Minutes of IFC Meeting of Wednesday, April 14, 2004

Present:
- UMKC: Jakob Waterborg (chair); UMC: Gordon Christensen, Sudarshan Loyalka, Eileen Porter; UMR: Todd Hubing, Michael Hilgers; UMSL: Rocco Cottone, Van Reidhead.
- Steve Lehmkuhle (VP Academic Affairs), Steve Graham (Assoc. VP Academic Affairs), Peter Wilden (Faculty Associate, Academic Affairs), Nikki Krawitz (VP Finance & Administration). After lunch: President Elson Floyd.

The meeting was called to order by the chair. The decision was reached to delete the Academic Dishonesty item from the current Agenda and place it on the agenda for next year’s IFC as a policy has been discussed at UMC but currently no action is anticipated at UMC. The Agenda was accepted without formal additions. The Minutes of March 17, 2004, were approved as submitted.

1. IFC engaged in a wide-ranging discussion of which a number of highlights are noted below as a start for continued deliberation. The start of the discussion was the Position Statement prepared by Gordon Christensen and distributed at the previous IFC meeting on “External and Internal” relationships.

Gordon started to define the issue as a concern about the regionalism, and its impact on a variety of political levels, as seen in the actions of the individual campuses when competition very frequently defeats the purpose of all, and nothing is realized. Gordon posed that while discussions must allow differences of opinion to come to the fore, once decisions are reached, we must be talking with a unified voice, as a University of Missouri and not as individual campuses. Too frequently that is not the reality. The current political budgetary situation reflects such an outcome. Other related questions would be the lack of cooperative interactions among campuses, e.g. between engineering at Rolla and engineering at Columbia, or the wish for a performing arts center at MU when Kansas City is the designated campus for the visual and performing arts. What are legitimate plans and what clashes with strategic development of university and individual campuses?

Eileen reflected that IFC represents a good example of real system-wide collaboration. We listen, discuss, and respect opinions. The IFC discussions have contributed to looking at the system as a whole while realizing for instance the long-standing problem of UMSL’s under-funding, the lack of equity. This has now been recognized by the President as an important issue. He has declared that this must be corrected, with high priority, so that it does not keep on interfering with the development of the University and all its campuses. Related to ideas in Gordon’s position paper, Eileen would object to making the IFC a lobbying body. IFC should remain focused on faculty consultation and dialog.

This brought the discussion to the current lobbying policies of the University. Rocco suggested that IFC must have Steve Knorr (VP for Government Relations) as an important discussion partner, just like IFC acting as System budget committee talks with VP Nikki Krawitz. We decided, if possible, to invite Steve Knorr to the next IFC meeting. Eileen reflected on the political issues brought to our attention through the General Assembly email briefs — mentioned on the back of this month’s Spectrum — as a positive development. What the current situation of a clearer central lobbying effort under Steve Knorr’s leadership now may be lacking is the voice of the regional political constituencies, of grassroots lobbying. We decided to discuss both aspects with President Floyd later in the meeting.

Van highlighted the tension between the regional versus the communal approach by reflecting that only when the St. Louis campus engaged the local political constituency was it able to get recognition for its under-funded status, relative to the other system campuses and especially relative to the regional institutions in Missouri. Van would like to see UMSL faculty endorse the one-system approach but the resource allocation issue as a recognized political problem for the whole university will have to be solved before that can become possible. Everyone recognized that ultimately divisive regionalism is bad for the campuses and the university. Regionalism has contributed to the state-wide under-funding of higher education in Missouri which is by far the lowest (5% of the state budget goes to higher education) among all the states in the region (e.g. Iowa 25%; Kansas 16%, Arkansas 15%). The equity of UMSL in terms of funding e.g. per student, degree, or headcount must be fixed, but without hurting the other campuses, as in some aspect or
other, or in many aspects, all our campuses are under-funded. Van stated the basis of our discussion clearly: We should aim for the mental track of being a System.

The discussion then explored some of the very good examples of collaboration and working as a system. The UM Research Board was mentioned as a prime example where research projects at the university as a whole are being judged and awarded for the best science, for the best proposals. Examples were given where collaboration between departments, e.g. anthropology at UMSL without a graduate program or aspirations for one, and at MU with a graduate program, could be beneficial for both. Mike Hilgers asked: Could IFC play a role in raising these attitudinal questions and in raising the public image and awareness of this issue? What is the basis for IFC to do this? (Later in the meeting we reviewed CRR 20.100 which defined in 1985? the role of IFC. The intended role, as described in the Executive Guideline, sounds very true to the current function and role of IFC.)

IFC decided to raise the issue of lobbying with the President. Rocco: Does the current unified approach not loose the importance of grassroots support? How could the UM System facilitate this? Steve: How can coordination of effort be part of this activity so that divisive action does not lead to a no-result outcome? Van: We must make sure that the lobbying efforts meet the needs of ALL parts of the System so that our collective approach is not lost.

The last word in this discussion was said by Gordon: We should learn from to the sociological knowledge that competitive behavior patterns may yield short-term gains but only cooperative behaviors yield long-term results.

2. Steve Lehmkuhle asked Peter Wilden to talk about the draft report of the taskforce that has been looking at Conflict-Of-Interest issues (see on the [http://www.umsystem.edu/vpacad/coi/coi_main.htm](http://www.umsystem.edu/vpacad/coi/coi_main.htm) website the ‘Report’ and ‘Guide to Managing Convergent Interest’ links). Our discussion focused around the pertinent realization that ‘Conflict Of Interests’ will occur if we as faculty and as institution develop the relationships with government, business and industry that are essential in the current climate where public institutions with reduced funding start looking and behaving more like private universities. The question in the big picture and in the specific cases is one of finding a balance between competing interests and imperatives, of accepting COI issues as a normal, expected part of our role with an expectation of assessment and balance. In some cases, COI issues will arise that will be incompatible with remaining a public institution of higher education. In many cases, recognition and acknowledgement of a COI should be accepted, managed appropriately and not be a basis for a priori dismissal of the new situation just because a COI issue is part of it. The current report and guidelines for best practices try to avoid being prescriptive, realizing the high diversity of situations that will and do arise. They are a draft that will be discussed in faculty forums on the campuses and is expected to evolve.

IFC accepted the suggestion to discuss COI at the August summer retreat in the context of a public university which, out of necessity, is moving into the direction of a private institution. What are appropriate and what are inappropriate directions and situations?

Van asked what the cost of managing COI issues will be versus the value that is added by the COI activities that help the university and faculty with their mission(s). Steve compared this situation with IRB compliance with federal regulations because new federal regulations related to grants beyond the current NIH/NSF areas will require COI compliance. In most cases, as in IRB, management is routine and will not cost significant time and money, but some fraction of COI situations will require complex management and oversight. The Faculty Accomplishment System may provide a COI reporting vehicle for faculty but one should realize that thousands of non-faculty employees will also encounter or create COI situations and relationships.

3. The FAS (Faculty Accomplishment System) user group has met for the first time. The next meeting is mid May. Various groups have been given tasks, the most critical one is the need to identify missing elements in the current FAS that ‘we cannot live without’. The aim is to have the first, system-wide availability by mid November 2004 so that the next annual evaluation cycle can be done using FAS.
4. Steve Lehmkuhle reported on a memo that has requested from all Chief Academic Officers feedback on how annual faculty evaluations are currently done. For instance, it will be unacceptable that non-regular faculty are evaluated over all 3 of the fundamental requirements that apply to regular faculty, teaching, research and service, as this would threaten tenure (by the legal route to force tenure to non-regular faculty without review, or by diluting or loosing current tenure criteria and protections). At the same time, appropriate recognition must be given to non-regular faculty for their contribution. Complicating factors may exist for schools where recognition of all 3 activities by non-regular faculty is accepted by the Corrected Rules and Regulations, e.g. in the UMC Medical School. IFC decided that this issue, that has raised recurrent discussions throughout the year, should be part of the IFC Retreat agenda for the beginning of the next IFC year.

5. IFC discussed the request from the campus and university Student Government organizations to be part, officially, in such decisions like the hiring of faculty. IFC accepted the need for student input but did not accept the request to be part of the decision process. And, in processes like evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure, a student voice was judged inappropriate.

6. The Board of Curators has accepted in their April meeting the new CRR 310.080 Regular Faculty Workload policy. Steve recognized that a continued need for education of Board members on aspects of this policy is anticipated.

7. After lunch, President Floyd joined IFC and campuses reported to him, among others:

    UMKC: Waterborg reported that the process leading to the selection of an interim provost was recognized as open, with effective discussions and input, and a well thought-out decision: dean W. Osborne (SCE) will be interim provost; Senate elections are in process that will determine whether any current IFC members will return for next year’s IFC activities.

    UMC: Christensen stated that the issue of Leadership on the MU campus now gets lots of attention after President Floyd decided on April 2, 2004, not to consolidate functions of System President and MU Chancellor (the Faculty Council was very appreciative that it was informed of the decision prior to the public announcement); The Council hopes to hear the President’s views on the rationales below the decision to proceed with the merger with NorthWest [Elson has presented these very recently in a special general faculty meeting at UMKC]; The report of the Grievance Taskforce has come out. A number of recommendations are part of the report that will be presented to Council and will be compared with recent changes in processes and the proposed new Grievance Policy; IFC will discuss this in an upcoming meeting. Apparently the combination of functions of ombudsman, of mediation services and of the need that academic chairs and deans must be able to correct problems, raises issues for discussion.

    UMR: Hubing reported that (like Kentucky’s mens and womens champion basketball teams) both UMR’s ‘mucking teams’ have become national champions. PeopleSoft pre-registration works! A vision committee including faculty and administrators has been developed to discuss the strategic direction ‘to grow the campus’.

    UMSL: Reidhead reported that it is ‘quiet of the eastern front’. Faculty appreciate the new Faculty Workload policy but at the same time there is the recognition that education of faculty on issues of faculty governance is a recognized need. Van reported on the discussion whether Evening College should continue to exist. The offering of evening class offerings is not being questioned but the role of this college, without regular faculty, on the campus, with accounting for SCH and protecting evening classes (with a similar issue for Summer School) being issues. The Steering Committee with faculty input is engaged with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to assess a possible reorganization of Student Services to take better care of students. The lawsuits that have arisen from the new process for Promotion & Tenure are prompting a new look, with input from Legal, at the P&T Guidelines. Based on President Floyd’s commitment to address the equity issue, UMSL hopes that a real solution can be reached.

8. Elson reported that the process to get an Acting Chancellor for UMC has started.
9. IFC continued its discussion of a single common university versus the regional tensions of the campuses with President Elson Floyd. Rocco asked the President how we, with more centralized lobbying activities, support grassroots activism and involve constituencies of faculty, students and alumni. Elson responded that the choice of having assigned lobbying team members on each of the campuses aims to avoid the disjointed and interfering lobbying that has hurt the university in the past. He said to have recognized that we must involve faculty, alums and students and develop a better integration for the ‘approved legislative agenda’. It is clear that especially distinct elements raised by the urban agenda’s of the Kansas City and St. Louis campuses must be integrated and consistent across the system. Increased engagement of the faculty across the campuses in the collective agenda of the university, e.g. the Life Sciences Initiative, must be realized. Eileen Porter said that the Legislative Update emails contribute to this goal, but she requested that these include indications for appropriate action, if possible, by faculty and students. Van Reidhead thought that the UM Research Board is a good example for a positive collaborative process for the whole university. IFC is another venue where difficult issues can be tackled on behalf of the whole university.

10. IFC continued with its Agenda items. The question had been raised a year ago whether IFC should develop a policy against Consensual Relationships between faculty and staff. Taking into account whether the system would be willing to act legally on violations of any official policy [likely not], that the existing sexual harassment policy is much more real protection, and that the new Conflict Of Interest raises the sensitivity to the inherent power conflict, IFC decided not to try to legislate common sense.

IFC concluded its meeting before 2:00 pm.