Members in Attendance: Sudarshan Loyalka, Chair, MU; Michael Devaney, MU; Eileen Porter, Secretary, MU; Jakob Waterborg, UMKC; Max Skidmore, UMKC; Van Reidhead, UMSL; Rocco Cottone, UMSL; Todd Hubing, UMR; Leonard Koederitz, UMR; and Ralph Wilkerson, UMR. Kathleen Schweitzberger, UMKC and Lois Pierce, UMSL could not attend.

Call to Order: S. Loyalka convened the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of January 31, 2003 were approved as previously circulated (moved L. Koederitz/seconded J. Waterborg/consensus). E. Porter will send them to K. Volle to be posted on the IFC website.

Agenda Items:

1. Charge to Faculty Workload Policy Subcommittee
2. Policies with Respect to Athletics
3. Research Board
4. Faculty Benefits / Salary Adjustment Policies
   (Prior to this meeting, S. Loyalka had arranged for VP Hutchinson to discuss this issue with the IFC on April 23, 2003.)

Review of the Agenda:
By consensus, the IFC made three additions to the agenda:
5. Promotion and Tenure Issues, J. Waterborg
6. Graduate Supplemental Fee Policy Revision, R. Cottone
7. Posting of IFC minutes to the IFC website, E. Porter.

Discussion of Agenda Items:

1. Charge to Faculty Workload Policy Subcommittee.
S. Loyalka announced that L. Koederitz, L. Pierce, J. Waterborg and E. Porter (Chair) would serve on the subcommittee. S. Loyalka requested that the subcommittee prepare a statement regarding suggestions for modification of the Executive Guideline on Instructional Workload (relative to Section 310.080, Faculty Workload Policy, of the UM System Collected Rules and Regulations). He recommended that the subcommittee work to encompass all aspects of faculty workload as referenced in Section 310.080.

J. Waterborg commented upon a problem associated with implementing to the instructional waiver feature of the Executive Guideline. That is, a department chair cannot readily identify when a waiver might be needed for a particular faculty member, who might have to either teach
an extra course to substitute for a colleague or teach (unexpectedly) in the summer. He noted that the data collection and reporting mechanisms at both campus and system levels are problematic, and this is a topic of discussion by UMKC faculty and administrators. For instance, data relative to research efforts are now focused only on research supported by general operating funds, rather than external sources also.

E. Porter noted the logic and consistency between the initial reference to the departmental workload model in Section 310.080, Part A. and the later reference to the three aspects of individual faculty workload in Section 310.080, Parts C and D. She remarked that whereas some departments surely could improve their efforts in developing appropriate workload models and in making decisions about the workload of individual faculty, a critical missing link is the aggregation and reporting of “departmental/division workload data” by the UM System, as required in Section 310.080, Part B. She remarked that in her view the basic and critical features of a faculty workload policy consistent with the university’s mission were inherent in Section 310.080. She concluded by noting that the subcommittee would consider these issues, in keeping with the remarks of President Floyd at the last IFC meeting (1/31/03) concerning the need to focus on reporting faculty workload data (a) in the aggregate and (b) across the spectrum of the university’s mission, in lieu of focusing on the nuances of an individual’s workload.

M. Devaney noted that a possible motivation for the Executive Guideline was the difficulty of some department chairs in balancing the activities of the faculty, remarking that this is a personnel matter involving effective performance of chairs. V. Reidhead indicated the importance of seeking best reporting practices, so that the university might report outcomes that reflect our values and our mission. M. Devaney noted that the public could easily misinterpret individual-level data. Faculty workload data must be viewed in a systematic manner, and departmental data collected must be consistent with data collected by the system.

VP S. Lehmkuhle was unable to attend the IFC meeting due to illness, and he had asked Asst. V.P S. Graham to attend in his place. Asst. VP Graham and Assistant to the President S. Knorr joined the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

Discussion on Federal Programs/Funding
S. Loyalka expressed the gratitude of the faculty concerning S. Knorr’s efforts in enabling the faculty to secure funding from various federal sources in the past. On behalf of the faculty, he sought S. Knorr’s advice as to how faculty could be more involved in these funding processes at the outset, so that the best faculty proposals and ideas would have the best opportunities to be considered for funding (or better opportunities than is currently possible in some cases). S. Knorr thanked S. Loyalka and suggested that he begin by summarizing the federal relations effort. Although faculty and others often think of it as a process of seeking and securing “pork,” his efforts are multifaceted. He and his staff work on seeking the support of Missouri’s delegation to the U.S. Congress for federal funding in several areas, including earmarked projects and competitive grants. In addition, they work to raise the university’s stature nationwide by enabling opportunities for appointments of faculty members to national advisory committees. In all of these efforts, S. Knorr encourages members of the delegation to send letters of support and to talk with officials of various federal departments.
S. Knorr noted that all of these efforts have taken the university to a new level of national prominence. Whereas the earmarking aspect of the effort has been extremely successful (yielding $200 million in the last four years), it is not reasonable to expect further improvement in that area, because the committee assignments of key members of the delegation have been a key factor. At this point, we must work more on becoming increasingly competitive in the other opportunities. On behalf of the UM System, S. Knorr initiates campus-based development of an annual list of priorities for federal funding opportunities. Typically, he works with the Vice Provost for Research on each campus. At present he is working on FY2004, having sought campus-based priorities in August, which were due back to him by November 1. From the VP for Research, the call for proposals goes to department chairs, then to faculty, and then back up the chain. Each decision-maker has opportunity for input in providing a ranking from each campus. This is not a competitive grant process; each project put forward by a campus is summarized on a two-page brief, and one year of support is requested. Having prepared a compendium of all project briefs, S. Knorr will discuss it with the President and seek input on the President’s priorities. He will be meeting with President Floyd soon about this matter.

Although the members of the delegation have been very responsive to the university’s priorities, they have their own priorities in view of current events and other situations. After funding a project for an initial year, the delegation will gauge the feedback on the project from a variety of sources as they make their decisions about increasing support over time.

S. Knorr then invited questions. S. Loyalka inquired about the initiation of peer review of the proposals by the UM System Research Board prior to review by the President. S. Knorr responded that the procedure has been established so that the ranking of proposals comes moves from faculty through various levels of administration on each campus and finally to system administration. Because this matter is not within his purview, he suggested that faculty work with campus administrators on this matter.

J. Waterborg inquired about the issue that arises when other funding comes in to an earmarked project. S. Knorr noted that the ultimate motive of the delegation is to help the state move forward by enabling the university do so. He has found that the delegation understands if a change needs to be made as long as the timing is appropriate.

In closing, S. Knorr remarked, “Your imagination is our boundary.” If faculty can think of it, his staff will do their best to help us bring it about. Although he is happy to answer questions of individual faculty, he cannot add priorities brought to his attention by individual faculty members, because it is a campus-based system. S. Knorr encouraged IRF members to remind faculty to keep current with federal priorities and initiatives and to maintain flexibility. The weakest component of the federal relations effort is in the strategic thinking that would enable us to effectively influence the research funding priorities of particular federal agencies. In this realm of the effort, he believes that the sky is the limit. In S. Knorr’s view, we need to work to ensure that members of our delegation are aware of our research strengths in specific areas, so that perhaps these can be targeted in the budgets of the federal agencies that fund research. Some other research universities focus solely on those kinds of efforts rather than earmarking. S. Loyalka thanked S. Knorr for a thorough review of the federal relations effort.
Student Fee Increase for Fall 2003
S. Graham shared the news release (see Appendix 1) concerning the decision of President Floyd and the General Officers to hold the fee increase for fall 2003 to the level of inflation. This action was taken in view of the assurance by Governor Holden and the legislative leaders that they will do their best to hold the university harmless. L. Koederitz inquired as to how the UM System can take a $5 million cut, which is 55% of the latest anticipated budget withholding from the State of Missouri. S. Graham responded that he believed that President Floyd felt this was the appropriate thing to do, but he did not know the specific reasons. However, in general, S. Graham noted that President Floyd views the System office as a value-added opportunity to enable the work of the campuses, which is the same approach that VP Lehmkuhle and he have taken in their work on each of the four campuses.

Department/Unit Reviews
S. Graham noted that the program reviews have tended to be bureaucratic in tone without much involvement by the faculty. VP Lehmkuhle has been concerned about this for some time. Their office has initiated an effort to view program reviews as formative and more developmental, so as to address the question, “Why do we do what we do?” They have created a departmental audit pilot program, involving 25 faculty members of different departments across the different campuses. A team of six faculty members visited one department on each campus. The dialogue with these other colleagues enables the departmental faculty to reconsider their own processes. It is also a very useful opportunity for the audit team to be exposed to new ideas. V. Reidhead has been involved. He believes it will be very effective in evaluating undergraduate and graduate teaching programs. It is a radical alternative, in his view, to the way in which we have conducted program review. The point of enabling the department to look at its objectives and the extent to which it is meeting the objectives is new, essential, and exciting. However, those conversations enable consideration of a critical question that typically has not been addressed: “What are the processes that are enabling the objectives to be met?” S. Graham noted that when faculty members ask each other questions of why and how, it opens up a new level of dialogue.

In response to J. Waterborg’s question, S. Graham differentiated the pilot departmental review effort from the program viability audit. Institutional Research will generate data relative to program viability, and each Provost’s office will then decide which departments they want to look at based on parameters of student numbers and faculty productivity. No specific action about program viability will be linked to any specific set of quantitative data.

S. Graham reiterated that there is no punitive element in the pilot program at present. However, a more responsive component could be added, and the departmental faculty could come up with their own ideas for improvement as well as a timetable for implementation. V. Reidhead noted the obvious benefits of the faculty from the different campuses working together. J. Waterborg inquired as to how the participating departments had been selected, and S. Loyalka wondered if this was an ad hoc effort. S. Graham responded that this was done in place of the usual five-year program review. Upon the request of VP Lehmkuhle to each Provost, one department on each campus had volunteered for the pilot project.

S. Graham explained that there was neither a plan nor an expectation that the template of this pilot project would take the place of program review. This effort will be informative to the usual...
process with possible changes in that procedure coming upon evaluation of the pilot. There will be a wrap-up, debriefing session with all of the auditors to review what was learned as a result of this effort. Some members of the team of faculty auditors will meet with the Provosts to explore alternatives. E. Porter suggested that what had been learned about departmental processes (and about how to ask good questions about departmental processes) could be useful to everyone even at this initial stage. L. Loyalka suggested that a report about this effort be published in the *Spectrum*. UMSL has asked for specific help with their departmental review process; VP Lehmkuhle and S. Graham and staff will do this in 2003-2004.

The IFC resumed discussion of agenda items.

2. Policies with Respect to Athletics
M. Devaney noted that the MU Faculty Council has been very involved in raising issues concerning Section 200.040 in the Collected Rules (Student Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics). (See Appendix 2, the original version.) A chief concern has been the potential for a conflict of interest on the part of the athletic director who currently has the responsibility of deciding whether a student athlete charged with a felony will be suspended from athletic participation. The principal reason for the faculty’s concern is that the athletic director’s contract includes a performance incentive. On February 27, 2003, the MU Faculty Council approved a Resolution Regarding Student Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics (see Appendix 3). The MU Faculty Council is recommending that the decision-making about suspending a player who is charged with a felony be transferred from the athletic director to the Provost. M. Devaney also distributed an article printed in *Academe* (see Appendix 4), in which the rationale for the change is summarized. The main rationale is that of accountability; the MU Faculty Council believes that the Provost is in a better position to evaluate the impact of a student’s alleged behavior upon the mission of the university. Although the MU resolution is in keeping with MU’s governance structure, it was recognized that the governance structure is different across the four campuses. As this was a discussion item today, M. Devaney requested that IFC members discuss this matter with their colleagues to consider campus-specific implications of the resolution. This resolution will be an action item at the next meeting. The goal will be to seek a change (of the type and for the reasons discussed above) in Section 200.040 of the Collected Rules and Regulations.

*VP Krawitz joined the meeting at 11:00 a.m.*

Update on the University’s Budget Situation. Concerning FY 2003, VP Krawitz noted that the state has withheld GO revenues of $9.5 million. The “Other Curator Programs” have also had a withholding. These programs include University Hospital, MOREnet and MObius, although the latter two were held harmless. The System took a 1.25% withholding, and each campus took a withholding of 1.25%, except that the System also took one-half of the 1.25% withholding for UMSL to protect their academic programs. President Floyd had received the assurance of the Chancellors that in taking this withholding, they would hold academic programs harmless. Some of the funds needed to manage the withholding came from the System’s contingency fund of $3.5 million. Each of the administrative units took a 2.5% cut on general revenue, and they pulled some small reserves in other areas. They might need to pull money from other sources, because this might not be the entire withholding for the year. The State of Missouri is projecting a short fall of $350 million, but the deficit could exceed that amount.
The budget for FY2004 (see Appendix 5) will be presented to the Curators in May 2003. The increase in benefits costs will be substantial. With the legislators, VP Hutchinson has been advocating for the University to retain its current health benefit program rather than becoming part of a larger buying group of all state employees. S. Loyalka distributed a letter from VP Hutchinson to Senator Kinder (see Appendix 6). As VP Krawitz explained it, the General Officers view the effort represented by Senate Bill 450 as a case of sub-optimization. Another major issue is the retirement fund. The actuarial report has just been increased, and we will have to contribute 6.7% next year. This year, we contributed less than 3%. Although an increase was anticipated, the General Officers are working with consultants to make sure that the asset allocation in the retirement fund is best in terms of a long-range investment (15, 20, or 30 years). We have more than sufficient funds to meet the required capacity for an 8% annual disbursal. For planning purposes they have put into the budget a 2% compensation pool adjustment; this is really for equity market and merit. The new tuition reimbursement package for dependent is included in this package. VP Krawitz discussed the 3.2% increase in student fees for fall, which will be considered by the Curators at the March meeting. The General Officers might need to seek approval to increase fees for Winter 2004. At present, there is budget shortfall of $16.7 million, with a remaining shortfall of $.8 million after the core reductions realized due to VERIP. If there would be a further 5% cut in state core funding, the net budget shortfall would be $21.4 million, but VP Krawitz is guardedly optimistic about the likelihood of a further cut.

Concerning FY2005 (see Appendix 7), VP Krawitz presented very preliminary information concerning appropriations request. She noted that the phrase “cost to continue” is basically a reflection of the inflationary increase. L. Koederitz sought verification of the perception that UMR did not get all of its allocation of Mission Enhancement monies, although the other institutions of higher education in the state did receive their complete Mission Enhancement allocations. VP Krawitz confirmed that this was the case due to timing of cuts to the budget core. In the FY2005 budget, the General Officers will establish as a base the budget as it was prior to the recent cuts to the core. At the same time, they recognize that the budget will be flat, based on previous statements of the legislature. The General Officers have discussed presenting this “new method” of viewing the budget with the “old method [i.e., FY 2004 method] as a footnote.

VP Krawitz noted that the issue of funding equity occurs and reoccurs at each level of the university, from individuals to the system. They believe it is important to look at resource requirements to operate what we have. Then knowing that you have limited resources, you have distributive justice issues (with need, contribution, and effort as key parameters). A sophisticated resource needs model was developed some time ago here at the university to consider the varying costs of different programs, levels of programs, and look at it over time, looking at the various facets of the university’s efforts to create an algorithm in each area. They are beginning to look at underlying principles and components of the model. Because this design is in effect a policy governing budgetary allocations, they will take to the Board of Curators in March. J. Waterborg asked whether the model could incorporate differences in terms of the abilities of various departments can generate in external funding. VP Krawitz affirmed that this would be the case, noting that there are campus-to-campus differences in this capacity as well. R. Cottone emphasized the importance of addressing the equity issue at UMSL, noting that they did not want to be less than fourth on the list of the state’s institutions of higher education in terms of funding per student. At this point, he noted that UMSL is around tenth on this parameter. VP
Krawitz noted that we need to address such issues of equity within the System to the extent possible, recognizing that it is a zero-sum game. She also noted the important difference between equity and equality in view of the fact that certain vital programs are extremely expensive. She noted that focusing only or primarily on FTE is problematic for a variety of reasons, including the limited relationship between that parameter and the other facets of the university’s mission.

Luncheon Session: S. Loyalka convened the IFC at 12:00 p.m.
President Floyd, VP Ron Turner, VP Ralph Carruso, and VP Ken Hutchinson joined the group. V. Reidhead departed to attend another meeting.

President Floyd asked VP Carruso to report on the grants module of People Soft. He noted that we went live in sequence on all the campuses, with UMR the last to implement. Based on his ongoing dialogue with users, he has a detailed list of about 65 items that warrant attention. These items have been placed on lists of priorities to be addressed within 30 days, 60 days, or 90 days respectively. He made note of the resolution of the UMSL Faculty Senate to not implement the module (as discussed at the IFC meeting of January 31, 2003). He would like further input from V. Reidhead about this matter, and he would be happy to visit UMSL to offer assistance. R. Cottone will follow up with V. Reidhead and schedule such a session. R. Cottone noted that the faculty and staff at UMSL continue to have concerns about the PeopleSoft grant module.

Campus Reports:

M. Devaney reported for MU. M. Devaney reiterated the gratitude of the faculty for the President Floyd’s speech at the legislature. He presented a resolution adopted by the MU Faculty Council on December 12, 2002, entitled, “A Procedure to be Followed for Mergers and Consolidations of Academic Units” (see Appendix 8). He noted the recommendation that this procedure be followed for mergers and consolidations that do not involve the loss of tenured faculty but might be undertaken for improving efficiency. With regard to student participation in intercollegiate athletics, M. Devaney noted that faculty have been deeply concerned about the potential for conflict of interest due to these concurrent circumstances: (a) the performance incentive clause in the athletic director’s contract and (b) the responsibility of the athletic director to determine whether a suspension from athletic play is in order when a student athlete is accused of a felony. The recommendation of the MU Faculty Council is that the Provost be the decision-maker concerning a student athlete’s suspension from intercollegiate athletic activity. President Floyd asked the IFC to summarize its earlier discussion on this matter; members highlighted points from the discussion summarized on page 5 of these minutes. M. Devaney gave President Floyd a copy of the MU Faculty Council resolution (see Appendix 3), emphasizing that the resolution had been tailored to MU. M. Devaney noted that this had been a discussion item at this meeting, and that IFC representatives would consider it in view of the varying governance structures on each campus. Finally, he noted that this would be an action item at the April meeting of the IFC. President Floyd noted that it was important to address this issue promptly.

L. Koederitz reported for UMR. Due to ongoing dialogue, some doors of communication have opened between the Chancellor and faculty. The School of Engineering has recently implemented a reduction in the core curriculum to 128 credits. The 42-credit general education requirement is also under review. UMR is considering an affiliation with a different athletic
conference to better enable students to compete. The issue of joint appointment has surfaced, and it has been of greater interest during the process of reorganization. The UMR faculty will review MU’s policies for joint appointments. T. Hubing is chairing a faculty committee to streamline the Academic Council section of the UMR Bylaws.

J. Waterborg reported for UMKC. J. Waterborg reported for K. Schweitzberger. The Faculty Senate has been reviewing variations in duration of appointment of persons with the title “visiting professor.” They have concluded that the title is not appropriate for a “non-visiting” non-regular faculty position that is neither “clinical” nor “research” and has “normal” faculty responsibilities, when such a position continues for a period of many years. After further work, the matter will come to IFC. Another issue brought to the Faculty Senate is a perceived lack of guidance for probationary faculty during the probationary period. The Faculty Senate will ask the departments to take the three-year review much more seriously.

J. Waterborg then reported background on agenda item #5 for the IFC meeting, and the IFC engaged in discussion of it.

5. Promotion and Tenure Issues
UMKC faculty have been concerned because faculty in certain schools have been appointed on a tenure track to do research without an expectation for teaching. Although they are working within the bounds of their contract, this is not consistent with the scope of faculty responsibilities as outlined in the Collected Rules and Regulations. This has been problematic, because the tenured faculty sees the individual’s materials for the first time during the P & T process. IFC members noted that this practice occurs on other campuses also.

J. Waterborg concluded the UMKC report by noting that L. Dreyfus is the new Dean in the School of Biological Sciences. In fall 2002, the enrollment at UMKC was up 7%. Winter 2003 enrollments are up 20% from last year. M. Skidmore reported on a recent article about UMKC in a Kansas City newspaper.

R. Cottone reported for UMSL. R. Cottone read from V. Reidhead’s written report, in which he expressed the gratitude of the faculty for the President’s graciousness during his recent visit to UMSL. He also thanked the President for deciding to hold the academic programs harmless in the recent withholding and to hold tuition to the rate of inflation. A major focus of V. Reidhead’s report was the Faculty Senate’s decision to endorse the recommendation of an ad hoc Senate committee that the summer pay scale remain the same. (V. Reidhead had left the IFC to attend another meeting on that matter.) Finally, the Academic Search Consultation Service has been very helpful in the planning for the search process for Chancellor.

R. Cottone emphasized the gratitude of the UMSL faculty concerning the President’s stand on the issue of equity. In response, the President noted that depending on the measure one uses, there are issues of equity on all four campuses. It is a huge issue, according to President Floyd. He asked the UMSL campus to allow the System to come up with ideas that are envisioned and implemented “under the tent” of the university.
Discussions with President Floyd:
President Floyd noted that the university’s budget has been and continues to be his fundamental priority. President Floyd referred to the difference between having four regional campuses and having four campuses of one university – that is four doors in which to enter the university. Although the latter is our model is, it is nonetheless important for each campus to systematically examine our strengths and our opportunities within the communities we serve. He then invited questions of the IFC on any matter of interest, and he asked the Vice Presidents to comment, as they desired. The IFC discussed the following matters with President Floyd.

The grievance issue. L. Koederitz asked about the matter of resolution of longstanding grievances. President Floyd has asked General Counsel Wright to pull all of those files, and he is working on a time frame to get back to the individuals.
The President’s involvement with the Legislature and the Governor. In response to R. Cottone’s inquiry, the President believes that he has been well received by individuals and by the committees. Next year for Legislative Day, he would like to have the reception in the mid-afternoon in the rotunda, so as to enable faculty from all four campuses to participate more fully. He has spent a great deal of time with the Governor in dialogue about the university’s mission. Senate Bill 450. VP Hutchinson spoke to this issue, referring to the letter that he had written to each Senator (see Appendix 6). He cannot predict what the next steps will be with regard to this matter, but he encouraged the faculty to monitor the situation carefully. He might write to the IFC about the matter in some detail. He noted that it is a huge issue for the university in terms of governance and cost. The IFC expressed gratitude to VP Hutchinson for his efforts on this critical issue.

Faculty Workload Policy Subcommittee
S. Loyalka noted that the IFC has formed this subcommittee. Within the next few months, the subcommittee will report to the IFC. The goal is to produce information that might be helpful to President Floyd if he wishes to develop an executive guideline concerning all facets of faculty responsibilities.

Promotion and Tenure Concerns
S. Loyalka reviewed some of the concerns of the faculty relevant to guidance of probationary faculty. He noted that the IFC might consider forming a subcommittee on P & T also.

President Floyd and the Vice Presidents left the meeting. Asst. VP Graham stayed for the remainder of the meeting. The IFC resumed discussion of agenda items #3, #6, and #7.

3. Research Board
There will be $1 million available per semester, according to M. Skidmore. The number of proposals funded is comparable to the past, although the amount of money available is less than in the past.

6. Graduate Supplemental Fee Policy Revision
R. Cottone and his colleagues had inquired about this. In the past, graduate supplemental fees were divided up according to a predetermined plan with some monies going back to the department. S. Graham reviewed his understanding of the new policy, which was developed primarily by VPs Lehmkuhle and VP Krawitz. The new fee schedule has several tiers of fees
with each tier linked to a particular percentage of a unit’s course offerings. It is designed to be more flexible, enabling the programs to charge fees more comparable to what the market will bear. This will give each campus more latitude in decision making about the distribution of the fee revenue. He referred to the RAC model at MU. UMKC representatives had not heard anything about this policy, and UMR is not planning to use it. R. Cottone suggested that a study be undertaken of the implementation of this policy across the system. S. Graham will provide information about this to the IFC. In this vein, M. Devaney referred to the new course renumbering policy of MU, which will enable division of undergraduate and graduate credit, therefore allowing for fees to be properly charged.

7. **Posting of IFC Minutes to the IFC Website.** S. Loyalka informed S. Graham that the IFC minutes had not been posted to the IFC website although the IFC had decided in October that this would be done. E. Porter has forwarded approved minutes for posting, including the minutes of the September meeting. S. Graham will investigate this matter promptly.

*President Floyd returned to the meeting briefly.*

Concerning the resolution of the MU Faculty Council pertaining to Section 200.040 of the Collected Rules and Regulations, Student Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics, President Floyd sought the IFC’s counsel with regard to this proposed revision in Section B. 1. [Here, the original statement of the rule is in plain type, the additions of the MU Faculty Council resolution are in bold type, and the President’s suggested addition is in italics.]

****

Within 48 hours of notice of a suspension, the athlete’s coach or designee and the Athletic Director shall review the suspension and recommend to either the Chief Academic Officer or the chief student affairs officer (as determined by the Chancellor) whether the suspension should continue.

****

President Floyd asked whether this addition was flexible enough to be workable within the different governance structures on the four campuses. Members of the IFC responded affirmatively and enthusiastically.

**Adjournment:** S. Loyalka adjourned the meeting at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen J. Porter, Secretary