Present: Carole Murphy (UMSL), Tim Farmer (UMSL), Frank Blum (MS&T), Wilson Watt (UMC), Doug Carroll (MS&T), Kurt Kosbar (MS&T) Alex Holsinger (UMKC), Gary Ebersole (UMKC), Nancy Stancel (UMKC), Frank Schmidt (UMC), Steve Neal (UMC)

IFC Minutes January 8, 2008 approved

V.P. Steve Graham is not available today because he in attending a search committee meeting for the V.P. Human Resources position.

The IFC Chair brought up the issue of the policy on academic dishonesty and plagiarism. There is dissatisfaction on the UMKC campus about how the policy is implemented. The CRR states that faculty can assess (evaluate) students on grades but they can not punish them with such actions as expulsion or failing the course. On the UMKC campus, a faculty member may not fail a student for the course if dishonesty or plagiarism is discovered. The topic was taken off the IFC agenda because it’s laid out in the CRR and the legal department reaffirmed its response that a faculty member cannot hand out punishment without due process. However, professors believe that failing a student is not a punishment, it’s an assessment. The Chair would like to bring the issue back to the IFC level because there are different applications at UMKC and UMSL than from UMC and MS&T.

UMC has dealt with this issue and won its stance on this. A faculty member may flunk a student on these grounds but he is required to report it. There are two options: a faculty member can take action and then report it. The action is noted in student’s record; or it can be reported with a recommendation of sanctions that a faculty member may not agree with or is beyond the scope of the course. You can take any steps including failure at UMC but you cannot automatically say a student has failed a course without going through steps laid out in the policy. It is not easy to track a student once a directive is ordered (i.e. a student is barred from taking a class the next semester but he does). This information is in UMC’s student handbook and it also must be placed in the class syllabus to garner support from the administration.

This is not true on the St. Louis campus. A faculty member can only fail a student on a specific assignment and the result is a lack of reporting of dishonesty. The onus is placed totally on the faculty member and there is little consequence for the student for this behavior. At UMSL, you may fail a student for a course if the decision violates ethics issues defined by the program.
On the MS&T campus, the Provost page states that a faculty member can fail a student for the course. All incoming graduate students in at least one department are now required to take a one hour credit course on this topic. This issue is going to the Academic Council for approval. IFC could ask Jim Devine from UMC (professor at School of law but he was legal counsel for a few years) to come talk to us about this.

10:00AM Discussion

Assistant V.P. Noble – The Faculty Leave Policy was approved by the BOC. It took great effort from all campuses to put this policy together and she is appreciative of all our hard work. The policy should be up on the web this week.

Assistant V.P. Smith – Compliance to S.B. 389 – we will start testing the web application sheets for its input of personal information. When it is verified that it is working correctly the faculty will be informed. There is a box where faculty members can place additional information but it will not include hot links for security reasons. Faculty should only have to do this once unless bio information changes. The class evaluation information is not part of the public consumption information. Each campus is creating its own set of questions for students to answer. Faculty information is tied to the course schedule so you would have to keep information updated on GTAs who are teaching (includes those GTAs teaching labs). Faculty listings will be alphabetical by campus. If the schedule says “staff” the faculty member will need to add names as soon as that information is available. Data does not include a person of record (giving the grades) it’s actually the person who’s in the classroom or lab, adjuncts, or those teaching who are not being paid. It is the HR and IT departments that place the information on the web. Department Chairs have the responsibility to make sure class information is correct. We should have a great deal of latitude getting the information in because not all information will be available until later.

UMC is using three survey questions for students rated on a scale of 1-5. Was the instructor clear in his teaching?; was the faculty member interested and engaged?; was this a good course? Survey results for a class should not be posted if there are fewer than 10 students or less than a 30% response because it would not be reliable statistically. Frank Schmidt will forward the survey questions to IFC members.

Fellow Akers – New Faculty Mentoring Workshop: Kent Wray asked them to go to MS&T to present a workshop to department chairs on mentoring faculty. They did so last week accompanied by Greg Holiday. Two sessions were given and 80% of Chairs were involved. A particular model was not given, rather, they wanted an engaged conversation on what the data says about faculty mentoring and concerns they may have about this. Discussion included how much it costs to replace a faculty member. They talked about special needs faculty and underrepresented faculty (i.e. men in nursing programs, women in engineering programs). They are willing to engage more targeted groups at other campuses if that would be helpful. The question was asked, “What about someone mentoring the chairs”? This was not addressed and discussion was mostly about senior faculty mentoring junior faculty. The data shows that when this is done new
faculty perform better and stay at the institution longer. The suggestion was made that we also need programs on mid-career mentoring once tenure is reached. At UMKC it is a requirement that junior faculty have a mentoring plan. That raised the question of whether there are mentoring programs on other campuses. UMC has a new faculty program. UMSL assigns a senior member to mentor a junior mentor. There needs to be a good match or it’s problematic. At MS&T it’s done department by department. A mutual choice is made where a junior faculty member is asked to choose a senior faculty member to mentor him. UM is not offering a mentoring program per se (it’s a workshop), but rather it’s an engaged dialogue and discussion is in terms of retention of faculty.

**Assistant V.P. Smith – Communication Survey:** As of today, the Faculty (includes GTA”s) Communication Survey (it used to be called English language proficiency) will be going out to students to respond to classes they took in fall of 2007. It surveys whether teachers are understandable and whether they communicate effectively. An annual report is presented to the BOC and then given to the campuses. Data shows that grades do not correlate to whether a student could understand an instructor. At UMKC there was a 50% decrease of student complaints by increasing the test requirement by 2 points (out of 60) which made a huge difference. UMKC also has an accent modification (reduction) program to help faculty with this. The survey did not include GTAs previously but now it does. Assistant V.P. Smith will send the survey to IFC so we can review it. It’s a self-reporting grade. Curators had the assumption that those who don’t speak English as a first language were problematic for students in the classroom (i.e. it doesn’t enhance the learning experience). The survey does not identify individual faculty members, but rather areas in which they teach. Chairs are told what the course is but not the name of the faculty member to keep it at the unit level. IFC wanted to know why not tell the name of the faculty member? V.P. Noble will send us background on this and samples of the survey and this may answer some of the questions. There is concern expressed that as more assessments are added to faculty loads, it would be nice to eliminate other surveys when possible. Surveys can pay off to improving programs but it’s at a cost. Fellow Akers said that the workshop has been presented at MS&T and UMSL. UMC and MS&T have volunteer speech pathologists that work with faculty who need this service and it has been very successful and enjoyable for faculty.

**11:30AM Discussion with Director Erin Elliott (Steve Knorr not available today)**

**Government Relations Update:**
Current district data sheets were passed out to show how UM graduates impact the state by district. It is important that UM gives legislators a snapshot of how we impact their individual districts. This is even more important with initiation of term limits. The information is on the web. An IFC member suggested adding the categories of principals and superintendents to the UM Alumni Teaching K-12 in the state in 2007 data sheets. Another IFC member expressed that it is important to also demonstrate in this data what UM could do if we got more money. Another suggestion was to include revenue from out-of-state students. For UMC, it’s equivalent to the state appropriation. Elliott states that it becomes a constant re-education because of term limits and the data sheets serve as
a tool to demonstrate that we are a stat-wide institution and we could do more if we’re given more money. The sheets go to the whips (40 for the House, 6 for the Senate) to brief them.

The Supplementary budget H.B. 219 will give us $31 million for the Ellis Fischel building (UMC) & Pharmacy (UMKC) will be funded this year, possibly in March. It goes to the Senate tomorrow morning and should be on the floor next week. Work on the operating budget is progressing. The House is meeting today to discuss H.B.3 that is shared with DHE funding and the $13.4 million of the “Preparing to Care” initiative. There’s a plan on how to divide up these funds and the emphasis is on nursing and nursing faculty. The community colleges are focusing mostly on two year nursing programs. We are hoping that higher education funding will not take a hit. $15 million will be taken out of the Access Missouri program to help out else where. The Governor recommended a 4.2 % increase ($430 million) and $457 next year to get us up to our high water mark in 2002.

Faculty compensation is another issue with the legislature. It’s a hard argument because it’s a local issue and it does not impact every district. An IFC member remarked that we can’t catch us up by cutting another 1% from our operating budgets. Being efficient isn’t the issue anymore but that message doesn’t seem to get through to legislators. It isn’t just faculty salaries that drives faculty to leave, it also impacts the ability to do our jobs when we have these cuts. The BOC and the legislature understand that it’s about the salaries and jobs. Members of the House Appropriations on Education Committee spent a whole day at UMC so it has a good understanding of what is at stake.

The “Emily Brooker Act” had a hearing. The Chair of the Education Committee does not like this bill. Even if it gets out of committee, he has the power to decide if it gets to the floor. The Senate will probably not go along with it.

**Chief of Staff David Russell:** Has there been any progress on formula funding? DHE is working on this and so is COPHE. The results are clear that two year schools have more success with this task. A task force has been formulated to work with this and UM’s Larry Gates serves on this committee. IFC members wanted to be sure that the formula includes the how the nature of the discipline affects the cost of a program. The matrix does account for the nature and the level of programs. The numbers have been run and have a good model. It is hard to get a consensus among four year H.E. institutions. Gordon Lamb is working hard on this. The formula needs to go forward next week so our differences need to be reconciled with the other institutions. We can no longer rely on headcount to create a rational, calculated model.

Has Julie Jolly’s position been filled? Yes, Steve has hired someone from Congressman Clevear’s office.
Campus Reports to Interim President Lamb

UMSL
It remains quiet on campus and work is progressing on its reaccreditation. It is looking at strategic planning in a different way rather than as a laundry list of items. A consultant is working with the campus to do real strategic planning. Honorary degrees remains controversial. Faculty feel that the degrees issued should be tied to the university or the region but the administration does not think that is necessary. It wants to look for innovative people from around the world so the campus will probably broaden its approach in awarding these degrees. UMSL is busy work on the compliance piece of SB389.

MS&T
Their campus has a question about honorary degrees as well and there will be a special faculty meeting tomorrow to approach candidates on this. The Faculty Senate will be presented with a computer privacy policy built off of the one created by UMKC. The legal department has questions about the policy statement and it may be that we’ll have a system-wide policy that may supersede the policy MS&T is reviewing. The campus will proceed on this regardless. There have been some computer system issues because of the name change the campus has gone through and there have some trouble with spam filters. The campus has a committee to deal with SB389 and the required faculty survey that needs to be developed. They may want a larger group of faculty to look at that issue. The campus is looking at its emergency preparedness processes. Concerns about the delegation of authority have been charged to a faculty ad hoc comm. The committee will look at broader aspects of emergency preparedness and what types of training will be needed. Interestingly, FEMA states that one is suppose to be compensated for this type of service, but that’s a whole other question. Otherwise, things are quiet on campus.

UMC
The campus has altered the requirements for transfer of admission for those without degrees. It is discussing the grievance procedures adopted for a three year period that has ended. It will revise them. Recommendations will be made to the faculty and the hope is that a vote can be taken on the revisions in March. There is interest in “MyZou” but not having to scan in reports should be helpful. The Medical School had its accreditation visit last month and it went well. It is searching for a Director of the Campus Writing Program. It has written three evaluative questions for survey compliance to SB SB389. It is starting procedures for Intellectual pluralism and how to deal with complaints.

UMKC
The Faculty Senate is revising bylaws that are out of date. A subcommittee has made recommendations to the Faculty Senate to update its operating procedures and a vote will be taken at the next meeting on the changes. A COSCO subcommittee is working on recommendations to revise our grievance process and many of the recommendations will come from MU’s process. Our current procedure tends to be an onerous and drawn-out. One-half of the grievants since 2000 have chosen to leave the university before the
grievance was resolved. The new P&T process has cleared the legal department and the Chancellor has signed off on it and it will go into operation in this year’s cycle. The campus has two dean searches in progress and we are waiting to bring candidates on campus when our new Provost begins her position next week. Like UMSL we are beginning preparation for our re-accreditation process. The site visit will be in October 2009. The issue of academic dishonesty policies and the divergent interpretations on our campuses needs to be investigated. Chair Ebersole received an email from the MAFS to reschedule its meeting with IFC at the March meeting. The MAPS Executive Committee will be observers after lunch. Chair Ebersole recognized President Lamb at the meeting to give him IFC’s appreciation of his service and support of our faculty. He will continue to work with President Forsee for the next year and he will have projects that he will be involved in.

**V.P. Gary Allen:** faculty profile information will be pulled from the HR system to make appropriate information publicly available through the webapps page. A provision has been made to add space for additional honors and awards in free text form. IT recognizes that faculty may want to point to a website outside of UM’s. Faculty may add HTML code to do this but URL will not be hotlinked. An IFC member mentioned that we should notate on the front page of the public website that the links are not hot. The public information mirrors what’s available in the directory information. We are attempting to comply with SB389 without trying to encumber too much in cost.

**Assistant V.P. Smith:** IT supports the back end of the FAS—they don’t own it. The FAS resides under Assistant V.P. Smith’s purview. Faculty have several complaints concerning the lack of categories. If you have suggestions on categories to add, or additional issues, they should be sent to Assistant V.P. Smith. A committee will meet to go over these issues and most of the committee is made up from people from the IFC group. One complaint was that when you have an ongoing project, it’s not recognized while you’re involved in it. There needs to be recognition during the project to allow a faculty member to earn merit increases. Smith stated that the information put into FAS is there as long as the professor wants it there. A faculty member may remove any information he wants from the FAS at anytime.