Minutes of IFC Retreat
August 2-3, 2001

Members attending: Lawrence Barton, Judith Goodman, Leonard Koederitz, Judith Goodman, Donald Myers, Kathleen Schweitzberger, Jakob Waterborg, Ralph Wilkerson, Russ Zguta

Others attending: Ralph Caruso (8/3 only), Steve Graham (by teleconference on 8/3 only), Steve Lehmkuhle (8/3 only), Tom Sharpe (by teleconference on 8/3 only), Paula Short, Kandis Smith, Jim Snider (8/3 only)

Following dinner, the meeting began on Thursday, August 2nd, at 7:00 PM with the introduction of those present. The Chair then suggested that the topics that IFC Representatives had identified preceding the meeting retreat be considered. Those topics in order of highest priority were:

1. Research Board
2. Centralization
3. Performance Standards
4. Campus Administrator Review Process
5. Tracking of Implementation of PeopleSoft
6. Current Budget Choices, system-wide and on individual campuses, and for the next years, as a focus for maintaining campus and program viability and recruiting/retaining/rewarding faculty and staff

Items added for consideration were:

7. Faculty Performance Shares Plan
8. Proposed Intellectual Property (Copyright) Policy

The concern expressed by Russ Zguta relative to the research board topic was whether the selection process was going to be altered with the decrease in funds available, as well as whether there would continue to be a bias toward junior faculty. There was an interest expressed also in learning more about the level of success achieved by past Research Board award winners generating external funds. This topic was to be pursued further with Steve Lehmkuhle on Friday.

There was interest in learning more about the specifics of the UM System’s plan for centralization of certain activities, including purchasing. Specifically, there was some skepticism as to whether savings in fact could be achieved and whether there would be unreasonable constraints on the flexibility of purchasing locally. A study done some time previously, known as the Knight Report, had recommended that there should be decentralization. Concern was expressed as to how the savings from centralization would be tracked. This topic would be discussed further by Ralph Caruso on Friday.
The reports of the attending IFC Representatives on the extent of progress in developing minimum performance standards as required for the Review of Faculty Performance (310.015(B)(1)(a)) varies across campuses and even on campuses. The concern was with the consequences if there were no minimum performance standards should a department Chair try to invoke the Review of Faculty Performance policy with no such standards available. The issue was to be discussed with Steve Lehmkuhle on Friday.

It was concluded that campus administrator review process was provincial to each campus and that later in the academic year each campus could report their efforts and lessons learned.

There was concern expressed with the implementation of PeopleSoft and the disruption resulting from the change over the present systems and PeopleSoft. Ralph Caruso will make a report on Friday.

Interest was expressed in the Current Budget Planning Process and concern with the significant budget cuts made without requesting any faculty input. It was concluded that Jim Cofer would be requested to meet with IFC for its September meeting to discuss the process and the role of the faculty in that process.

Steve Lehmkuhle will be requested to report on Faculty Performance Shares Plan on Friday.

Kandis Smith and Steve Lehmkuhle will report on the Proposed Intellectual Property Policy on Friday.

Tom Sharpe will report on proposed changes for Patent Royalty Distribution Formula on Friday.

Additional items in which it was concluded that they should be continued to be pursued were tuition wavier for dependents and contract starting date. Ken Hutchinson will be requested to report the result of his continued study of these issues at the IFC September meeting.

The New Faculty Teaching Scholars Program was discussed. It is designed for the purposes of establishing a comprehensive, system-wide program to build collegiality and capacity for new faculty. The question was raised as to whether the program would lead to addition retention. It was concluded that a mid-year progress report to IFC would be requested.

The last topic for the Thursday evening was the schedule for IFC meetings during the academic year. It was concluded that Steve Lehmkuhle’s office would be requested to provide assistance in coordinating the planning of the schedule. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 PM.
The meeting continued on Friday at 8:40 AM with Steve Graham joined the meeting by teleconference to discuss the President’s Academic Leadership Institute. The Institute will provide additional leadership activities for faculty in curriculum development. Concern was expressed that faculty see no reward for providing such leadership.

Kandis Smith presented most recent draft of the proposed Intellectual Property (Copyright) Policy. Underlying principles of the policy includes that copyright ownership resides with the author unless there are use of substantial university resources. A written agreement between the author and university is encouraged. If there is no agreement, then the ownership will belong to the faculty if it is created in the course and scope of employment. The faculty is to be given the opportunity to review the final draft of the proposed policy with a process much like that used for the Review of the Faculty Performance Policy for review.

Tom Sharpe joined the meeting by teleconference to discuss proposed changes in the Patent Royalties Distribution Policy. The proposed change is motivated by the consequences of the small budget available for outside patent counsel to prepare patent applications. The UM patent applications and filing budget would need to be increased 4 to 6 times to match other AAU institutions’ budgets. The proposal would modify the present formula from the first one third of royalties being distributed to the inventor(s), then following the deduction of unreimbursed patent and related costs, the remaining royalties being divided equally between the UM System, the campus, and the department of the inventor to the Office of Technology & Special Projects (OSTP) first taking 15 percent of the royalties, with the inventor receiving 40 percent of the first $100,000 of royalties and 30 percent in excess of $100,000 after OSTP deduction with the remainder distributed equally between the University System, campus, and the department of the inventor.

Jim Snyder briefed the attendees on legislative issues. He suggested that these were times of tight funding. Revenue is forecasted to be flat at best for the new fiscal year. The base funding will include mission enhancement funds, i.e., they are delayed as a result of the withholding this fiscal year but not lost. More accountability for teaching will be insisted on by Governor Holden. It be expected that State auditors will have more involvement relative to this accountability. A citizens committee is looking at a sales tax increase for funding road construction/maintenance which would eliminate a future potential source of increased funds for education. Conflict of interest will be an issue as a result of the UM nuclear reactor incident. Steve Lehmkuhle offered the thought that the present self-disclosure UM policy is not going to be sufficient to satisfy legislators. It is thought that if the present self-disclosure policy is not changed, UM will be governed by the CBHE policy. It was indicated that there are no Post Tenure Review or Alcohol Abuse issues with the legislature. Spoken English is always a possible issue with the legislators. There are potential repercussions, i.e., silent price, of the present four percent (4%) UM annual raises even though there exist a lag from the state ten year average raises of 25 percent for the state compared to 21 percent for the UM. The General Education Block (42 hours) is expected to be put in place. The tobacco settlement will include $8 million aid for the UMC Hospital to match $13 million from the Federal
government in FY2002 for indigent care. The result is that other campuses will not have to take cuts to support the hospital. There will be funds from the tobacco settlement to support three life science research centers in St. Louis, Kansas City, and at UMC.

Ralph Caruso reported on the status of **PeopleSoft** implementation. He serves as Chair of the Steering Committee including Ken Hutchinson, Jim Cofer, Steve Lehmkuhle, and campus representatives. The committee is one of “joint ownership”. As of July 1, the general ledger and budget module of PeopleSoft is operational. The payroll and the base human resource modules may be operational by October 1. The student system pilot at UMR is expected to be operational by October 1. The PeopleSoft implementation schedule has been delayed and is expected to be completed in July of 2003, one year behind schedule.

Insights into the plans for **centralization** were provided by Ralph Caruso. There is a related committee of Caruso, Blanche Touhill, Richard Wallace, and Steve Lehmkuhle reporting to the UM General Officers. The purpose of centralization is for cost containment. Procurement is to stay with the campuses by ordering through central procurement agreements. Variation from these agreements would be allowed.

It was reported by Steve Lehmkuhle that the **Research Board** would focus on new faculty and special projects but ask that the current policies be maintained.

Steve Lehmkuhle indicated that the **tenure policy** would be changed to eliminate instructors from being a tenure track position. He reiterated the need for rapid resolution of the matter of **conflict of interest policy** from being a self-reporting system. A handout was provided that indicated the distribution of **Faculty Performance Shares** funds on each campus. He noted that each campus followed their unique strategic goals.

Relative to minimum **performance standards** for the Review of Faculty Performance, Steve Lehmkuhle indicated that the process is designed to give credible feedback to faculty. As to the matter of the lack of any departmental minimum performance standards, he suggested the Chair/unit head would not have a basis for invoking the policy without minimum performance standards. He would expect that the Curators at some point would be asking for a report on the implementation of the new policy on Review of Faculty Performance.

Finally, Steve Lehmkuhle discussed new programs for academic planning

Respectfully Submitted,

Don Myers and Lenn Koederitz