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Attendance:
Rocco Cottone (IFC Chair), Stephen Graham, Michael Hilgers, Stephen Lehmkuhle, Sudarshan Loyalka, Stuart McAninch, Lois Pierce, Van Reidhead, Frank Schmidt, Robert Schwartz, Kathleen Schweitzberger, Donald Sievert, Kandace Smith, Paul Speck, Katina Volle, Jakob Waterborg, Peter Wilden. Specific session attendees were Ralph Caruso, Stephen Knorr.

Agenda: 2004-05
Rocco Cottone, IFC Chair, with Vice President for Academic Affairs Steve Lehmkuhle’s assistance, went over the 2004-05 agenda. Under “Information Items” discussed with Steve Lehmkuhle, in addition to the printed agenda the following issues were briefly discussed: Libraries with regard to the demand for and costs of electronic resources such journals and the problem of hardcopy storage; contingencies affecting the proposed Northwest Missouri State merger, such as the certainty of a new governor and issues with the Missouri State universities; the political climate on stem cell research and the impact of this discussion on the University and the research climate in the state; and resolution of the state of flux with regard to higher education governance in the state.

Information Technology Issues, With Vice President Ralph Caruso
Vice President for Information Technology Ralph Caruso outlined the overall responsibilities of his office, which includes statewide Morenet and Mobius systems, in addition to all aspects of System-wide IT. The total budget for operations in his office is about $50M annually.

The major discussion was on PeopleSoft (PS), which was discussed with laudable frankness and transparency by Vice President Caruso, who opened with the statement that ‘we are nowhere near where we would like to be with PS.’

Rocco Cottone asked if PS has worked as promised, to which Ralph Caruso responded that by and large yes, though it is not apparent to everyone who uses the software in financials and human resources, where the software is much more powerful than the Legacy system.

Jakob Waterborg asked about the rationale for the independent consultant review, and Ralph Caruso responded that it was advised by an outside consultant and that President Floyd decided for the PS review over some internal objections from his leadership team.

Frank Schmidt asked if the problem of every field in an input module having to be complete before it will take has been fixed. Ralph Caruso said they are trying and asked for personnel contact information to help. Frank Schmidt mentioned problems with the grant module and suggested Fastlane as a better system for grant applications. Ralph
Caruso responded that UMC’s grant people had advised implementation of the PS system.

Jakob Waterborg asked why there is not a single system-wide sign-in, and Ralph Caruso explained that it is due to variable security systems across the 4 campuses. Jakob Waterborg expressed concern about what will happen when the UMC student module goes live, considering that the UMR module volume causes PS to regularly crash. Solutions were discussed.

Rocco Cottone asked if the PS implementation timetable will be revised, and Ralph Caruso said, “Yes.”

Paul Speck discussed the length of time spent in transition, which indicates that not enough resources were dedicated to the project as needed. Ralph Caruso said that they had hoped that the original allocation was sufficient but from the get-go it was not enough, and then the state’s budget problems made matters worse. We have been short on resources all along. Paul Speck said that frustration is causing us to lose the services of people who have gained PS knowledge, and this creates further delays thus compounding the frustration in a vicious cycle. He asked if the System would put up the money needed. Ralph Caruso responded that this is a decision for the General Officers. He noted that there is a breakdown in communication down to the local level.

The question was raised whether the PS problems are too deep for the system to be salvaged at UM. Ralph Caruso said that many other universities have successfully implemented PS, that there are few alternative systems available, and that the people in the IT office at U-Hall have mastered the system thus indicating that it is doable.

Other questions in a similar vein were asked and discussion continued after Ralph Caruso departed the meeting.

**[IFC Agenda Item]** This is an issue that IFC will discuss with President Floyd and monitor throughout the year, as an agenda priority, all agreed.

In addition to PS, the FAS (Faculty Information System) was discussed. Steve Lehmkuhle said that final complications are being worked out to implement a clinical faculty component. He said that FAS would go live for all campuses by November, in time for campuses that review in calendar year cycles. He identified training preparedness as the main concern at this point. Jakob Waterborg introduced a brief discussion of how the FAS structure translates to variable data requirements across the campuses.

**Conflict Of Interest Continued From 2003-04**

Peter Wilden gave an overview of the effort to produce a new Conflict of Interest Policy. The aim is to produce a policy that is process driven rather than prescriptive, locally instead of centrally managed, with a single policy for all UM campuses. All of the accumulated documentation of work on this project is available at the UM Academic Affairs web site. He reaffirmed the overarching philosophy developed last year, that conflicts are normal, to be expected, and not to be hidden. The question, he said, is how to manage conflicts of interest for the good of employees and the University? When a conflict is not manageable, we need to know how to address it processually.

**[IFC Agenda Issue]** Steve Lehmkuhle identified this as a high priority policy issue that needs to move forward to completion in a timely way in light of the work
invested last year and of the need for a new policy. Faculty input needs to be completed during this Fall Semester. He requested IFC’s advice and facilitation in setting up meetings for Peter Wilden with key faculty groups on the campuses to discuss the policy. The need is for IFC to get the policy to the point where his office can conduct discussions with administrations on the campuses. Lehmkuhle said that the policy would cover faculty, staff, and administration, prompting Frank Schmidt to point up the need for convergent language. Sudarshan Loyalka suggested the need for the document’s wording to show areas of overlap between the needs of different employee groups.

Frank Schmidt asked if one person would be in charge on each campus. Steve Lehmkuhle affirmed the need to identify one person to be in charge and for a conflict of interest committee formed. As currently structured, he said that chairs and faculties don’t know who to go to. Peter Wilden added that the aim is for one such a person to be in charge, responsible to the chancellor. Paul Speck asked if the committee will be a Senate Committee, which would function purely for faculty and about its purpose: Would it be strictly for oversight? Lehmkuhle said he doesn’t know where the committee will reside, but it will not be under the Chief Research Officer, who is already in conflict from needing to promote faculty research. Frank Schmidt and Sudarshan Loyalka emphasized the need for the policy to include everyone and the committee to represent everyone—faculty and staff alike, because of the complexity of instrumentation uses and outside incentives with hidden legal restrictions, etc. Don Sievert added that it must also encompass Athletics. Rocco Cottone pointed up the need to resolve writing and implementation conflicts arising from who will be under the rule, just faculty only, or all employees. Jakob Waterborg said that it is not yet clear where the compliance committee should reside but that compliance probably should not belong to the Senate. Lois Pierce said that the list of those involved is so broad that the process should start with Chancellor, to whom a committee encompassing all campus constituencies would report.

Rocco Cottone asked how many complaints arise annually per campus that would go forward to committee for review. Pete Wilden said that it is in the double digits at UMC, less on the other campuses.

Steve Lehmkuhle said that a problematic question is whether implementation, which is the biggest problem in this issue, could bring the University to its knees. Van Reidhead asked if the cost of implementation could be higher than the cost of non-compliance. Pete Wilden said there are diverse costs, which together leave no option except to implement an upgraded policy.

Steve Lehmkuhle said that the core problem boils down to protecting core values in an environment where the private sector wants the University to be beholden to its interests.

Paul Speck asked if similar issues would be resolved differently across campuses. If yes, does this leave us liable? Steve Lehmkuhle indicated that the Legal Department says this is not a problem. According to Legal, procedural violations cause legal sanction, not inconsistencies in how activities are classified. He stressed that the committee members must be disinterested parties.
Peter Wilden urged that once implemented it will be valuable for him and campus faculty leadership to meet with members of cross-campus groups to share practices so the campuses do not end up operating in isolation of each others’ experiences.

**Programmatic Enrollment Management:**

Steve Lehmkuhle introduced the topic by confirming that there is not a CBHE moratorium on new programs. New program proposals are coming to his office, and some have been approved. UM has never had a moratorium. He said that we must continue to programmatically grow to avoid withering.

Steve Lehmkuhle said that President Floyd’s enrollment goal for the next 5 years is 10,000 more students than at present. This goal is complicated for several reasons: 1) We have raised tuition 30% over the past few years, 2) The high school graduation rate will peak in 2008, then will plummet, 3) We do not know the percentage of high school graduates who will go on to college, though rates in Missouri are climbing, 4) Market share is a factor, and it will be impacted by tuition relative to other universities, and this will be affected by the programmatic mix on the UM campuses.

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Steve Graham discussed program reviews and new approvals. The Board, he emphasized, is more anxious to prevent degree program proliferation in the foreseeable climate of state support, because the opportunity cost for one program restricts future possibilities. In light of this, the Board wants UM campuses to be more strategically focused in order to achieve optimal benefit from new programs judged by how the fit into the program mix in consideration of comprehensive needs and economic/demographic conditions. Meanwhile, CBHE directed President Floyd to provide a market analysis. Subsequently President Floyd directed that three things will be required for new programs: 1) Funding for any new program should not interfere with commitments made to already established programs, 2) Good market analysis must accompany new proposals, 3) New proposals must contain a complete business plan. In the past we have tended not to do rigorous financial planning, with no basis for the enrollment projections. The example in the case of the program in Biochemistry at UMSL it is not clear how many students are actually new vs. existing Biology or Chemistry students who have been shuffled to Biochemistry. UM System has created an algorithm to look at program requirements and estimate actual costs, including personnel, space, etc. It was emphasized that Academic Affairs (System) under President Floyd wants the campus faculties to make decisions about what each campus really wants to do for the development of their specific campus. Academic Affairs wants each campus’ faculty to state its priorities, take ownership of the plan, and commit to proceed accordingly. The UM System wants this level of analysis and commitment to come up from each campus, so that the Academic Affairs office can complete the internal review based on rich information. It was explained that the program review process is similar to the journal review process, as follows: First, 2 people internal at U-Hall conduct an internal review, Second, related departments among campuses are consulted, and Third, if the proposal is for a doctoral program, and sometimes others depending on the nature of the program, the proposal goes out for external review. Plus, System Academic Affairs uses a national database to assess ballpark accuracy of projections by comparing them to national data and trends. Fourth, there are direct discussions with the campus before going to the Board, which carefully
scourishes the proposal. The Board now demands rigorous plans that are consistent with President Floyd’s 3 directives. Finally the Board’s decision goes to CBHE, which does not have a history of overturning Board decisions.

Stuart McAninch asked how System deals with understaffed high cost programs. Steve Lehmkuhle, using the example of Nursing at UMSL, which has high student demand but too few faculty, said that the campus is expected to make a commitment to adequately staff the program, or get out of that field. Rocco Cottone said that deans are driven to certain new programs out of responsibility to the community and its needs. To sustain credibility for the college mission in the community, deans sometimes assess that they have no choice except to create programs for which there are insufficient faculty. Steve Graham acknowledged the issue, saying that this has to be addressed in detail, and with commitment at campus level, considering all of the options. Costs and other considerations have to be assessed so that we know what will be given up vs. gained by a decision.

Paul Speck emphasized the need for quality discussions regarding new programs and the need for timely decisions at the System level. St. Louis and Kansas City are in highly competitive markets, such that many modalities—cost, delivery, timing, etc.—must be examined. Differential planning is beneficial, but there is also a need to move in a timely manner from planning to start-up, so that the lapse between proposal submission and start-up is 2 years instead of 20. He also identified a serious conundrum facing the St. Louis campus, the choice between low cost programs, where faculty will make less, or ones with high student volume, which is not the best way to become the institution we want to be. To the latter issue, Steve Lehmkuhle responded that System is considering this very issue at all the campuses. Academic Affairs is asking the question: To achieve a viable student experience, what enrollment numbers are optimal at different levels of the curriculum? Numbers vary by level, from freshman to Ph.D. He acknowledged that we could increase enrollments by lowering standards, but that is not an option.

Paul Speck asked about the case of programs that have honest potential to become nationally competitive, ones that require more investment in faculty and in which the market will bear high tuition to support more faculty as well as recruitment of national stars. To build nationally competitive programs, it may be necessary to vary tuition even between MBA programs within the same college. Steve Lehmkuhle suggested that consideration of this issue must be taken in light of the reality that some programs cannot pay their own way, and the more economically successful ones cross-subsidize these. High tuition programs will need to do this to some extent. Paul Speck identified an Executive MBA and a MBA for Physicians as programs that the St. Louis campus would like to introduce but cannot, because UM’s inflexible tuition structure does not allow UMSL to compete with Washington University.

[IFC Agenda Item] Steve Lehmkuhle suggested we put variable tuition on the agenda for discussion with Vice President for Finance, Nikki Krawitz. He would like us to be ready in the next tuition cycle to gain Board approval for variable tuition along the lines of Paul Speck’s question. The Board is open to it now, where it was closed before. Considering that high school graduation rates will peak in 2008, Lois Pierce asked, ‘If we gear up to deal with such demand, at higher prices, with large faculties, will we have to step back and downsize the same programs later?’ Steve Lehmkuhle replied that the
main cost factor in mounting a program is the number of faculty required. Under normal conditions the faculty attrition rate is 7-8% annually, and this will help deal with needs for downsizing post-2008. Current faculty numbers are down, because this is how we’ve dealt with reduced state funding [and we will have to build back up]. One of things that will happen after 2008 is that some programs will wither, and faculty will be hired to match needs at that time.

Stuart McAninch said that there will be a graying of students, and this will affect program needs in yet another way. Because of the nature of today’s work place, workers trained in one professional area will change jobs more frequently than in the past, and many new jobs will be preceded by new education.

With regard to new program proposals, Rocco Cottone said that to achieve the best outcomes the faculty who actually write a proposal need to be able to negotiate directly with System Academic Affairs, because campus level administrators are not able to address options and needs at the unit level. Steve Graham said that he no longer sees this as a problem for any of the campuses. This has never been a problem except with St. Louis, and he thinks that Academic Affairs and the new UMSL administration have agreed to rectify this so that System Academic Affairs staff and St. Louis faculty negotiate directly. Steve Lehmkuhle said that contrary to perception new program review is not a political process. He acknowledged that the way it has been handled in St. Louis has disconnected those who know the most about program proposals from those who approve them. To accurately assess market conditions, Paul Speck stressed the need to be able to share market knowledge about such things as who a program’s competitors are. Steve Graham named Jay Goff at Rolla as a potential resource person who is especially knowledgeable and good at this kind of analysis.

As discussion drew to a close, Steve Lehmkuhle said that in this election cycle CBHE would be under pressure from the State Auditor, who is a candidate for governor, to revise program review policies. Because CBHE involvement in program review would be counterproductive to our mission to deliver quality education to the state, UM Academic Affairs will work with CBHE at whatever level is required to assure that CBHE’s role is the one that is most effective. Considering that UM Academic Affairs can’t tell which proposed program is valuable and which is not, and so must solicit review by professionals who do, how can CBHE discriminate between programs of greater and lesser value? Currently the door is open for CBHE to get out of the program review business, because Quinton Wilson wants to eliminate this added level of extra institutional review. He emphasized that Missouri legitimately needs the oversight of program approval to prevent unnecessary proliferation of programs in universities across the state, but this is not the same thing as program review. The State does need an effective way to monitor mission differentiation issues between universities across state and enforce this. If, for example, Rolla wants an MBA program, that is a matter for UM to decide, not CBHE. If Southwest Missouri State, however, wants a Ph.D. program, this is a CBHE issue, because it is a mission issue as established by the State.
UMC Grievance Procedure:

The 2003-04 IFC was supportive of a pilot grievance process for the UMC campus. Sudarshan Loyalka reported that the UMC Faculty have approved implementation of the pilot procedures by vote (90% of those voting, voted in favor) and that the Chancellor and Provost are supportive. He stated that the UMC would need the Board approval to go ahead with the procedure. Steve Lehmkuhle advised that Presidential and Board approval of the pilot program, with a sunset provision because of its pilot status, would be the final implementation steps. However, he asked the 2004-05 IFC to confirm IFC approval to go forward.

Jakob Waterborg asked for confirmation that it is only a UMC implementation at this point. He suggested that the term “pilot” not be used, so people at UMC could appeal outcomes based on the argument that this is not an approved, official procedure. UMKC wants to see it move quickly, because some colleagues feel that the UMC “pilot” is better than what UMKC now has in place.

Steve Lehmkuhle stressed that the key is the sunset rule. Jakob Waterborg asked how “sunset” would be interpreted? If the pilot at UMC does not win final approval, will the grievance process role back to the current procedure? If successful, will a decision then need to be made to approve the pilot? Frank Schmidt stated that UMC faculty believe that this is not a pilot, for UMC, but final as pertains to them. It is believed there is no sunset for UMC. Frank Schmidt wants it official and permanent in CRR and suggested the stipulation not be stated as a sunset rule but that it will be reviewed at a certain time. Sudarshan Loyalka voiced agreement with Frank Schmidt. Steve Lehmkuhle assured that it would supplant, for UMC, the current CRR, but not for the other campuses. The problem is that we will now have different policies for different campuses, which opens a set of legal problems that will complicate matters for the UM Legal Office. This is why it is desirable to include a sunset clause.

Rock asked if we shouldn’t go to the other campuses and see if they will adopt the “pilot” thus keeping all campuses on the same footing. Lois Pierce commented that UMC has more grievance cases than other campuses, so if it will help that campus, we should let it go forward since the existing procedure is problematic for them. Steve Lehmkuhle added that even two cases per year can bring an institution to its knees. Van said that it would take a minimum of 1 year for the other campuses to move, so we should let UMC go now and the rest of us come on later, when we are ready. There was general agreement. Van Reidhead asked, since this was approved last year by IFC does the 2004-05 IFC need to ratify it again? Steve Lehmkuhle said that we could go forward with a memorandum. “My question now,” he said is this: Is IFC committed to go forward to develop a common procedure? He asked Rocco Cottone if he could produce a memo giving support to UMC going forward with the process as a first step toward IFC producing a common procedure. It will be best, he said, if we move back to a common grievance process.

Steve Graham said that the other campuses need to get started on this now, with the idea that the other 3 will make decisions within 2 years. Steve Lehmkuhle stressed that reviewing grievance procedures burns up a lot of valuable faculty time in cycles, and he does not want it to use up more than is necessary for UM this time. The key is to set dates for making decisions to protect faculty time this time around. Grievances themselves chew up lots of time, and he believes it is worth seeing if the UMC pilot
procedures move things along better and faster. Once this is known, then go to campuses. Sudarshan Loyalka added that two years would be needed for UMC to gather enough data for the other campuses to assess and decide if the pilot procedures are better than what exists now.

There was general agreement that the other campuses will wait for 2 years, rather than waste time now.

**[IFC Agenad Item]** Rocco Cottone, Sudarshan Loyalka, and Jakob Waterborg agreed to do the resolution/memorandum for discussion with President Floyd and approval at the September meeting.

**Executive Order No. 26 (CRR 310.025) Extension of Probationary Period for Faculty:**
The existing policy and 2 suggested options for policy change were available for discussion. With regard to the options spelled out in the handout, Steve Lehmkuhle said the issue is whether we extend the options that justify extension of the probationary period, leave it to the discretion of each Chancellor, or grant all faculty (those with 85% appointment or higher) an extension, as per Option #2. Frank Schmidt suggested that Option #2 will conflict with federal protections for disabilities, and related protective laws, which hold persons harmless. Steve Graham also believes there are FMLA issues with individuals receiving extensions getting only 85% of their salary during the extension year.

Van Reidhead asked if the current system is broken, to which Steve Lehmkuhle responded that “broken” is too strong a statement.

Jakob Waterborg suggested a policy that elaborates the kinds of allowable reasons for an extension, but not to change the rule. Lois Pierce agreed. Rock said that the difficulty is that vice chancellors enforce open-ended policy differently, thus the issue. Mike Hilgers said that the UMR rate of rejection of extension requests is higher than the other campuses and said the issue is how to protect people from a chancellor who rejects them at what appears to be an unfair rate? He said that the UMR effort to improve undergraduate graduation rates is problematic for faculty who are having trouble with teacher evaluations. It is believed that rather than work with faculty on this issue, that it becomes a reason to unfairly reject their probationary extension requests in order to get rid of them.

Steve Lehmkuhle commented that he did not sense that IFC wants a change. Rocco Cottone said that it appears UMR does. Van Reidhead said he believes that UMSL is OK. He believes St. Louis decisions are actually made at the department and dean level, with higher levels blamed. Mike Hilgers said this might also be the case at Rolla, although what he hears from faculty the perception of unfairness at the highest level. Lois Pierce believes we need something to protect faculty with pregnancies, which slow down their production and against which prejudice persists when it comes to realistic assessments of productivity. She said there are FMLA issues that suggest spelling this out. Paul Speck agreed with Lois Pierce’s point, saying that pregnancy is sometimes viewed chauvinistically. He said we should avoid creating entitlements, but we should not contradict FMLA.
Frank Schmidt said that at UMC faculty have to be encouraged, even directed to apply for extensions, and Van Reidhead said it is the same at UMSL. Lois Pierce and Paul Speck each said that their concern is that people who take extensions are penalized, in that they are scrutinized more carefully. Rocco Cottone asked for consensus. Do we agree against changing the policy *per se*, unless, of course, a campus wants to do something different on its own? The group assented, yes.

On the related issue of FMLA, Steve Graham clarified the roles of FMLA as understood by the Academic Officers with regard to FMLA leaves, not probationary extensions. Faculty are entitled to take FMLA, the question is whether they get paid. As a rule of thumb, the Academic Officers say faculty will get paid. Some Dean’s have resisted, but as rule of thumb faculty will be paid when they can meet the FMLA guidelines. The rule of thumb, then, is that faculty will be compensated for 12 weeks paid leave under FMLA.

**Incentive Programs:**

Steve Lehmkuhle proposed a set of principles to improve variable incentive pay programs for employees. He noted the importance of arriving at a set of principles that are acceptable to the President, who must approve incentive plans. UMC has 17 incentive programs. Incentive principles must strike a balance between core values and the work requirements of faculty. Jakob Waterborg said that he thought we agreed last year that UMKC would go forward with a pilot incentive program, though he noted the campus is still working on the plan. Steve Lehmkuhle answered that it turned out that the campus was not ready, and we need to move forward for UM as a whole. Peter Wilden noted the existence of incentive programs at UMC and UMKC but also the greater need to move forward to a common set of understandings and principles, which we need to put forward an implement without holding existing and new incentive programs back. UM Academic Affairs, he said, sees room for diverse incentive plans, which address the needs of faculty at different levels of organization ranging from particular faculty groups to an entire campus or University as a whole. Key questions are: How long should incentive programs run? Should termination dates be set? What levels of compensation should be offered? How do we deal with those who warrant compensation above the threshold? Who will review programs? Who will review cases? How will existing programs be affected? It is important not to impede them, but they need to incorporate the same principles as the new guidelines. Jakob Waterborg asked if there are existing programs that violate the principles in the DRAFT plan? Peter Wilden said that in some the goals are not explicit. He noted a wide range of kinds of incentive programs, not all of them affecting faculty and the need for all to be justified by principles consistent with the University mission. It does not appear that any existent program would be discontinued, but some will need to be modified, with goals, purpose, and principles for justification spelled out (revised, Yes, but killed, NO). Steve Lehmkuhle noted that existing and new programs need to address balance, consistent with mission values—teaching, research, service—to assure that incentives do not distort the core mission. He further noted that it is not
clear at what point compensation gets out of line. Steve Lehmkuhle emphasized that
times change and the limits and reasons for programs change. Consequently, supports
time limitations to insure regularized reevaluations. Upon reevaluation, some programs
will need to be discontinued based on changing conditions, while others may need to be
adapted but sustained. The, Steve Lehmkuhle noted, is that programs must be open
and transparent.

Sudarshan Loyalka asked the purpose of the clause, “open and transparent
‘where possible.’” Steve Lehmkuhle clarified that this protects our ability to use
incentives to recruitment candidates quickly when required while protecting their
privacy. This does not impair transparency, but it does mean that in some cases
checks and balances will come after the fact.

Jakob Waterborg asked if the President must approve individual applications?
Steve Lehmkuhle said, no. The President must approve the principles upon which the
whole set of programs is based.

**[IFC Agenda Item]** Steve Lehmkuhle stressed that we do not want vetting and
approval of the principles to take a full year. Quick feedback is needed, because there
are programs that are ready to implement now, and Academic Affairs does not want to
hold them up. Peter Wilden confirmed that the version to be vetted on campus is this
version (released at IFC Retreat)? Steve Lehmkuhle asked IFC and campus leaders to
take the plan to campuses for feedback now, because President Floyd wants faculty
feedback from the campuses before approving a final set of plan principles to guide all
incentive programs. However, President Floyd has not endorsed a set of principles.

As for timeline, Steve Lehmkuhle asked for feedback from campus executive
bodies at the first meeting on each campus, so that feedback can be shared with the
Academic Officers in September or October at the latest. Once he knows the thinking
of the faculty, he can produce and Executive Order to implement the principles.

Rocco Cottone asked if this is precursor to implement a new Grants Incentive
plan, and Steve Lehmkuhle confirmed that it is. There will be further discussion about
the Grants Incentive program *per se*.

Paul Speck asked if there is a way to share the plans so that people across
campuses can learn from the diverse plans. Peter Wilden said that this could be done.

**Unified Academic Calendar**

UM is a single University, and the President want a common calendar that
communicates a common identity. Steve Lehmkuhle presented an initial proposal for a
common calendar, which applies the old IFC calendar (approved by IFC some years
back). This formula is a proposal only.

Paul Speck noted that St. Louis is preparing to discuss a year-round calendar
with a full summer semester. It is hard, he said, to see how a common calendar will
work with the year-round calendar that UMSL will produce.

Mike Hilgers asked how ratification would be handled. He wanted to know if he
is expected to go back to Rolla and kill the St. Pats Day break. Or, will UM System
simply impose a plan. Steve Lehmkuhle asked that campus faculty leadership lead an
evaluation to establish how the existing models fit the proposed algorithm.

Paul Speck questioned why are we going to an algorithm, when we are terribly
concerned about market conditions and responses to these. An algorithm reduces
flexible response opportunities? Steve Graham indicated that System would be open to discuss the merits, if we can show good evidence.

Jakob Waterborg advocated adoption to signify that we are one University. There was substantial disagreement on this position. Paul Speck argued that a common calendar is a form of standardization, but that it does not lead to a one University outcome. Lois Pierce sees it as signal that we are one University, pointing up that she has had students who are confused with different start dates across the campuses. Paul Speck responded that it is not the right marketing way to do it. You don’t, he said, open 40 stores and tell them all to have same hours.

With division on the issue of a common calendar, IFC will need to address it further.

Policies on Non-Regular Faculty

Steve Lehmkuhle introduced this topic saying that the University is now recognizing the importance of non-regular faculty, and it wants to find a way to recognize them. This issue will go forward, he said, and we need to get our arms around it so we can develop some good policy. We need a promotion track for non-regular faculty and a process to promote people along that non-tenure track. What is a proper title system? What guidelines should a non-regular track incorporate for hiring and promotion in the non-tenure track? Steve Lehmkuhle suggests that before we act, we need to look at what other universities are doing as a comparative basis for establishing best practice. We are at an early stage in figuring this out and implementing the right mechanisms for promotion.

Curators and Distinguished Professorships

Steve Lehmkuhle introduced the issue, saying that the issue of compensation for Curators and Distinguished professors, which the campuses pay, has been worked out, but left open is the question about term reviews with option for termination. Five-year reviews have been suggested, with pro-forma continuation, based on productivity.

Jakob Waterborg voiced concern, in the event of periodic reviews, that it would provide an incentive for provosts to terminate appointments in order to pick up $10,000 to use somewhere else.

Sudarshan Loyalka felt that procedures for selection have been ad hoc. He also argued that $10,000 is too small to make a significant research impact, and that faculty with such distinguished achievements should be awarded a larger annual sum. He also said that we should not pull recognition out from under these distinguished people without a sound process and without good cause. Steve Lehmkuhle responded to Sudarshan Loyalka’s points. He said that now the materials required for nomination and appointment are substantial, and cases are well vetted on campus, so appointments are no longer ad hoc but well documented and reviewed. He acknowledged that the award amounts are indeed small and said that some provosts favor increasing the annual purse. There is, he added, a sense that Curator’s Professor award amounts should be the same across campuses. As requested by Steve Lehmkuhle, Katina Volle informed us that the number of Curators Professors is large, but that the number is small for Distinguished Teaching Professors. Sudarshan Loyalka noted that UMC provides a smaller per faculty purse for Curators Professors than Rolla
and suggested that a committee be constituted to look at appointments and standards. Steve Lehmkuhle said that in President Pacheco’s day award amounts were variable amounts, but during his term Pacheco standardized it at $10,000. Mike Hilgers served on the committee at UMR and noted that the process was substantial, with good documentation, and a good outcome.

To decide the term review issue, Mike Hilgers asked if Curators and Distinguished professor recognition is intended principally on the basis of faculty achievement, or is it a role model, mentoring position? Rocco Cottone asked if we have demographic data on recipient ages. If appointments come later in life, term reviews are not warranted. If, however, people tend to get these appointments in their 40’s or 50’s, then a review process is needed. Steve Lehmkuhle said that more and more Curators’ appointments are being used as a retention tool for star faculty, and so the number of middle age faculty is increasing. They have a history at UM, but they are younger. Based on this, Rocco Cottone voiced support for a review process. Paul Speck asked Steve Lehmkuhle what he thinks about it being used as a retention tool. Steve Lehmkuhle responded that if a person meets the criteria and the campus says it needs to keep a person, and UM Academic Affairs is willing to put her/him forward. Such cases should get the award, because the academic department, dean, and provost are saying they are worth it. Appointments should not, he said, be used to recognize someone at the end of career. It is not being used that way now.

Paul Speck asked, of those who hold these, is your sense that 2 or 3 are problems, or more? It seemed we did not know. Steve Lehmkuhle said, however, that how to assess this comes back to Mike Hilger’s question: What’s the purpose of the award? Is it for past history? Or is there also a mentoring dimension? Frank Schmidt commented that this looks like a solution looking for a problem. He asked if a little data would answer the question and suggested that a group be constituted to look at the data and see whether Curator’s Distinguished Professors are doing what they are supposed to. His sense is that at UMC the current process is working very well. He said he couldn’t think of a Curator’s Professor whose title or award should be pulled.

Steve Lehmkuhle indicated that he heard us, and the issue will not be addressed this year.

**Academic Integrity**

Kandace Smith introduced the problem of students suspended on one campus who enroll in another. We discussed two approaches: first, pros and cons of an agreement that a student suspended on one campus would thereby be suspended from the University, and second, the possibility that the Legal Office would prefer a single system-wide policy. Most discussion focused on the former position, but there is a difficulty of communication among campuses.

The question was raised whether the Legal Office advocates one policy; when suspended on one campus, a student would be automatically suspended on all campuses. Suspension is sometimes for physical conduct. A student at UMSL attacked a faculty member, was suspended, subsequently enrolled at Rolla and did the same thing again. How do we deal with this across campuses? Lois Pierce suggested that the Admissions Committee on each campus could be given the data—which should be provided on the transcript—because then they will not admit them. The simplest
thing to do, she said, is enter “Suspended” on the transcript. Steve Lehmkuhle asked if we should put it on the transcript *per se*, because if we do it will follow the student down the years. At Georgetown he said it goes on the transcript but after a specified time with a clean record, involving rehabilitation activities, it is removed, leaving a clean slate. Van Reidhead voiced support for such a method of forgiveness. Lois Pierce voiced support for permanent record on the transcript, because by the time this is taken a student has been through a long process, such that only the worst offenders will ever have it entered on the transcript. Frank Schmidt strongly supported Lois Pierce, referencing the ethics code in the sciences and journalism, where the code is ‘one time and your out.’ The code is so engrained that nobody misunderstands, and there is high compliance; this is the level of responsibility we need to model for students. Paul Speck said that a student could enroll at one of our campuses without the transcript from another campus, so there is no failsafe method. Suspension, he argued, is punishment enough; we do not want to stigmatize people for life. Franks said that his concern is much more with the consistent cheater, with a pattern of behavior that can’t be tolerated. Rock suggested that ‘Expelled’ be entered on the transcript but ‘Suspended,’ not. Lois Pierce argued that we need to hold students accountable for their actions, so a strong code is needed. Paul Speck suggested that if we follow this line of thinking, we should label the specific behavior on the transcript. That way, subsequent institutions would know the actual infraction; if the suspension is for cheating, enter ‘Cheating’ on the transcript.

Steve Lehmkuhle said that he would take it to the Academic Officers and bring it back to IFC for further discussion.

**Parental Notification of Alcohol Abuse**

We discussed the parental notification letter, with no change in policy and not need for further discussion.

**Government Relations**

Vice President for Government Relations Steve Knorr discussed government relations and answered questions. Prior to President Floyd’s tenure, anybody who felt the need lobbied government officials directly, resulting in confusion among elected officials who voiced their concern. President Floyd has adopted a speak with one voice model, with all direct institutional communication with state and federal officials going through the System Government relations office.

In response to a question from Jakob Waterborg, Steve Knorr said that we must get our internal house in order, and this will take some time, before we can effectively mobilize the grassroots. Otherwise our grassroots constituents will not know what they are supporting, or with whom it originates. When Rock asked if we as faculty can communicate directly with our representatives, Steve Knorr spelled out that it is unlawful to use faculty email, University letterhead, stamps, and the like for these purposes, so faculty communication is constrained by legal limitations. This, however, does not impose limits on what the faculty do with their own time and resources.

Jakob Waterborg said the problem with centralized communication is the question of a campus-specific voice, which at present is perceived non-existent. If the system is to be centralized, there needs, he said, we need to know the strategy that U-
Hall is pursuing to get us out of hard times. Steve Knorr said that this is happening. The campus legislative representatives from his office meet regularly with campus administration down to the level of the deans. Further, Government Relations posts the ‘Legislative Update’ by email to all employees regularly. Every speech the President makes is posted in its entirety. At present he said, President Floyd is working to create better legislative coordination among the colleges and universities of the state, because at present it is poor.

Rocco Cottone asked if faculty can make contact with legislators to let them know how we are using the money the state has given us. Steve Knorr advised that faculty when they have the opportunity should tell legislators what we as faculty do—this is what the need and want to learn about—but advised faculty against getting into lobbying, because this turns them off. Everybody wants to lobby them.

In response to a question from Paul Speck, Steve Knorr encouraged campus executive committees to meet with the campus legislative representatives. Rocco Cottone asked Steve Knorr to provide representatives’ names to Senate/Council Chairs on each campus.

Frank Schmidt asked how Government Relations is dealing with the negative fallout from issues facing the University. Steve Knorr said that the approach is to engage legislators consistently at the level of what a legislator needs to do to meet the needs of the University for her/his constituents. If the first thing on a legislator’s mind when they see University employees is, “What have I done to help the University meet its needs?” there will not be time to think about Ricky Clemons. The stem cell research issue is important to us, and the University is limited in its ability to education. Legislators who have made up their mind on this may not be open to education. However, this will soon be a $1 billion/year industry in Missouri, and this will influence the outcome more than anything we can do. Steve Knorr noted that like stem cell research, the Intelligent Design issue is sensitive for the state and the University. The K-12 funding issue is significant in Missouri, because K-12 is built into the budget, whereas Higher Education is not. K-12 is suing the state for $1 billion that it claims the state owes them under this formula. If they win, and Steve Knorr believes the courts will want to help K-12, the University will suffer. We do not want to protect ourselves at the expense of K-12, he said, but the University’s approach is to communicate the message that the state can’t hurt the University as a means to help K-12.

In response to Jakob Waterborg, Steve Lehmkuhle said that the University is trying to coordinate, to mutual advantage, with the 2-year colleges. Jakob Waterborg offered the suggestion to Steve Knorr that his office establish good communication with the Missouri Association of Faculty Senates, which meets twice annually in the Jefferson City. The fall meeting is devoted to communication with CBHE, and the spring meeting with members of the Missouri Legislature.