Inter-Faculty Campus
Draft Minutes
October 23, 2007

Present: Richard Wright (UMSL), Frank Blum (UMR), Doug Carroll (UMR), Carole Murphy (St. Louis), Tim Farmer (St. Louis), Frank Schmidt (UMC), Wilson Watt (UMC), Gary Ebersole (UMKC), Nancy Stancel (UMKC)

- Revised draft summer retreat minutes accepted as written with the addition that the names of attendees be included.

MAFS
The Executive Committee of MAFS is interested in attending an IFC meeting on the Columbia campus. In particular, it is interested in discussions on the impact of policies surrounding the DHE in enacting Senate Bill 389 (Consumer guidelines). In February each year MAFS sponsors and annual Legislative Day in Jefferson City. It includes all the public regional institutions of higher education. Robert Stein from the DHE meets with MAFS every year at its fall meeting. The IFC agreed to invite the MAFS Executive Committee to its December 12th meeting. Frank Schmidt will serve as the contact person to arrange for a meeting room for MAFS. Two UMR IFC representatives may be available to attend the MAFS meeting since they will be on campus for other meetings.

The suggestion was made that perhaps IFC Chairs could ask for a thirty minute working session at the Board of Curators meeting, much like the Chancellors have.

10:00AM Discussion with Vice President Krawitz; Associate Vice President Larry Gates (Chair of the Task Force for Funding Formula). The draft 2008 budget was emailed in advance to IFC members. V.P. Krawitz went over several documents with IFC members.

Document 1. Code of ethics
This is a proposal by the Finance and Administration Office to expand the code of ethics that was developed a few years ago to comply with the Sarbanes Oxley Act. It was thought that it would be appropriate to expand this code to cover the UM system and not just finance and administrative personnel. When discussion began to develop a fraud hotline, the code of ethics topic came up and it was decided to broaden the code so it applies to all campuses. The Chancellors were comfortable with this. An IFC member noted that the policy was created by the administration before faculty had a chance to review it. V.P. Krawitz said that that was why she included it in the packets that were handed out. IFC members wanted clarification on whether the code supplants other aspects of the existing codes of ethics for faculty? Do we need to alter it so that it applies only to staff since there are other ethics codes under which faculty operate? Krawitz stated that higher level principles were not meant to replace other ethics statements. The Chair recommended that we take the document back to our senates for dispersal to see if it is acceptable for faculty and staff alike. This policy would not cover behavior outside
the work environment. IFC members will report back on responses at the next IFC meeting. V.P. Krawitz will send the ethics draft out electronically.

**Document 2. Budget update for 2007-2008**

V.P. Krawitz sent out the operating budget to IFC members prior to the meeting and it gives details on each campus’ budget. It can also be found online. The campuses 1% reallocation pool was built into the budget and there is $7.9 million needed to balance it. Discussion ensued on the significant impact the 1% pool has had on campuses. For example, at MU, it has prevented the hiring of new faculty. V. P. Krawitz explained that it is new initiatives, not the 1% reallocation that causes the problem. And, some campuses have incurred debt they also have to deal with. There is a 2.7 to 3.2 % inflation increase projected next year and we’ll also have to deal with a cap on student tuition increases. The Board of Curators can request a waiver for student tuition increases, but that probably won’t happen.

The 1% pool will be built in as “efficiencies.” There was concern that this would make it look like there is “fat” to cut rather than leaving it in the budget as a deficit so that legislators see it as such. V.P. Krawitz is willing to have that conversation with the Board but there are board members who don’t buy it at all. IFC members strongly felt that the 1% pool needs to be identified as budget cuts.

**New Guidelines for student loans**

Background: Then-New York General Attorney Spitzer identified kickbacks that were occurring in financial aids offices. Some campuses were getting kickbacks from loan agents such as Sally May or banks for steering them to their institutions. The result of this practice was a national look at this problem. As attorney generals in many states began looking into this, a set of principals was developed and there was movement to have every educational institution sign a statement agreeing to the set of principles. The problem with this would be that if there needed to be changes to the policy, it would take an executive order to deal with it. The preference was to do this internally instead of going through the Attorney Generals Office.


This document is on the planning budget website. We are asking for 59.5 million additional funds from the state but we probably won't get that much. The UM System is taking a new approach and looking at funding as a partnership between the institution, the students and the state. We are asking for a core appropriation of 21 million. V.P. Krawitz will send us information on the 23 million “Preparing to Care” – to invest in educational programs and graduates in health care programs. Expenditures based on FTE students is to be used as an efficiency measure. We’ve done quite well using this measure and the Board of Curators approves of it.

**Document 4. COPHE Higher Education Funding Formula**

Last January, there was a movement to come up with a funding model for higher education. UM has taken the lead to investigate funding models. Larry Gates has a lot of expertise in this area and he was asked to chair a task force to develop a funding model
for four-year higher education institutions. This committee has written six white papers. June was goal for the model to be released. The Presidents of other four-year institutions are doing this as well and asked to see our white papers. Then, the other four-year higher education institution Presidents asked to work with the UM task force to come up with funding models. Draft funding proposal recommendations are targeted to be done by the end of October. At that time we want to have recommendations and a model that we can embrace and forward to the DHE. The draft recommendations are close to being finished to forward to the Presidents of the four-year institutions of higher education.

The question was asked about how were cluster institutions defined? The Delaware Cost Study was used and the committee examined two years of data to come up with lists of disciplines and their associated costs. Since several programs such as Pharmacy, Nursing and Conservatory of Music are not addressed by the Delaware Study, how did the committee analyze those programs? Those programs were specifically excluded from the matrix and the committee will examine them separately, looking at national data at about the 50 percentile. If the recommendations are accepted by COPHE, what happens next? It is critical that COPHE embraces the model. Once it signs off on it, it would go to the DHE Funding Task Force and it would be tied into a model supporting two year institutions of higher education. There was concern about the large percentage of growth among the two year institutions over that last 20 years and what that does to the funding model. We are trying to get our task force in place as an advisory group to the DHE who is asking for help on this process. It is unknown whether the outcome will go into a statute, and that could be problematic. The CBHE will then have to adopt it. It is critical that the performance piece highlight doctoral education and research which is unique to the UM system.

**Document 5. Capital Funding**

The capital funding piece has gone to the state. The Governors Office has told us not to expect anything more in support of capital funding because we got funding from the Lewis and Clark Discover Initiative. He wants us to submit only smaller projects. It was made clear to the Governor's Office that the Lewis and Clark Discover Initiative cannot take the place of other capital needs. We have ranked ordered the top 13 capital needs as the next to be funded. This year, we will give the legislators more complete lists of projects as backup so that if something else pops up, we can move up projects if the legislature is more likely to support them.

**Document 6. A-133 and A-21 Compliance**

There were several issues that arose during the 2006 audit which are being addressed. The 2007 A-133 audit should be better. The system has been dealing with issues at the macro level, which occurred more centrally within the system. New audits will be more at the micro (unit) level. V.P. Krawitz is not convinced that problems won’t be found with effort verification reports. Federal grants and contracts are being more closely looked at and federal agencies are looking at this to see if they should get money back. We have not done a good job about educating the faculty on how to fill these out. We’re doing much better at getting reports turned in. With the hiring of a training person to help faculty with this, the problems should decrease.
Document 7. Resource Allocation Principles
This document is a history on the principles for UM’s allocation of funds. IFC members need to read it and be ready to discuss it at the next IFC meeting.

Document 8. Fraud Hotline
Many higher education institutions and large corporations have had fraud hotlines for a long time which are used to report misconduct anonymously. The Sarbanes Oxley Act also addresses this issue. The question arose that the reporting mechanism is anonymous, but often only a handful of people may have access to certain information. How are these whistleblowers protected? UM legal counsel believes that we have sufficient protection for employees who report fraud tips. The tips come in to V.P. Krawitz’s office and then are forwarded to legal counsel. The committee that deals with fraud issues decides whether to send it to the campus liaison. Or, if the report comes back that had not gotten good campus response, internal auditors would look at it. Typically, the liaison does not go back to the supervisor from whom the complaint originated to investigate the issue. What about false reports? False reports can usually be determined fairly quickly.

E-procurement is being tested and will go live in January. The UM system will receive 5 million in savings from vendors who have agreed to participate in the program.

Campus Reports

St. Louis
The units have received responses to the five-year administrative reviews and made recommendations over the summer by the advisory team. The Faculty Senate met with the new athletic director who presented at Senate and was well received. There are concerns about the implementation of Senate bill 389 and there will be more faculty discussions about it. The Consumer Information posted on the web has been pushed back a year.

Columbia – The Senate hosted a successful Curators’ breakfast. It is working on gathering responses to issues for the Compete Missouri Program. The student ombudsman position proposal has gone forward. The posting of student evaluations received several comments and remains controversial. All open campus committee positions have been filled. Senate is working with the Speakers Bureau. It is very good at providing knowledgeable speakers about what they do individually, but there has not been a good translation of what the university does and how it is beneficial to the citizens of Missouri. MU is looking for people who can speak to that. It was noted that John Foley has a good website on this issue.

Rolla
The Academic Council has a new secretary and members are pleased with her work. The Council is working on bylaw changes to remove the Dean structure from the document and it will be submitted today to the Senate General Faculty for approval. The Bylaw changes will need to be made to the UM Collected Rules and Regulations as well. There are questions of how to handle Curricula and P & T issues with a Deanless
structure. There was a decision for uniformity across campus on these issues and now that the Dean structure is gone, it is difficult to know how to maintain this uniformity. Previously Deans played a role in uniformity in curriculum and degree programs across like disciplines. Without Deans this is going to be harder until some mechanisms and norms get worked out. Changes will need to be made to the UM Collected Rules and Regulations as well—Rolla also had to replace College based representation on campus committees. Kurt Kosbar did an excellent job on preparing slates for the staffing of the committees based on demographics. The Academic Council reported its interpretation of department chairs positions being vacant if departments are split or merged on interest to merge departments while there was interest from below to split departments. This whole process of re-organization was based on the idea that it would reduce administration, but it comes with a cost. It has been a tremendous effort to reorganize and reassign Dean responsibilities. Two committees are looking at creating a student excused absences policy. A Panel of Peers has been convened to discuss new monies but it conflicts with the existing Budgetary Affairs Committee so work needs to be done to resolve this.

UMKC
Capital projects: the new Nursing and Pharmacy building was dedicated on September 21st and there will be a ground breaking ceremony for the library expansion on October 31st. The new dorms are going up on the west side of campus and will house 550 beds. It is due to open in fall 2008. Four candidates for Provost are on campus this week and we hope to have a Provost hired by January 1st. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has charged COSCO to study the faculty and staff grievance process. There have been problems with the process, especially following timelines. Our campus will be contacting UMC to discuss its pilot project for grievances. We are still waiting for a report on the sexual harassment case. We won’t look into the student grievant process until this investigation is over. The affirmative action portion of the hiring process became an issue this month. Affirmative action staff did a presentation at Senate and provided a flowchart for new hires. It looked very time intensive and Senators felt it was bureaucratization of process. The Executive Committee of Senate met with them and we think we have an acceptable compromise to recommend to the Senate next week. The new resource allocation process will begin July 2008 and there is some anxiety about it.

1:00PM Discussion with Interim Vice President Graham, Assistant Vice President Smith, Assistant Vice President Noble, Faculty Fellow Akers

Chief of Staff, David Russell (President’s Report)
1. Senate Bill 389
The Consumer Information procedures have been approved by CBHE and it is now looking at other aspects of bill 389. There has always been a coordinating agency but its role is changing and it will now have to develop policies for higher education. We are approaching CBHE with offers to help them with this. It wants to have a draft policy out by November 1. We have provided information that we hope makes it way into the policy. We are the first institution to suggest items that CBHE is looking at to use in its policies.
Dr. Lamb is being very proactive because he feels that we need to influence the legislature now and not at the point that it goes into session. He has an aggressive calendar of appointments to meet with many of them. There is a “Leg forum” scheduled for each campus. There is also a scheduled series of unity tour stops. This has proven to be a good process. For the first time the President of MSU and our President appeared on stage together.

We are resurrecting the 1990s “Proposition B” effort by visiting various Missouri groups around the state to respond to questions and concerns that citizens have. Seventy-five visits were done previously. We will be asking campuses to identify persons to take with us to help with presentations. It will be January before this can happen.

“The Missouri 100” – This is a new Chancellor Advisory Model that they’re creating at the UM system level. Invitations have been sent out to the most influential people in the state. Lobbying is not the primary focus. This is a constituency that can be tapped in to, to discover how the university is doing. It will provide a structure for when the new president comes and can help in getting exposure for him. The first meeting will be November 9 or 10. UM is trying to be proactive by talking directly with Missourians and building relations with them. It’s bi-partisan. There will be a reception to honor both US Senators in the state.

V.P. Human Resources, Ken Hutchinson
The search continues for a new University of Missouri President. There will be nothing to report from the Board at this time except that we have a strong candidate pool. The Board of Curators is taking the time it needs to continue the search. The search to replace Ken’s position is proceeding. A search firm has been hired and a committee has been appointed. Jim Ross will be chairing it and Ken will serve in an advisory role. There will be no premium increases this year in the health benefits plan and the dental plan. There will be a -6% decrease in the premium for the Retirement Indemnity Program.

Asst. V.P. Noble
1. Faculty Leave Policy
V.P. Noble will meet with UM counsel and HR staff after our November meeting. There are questions about what the cost will be to the university in offering paid leave to full-time ranked, non-tenure track faculty. It was pointed out that it’s the right thing to do. The paid leave portion will read the same as for full time tenure track faculty FMLA leave and the Provost (who recommended this) and the President are on board with this. Since IFC agreed to that change, the policy can be fast-tracked to the legal department so that we can try to get it on the Board’s November agenda. The proposal will be changed to say the “…full time ranked non-tenure track faculty will have the same paid FMLA leave that is provided for tenure track faculty” as long as federal compliance is met. IFC voted unanimously to support this. The definitions of faculty members can be seen in the Collected Rules and Regulations at 310.005. The President and Provost will need to work through where any additional money that might be needed will come from.
Asst. V.P. Smith

2. Assessment Proposal
V.P. Smith emailed IFC members a draft proposal after summer retreat. It will be discussed at the next IFC meeting.

3. Brief Review of Procedures for Post-Tenure Review
This will be discussed at the November IFC meeting. See: www.umsystem.academicaffairs/posttenurereview.edu

4. Review of Criminal Background Checks Procedures
St. Louis noticed in the new faculty hire form that credit checks could be required. This will be taken care of and this will not be on faculty criminal background check form that candidate has to sign.

Since Chair Ebersole and IFC representative Stancel are not available for the November meeting, IFC representative Frank Blum agreed to chair the November IFC meeting.