Minutes of IFC Meeting of Friday, September 12, 2003

Present:
- IFC members: UMKC: Jakob Waterborg (chair), Kathleen Schweitzberger, Max Skidmore; UMC: Eileen Porter, Susarshan Loyalka, Don Sievert (as replacement for Gordon Christensen); UMR: Todd Hubing, Michael Hilgers; UMSL: Van Reidhead, Lois Pierce, Rocco Cottone.
- During all or some of the meeting: Mary James (Curator), Steve Lehmkuhle (VP Academic Affairs), Steve Graham (Assoc. VP Academic Affairs), Peter Wilden (Faculty Fellow, Academic Affairs); and during lunch: Elson Floyd (President), Ken Hutchinson (VP Human Resources), Ralph Caruso (VP Information Systems), Ron Turner (Exec. VP).

The meeting was called to order by the chair. IFC accepted recording the meeting to assist making Minutes. The minutes of the IFC Retreat were accepted as submitted. The Agenda was accepted as submitted. The numbering of reported items below matches the numbering of the agenda.

**Major Discussion Items**

1. Eileen Porter presented Draft #3 of the committee for the Revision of CRR 310.080 Regular Faculty Workload Policy. Discussion of the expectation of “9 credits” (sub C) lead to a decision by vote not to follow this phrase with “per semester”. The initial word of section C was changed to read “Considering”, the first instance in C of “per academic year” was removed, and “Dean” became “dean”, consistent with CRR usage. The resulting Draft #4 was accepted as an IFC recommendation for discussion by representative faculty bodies and VP Lehmkuhle will distribute it to Chief Academic Officers for discussion by deans on all 4 campuses. In its October meeting, IFC will discuss comments and decide when to send a draft text to the Board of Curators, recommending acceptance.

2. Resource Allocation Principles themselves were not discussed. Steve Lehmkuhle provided background information on Bill Massy who will engage Curators on Th, Sept. 18, and IFC members on Fr, Sept. 19, 2003 in discussion of resource allocation models. The intent of these meetings is to reach an understanding of funding and quality issues in UM System budget models, a comparison with the current model used by the MO Department of Higher Education, and a basis for Board recommendations and action.

3. Grant Incentive Proposal. The IFC had an extensive discussion of the proposed Grant Incentive Proposal posted (http://system.Missouri.edu/vpacad/report grant incentive program.htm) and the posted comments with suggested responses (http://http://system.Missouri.edu/vpacad/grant incentive program.htm, updated August 11, 2003). The main thrust of the discussion centered on how this program can provide reasonable financial incentives for research active faculty, while keeping balance across different areas.

   Financial estimates related to the proposal. Currently, approximately $25 Million per year System-wide is not collected in indirect costs (F&A), which theoretically might be collected. Reduction in waiving acceptable indirect costs was identified in the RedAC (Reduction of Academic Cost) report as a possibility to increase income into the UM System without significant negative aspects. The Grant Incentive taskforce identified that, at this time, some $10 Million extra F&A could be collected. The proposal is to use maximally 5% of this extra gain as incentive funds for individual faculty or their research project, as chosen by the faculty. The 95% of this extra gain would represent extra general operating dollars for use by each campus. Overhead return dollars — funds released from General Operating funds by the F&A contributions — would spread this extra gain across campuses, academic units, researchers and programs funded from indirect cost returns.

   Peter Wilden told the IFC that initially, based on FY2001/2002 data, it was estimated that this incentive plan would cost between $1.5 and $2.5 Million to reward current externally funded faculty research with full F&A recovery. Thus, simplistically seen, the initial gain of this program, if it works, would be approximately $10M reduced by the estimated current cost of approximately $2M. (Obviously, if the incentive program does not increase F&A recovery, costs would result without gain.)

   IFC discussed the possibility to even out the perceived inequity between researchers in heavily fundable areas, basic researchers without such clear funding opportunities, and faculty in area where research and scholarship is strong but funding sources are negligible. It was suggested that campuses from their
individual share (the “95%” extra income) should set aside a fraction to establish performance incentives for teaching/learning and for basic research areas. This could be structured like the Faculty Performance Shares program that had been established a couple of years ago but which currently was inoperative due to lack of funds.

Differences currently exist in assessing the grant incentive program as it has been proposed. UMR faculty generally are in favor but administrators oppose the idea. UMSL expects the need for further discussions and clarifications so that it becomes clear that currently existing incentive programs and other initiatives, funded from general operating dollars released by F&A returns from grants, will not be harmed. UMC has to clarify its policies and practices, having learned from problems that have arisen in the RADL incentive program, before it would be ready to engage in this proposal. UMKC has shown a generally very positive response and has requested to be considered as the campus for a pilot implementation. The IFC thought that a full-scale pilot testing of the Grant Incentive Program on the UMKC campus might be very worthwhile. It would like to see the suggestions and concerns noted above are taken into account.

4. Assessment of the Faculty Accomplishment System was postponed to the October IFC meeting, anticipating that all members by then will have had enough time for a thorough individual evaluation.

Update Items

1. Van Reidhead has received the OK from Board President C. Silverstein to present a motion on behalf of IFC and UM System faculty at the Board meeting in October 2003 in St. Louis.

2. Progress of and Concerns with Program Viability Audit processes on all 4 campuses. Lehmkule clearly identified PVA as campus-based processes that were started in their initial round by system-wide numeric data and that were focused by each campus on the currently identified list of programs. He liked especially the UMKC and UMC approaches that have folded PVA into their program prioritization and evaluation initiatives. Lehmkule and Graham will just monitor campus PVA processes. In that context, the request from Lehmkule for a campus report by December 15, 2003, is to keep the Board informed of progress made and not to hasten valid discussions that must be part of this type of long-term planning.

3. Merger UM System with Northwest. VP Lehmkule informed IFC of recent developments. Leadership teams of both institutions are planning to meet to assess a matrix of all major components. Many issues have been resolved, some policy changes are anticipated (with transition periods) and some issues remain unresolved. Apparently, no clear market overlap exists between Northwest and UMKC. The UM freshman success rate criterion of $>80\%$ is met by NW. (Further) differentiation of tuition levels by campus and program will likely be considered. The Board will be informed about all in its October meeting. However, the political decision is not clear and the merger is not a done deal.

6. Peter Wilden informed the IFC of the discussions in the current Conflict of Interest taskforce, reported on the http://system.missouri.edu/vpacad/coi/coi_main.htm website. This group of campus representatives has been gathering information on how other institutions define and handle COI issues. Analysis of current UM policies and practices is planned for October, with meeting to consider action later in the Fall. A major issue appears to be the perception when COI arises, not just in financial terms. Major underreporting of COI has been deduced. IFC discussed the negative perception associated with the COI phrase but thought that it would cause problems if this standard phrase would be replaced by a more general but less recognizable phrase. All agreed that a model where prior approval of COI would be required (as used by some but not most institutions) would not be appropriate for the UM System. Rocco Cottone suggested that a Code of Conduct for faculty might be in order. However, if we spell out guiding principles, what could reasonable repercussions be if such a code is violated?

Following lunch, campus reports were made to President Elson Floyd. Among others, the following comments were made:

- UMSL’s new chancellor, Tom George, has an open-door policy, has initiated strategic planning, and appears to be strongly process-oriented, requiring transparency.
- UMR has appreciated President Floyd’s conference keynote address on their campus. A reported legal wrinkle in changing Academic Council bylaws which would require electing committees now and once again following delayed action on bylaw changes, was solved by Floyd’s proposal that the bylaw change...
could be acted upon at the Board committee meeting on September 18 and would not have to wait until a later Board meeting.

- UMKC reported on the September 4th Day of Learning; the September 11th memorial service initiated by the students; the search for the new School of Nursing dean; and the split of the position of Vice Provost for Research into the position of the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and a VP position focused on research. Pat Long, Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs, currently also heads University Communications.

- UMC Eileen Porter reported on the Annual Faculty Council retreat and year planning, the distribution to faculty of the draft for the UMC grievance procedures, and the reconsideration of the Ombuds proposal to be dove-tailed with campus mediation services. She presented a Resolution on the Role of Intercollegiate Athletics in an Academic Environment, a Big-12 initiative. During later discussions of this resolution, introduced as an item of information, the IFC recognized that athletics on the UMKC, UMR and UMSL campuses is in such a completely different situation that the issues raised by the UMC resolution are not applicable. The IFC concluded that, as IFC, no action would be taken.

President Floyd discussed with IFC changes in the University’s non-discrimination policy in the Collected Rules and Regulations, planned for Board action in October.

5. He elucidated for IFC once more the factors in his decision to adjust chancellor salaries on all campuses to $250K, and reported on his meeting with the Executive Committee of the UMKC Faculty Senate.

4. Administrative Consolidation was discussed with President Floyd. Leadership teams of UMC and the system office have been meeting to analyze a matrix of responsibilities and a report is expected mid October. Following further analysis during November, a recommendation will be reached in time for action at the December Board meeting because, if it is no-go, the search for a new UMC chancellor must be able to start on time. President Floyd once more told IFC that a consolidated university structure would be less ideal than the current one but that fiscal realities may force this action to minimize effects on academic programs. When asked whether the consolidation process is purely cost-driven, Floyd identified that accountability is also an issue. Lois Pierce stressed that the perception of campus equality is important, and President Floyd acknowledged that.

IFC continued to discuss this issue of campus balance and the price that UMC may pay when more positions than just the chancellor are combined with equivalent system positions and offices. VP Lehmkuhle stressed that it remains an issue of effectiveness, of quality-and-cost where closer collaboration in Columbia and not necessarily less personnel will have a positive effect. The example presented was Institutional Research, with possible integration across the 4 campuses. Van Reidhead was concerned how to avoid the risk of a ‘shakedown’ in this and other areas in favor of UMC. IFC clearly supported the idea that local needs exist on campuses that must be met. It discussed once more the tension between issues of equality among campuses versus the unique character of each campus. It acknowledged the saying of President Floyd, as presented by VP Lehmkuhle: “If you don’t add value, you should not exist.” This dictum applies to system offices, to all levels of campus administration and to all positions across the UM System alike.