators he will report back to them on the details of the brainstorming effort in the months to come. His proposal came at the end of a discussion of University management philosophy, particularly regarding the definition of the word "quality."

"Your continued reference to quality and improving the quality of the University," Russell told the board, "makes me certain that unless we know what is meant, and how we will measure progress toward improving quality, we will never attain the goals you desire."

Russell said that while he expects no broad consensus on what "quality" means, addressing the University's national reputation could be useful.

"The University of Missouri is the only major public research university in the state and the only public academic institution responsible for doctoral-level work and professional training," Russell said. "Reputation in the public Association of American Universities institutions can serve as a good measure of our quality."

Measuring the quality of undergraduate education, Russell said, won't be as easy, especially when outdated assumptions are still in use. Russell noted that of the 12.5 million students enrolled across the nation, fewer than 2 million are the traditional college students of a generation ago — 18-22 years old and full-time campus residents. □

UMR's Sears named student representative

Gov. Mel Carnahan April 4 named Andrew L. Sears, a junior at UM-Rolla, student representative to the UM Board of Curators. Sears, a native of Blue Springs, is studying electrical engineering. His term will end in December 1995. □

Committee estimates damage of Hancock II to education

The Committee to Protect Missouri's Future has reported that passage of the Hancock II Amendment to the Missouri Constitution would result in funding losses equivalent to approximately \$1,900 per student in the state's public four-year colleges and universities.

According to the committee, the state of Missouri would lose, through a combination of budget cuts and tax refunds, approximately \$1.16 billion in fiscal year 1996.

Of that amount, \$206 million would be applied to higher education. If allocated proportionately, the committee states,

public four-year institutions would lose 85 percent, or more than \$175 million of the total.

Such a loss in funding would be the equivalent of about \$1,900 per student, based on fall 1993 enrollment of 91,870 full time equivalent students. The University of Missouri enrolled nearly 52,000 students in the fall of 1993, a full time equivalent enrollment of more than 38,000.

Persons with further questions may contact Rodney Gray, executive director of the Committee to Protect Missouri's Future, at (314) 761-9030 in Jefferson City.

SPECTRUM

is published seven times a year, following UM Board Of Curators meetings, for University of Missouri System faculty, staff and retirees by UM System University Relations, 828 Lewis Hall, Columbia, Mo. 65211, in cooperation with the UM-Columbia, -Kansas City, -Rolla and -St. Louis information offices.



Editor
Martha Brendel
314-882-0607

Circulation:
314-882-4591

