Minutes of IFC Meeting of Wednesday, May 12, 2004

Present:

- UMKC: Jakob Waterborg (chair), Kathleen Schweitzberger, Max Skidmore; UMC: Gordon Christensen, Sudarshan Loyalka, Eileen Porter; UMR: Todd Hubing, Michael Hilgers; UMSL: Rocco Cottone, Lois Pierce, Van Reidhead.
- Steve Lehmkuhle (VP Academic Affairs), Steve Graham (Assoc. VP Academic Affairs), Peter Wilden (Faculty Associate, Academic Affairs), Nikki Krawitz (VP Finance & Administration). At lunch: President Elson Floyd, Ken Hutchinson (VP HR), Ralph Caruso (VP IS), Ron Turner (Exec.VP).

The meeting was called to order by the chair. The chair thanked all IFC members for their contributions for the year and especially the members who will be replaced for 2004-2005: Lois Pierce, Kathleen Schweitzberger, Max Skidmore, Sudarshan Loyalka, and Eileen Porter. Rocco Cottone (UMSL) will chair of IFC for 2004-2005. Van Reidhead requested that the functioning of the Missouri Research Park (Weldon Spring) and similar initiatives be added to the Agenda. The discussion with Steve Knorr (item 4) was postponed to the IFC Summer Retreat. The Agenda was accepted. The Minutes of April 14, 2004, were approved after correction of a few typographical errors.

1. VP Nikki Krawitz (Finance) discussed with IFC, as the System faculty budget committee, the State Appropriations Request for FY2006 that will be discussed with the Board at the May meeting, for approval at the July Board meeting. There is a reasonable expectation that the to-be-approved FY2005 budget will be (97% of) $401 million. To this are added: the Cost-to-Continue (x 60%) such as 6.3% benefits, 4% salary pool, 3% equipment and expenses; Operating New Buildings; and 3 new decision items requested as rate funds. These resources aim to close the gap of campus funding through strategic targeting (see UM Strategic Plan below): $10M as the 1/3 State match for the Missouri Endowed Chairs program which did not make it this year and which will no longer be presented under the flag of ‘Life Sciences’ to avoid the political opposition to stem cell research; $10M as a 50-50 match for private funds for increased need-based student access to create about 670 $1500 scholarship grants; and $20M for Health Care Workforce Needs for program expansion to prepare the next generation of health care professionals.

2. “Operationalizing the Resource Allocation Model” (Draft April 2004) is the start of the discussion among Chancellors and campuses upon the request of the President to define the practical choices for generating and allocating resources. It asks a large number of questions about what choices we would want to consider. The major focus at this time is on pricing strategies in an environment of uncoupled tuition levels, inherently linked to the issue of financial aid (and the balance of need-based and merit-based aid) and the quantitative and qualitative consequences on enrollment. The ‘Strategy for Decoupling Tuition’ presented a large number of options to consider for tuition pricing structure, financial aid philosophy, campus enrollment management plans, the annual increase in tuition and fees, and the financial impact of options chosen. IFC members asked for clarification on issues and discussed several of the options and models and their consequences. Although many options exist, it may be worthwhile to consider that ‘simpler may be better’. The decision on tuition is independent of the second major aspect of operationalizing, i.e. the choices and options on how funds will be allocated at System, campus, school and department levels. A first draft is expected back from the campuses for central discussion by July 1, 2004.

3. A draft of a new “University of Missouri Strategic Plan” is being developed (we looked at a version dated May 11) through discussions of the President with the Chancellors, which starts with the Mission, Vision and Core Values statements and which develops a number of Strategic Themes and Goals: access to learning; academic achievement and quality; Community-University engagement; valuing people and creating a high-performance organization; improving core processes. The aim is accountability of campuses and system administration to the strategic choices we make and a way to assess progress. Nikki told us that the President wants to discuss this draft with us over lunch (see below). It has been discussed, among others, with Research Board members, and it is part of the Board of Curators agenda for May 26-27 at UMKC. The draft was characterized as “bold”, “a stretch”, a clear “vision for the institution”. One of the more practical consequences of considering the totality of the University of Missouri as “one university”
will be a common (academic) calendar: not a question, not a point of deliberation or discussion, just a common-sense fact.

4. We discussed the current FY04/05 appropriations, which are on the Governor’s desk for signature. Nikki was confident that the resources will be available, including $11.7M in new funds. These funds were possibly appropriated because all the other legislative initiatives such as a new endowed chairs program and the life sciences initiatives have floundered and failed this year. The state budget includes some $250M in carry-over from last year and $300M in new growth. Whether the $600M growth of the state budget can be sustained for upcoming years without carry-over is unknown. As decided by President Floyd, $2.7M of the new resources have been allocated to UMSL as a move towards equitable funding levels among the campuses, while the $9M has not yet been allocated. This is anticipated for the upcoming weeks, with a clear choice to use this money strategically.

5. Legislative future gazing lead to the realization that in the next session the name-change of SMSU, which this year has killed all initiatives including the merger of UM with Northwest, will happen. One of the other major issues lost this year was the Life Sciences bond initiative which had grown too big with all the additions made, and it became a bulls-eye for pro-life groups which protest any stem cell research (see #1 above).

6. IFC asked VP Steve Lehmkuhle to report on his discussions with the Chief Academic Officers of the campuses on faculty (post-tenure) review. This issue has a strong interest from Board President Mary James, and has been raised in prior IFC meetings. Steve distributed an overview of implementation: “Procedures and Outcomes for Review of Faculty Performance”. This included (1) the percentage of departments that have set standards for faculty performance as stipulated in CRR 310.015. Some IFC members questioned the reported 100% compliance for their campuses. (2) Apparently nearly 100% of departments on all campuses require written faculty activity reports. (3) So far, a very small number of negative evaluations, which might result in a CRR 310.015 developmental process, have been identified: (4) possibly 11-13 faculty at UMC and 1 faculty member at UMKC. Retirement and resignations at UMKC have eliminated 7 faculty as potential targets for the developmental process. At the UMR and UMSL campuses, extrapolation of current data to the 5-year mark has not yet identified any faculty.

7. Sudarshan Loyalka shared the UMC “Final Report of the Grievance Review Task Force” with IFC members. Some of the summary comments: The number of grievances is low, tending down from 5 to 3 per year, possibly due to the help of Mediation Services. It remains a concern that most grievance procedures take much longer to be concluded than the 180 days allowed. No records exist that recommendations made are acted upon. Faculty Council is in conversation with the Provost office to assure follow-up tracking of grievance outcomes and recommendations.

8. After lunch, campuses reported these items to President Floyd, among others:

- **UMKC**: Kathleen Schweitzberger reported on the outcome of the Faculty Senate elections, on graduation commencements which next year is planned to be a single large event at Kansas City, on the good impression made by Interim Provost Bill Osborne, and invited all to the Board of Curators meeting in Kansas City, May 26-27.

- **UMR**: Todd Hubing thanked VP Ken Hutchinson for providing salary data requested, reported that entering of grades into PeopleSoft has worked and that CAPS Sheets for student advising are web-accessible “It all worked. I was impressed.” (VP IS, Ralph Caruso, accepted applause). Also administrator reviews have been concluded and a copy of the report has been submitted to the President. (After conclusion of the IFC meeting, the UMR IFC members met with the President to discuss the evaluation outcomes.)

- **UMSL**: Van Reidhead reported that the Spring faculty meeting approved unanimously, in an advisory vote, the campus action plan, which had been widely discussed and vetted. A faculty member now chairs the campus budget committee. An atmosphere that allows open discussion now exists. Van thanked the President for his presentation to the UMSL Faculty Senate, and for the $2.7M in new funds
to start to address the equity funding issue at UMSL by targeting faculty staffing levels, funds for student scholarships and support for the campaign for staffing development.

- **UMC**: Gordon Christensen thanked the President of attending last week’s Faculty Council meeting and his participation, with Deaton, in the General Faculty meeting, later that afternoon. The new Faculty Grievance Procedure for MU will be voted upon soon by UM faculty. If approved, the procedures will be shared with IFC prior to submission for Board action. Academic Dishonesty policies have been revised to separate faculty action in response to dishonesty from punitive actions, which will be handled by the Provost office. Athletics and the NCAA report is back in people’s attention. While not good in general, it may focus attention once more on faculty input into athletics and may lead to resolutions and action (in 30 to 40 associated schools in all major conferences).

9. IFC discussed with President Floyd the “University of Missouri Strategic Plan” draft (see item 3), which will be introduced at the May Board meeting and which is directly linked to performance measures. Some of the points discussed: A common University academic calendar (III.1). Waterborg requested to consider addition of ‘administrative’ to the listed instructional and research requirements that should be supported by quality IT (V.2). Porter suggested insertion of ‘and research’ behind ‘Academic’ in goal “II. Academic Achievement and Quality”. Cottone suggested addition of the goal to “add innovative programs” as part of enhancement of instructional programs (II.5). President Floyd responded that he would want campuses to fill in the campus roles in this type of strategic goals. Loyalka asked attention for high standards in considering Promotion & Tenure decisions as part Academic Quality (II) or Creating a High-Performing Organization (IV). Christensen responded that a balance of high quality must be balanced with ‘serving the community’ and ‘providing open access to education.’ President Floyd responded that all strategic goals would be measurable with year-to-year assessment. IFC discussed some of the possible peer institutions being considered. Hilgers thanked the President for these strategic goals, as they would help in discussing the UMR budget model in terms of strategic goals. President Floyd responded to a question by Waterborg that NorthWest has been engaged in the discussion of this draft and appears to have no problems with it even if some of the goals may not apply to them. In fact, the President stated that some of the University-wide strategic goals will certainly fail to apply to all of the current 4 campuses. VP Lehmkuhle noted that each campus, including NorthWest, would develop their strategic attention on specific chosen goals. Hubing accepted this strategic plan as an accepted expression of IFC discussions throughout the year: “Four campuses as one university.” In fact, this plan confirms that we do not acknowledges campuses as “different”. Van Reidhead also recognized the absence of campus competition and of “angst” for campus mission differentiation in the strategic plan. Loyalka asked special attention for the implementation of PeopleSoft as an opportunity ‘to support faculty and staff in their respective responsibilities’ (IV.3). The identification of the strategic goal “increase public support” (III.3) was thought to be tied to the need to engage the State of Missouri (one of the discussion subjects planned for the IFC Summer Retreat).

10. VP Ralph Caruso once more acknowledged appreciation for the UMR implementation of the Student PeopleSoft module and said that January 05 would bring a similar success to Kansas City. He informed IFC that he would continue to provide IFC with updated information, e.g. from the System-wide IT Steering Committee.

IFC concluded its meeting just after 2:00 pm.

DRAFT Reported, J. Waterborg, IFC chair, May 18, 2004 (revised May 22).