Intercampus Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
October 22, 2008, 321 University Hall, Columbia

In attendance: Phillips, Watt, Wiebold, Ebersole, Holsinger, Stancel, Keefer, Murphy, Speck, Blum, Carroll, Schulz

Absent: None

[Call to order: Approval of agenda: Approval of minutes of IFC Retreat September 16-17, 2008: Additional Agenda Items: Discussion of the IFC Agenda for 2008-2009]

The meeting began at 10:34 a.m. with informal introductions made around the table.

Speck asked for an agenda change. Agenda change approved.

If business is completed the meeting should finish by 3:00 p.m. It was noted that this is the first IFC business meeting with President Forsee. A question was asked if the start time of IFC meetings could change to 10:30 a.m.; answer, need to check with Katina.

Academic and Student Affairs:

Since there were a number of items that could result in a lengthy discussion on e-Learning & International Programs it was suggested that they are postponed until after the discussion with President Forsee.

Academic Dishonesty Policy:

Discussion on academic dishonesty policy: Since academic dishonesty is an issue across all campuses, it was suggested that the IFC revisit this policy. IFC members agreed that we needed to come to closure on this item.

According to legal faculty can give an “F” for the test or paper on which a student has been dishonest, but faculty cannot fail the student for the course. Failure in the course is punitive and that is for the Provost. The question was asked, what are the options if a student is caught cheating on an exam or a paper?

The issue was temporarily set aside until the minutes from the retreat were approved. Minutes of the retreat were unanimously approved.

Discussion of academic dishonesty policy continues: The question was asked again if a professor can fail a student if caught cheating or does it have to go to a university committee. Going to a university committee was rejected by faculty. Professors have full responsibility over courses. On the Columbia campus, if a student is caught cheating they can be failed and a note is sent forward to the Provost Office. The issue is one of legal versus academic action. When sent to the Provost it is a legal action, when handled by the professor it is an academic action; The IFC Chair asked if the committee dealing
with academic honesty researched this topic with AAUP, Chronicle, etc.; it was the feeling of the IFC that the decision should be in the hands of professors; Chair Speck calls for the establishment of a subcommittee of the IFC, who worked with the academic dishonest policy last year, to develop a report and then report back to the group. A report discussing the history of the policy will be developed and distributed to members of the IFC before our next meeting and the discussion will continue in November.

Discussion with Interim Vice President Graham, Assistant Vice President Smith, and Assistant Vice President Noble regarding e-Learning, consulting report, COACHE launch, conflict of interest, board meeting update, and international programs

Consulting Report:

The FAS is used to generate reports. A letter will be going out soon to faculty & staff about how to prepare and submit their annual consulting reports electronically. The system wants to see what we are doing on each campus. If you are not doing any consulting, you need to go in a put “None.”

Conflict of Interest:

Several groups from each campus, Provost, Research Officers, etc., have reviewed the policy and responses have been returned to System. It is ready to go to legal and then to Board.

COACHE Launch:

A study, Collaborative on Academic and Higher Education, is being conducted by Harvard. The study looks at the quality of mentoring junior faculty and informs policy. The purpose is to make junior faculty as successful as we can. We are trying for balance of personal and professional lives. Asst. VP Noble stated that the University of Missouri is now participating in a survey of tenure-track junior faculty on quality of life issues. Feedback should be ready in the spring. The campus leadership will get feedback first and areas for improvement will be flagged. This is a grant funded item with a PI and IRB approval.

Board Meeting Update:

Discussion: There are no controversial items expected for this meeting. A few years ago an issue came up about old courses on record. The question arose, are we keeping courses up to date? We need to take a look at courses each year. If the course has not been taught within the last five years, it should be put into a “deep freeze.” After ten years it should be dropped. This same process is used for programs as well. What typically happens is that when a campus finds that a program is not being viable anymore then they report it to the system Office and the System Office puts it into a “freeze” state. They can be reactivated if needed.
President Forsee has issued a strategic directive to each Chancellor to document what each campus does best. This information is to be sent to the President in time to present to the BOC.

**eLearning:**

A handout was passed around regarding the eLearning project. There is currently a task force that is working on this project. Members of this committee were discussed. The IFC Chair requested a complete list of who serves on this committee. It was suggested that we involve more of the faculty on the committee. A complete list will go out to IFC members shortly.

Some issues regarding eLearning are as follows: (1) MU is not hearing much about this project; (2) the title is problematic; (3) it was noted that the system is not in charge of distance education. The degree programs stay where they are; (4) Texas was named as having an excellent program that we should take a close look at when designing ours; (5) the project comes under redefining higher education in the area of electronic education; (6) a question was asked if they are trying to achieve logistics issues for students or are they trying to redefine higher education?; (7) are we getting the horse before the cart by advertising for an Executive Director?

Chair Speck asked if the committee would like to put off more discussion on this topic till next month since it was lunch time. Committee members agreed unanimous.

**Lunch with Vice Presidents**

Vice President Krawitz invited to report. VP Krawitz was asked about President Forsee’s email to all faculty & staff regarding the economic downturn in our economy. How will this affect our retirement program? Faculty concerns fall into two areas: Information related to personal lives, and information related to work. VP Krawitz reported that the university system is sound financially and that our retirement fund is protected; (2) she expects ratings to upgrade from a current AA2 to an AA1 next year; (2) the System has implemented a stabilization plan to provide a short run cushion; (3) a recent study shows that our current budget has enough cushion built-in so that we do not have to tap into the stabilization plan. Our cash and liquidity are in good shape. We have a long-term investment focus for our endowment and retirement trust funds. We have the right banks marketing for us. There were no further questions for VP Krawitz and Chair Speck thanked her for her report.

**The President’s Report:**

President Forsee joined the group. He asked if a special committee needed to be formed to gather and respond to questions concerning the financial downturn.

President Forsee: In 2007 our curators adopted nine measures to make us more transparent about what we are doing with our resources. There are 50 measures to look at
best practice. The question is being asked, how efficient are we in research, faculty teaching loads, and student output. It is important that the citizens of Missouri see that there is “a hand on the rudder” at MU. We are in a financial crisis in our nation and the world that calls for leadership to stand-up. By this time next year we will have a report by campus using benchmarks of what we are doing.

Discussion: It was brought up by one of the IFC members that many of the benchmarks have to do with grants and research. In the arts we do not have measures that reflect what we do. We need to take a look at other measures to incorporate into our assessment. We welcome these measures.

Students may have difficulty obtaining credit. We may need to consider putting in a special hot-line for questions regarding loans and financial support.

Vice President Rodriguez from HR stated that there is a website available to all employees on investment companies so employees have access to immediate financial information.

Question for VP Krawitz: If the state economy goes down more what is the potential for our university? VP Krawitz replied that she is constantly tracking this possibility, keeping close tabs on the state’s budget and finances so that she can put in proactive measures.

Question for President Forsee: In anticipation of cuts, what kind do you expect and what campus will be affected?

President Forsee responded that, (1) we have to put pressure on the state that we need to fund our institutions; (2) we need our administration to protect us from what happened in Florida; (3) we need to show that we are using our resources efficiently and that we are prioritizing our needs; (4) important to have “depth vs. breath” and “quality vs. quantity”; (5) if we must make cuts they must be well thought out and defendable; (6) transparency is important and having faculty involved in the process.

We are currently awaiting a phone call that will inform us if monies will be withheld. We want the opportunity to create our own solutions based on careful considerations. We will try to stay in front of the economic situation so that we can be proactive rather than reactive.

We are currently enforcing a number accountability measures. There were comments made at the last BOC meeting about concerns surrounding accountability measures and campus reports.

President Forsee led a discussion regarding faculty governance and faculty/administration working together. Forsee stated that he needed the help of the IFC in the area of governance. One observation is that faculty governance allows the faculty to abuse the brand of the university. On one hand we have a great grievance process, but there is not a
clear code that protects the brand of the University. Is there a gap here? President Forsee asked what would be the appropriate procedure to challenge behavior that is not good for the University. With all the time we spend on governance, why is this issue a problem?

Discussion: Reminds me of three things: moral and ethics are important, as is loyalty. There are best practices that have been spelled out by the AAUP, etc.

We have not yet arrived at a general consensus between the three levels of governance. We need to have a conversation of what are our boundaries.

A question was asked about on-line delivery of courses, and the need for an executive director for distance education. It was not clear what the System had in mind. President Forsee was asked for his vision. It was state that the faculty wanted to be involved.

President Forsee stated that the university may already be behind in the area of eLearning. He asked how do our students want to learn and how do our teachers want to teach? It was felt that we needed a program manager to think through these issues, develop a business plan and/or what a business plan would look like. That is the reason we need an Executive Director.

Discussion: This is about a revolution in learning, there needs to be more talk about this revolution first.

This is the first year of the stabilization fund. We have been tracking state revenues and they are down 1 ½%. They have enough in reserve to make it through the year without going negative. The University is looking at what it needs to do to be proactive. The State’s fiscal year ends July 1. What do we need to do to help faculty understand what is going on with the State budget? Kansas City will be running best to worst scenarios in the next few months. Education is the primary target. Because of the Hancock Bill, education is the only fund that can be tapped. We need to look at our programs and be more efficient. If you cut everyone 2% it is devastating. The very best people leave. We need to have the conversation about what programs we need.

President Forsee said he would resist having a certain percentage withheld. He is working with the house and appropriations committee. If there is a problem, he wants to be involved in the decision-making. As part of this, if we can create our solutions then we can rethink what we do and make changes based on careful considerations. For us to be in front of this we need to create an environment where we are part of the conversation. We are not competitive in terms of salary and benefits. We need to look at other funding methods. It is important that we need to think about different outcomes, not wait for the call that tells us that we must cut 4%. Again, we need to be proactive not reactive.

President Forsee asked IFC members to get their brains working to come up with a plan to leverage within our departments more efficiently.
[continue discussions of agenda items]

VP Graham – “kitchen cabinet” (open discussion) style of dialogue with the President. He wants eLearning on the agenda for the November meeting. Chair Speck – requests people from last year to make a list/report of items of business remaining from previous year.

[adjourn]