Members in Attendance: Sudarshan Loyalka, Chairman, MU; Michael Devaney, MU; Eileen Porter, Secretary, MU; Jakob Waterborg, UMKC; Kathleen Schweitzberger, UMKC; Max Skidmore, UMKC; Van Reidhead, UMSL; Rocco Cottone, UMSL; Lois Pierce, UMSL; Todd Hubing, UMR; Leonard Koederitz, UMR; and Ralph Wilkerson, UMR.

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

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of February 28, 2003 were approved as previously circulated.(moved M. Skidmore/seconded Koederitz/consensus), with these revisions, suggested by J. Waterborg. [Deletions are indicated by strike-out; additions are in bold type.]

1. p. 3, first paragraph, line 7: Typically, he works with the VP Vice President for Research on each campus.
2. p. 6, first paragraph, line 8: This year, we contributed less than 3%.
3. p. 6, second paragraph, lines 4 – 6: L. Koederitz sought verification of the perception that UMR UM did not get all of its allocation of Mission Enhancement monies, although the other campuses institutions of higher education in the state did receive their complete Mission Enhancement allocations.
4. p. 8., second paragraph, line 1: UMSL UMKC faculty have been concerned . . .
5. p. 8., third paragraph, line 1: J. Waterborg concluded the UMSL UMKC report . . .

E. Porter will correct the minutes and send them to K. Volle to be posted on the IFC website.

Review of the Agenda of March 19, 2003: There were no changes to the agenda.

Agenda Items:

1. Faculty Workload Subcommittee of the IFC
2. Promotion and Tenure Issues
3. Faculty Incentive Plans.
4. Program Consolidation and Mergers
5. Post-Tenure Review

Discussion of Agenda Items:

1. Faculty Workload Subcommittee of the IFC
E. Porter reviewed the work of the subcommittee at its first meeting, which was earlier in the day. Members are L. Koederitz, L. Pierce, and J. Waterborg. There had been discussion about the charge (see IFC minutes of 2/28/03, page 1), as two members thought that the charge had been to more expressly quantify the research and service aspects of the mission, while considering the Executive Guideline on Instructional Workload as the aspect of a revised faculty workload policy relative to instruction. E. Porter referred to the draft document she had developed for the subcommittee’s review pertaining to the implementation of faculty workload models of
academic units as a mechanism of filling out each of the four facets of section 310.080 Faculty Workload Policy in the Collected Rules and Regulations. She noted that such a guideline would afford attention to gathering and reporting data about each aspect of the faculty’s work relative to the university’s mission. She noted that the subcommittee had differentiated the purview and measurement methods needed for a particular unit’s workload model from a system-wide approach to implementation, evaluation, and reevaluation of workload models.

In view of the discussion about the subcommittee’s charge, E. Porter reported that they had taken the initial decision to propose two alternatives to the IFC as suggestions that President Floyd might wish to consider relative to this matter. These alternatives were: (a) to consider an executive guideline focused on implementing faculty workload models of academic units and to recommend its adoption in lieu of Executive Guideline No. 31 (Instructional Workload) OR (b) to consider an executive guideline focused on implementing faculty workload models of academic units, which (in a section pertaining to the individual teaching load of each faculty member), would refer to implementation of the instructional waiver aspect of Executive Guideline No. 31 as needed. In the event alternative (b) was considered, the subcommittee would recommend that the guideline on implementing faculty workload models be incorporated in the Collected Rules prior to Executive Guideline No. 31, as the former would address all aspects of faculty workload, while the latter is focused only on instructional workload.

E. Porter asked members of the subcommittee to offer their perspectives and to report on any additional matters. With regard to interpretation of the phrase “when necessary” in the description of alternative (b) above, L. Pierce pointed out that if a unit’s faculty were within the overall guideline (vis-à-vis all aspects of workload), then there would be no need for an instructional waiver. J. Waterborg commented about the need for more information about the nature of data that are currently reported and for improved reporting of workload data. E. Porter noted that VP S. Lehmkuhle had volunteered to assist the group, and that they would talk with him about reporting mechanisms that would enable the System to obtain the necessary data to fulfill its responsibility (per 310.080 B) relative to reporting workload data. She noted that the subcommittee plans to invite VP Lehmkuhle to take part in a telephone conference call during the week of April 14. If possible, a demonstration of available reporting systems could take place during the IFC meeting of April 23. L. Koederitz suggested that VP R. Caruso also be involved.

E. Porter then invited discussion by the IFC on the proposed trajectory of the subcommittee relative to continuing to pursue alternatives (a) and (b) described above and (as L. Koederitz) had suggested, to share this approach with President Floyd at today’s meeting to get his feedback. She related several issues discussed by the subcommittee relative to pursuing either alternative at this time. First, members had discussed the fact that there had been insufficient time to see how the Executive Guideline on Instructional Workload would work out in practice. J. Waterborg noted that if in fact the guideline was now viewed as unworkable and as involving significant expenditures of time, then it was suitable to consider the alternatives. L. Pierce noted that if Executive Guideline 31 were perceived as potentially problematic, it would be better to recommend its discontinuance now than to wait until the problems were manifest. Second, E. Porter noted that there had also been some reservations about presenting an alternative to the Executive Guideline that the IFC had sent forward to President Pacheco in December 2001 from VP Lehmkuhle and the Task Force on Reducing Academic Costs. V. Reidhead suggested that it was apparent from our efforts over time on the matter of Executive Guideline 31 that faculty had not been entirely happy with it. He noted that we should not be silent on it at this point and hide any concerns that we might have. M. Skidmore reviewed the rationale for the Instructional
Workload Guideline with regard to history and the statistical analyses that had shown the need for concern about the instructional workload of some faculty members.

M. Skidmore’s concern about the public relations impact of this perception was echoed by V. Reidhead, but from a different perspective. He noted that we need to provide a clear view of all of the domains of our work, rather than leaving two domains untidy. L. Pierce noted that we have not enabled the citizens’ understanding of our research and how it impacts the state. V. Reidhead inquired as to whether we might recommend to the President that there be a sustained campaign to educate the public about our research efforts. L. Pierce responded that we might simply ask President Floyd about his goals in this regard. There was some discussion about obtaining and reporting workload data. Although an on-line Faculty Accomplishments System reporting mechanism is in place at MU through the Provost’s office, such a system is not in place on the other campuses yet. K. Schweitzberger noted that UMKC had considered such a system, and that the specific needs and situations of each campus need to be considered prior to implementing a system-wide reporting mechanism. J. Waterborg emphasized that certain data are collected and sent to the Provost; it can be assumed that some of these data are filtered up until they get to the System level, but it is uncertain what form the data have taken on by that point in time. M. Devaney noted the need to review the types of data that the System now has relative to overall workload. L. Koederitz emphasized that if data are reported correctly to and from the System, then President Floyd and others would have these data to use in various arenas.

E. Porter sought direct feedback on the proposed direction of the Faculty Workload Subcommittee as outlined above. There was agreement to proceed with (a) responding to VP Lehmkuhle’s gracious offer to assist the group and (b) presenting an outline of the two alternatives to President Floyd later in the meeting. She concluded by stating that the subcommittee plans to complete its report prior to the IFC meeting on May 28.

2. Promotion and Tenure Issues

S. Loyalka noted that the IFC had discussed concerns of the faculty relative to promotion and tenure (P & T) at the last meeting. Via e-mail, he had sent the guidelines for making decisions about tenure and promotion at the University of Iowa (see Appendix 1), remarking that the process described was transparent with regard to potential difficulties that could arise and to the approach for addressing those difficulties. M. Skidmore asked whether the concern was for the adequacy of the policies/procedures or the implementation per se. S. Loyalka suggested that the latter was the primary problem. The group agreed that this is a critical issue. M. Devaney noted that while the faculty are responsible for developing the rules, the administration is responsible for implementing them. So, if there are holes in the rules, this can be problematic. S. Loyalka noted that at the University of Iowa, the faculty member has access to negative reviews.

Vice President S. Lehmkuhle and Associate Vice President S. Graham joined the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

R. Cottone explained that UMSL had undertaken a major revision of P & T guidelines, which took three years. They completed the work last year. He distributed a copy of the UMSL guidelines for P & T (see Appendix 2). When faculty reviewed Executive Guideline 6A in the Collected Rules and Regulations, they found that their current procedures were inconsistent with it. They consulted the UM System General Counsel, and they created their procedures around Executive Guideline 6A. J. Waterborg asked whether there had yet been feedback about its implementation. R. Cottone explained that it had been revised along the way and after its initial
use; he noted that it is fair to the faculty. Anything that becomes part of the dossier, including the internal reviews that go up to the line) is open to the candidate, and there is an opportunity for the candidate to respond at each level. On p. 2 of the UMSL document, response options are listed. S. Loyalka suggested that R. Cottone look at the Iowa document and compare it to the UMSL document as well as to the relevant information in the Collected Rules and Regulations. VP Lehmkuhle noted that the basic information pertaining to P & T is in the Collected Rules, and that it is up to each campus to develop its own specific policies and procedures. S. Loyalka noted that it is important to focus on transparency and responsiveness, and that it might be necessary to assess the policies in the Collected Rules by those standards. There was consensus that we might well be concerned with both the policies/procedures and their implementation. Relevant procedures on each campus were discussed briefly.

3. Faculty Incentive Plans
S. Loyalka introduced the discussion, noting that a relevant article had appeared on March 8 or 9, 2003 in the Columbia Daily Tribune. About six faculty at the MU School of Veterinary Medicine received $100,000 or more (in addition to their regular salaries of similar amounts) as incentives/bonuses for service work for RADIL. He noted that in view of this circumstance, it would be good to know as to what policies pertaining to incentive plans are being implemented system-wide and to consider the pros and cons of such situations and such policies. M. Devaney pointed out that such plans should not enable a conflict of interest, allowing a chair or dean the opportunity to authorize different degrees of support for faculty who are in the group and faculty who are not in the group. VP Lehmkuhle said that this discussion bears on a system-wide grant incentive plan that is being developed (See p. 7). S. Loyalka noted that there should be safeguards in place for all faculty and that all relevant decisions should be transparent.

4. Program Consolidation and Mergers
M. Devaney re-introduced the document (see Appendix 3), which the MU Faculty Council had approved and sent forward to IFC on 2/28/03. He noted that there is no mention of mergers or consolidation of programs in the Collected Rules & Regulations. M. Skidmore asked whether there was a concern with procedure or whether specific instances had precipitated the development of the document. S. Loyalka and M. Devaney responded that it had been a matter of both procedural and situational issues. L. Pierce wondered whether the MU Faculty Council was suggesting that this particular resolution be implemented on other campuses. M. Devaney said that it was being proposed for inclusion in the Collected Rules & Regulations. M. Skidmore suggested that we consider whether this should be campus-specific or system-wide. R. Wilkerson suggested that the need be considered in relation to the strategic plan of each campus. L. Koederitz noted that UMR had raised this matter last year, but that the IFC had not acted on it. The proposed document would give faculty certain rights in this circumstance and would afford due process, according to M. Devaney. J. Waterborg asked which issues had been particularly threatening to faculty. M. Devaney noted that some faculty felt like they had been forced into new administrative structures without (a) the opportunity to make their case or (b) consideration of graduate students’ needs and research opportunities. The proposed document would not (and could not) prevent a merger, because such a decision is up to the Chancellor, but it would promote public awareness and faculty involvement in the discussions of the potential merger, according to S. Loyalka and L. Koederitz. R. Wilkerson described it as akin to a delaying tactic with regard to the merger decision, allowing time for further consideration of issues. VP Lehmkuhle noted that the procedures included in the proposed resolution could be useful as best practices, noting that it was important to involve faculty in such discussions and that effective administrators would do this as a matter of course. V. Reidhead noted that with this
policy, faculty have the right to be involved in the discussion, even though they do not hold the authority to make the decision. K. Schweitzberger noted the importance of involving students in discussion about mergers and consolidations of programs. L. Pierce suggested that the document might better go into a set of “best practices” that would be collated into a manual, rather than being placed in the Collected Rules and Regulations. The group agreed that the document reflected a “best practice” and endorsed the idea of a “best practices” manual.

Assoc. VP S. Graham noted that the merger opportunity is a good one for potentially weak programs to join forces with stronger programs and to get critical mass and horsepower. V. Reidhead noted that it was important for the faculty to take the initiative to discuss potential opportunities for mergers. Finally, L. Pierce pointed out that if we implement the program viability audit, mergers and consolidations would be one critical approach of keeping faculty in who are smaller units with limited viability otherwise.

5. Post-Tenure Review
R. Wilkerson noted an apparent lack of consistent implementation of the post-tenure review policy at UMR. Faculty have discussed whether the chair or the department should do the post-tenure review. According to the UMR Faculty Bylaws, an individual’s post-tenure status is to be monitored annually in keeping with specific standards, but he is not seeing this implemented. In his view, unless the campus embraces it as part of the process of faculty evaluation, it will not happen. UMR has campus-level mid-term review prior to tenure, but MU does not.

VP Lehmkuhle will talk to the provosts on each campus about implementation of the post-tenure review policy, and he will discuss it again with the IFC. The 2003-2004 academic year will be the third year for implementation of post-tenure review. He noted that the concern about implementation had surfaced elsewhere as well. He briefly reviewed the rationale for the formative processes involved in the policy. It was meant to be a tool, not a punitive process. He noted that each department is to state standards for satisfactory performance. However, the IFC agreed that unless the policy is implemented uniformly on each campus and across the System, it will have little value anywhere. K. Schweitzberger noted that some supervisors might inflate the level of performance so that everyone could get some sort of pay increase. S. Graham said that some faculty (and some administrators, according to E. Porter and M. Devaney) might minimize the importance of the annual review in anticipation of minimal pay increases.

Discussions with VP Lehmkuhle and Assoc. VP Graham:

1. Teaching and Research Awards
S. Graham reported that the UM System’s awards and application deadlines were listed on the new website. He wants to raise awareness, because there are few nominations. Nominations are to come from each campus. L. Koederitz, who had chaired the Teaching Award selection committee for four years, noted that typically there were new candidates to consider each year. Faculty need to inform colleagues of the importance of reapplying. There has been a disparity in the number of nominees from the different campuses.

2. Parental Leave Policies
S. Graham distributed copies of the summary report of the Faculty Medical/Parental Leave Task Force (Nov. 19, 2002). The Task Force had spent considerable time on this topic last year, as had the IFC. At the time, all of the campuses were quite concerned, except UMKC. S. Graham asked for feedback on this issue, noting that it is so complex that there is a counter-idea about each new
idea that could surface. Few faculty really want to keep track of sick leave. They might have to
double-teach in a summer to pay back time they had been granted for parental leave, and this
might not always be workable. The option that seemed most palatable was to use the timeline of
FMLA as a guideline for the duration of a paid medical or parental leave. This would not cover
an entire semester, but it could serve as a rule of thumb. L. Pierce, who had served on the Task
Force, noted that they were concerned about consistency between units and across campuses.
She stated that they had considered FMLA as the most appropriate option, in part, because
faculty might be able to continue to do their research or to teach one course while on medical or
parental leave. In such cases, faculty would not be setting aside all responsibilities while on
leave. M. Skidmore suggested that the 12-week timeline (of FMLA) be perceived as a minimum
and not as a maximum. He noted a concern about the potential for required payback, stating that
there is a need for flexibility for faculty who face such circumstances.

With regard to the potential sources of funds for such a benefit, L. Pierce noted a task force
member had proposed a small payroll tax. S. Graham and S. Lehmkuhle reiterated that at this
time there are simply no funds to consider a paid FMLA leave for staff who accumulate sick and
vacation leave, although they would not want to rule this out in the future.

S. Lehmkuhle noted that report of the Task Force has not yet been vetted with Human Resources,
and it has not been presented for discussion to a group other than the IFC. For those reasons, he
asked that we not share the report with others at this time. S. Loyalka asked what should be done
with this report at this time. M. Skidmore suggested that we table the report. L. Pierce suggested
that we consider it as one facet of the “best practices” manual. S. Graham and S. Lehmkuhle
suggested that we talk with our colleagues on each campus about whether the FMLA timeline
would be a feasible best practice for the duration of a paid medical or parental leave. In such
cases, the unit would finance the leave with assistance from the Provost when feasible. S.
Lehmkuhle said that it was important for the IFC to continue discussing this matter. Some IFC
members reiterated that it is a concern among faculty on their campuses.

3. Conflict of Interest
S. Lehmkuhle noted that because of the changing environment of academia, it is critical to
consider issues related to conflict of interest. Mentoring, consulting, publishing in particular
journals, and patents – all of these issues and other will be encountered and must be managed
proactively. If we are not running up against such issues, perhaps we are not fully doing our
jobs. His staff is forming a committee to discuss this matter, and he will seek representatives
from IFC. They want to compare policies of the UM System to those of other systems.

4. Homeland Security
S. Lehmkuhle noted that S. Knorr will work with the federal agencies so that we can position
ourselves effectively when requests for proposals are issued. The big push will be for centers.
Relevant information is on the UM System website. The goal is to involve as many faculty and
research teams as possible.

5. The University’s Responsibility During Times of Protest
S. Lehmkuhle commended to the IFC the AAU document entitled, “The Responsibility of
Universities at a Time of International Tension and Domestic Protest.” He noted the importance
of conversation about these issues on each campus and across the system. M. Devaney noted that
the MU Faculty Council had endorsed the document with a minor modification concerning the
statement about “prevention of classes.” The modification was made so that the AAU document
could not be misconstrued as preventing the instructor’s prerogative to modify the nature of learning opportunities. M. Devaney noted that MU Faculty Council requested that the Provost’s office issue the “ground rules for campus protest” as specified in the AAU Document. This has been done; pertinent sections of the Collected Rules and Regulations were tapped. K. Schweitzberger said that UMKC also recently issued some ground rules relevant to protest.

6. Research Board.
S. Lehmkuhle inquired about whether the IFC had previously discussed the level of funding for Research Board proposals. Although the level of funding is too low at this point, M. Skidmore emphasized that there is $1,000,000 available per semester. He has had some difficulty obtaining reviewers because some potential reviewers assume that there will be no money to award. S. Lehmkuhle noted that fewer proposals had been submitted by UMKC. The Research Board funds about 20-30% of the proposals, making every effort to support junior faculty.

Vice President Ken Hutchinson joined the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

7. Faculty Incentive Plans
S. Lehmkuhle said that the UM System had had a group to help look at issues on grant incentive programs, and he would like our feedback. He has not yet discussed this matter with the President or the Chancellors. In the report of the Task Force on Reducing Academic Costs, they discussed two better critical areas in which there are few incentives for faculty at present: (a) increasing indirect recovery to more consistent and appropriate levels and (b) putting more salaries on grant dollars rather than GO dollars. Substantial savings were estimated with the currency of interest being academic programs in that analysis. The model that is being conceived was designed to impact both of those issues. At it is presently being conceived, to be eligible for the fund, a faculty member must (a) recover the full allowable indirect costs and (b) use grant dollars to pay one’s salary on the grant (in keeping with the appropriate amount of one’s FTE on the grant). The System would then take the sum of the salary that is on the grant (above the 22% allotted for summer salary) and the indirect cost recovery, and the faculty member would get credited some percentage of the sum, which would be put into a fund. The faculty member could have this amount as a salary supplement or as a research incentive fund.

S. Lehmkuhle had several questions for the IFC about this proposal. First, should there be a maximum on the amount of the salary bonus? They are considering a maximum of $30,000 or 30%, whichever is less, for the salary bonus, and the rest would have to go into the research incentive fund. M. Skidmore urged that there be flexibility with regard to the amount of the bonus. L. Koederitz said that there should not be a maximum, and T. Hubing noted that although $30,000 was not enough to cause certain professors to move major consulting contracts with outside firms under the university’s purview, he thought it was a reasonable maximum. The group agreed that there should be some limit on the amount. Second, there was discussion about the potential impact of a faculty incentive plan upon morale and whether some faculty would be opposed to having a salary supplement for this. M. Skidmore said that he doubted that faculty would have a concern about this in principle, because faculty who would not receive the incentive were not being penalized, although they were not being rewarded. M. Devaney noted that MU has a RIF for travel and so forth and that in his department, there is a strong policy concerning buying out of teaching. He asked whether this $30,000 would be used over and above the normal teaching load or in lieu of that effort. S. Lehmkuhle explained that the funding source for the incentive fund would be rather GO dollars rather than indirect funds per se. At this time,
he foresees that the proposed plan would have only minor impact upon the existing RIF. There is a lot of variability in terms of how the RIF is used across campuses.

There was general discussion about the potential benefits of such a program. L. Pierce said it was important to consider implementing an incentive policy, because faculty can and will take grants to off-campus venues if they do not get sufficient money otherwise. R. Wilkerson pointed out that some faculty would stop writing grants and simply consult, so he said that this kind of program could stem that tide. J. Waterborg pointed out that some faculty might want this money to go into their retirement funds. VP Hutchinson noted that they can now do more creative things with retirement funds; if you get a salary bonus, one can put that into the retirement fund in whole or in part, such that it would be sheltered, or the faculty member would have the option to this. They would declare this incentive as an employer contribution, which could be variable. However, if the faculty member would wish to do an additional amount, that would not be variable. This would be totally independent of VERIP; one can decide how one would want to manage one’s own funds. This fund is through Fidelity; this is separate from the university’s retirement fund. It would be prorated based on each faculty member’s effort on the grant. J. Waterborg emphasized that this would be an ongoing incentive.

VP Lehmkuhle reminded the IFC that he was merely soliciting opinions on this matter at present. He will keep us informed as planning proceeds.

**Discussions with Vice President Hutchinson:**

1. **Senate Bill 450 (SB450).**
   VP Hutchinson said that there is little news at present. It is still troublesome. We have amendments ready to go to take us out of the bill. It could be heard as early as next week. KH noted that we are trying to be as straightforward as we can in providing information about the bill. Our health plan offers more value and has a lower premium than that of the state employees.

2. **Tuition remission for dependents.**
   The General Officers are continuing to plan for this, although the university’s financial situation will be the key factor in whether or not it can be included in the compensation and benefits package.

**Luncheon Session:** After a short break, S. Loyalka convened the IFC at 12:30 p.m. *President Elston Floyd, VP Ron Turner, and VP Nikki Krawitz joined the group.*

**Campus Reports:** M. Devaney reported for MU. The MU Faculty Council endorsed the AAU statement on the responsibilities of universities during times of protest. He mentioned the addendum about alternative learning experiences (as previously explained), as well as the addition of a brief statement concerning academic freedom. He also presented the MU Faculty Council’s Statement on Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom (see Appendix 4), which had been approved on 10/26/00. He also reported on the Charter for the Grievance Task Force (see Appendix 5). Finally, he presented the resolution on mergers, noting that in earlier discussions today, the IFC had viewed the resolution as a potential “best practice” in such situations. S. Loyalka suggested that a website could be a suitable repository for a collection of best practices.

L. Koederitz reported for UMR. L. Koederitz thanked President Floyd for visiting the campus and for addressing issues, particularly with the staff, concerning compensation and SB 450.
There have been successes in both athletics and marked achievements in certain facets of technological development. In view of his previous mention of discussions about the possibility of changing the athletic conference, it was noted that the conference does not want UMR to withdraw; the loss of UMR would cause a drop in the conference’s graduation rate for athletes.

K. Schweitzberger reported for UMKC. K. Schweitzberger expressed gratitude to President Floyd for his recent visit to the campus. There are many budget conversations afoot. They have begun a daily forum for faculty, staff, and students to address concerns about the impending escalation of the international conflict.

V. Reidhead reported for UMSL. The faculty has actively exercised their governance responsibilities recently, particularly with regard to dialogue with the interim Chancellor and other administrators concerning budgetary issues. For instance, a committee of faculty and administrators will address a long-term plan for summer salary. Noting that it will be important to have a chancellor who has a philosophy of shared governance, V. Reidhead expressed his gratitude to President Floyd for his interest and his involvement. He stressed the importance of hiring a chancellor with a track record in consensus building and shared governance, stating that the losses to campus development would be incalculable if a command economy and decision-making chancellor were hired. He expressed the faculty and staff’s continued concern about SB 450, stressing that employees would choose to maintain the independence of the university plan, despite higher costs to the employer and fewer benefits in certain areas, to preserve the plan’s flexibility to respond to rapidly changing insurance market conditions. V. Reidhead asked VP Hutchinson to comment. Senator Goode had requested a side-by-side comparison of the state and university health plans, which VP Hutchinson will share with the IFC.

Comments by President Floyd:
Concerning the matter of grievances pending in his office, President Floyd reported that there are (a) six from M, (b) one from UMKC, and (c) two from UMSL. He noted that these grievances date back to October 1999. Each of these persons will be notified that they will receive a letter within 30 days pertaining to a decision about the grievance.

President Floyd invited questions of the IFC members. L. Koederitz asked about the budget. President Floyd responded that it is “a moving target.” VP Krawitz reported that the House had decided not to do line-item budgeting and instead, they had opted to let each state agency manage a reduced appropriation and make the necessary cuts to their own budgets. Higher education was slotted to receive a 10% ($88 million) cut to the core. VP Krawitz does not think it likely that the Senate will give up their responsibility to do line-item budgeting. Accordingly, it is possible that a conference will be required; the features of such a bill are simply a matter of speculation at present. There is limited information about whether the CBHE actually has constitutional authority to allocate funds among higher education institutions.

President Floyd noted that Governor Holden has appointed a commission to look at the future of higher education. The chairperson wants to take the long view and look at data for a year. VP Turner reported that Missouri is one of four states involved with a project sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trust. The project is designed to enable consideration of a long-term view of higher education. Thus, the Pew project will provide data that will drive the recommendations that will come out of the Governor’s commission.
Discussions with President Floyd:

1. Faculty Workload Subcommittee.
S. Loyalka asked E. Porter to report. She gave an overview of the information cited in these minutes on pages 1 and 2. She presented the two alternatives as options that the subcommittee had reported to the IFC, noting that the IFC wished to explore his interest in further consideration of these alternatives by the end of the semester. She explained the subcommittee’s intent to focus on all facets of the faculty’s workload rather than only on instruction. She also reiterated the group’s interest in working with VP Lehmkuhle, who had volunteered to assist, and on the need for a system-wide mechanism of reporting workload data. She explained that the IFC recognized that the matter of Executive Guidelines was within his purview but that the point was to offer recommendations on these matters from the faculty. President Floyd noted that he was pleased to receive recommendations, but that he would defer to VP Lehmkuhle on this matter. VP Lehmkuhle stated that he would like to integrate the reporting mechanisms across the campuses. Noting that there is obviously a need to do this, he stated that he would certainly work with the IFC on this matter. President Floyd noted that his main concern was that the workload study should not become a workload and that our efforts in this regard should be held to that standard. All present agreed that this effort should not be onerous. VP Lehmkuhle explained that he cannot pull up a list of faculty across the System who are working in a specific area. There is an insufficient database about our faculty at both the System and campus levels, with duplication of reporting in some areas. VP Krawitz noted that the Reporting Strategy group is working on the need for consistent data reporting across the system. There would be possibilities of implementing this through the Faculty Accomplishment System, which is now being implemented at MU, or perhaps through PeopleSoft. We will ask VP Caruso to join us in discussion of this matter at our next IFC meeting.

2. Promotion and Tenure Issues.
S. Loyalka reviewed our progress thus far. He mentioned that we had consulted procedures used at the University of Iowa, and he emphasized the need for transparency and responsiveness to be incorporated in our processes. He noted that the IFC believes it would be useful to have a best practices manual covering such topics and that in addition, we might make some recommendations for changes in the Collected Rules and Regulations. President Floyd suggested that when we look at best practices, it is important to engage in comparisons with the leading research institutions in the country. VP Lehmkuhle wondered whether the IFC was concerned about the overall P & T framework in the Collected Rules and Regulations or each campus’ guidelines. S. Loyalka responded that we are concerned about both, noting that Executive Guideline 6A is silent on matters such as whether the faculty candidate can review the Dean’s recommendation on tenure. S. Loyalka emphasized the importance of consistency between campus policies and system policies. L. Pierce noted that such resources could be available as best practices for campuses.

3. Faculty Incentive Plans
President Floyd noted that they have queried all campuses about any existing incentive plans.

4. Program Consolidation and Mergers
This item was not discussed again, because it had been covered during the MU report.
5. **Post-Tenure Review**

S. Loyalka stated the IFC’s view that the post-tenure review processes are not well-defined on some campuses. He noted that the faculty had voted about three years ago upon the issue of initiating a post-tenure review system. The MU faculty voted against it, although there was support for it on other campuses. President Floyd inquired as to whether there is something in the Collected Rules and Regulations about this matter. S. Lehmkuhle explained the procedures involved in the regulation [which is 310.015 B.], noting that we are into the third year of this cycle. He will talk to the chief academic officers to make certain that these standards are in place and to determine whether the performance is actually being evaluated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. President Floyd said that he would rather that the faculty spend time focusing on workload rather than devoting too much time to the post-tenure review process. He would like for us to focus on the “front end vs. the back end,” as the latter should take care of itself if faculty do well in the probationary period. He noted that what we have to do is to be clearer about our expectations relative to each aspect of our mission; if we are clear and if we measure this and we respond to these issues carefully throughout the cycle of promotions and tenure, faculty should have few difficulties in the post-tenure phase. He said he would be glad to work with the IFC on this matter. M. Skidmore suggested that we invite Dr. Theresa Theil, who facilitated the committee that authored the post-tenure review process, to an IFC meeting.

-President Floyd left the meeting.-

---

**Initiating new programs.**

R. Cottone asked VP Lehmkuhle whether any new programs are coming up through the system. He noted that last year, the UMSL Chancellor had asked faculty to consider proposing new programs. VP Lehmkuhle reported that President Floyd will consider a new program under three conditions: (a) it will not compromise current programs, (b) there is an apparent need, and (c) there is a business plan. The CBHE, however, has new guidelines in place concerning development of new programs. The system is working to facilitate the efforts of campuses in line with their strategic plans. Some new programs being considered at MU and UMR are essentially reconstituted curricula of currently offerings; other programs afoot would have greater costs than the opportunity costs. He noted that we need to improve in articulating the need for programs, ensuring that there is a student need and not just a faculty need. There was some discussion of the potential interest in an architecture program in the UM System. M. Devaney inquired as to whether we need to temper our strategic plans in terms of current fiscal realities. S. Graham noted that very few programs make money and that President Floyd wants to focus on quality. Some growth will have to come from substitution; we do not have the resources to expand.

---

**Resource Allocations Group.**

Working on the system level, this group will bring to the President some issues concerning resource allocations across the campuses. There was some sharing of current practices on the campuses with regard to resource allocation. VP Lehmkuhle recommended several books by Bill Massey, including *Resource Allocation* and *Honoring the Trust*.

---

**Adjournment:** S. Loyalka adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen J. Porter, Secretary