Minutes of IFC Meeting of Tuesday, December 16, 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, Van Reidhead. Excused: Lois Pierce.
- During some of the meeting: Steve Lehmkuhle (VP Academic Affairs), Steve Graham (Assoc. VP Academic Affairs), Peter Wilden (Faculty Associate, Academic Affairs).

The meeting was called to order by the chair. During the meeting the minutes of the IFC Meeting of November 21, 2003 were accepted. The Agenda was accepted as submitted.

**Major Discussion Items**

1. IFC discussed the draft of the letter of support for the President. A final version was created, printed, signed by all present, and handed to President Elson Floyd when he came in to the IFC meeting to apologize that he would not be able to join us for our usual lunch discussion. A public statement, initially drafted by Director of University Relations David Russell, was modified and accepted. The chair took the responsibility for the final text and distribution on behalf of IFC through the Office of University Relations to the press.

2. IFC discussed the postponement of the decision by President Floyd at the December Board Meeting as to the consolidation proposal of the positions of UM President and UMC Chancellor. President Floyd stated that more meetings and information would be required before he could reach a decision. The intended lunch discussion on the topic did not take place. Rocco Cottone suggested, in view of the strong negative stance against consolidation at UMSL, that a visit of the President to UMSL should be considered.

3. The Chief Academic Officers have had a demo of the Faculty Accomplishment System and they want implementation as soon as possible, thus VP Caruso’s team should start their work.

4. Eileen Porter lead a discussion of a first draft of a consolidated, single workload policy, created by her and VP Lehmkuhle, based on the existing CRR 310.090 text, the proposed CRR 310.080 draft and input from the Chief Academic Officers. This discussion of wording and phrases resulted in “REVISION: 310.080 REGULAR FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICY (IFC Draft 12/16/03)”. It will be distributed to all IFC members at the beginning of the Winter 2004 semester, requesting that comments be shared by Email prior to the follow-up discussion at the January IFC meeting where input from CAO’s is also anticipated.

5. A legislative proposal for a 4-year freeze on tuition was discussed. The situation of a similar proposal in Illinois where a high increase (maybe 50%) in freshman tuition that would be frozen for 4 years, is being discussed, favored by predictable funding information and incentives like completion of study in 4 years. However, in Illinois the state sets tuition levels and has the constitutional responsibility for funding of the universities. In Missouri, the situation is completely different and highly volatile. Will the Missouri Legislature want to start setting tuition levels (now a constitutional responsibility for the University) while at the same time possibly also cutting state funding?

It is anticipated that in response to changes in state funding and differences in market capabilities, undergraduate tuition fees will be differentiated, as professional fees have been. Fee differentiation has been approved by the Board for graduate fees in a 3-tier fee structure with fees accruing to the campus (and not like supplemental fees to academic schools). One year ago, distance education fees were already fully deregulated, determined largely by what the market will bear.

6. A resolution by the UMKC Faculty Senate ‘to restore UM System Award levels’ to previously much higher levels was discussed. While the UM System monitors the campus criteria for Curator’s and Distinguished Teaching Awards for consistency and reviews the selection processes, the campuses fund the awards and define the award level. Thus, whether teaching awards should be funded at least at the same level as for instance Curator’s awards, should be a campus discussion and decision.

7. VP Lehmkuhle reported on a UM budget strategy that now focuses on protecting the core but that looks to the future by trying to start again a state-matched endowed chairs program. We can demonstrate that this
program has been a very good investment. It is likely that the prior policy will be modified so that the best people for the positions can be chosen and UM employees not be excluded. The principles guiding such a program will be a pre-approval of areas that are linked to the programmatic focus of each campus, equitability among campuses, and the matching of a campus position with state matching funding and a System endowment supplement. A 3-year limit for filling positions is anticipated to prevent use of endowment funds for other than intended purposes, as has occurred. The quality control issue, raised by Gordon Christensen and answered by VP Lehmkuhle, will have to remain campus- and department-based. Endowed titles and funds should not be permanently linked to the current employee so the link can be severed if warranted.

8. Progress in campus Program Audit processes was reviewed. UMSL has submitted a set of recommendations. UMR has had the last meeting and is preparing its report. UMKC is in the middle of its process. The UMC process is now getting launched. IFC acknowledged that the process debriefing after this first year is important for a good continuous review of our program inventory “looking for doing less but better”. There exists concern that assessment is done and about the quality of the assessment panel.

9. IFC reviewed the updates in the differentiated campus mission statements that were accepted at the December Board Meeting. In the revised System mission statement, in addition to the well-known land-grant missions of instruction, research and extension, a fourth mission of the University, the mission to support Economic Development, has become more explicit. While aspects of economic development are implicit in instruction of students in workforce development, in research and innovation, and in service including Outreach & Extension, Economic Development has unique features like Tech Transfer that like the other aspects fits within the not-for-profit scope of the University. The University will try to align existing tech transfer processes and provide more support for public-to-private transitions by ‘realigning resources’ and implementing ‘best practices’.

10. Peter Wilden reported that the Conflict of Interest taskforce is nearing its final meeting and will produce a “procedural business manual” that will be link to CRR regulations, as a practical guidance. The task force is intentionally not trying to classify all possible cases and situations where COI may occur. It also recognizes that COI situation will naturally arise when faculty do what they are expected to do. Thus the manual, which will also be discussed in IFC, tries to educate and guide employees. For instance, employees should be aware of the need for disclosure in the knowledge that this will not result in censure or prohibition.

The related case of UMC’s RADIL COI has been resolved through resignation of supervisors and privatization.

11. IFC continued to ask about issues surrounding contingent faculty. This includes issues like the ‘non-regular’ designation, simplifying the mixture of existing titles, the possibility to recognize non-tenure faculty commitments through ranked titles and increasing contract length, and recognition of their role in our university mission with importance for instruction, for research and for clinical activities. System Academic Affairs and HR may contribute key questions and principles to this discussion but do not want to be the driver behind changes. Concern has been voiced about increasing contract length. The issue should be a faculty-driven matter. Could IFC bring this to the faculty governance bodies on the campuses for discussion and action? Christensen has observed that faculty at UMC have very diverse opinions on the matter. Reidhead thought that, despite the impression of wide opposition, UMSL could start a discussion in the Steering Committee as an aspect of faculty governance. For instance, the expectation to be able to do or to be expected to do research for non-regular faculty, hired by a research university, leads to lots of confusion. Porter explained that at UMC a Faculty Council committee had developed some years ago recommendations of rights and responsibilities of non-regular faculty that were submitted to the deans. Some schools have taken action and some have not. Faculty Council has asked the Provost to reissue the recommendations. Porter thought that sharing these recommendations through IFC with other campuses might be of help.

12. Todd Hubing thanked Steve Lehmkuhle and Steve Graham for their visit to UMR administration and deans which has helped to getting the Cabinet and Provost aligned about the prioritization of new programs in a clear academic plan.
13. Waterborg raised the question: Should IFC try to tackle the issue of workload expectations for others than regular faculty and, as a related aspect, should IFC ask for an administrative audit process and review of administrative efficiency? The impression of members was that administrative and non-academic personnel numbers have continued to increase and that administrative salaries were not outcome-based. An example that it could be dangerous to assume that these impressions were correct came from the UMR Provost office where several new vice-provosts had been named. When analyzed, it turned out that the overall size of administration and likely even of budget had not changed. Loyalka suggested that it was not the task of IFC to start the initiatives. Cottone suggested that we might ask the President, whose example of need-based consolidation of positions was exemplary, to be more forceful to the campuses in expecting a similar response in administrative belt-tightening, keeping core academic programs harmless.

The IFC meeting concluded near 2 pm.