Minutes of IFC Meeting of Friday, November 21, 2003

Present:
- IFC members: UMKC: Jakob Waterborg (chair), Kathleen Schweitzberger, Max Skidmore; UMC: Gordon Christensen, Eileen Porter, Susarshan Loyalka; UMR: Todd Hubing, Michael Hilgers; UMSL: Rocco Cottone, Lois Pierce. Excused: Van Reidhead.
- During some of the meeting: Ralph Caruso (VP Information Systems), Steve Lehmkuhle (VP Academic Affairs), Steve Graham (Assoc. VP Academic Affairs), Peter Wilden (Faculty Associate, Academic Affairs), Nikki Krawitz (VP Finance and Administration); and during lunch: Elson Floyd (President), Ron Turner (Exec. VP).

The meeting was called to order by the chair. The minutes of the IFC Meeting of October 29, 2003 were accepted after identification of some typographical errors. The Agenda was accepted as submitted.

Major Discussion Items

1. VP Caruso presented IFC with an update on PeopleSoft implementation. With the departure of the Executive Director of the PeopleSoft project, reporting is now directly to VP Caruso and he has been having meetings on all campuses, especially regarding implementation of the Student Module. Admission and recruitment is life at UMKC, UMR and UMSL, and on-line processes are expected by early December. Some browser incompatibilities must be resolved. Financial, records and registration is expected by May 2004 for UMKC, UMSL may have some data conversion delays and, resolving some critical path issues, by January 5, 2004 for UMR, facilitated by addition of an UM IT consultant. UMC implementation is planned for next fiscal year.

Credit card acceptance processes at UMR are being addressed. The Touchnet gateway at UM will provide non-PeopleSoft E-commerce and possibly PeopleSoft processes as well. The UMC grants module has some remaining input and report issues. PeopleSoft will be brought in to solve outstanding problems. Human Resources problems on all campuses will likely be solved by an update release. VP Caruso remarked that the persistence of existing processes, despite ASP implementation, is “killing us”: redesign and simplification of processes must be taken seriously. IS priorities for the fiscal year remain: successful roll-out of student modules; increase usability and performance of the financial and human resource system; establish a data warehouse facility to broaden data reporting capability; and pilot integration of all services into one window on the desktop, possibly through a portal.

2. VP Caruso reported how an Imaging System has been selected (Perceptive Vision of Lenexa, KS) which has workflow management as part of the structure. The choice was for a relatively ‘simple’ approach with limited training needs, automation capabilities and full search ability using one datawarehouse. The costs include up to $500,000 for the UM software license but the savings will be in the departments in efficiencies. Some process re-engineering and simplification will be required to realize savings. All campuses have departments participating, typically at least Financial Aid.

3. The UMC Faculty Accomplishment System exceeds in functionality anything that PeopleSoft could offer, including the import/export capabilities with Community of Science, and with PeopleSoft Human Resources and Grant modules. VP Caruso endorsed the IFC choice to implement the FAS system-wide. Some one-time update costs are anticipated such as increase link to Grants module and developing reports. The continuous need for (at least) two people to support training, documentation and helpdesk calls has been identified. IFC agreed that planning for system-wide implementation must proceed as quickly as possible, hopefully by Fall 2004. VP Lehmkuhle will request a clear decision from the Chief Academic Officers for FAS implementation. IFC agreed to have some IFC members (Christensen, Hilgers, Pierce and Waterborg) participate in a team to represent the identified user groups, including academic administrators and faculty, to make appropriate modifications and to drive implementation down to the departments and individual faculty. VP Caruso proposed to involve IFC members also in his initiative to start to integrate the various data systems, including FAS, PSAR, COS, websites, course managements, etcetera.

4. VP Caruso shared his opinion related to the upcoming agenda item on a possible administrative audit and the continuing IFC discussion of the faculty workload draft, that the UM System “lacks a workload policy
for the rest of us”. In these severe economic times it would be important to look at ways for the administrative structures in the system to be more efficient and to “give money back” with the aim to protect the academic core of the institution. A continued IT consolidation could contribute to this. Maybe other administrative consolidation could do the same.

5. IFC continued its discussion of FAS with VP Lehmkuhle. FAS has been demonstrated to the Chief Academic Officers and they want to implement it. It is recognized that they are a major factor in the assuring implementation of and compliance by all faculty. CRR text or an executive guideline may be required to clarify that all faculty who have Faculty Activity Reporting requirements and not just regular faculty would be required to use the FAS reporting system, among others as a basis of information for annual merit evaluation. FAS is recognized as an essential basis for the information that is required for planning and evaluation, including current and future Program Evaluation cycles and any consideration of an administrative audit process. A “reporting” taskforce to implement the necessary data warehouse infrastructure will be required so that it will become possible to “get” information as needed rather than remaining dependent on the need for periodic reporting, as currently exists. Data reporting capabilities for units such as departments must also become part of this set up.

6. Along this recognized need, IFC agreed with the assessment of the CAO’s to try to fold the IFC draft for CRR 310.080, the workload policy, together with the current teaching workload text of CRR 310.090, retaining the essential features but reducing the aspect of ‘reporting’. The CAO’s agreed that the proposed workload differentiation features of the 310.080 draft are essential and they clearly want to retain the instructional waiver as a tool. VP Lehmkuhle will confer with Eileen Porter to create an initial draft which will then be discussed by the current IFC members, including a UMR representative, on the workload committee together with one of the CAO’s and VP Lehmkuhle.

7. Progress of the Program Audit processes was reviewed and the following issues were discussed. The issue was presented well on the Columbia campus by Lori Franz and Steve Lehmkuhle. The overlap between the Program Audit and departmental Program Review (like COPE on the UMKC campus) processes has raised the awareness that Program Reviews must include a financial assessment of the departmental programs although the CAO’s have noted that cost data appear to have a lesser importance than the quality and enrollment issues of programs, which ‘must’ include national comparison benchmarks. Consensus appears to exist that the mandated Program Review processes, which apply to all schools and departments, should focus on proactive strategic planning, and that Program Audits of selected programs have a stronger retrospective aspect.

Gordon Christensen raised the question whether program reviews could become system-wide, and he thought of Nursing as an area where such an approach may be fruitful. Such review could be part of the general discussion of mission differentiation among the campuses. Steve Lehmkuhle reviewed some past successes and failures in trying to do joint planning. Success heavily depends on the leadership in the programs and it must be faculty-driven to have any chance of success. He reported on a new initiative of the UMKC School of Pharmacy to create a PharmD possibility on the UMC campus for some 26 students per year, supported by a few faculty located on the UMC campus, extensive distance-learning instruction and taking core science courses on the UMC campus, while the research aspects of the program remain at UMKC. Some reservations were expressed whether such a design could work, reflecting on the experience of Engineering at UMKC as a UMC-dependent program. As an example of a joint program that works, the Master in Library Science degree program of UMC was mentioned. It is offered joint with mostly UMC web-based courses. Similarly, Engineering is offered successfully at UMSL by UMR, with the added feature that the degree is awarded by both UMR and UMSL. It appears that success requires a mutual benefit, the active cooperation of all sides, a faculty-driven process and a supportive leadership that does not get in the way.

8. The work in UM Academic Affairs and HR has not yet resulted in a proposal on academic title reform for the group of faculty which are not ‘regular’ and which is being called “contingent faculty” by such national organizations as the AAUP. One of the national trends is to consider increasing the length of contract for contingent faculty beyond one year with increase in seniority in order to recognize the commitment to the institution and to increase protection of academic freedom. In spring 2004 a forum is being planned on the
UMC campus on the rights and responsibilities of contingent faculty. It was suggested that Professor Gruber of the AAUP from Truman State University would be a useful discussion partner in this forum. It was further suggested that the four faculty senates of the UM campuses collectively could sponsor this event, or hold events on all campuses. IFC agrees with the position of the CAO’s that rights and responsibilities of contingent faculty must be clarified and may deserve a place in the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University. These rules currently do not address this issue at all and only talk about non-regular faculty in such contexts as grievance procedures. In no way is it perceived that recognizing rights and responsibilities of contingent faculty could imply ‘getting rid of tenure’. E. Porter suggested that the phrase "complementary faculty" might be more appropriate than the phrase "contingent faculty."

9. Following lunch, campus reports were presented to President Floyd:

- UMSL. The new Chancellor has initiated a 5-areas Action Plan: academic excellence, enrollment management, improving our standing in research, community engagement, and finding resources. Campus-wide meetings have started on issues like the NSSE report with a focus on student recruitment and retention. A Budget & Planning process has been started to complement the Action Plan.

- UMC. The campus is arranging a Big 12-wide series of meetings. Also a faculty and student forum on intercollegiate athletics has been scheduled for January 2004. A forum on the new grievance procedures is scheduled for December, anticipating a subsequent faculty vote on accepting the new rules. RADIL discussions on campus, especially in the College of Veterinary Medicine, have been moved under the Campus Mediation Service. Following some discussions on campus on the possible consolidation of the President and MU Chancellor’s positions, a general faculty meeting with President Floyd has been scheduled for December 9, 2003. President Floyd has left no doubt in discussions with faculty that the future of the Medical School at Columbia is secure. The Academic Affairs committee has taken the initiative to provide each entering freshman with a 1-hour seminar by a senior member of the regular faculty, and the committee is revising the transfer policy, which is out-of-date. A forum for non-regular faculty has been planned. Revision of the ombudsman program is under discussion.

- UMR is seeing an increase of faculty interest in things that are going on. A procedure to track the quality of student advising by departments has been accepted. The Provost has been requested to reconstruct the campus Promotion & Tenure Committee in order to eliminate conflict of interest problems that had been created by the composition of the committee as it had been elected. Confusion appears to exist on campus when some programs of high priority are suddenly being replaced by other programs of high priority, and people are wondering about the direction of the campus.

- UMKC reported on the proposal submitted to the Kauffman Foundation for funding of a new Institute for Urban Education, which has raised many concerns on campus due to the exclusion of faculty from the design stages of the process and the creation of the Institute outside the existing School of Education. President Floyd responded that he also had concerns and had requested from Chancellor Gilliland that the proposal be put on hold so that necessary internal and external communications and discussions can take place about how this Institute relates to the School of Education. The Program Audit process of review continues. A review of salary increases at UMKC had been started in response to some questions about a few high raises and is currently an emotional point of discussion and of further analysis in Senate. This has resulted in a proposal by the Chancellor to create a partnership of administration, deans and faculty to try to figure out how to bring faculty and staff salaries up to market, based on what market means in various areas. Also, the need for a transparent budget process in all units has been recognized. The December Curators’ Board meeting on the UMKC campus is being planned.

10. Presentation by VP Lehmkuhle on the President’s initiative to create a ‘single-door approach’ to economic development. An outside consultant has reviewed all campuses to study the advantages and disadvantages of creating a Foundation under the Tech Transfer operation. An outside AAAS report of the Tech Transfer Office and related activities has just been completed. A strategic planning session has been planned for mid-December with knowledgeable participants from across the System. They will aim to create a single, seamless process from Disclosure to Commercialization for faculty. Currently, we have many offices,
which directly interact with faculty but in a disjointed way. The report will suggest reorganization, integration of private sector partnerships and strategic decisions on using “incubators” and involving entrepreneur initiatives in the area. Currently the UM System with 100 million dollars research support has clearly less than the 50 disclosures per year based on the expectation of one disclosure per 2 million dollar research support.

However, the economic development planning is much broader than just the Tech Transfer aspect. It will interface with teaching, with research, with extension, and with service.

11. The possible consolidation of the offices of UM President and UMC Chancellor was again discussed in trying to answer the President’s question to IFC: “What is the role of the UM System?” Elements mentioned included a role of oversight, of efficiency, support for collaboration and a role in enabling coordination and mission differentiation among the campuses. A stronger role for campus independence was mentioned but not generally accepted: it would cause unhealthy inter-campus competition and dysfunction. The assistance of the System to help all campuses focus on academic excellence and to make reasoned choices was recognized, as well as assuring a central role of the UM System in the whole constellation of higher education in Missouri.

President Floyd recognized that there exists a lot of campus autonomy, centered on the core mission of the University of teaching, research, extension and service and limited by budget options, and this is reflected in the diversity of campus Mission Statements that each campus has developed. In this setting we will have to discuss the ‘branding’ of the University. This will require active discussions. What does it really mean to have a degree of the University of Missouri? President Floyd asked, using the initiative to create an Institute on Urban Education in Kansas City as just one example, the question: Is it a good idea to move towards an institute of urban education? If we made the decision as a system what it means to be credentialled in education, would that mean whether we need an Institute for Urban Education or not? Is it consistent with our ‘branding’ as an institution? He thought that we had not had that conversation, that discussion and that the perceived urgency for such a choice had not been established. Another example was earning a degree in the performing or visual arts from the University of Missouri. What are the core competencies, the expertise associated with our campuses? Engineering exists in Rolla but engineering competency exists on the Columbia campus. The Blanche Touhill Performing Arts Center exists in St. Louis but the world-recognized competency in the performing and visual arts is in Kansas City. As a System we will have to come together and deal with these large and vexing issues, and that brought President Floyd back to the question: What is the value-added function that this office provides, U-Hall?

The President brought IFC up-to-date on all the conversations that he has had, and will still have in the coming days, reaching towards a decision on the consolidation issue. If it is done, there exists a lot of caution: to recognize the core mission of each campus; to give UMC neither an unfair advantage nor disadvantage; to discuss what will be the future process and the role of each campus be when a new Chancellor/President needs to be selected in a consolidated system; to watch fund-raising influence factors; to consider whether the choice should be made for a defined time limit; to consider the role and responsibilities of UMC’s Provost Deaton; to weigh financial implications. Any decision must be seen in the context of the current context of the huge financial downturn for the University with possibly more to come. Contrary to the general practice, background materials on this decision will not be distributed in advance of the December Board meeting in Kansas City because that meeting starts just one day after a general faculty meeting on the issue on the Columbia campus, and only final recommendations will be made after that meeting.

The question was raised which other consolidations might follow. The President clearly stated that the academic coordinating function of Academic Affairs would continue. Outreach and Extension has already been moved on the basis of its core competencies to the UMC campus, without a change in function or abandoning any state-wide responsibilities. (“Tell U-Hall if you hear concerns.”) Maybe some other moves will follow. Speculatively were mentioned, based on campus core competencies: bioinformatics in Kansas City because of Cerner or public affairs centered at UMSL. Institutional Research at Columbia and U-Hall has been consolidated (and is moving this week) and no consequences are anticipated for the other campuses other than maybe an increase in understanding of local needs.
12. IFC discussed some of the enrollment changes, the two-year increase seen on the UM campuses (but not seen at other state institutions), the influence of demographic changes underlying these trends, and the need to be in time with planning (student housing, for example) when this pattern will change again.

13. VP Krawitz reported that decisions on tuition rates for ‘04 will be delayed until later in 2004 when more clarity exists about the budget. IFC will discuss at its next meeting the first draft of allocation principles that have been distributed to the campuses for discussion. VP Krawitz referred to the agenda item on administrative audit possibilities and informed IFC that administrative productivity is often as difficult to measure as faculty research productivity. She noted that the recent system audit by Deloid & Tusch had noted that UM appeared understaffed with for instance the number of accountants in the comptrollers office expected for a 500 million dollar company while UM is a 2 billion dollar enterprise. A problem in assessing administrative productivity or the levels of administrator relative to faculty will also arise from the fact that no external benchmarks exist. Maybe an analysis of administrative developments over time may give insight.

The IFC meeting concluded after 2 pm.