IFC Draft Minutes
May 20, 2009

- Minutes approved as revised.
- Additional agenda items – What is the June phone conference about? IFC members need to be there for the meeting.

Subcommittee on Academic Integrity
The subcommittee is close to having the language resolved which describes the boundary of academic decision making versus administrative action. IFC should not need to meet about this issue unless a major revision is suggested. Sub-Committee Chair Watt said that additional communications will be done by email. The subcommittee is waiting for final language from legal counsel that should be coming shortly. IFC should have the draft language by end of June. It can then be taken to campus faculty governing bodies for a vote in the fall. V.P. Deborah Noble-Triplett would forward the draft policy to the Provost for his endorsement. Once that is done, it would then be ready as a consent item on the BOC’s agenda for the October meeting.

The other issue on academic integrity has to do with implementation of the policy. Training and/or discussion with faculty on each campus is needed. It should be lead by faculty council representatives, paying particular attention to the issues that were raised by legal counsel. The distinction between academic evaluation and administrative action needs to be made clear. It was suggested that a yearly faculty meeting in each department be conducted to review the policy. The CRR has no discussion about faculty involvement at the program level. The graduate body has the right to dismiss students from a program. There is no mechanism to invoke if a student has graduated and then it’s found that academic integrity has been compromised. There is no policy to rescind a degree in that circumstance so this needs to be addressed. Degrees are awarded by the BOC so it needs a policy to address this in the CRR. Mike Pruitt has a collection of best practices on this and we can ask him for information. He handles student discipline issues.

Textbook compensation
A suggested draft was written to revise this policy. There will be at least one if not two versions of the policy for review. The existing policy became very broad, stating that no one in the system could use another author’s work. We’ll get something today on this. IP is a very important issue for the campuses. The iPhone applications put a whole new twist on the issue. Right now, departments want part of the money from student work if the work was done as a class project. A handout was distributed which showed the original CRR 330.015 D.5. Policy on Conflict of Interest, along with the revised language.

Benefits survey
IFC members would like a copy of this survey. The survey presentation on land grant schools was presented at the last BOC meeting. V.P. Rodriguez had said earlier that she
was going to share this presentation but hasn’t done so yet. IFC also would like to see
the last actuarial figures that were used to calculate benefits costs.

**Hiring freeze**

IFC would like to know if the hiring freeze will continue into the new budget year. It
has really hurt MS&T which is a smaller campus. Student numbers have increased
significantly and there are fewer faculty to cover the increase.

**V.P. Betsy Rodriquez & Bill Edwards**

A salary market data handout was distributed. She would like IFC to review it to
determine whether the data displayed is the way we want it. The BOC has asked for a
summer orientation on university benefits. It needs to see benefits as a total
compensation package that includes salary information. The UM HR website salary
comparator information can be found on the left side of the main page
(http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/hr/compensation/cognos/facultysurvey.shtml). It
uses 9 month data and compares annualized salary, and average salaries. Nine month
appointments data was used because it has the most useful information. IFC members
wanted to know why median salary data was not presented. Edwards said that he tried to
do median ranges but the Columbia and St. Louis campuses insisted on using averages.
To do comparisons, you need to pick a CIE code. It uses the Urban21, AAU and AAU
Select (state institutions that are listed with UM), and other comparison sets. We need to
let HR know if the data is providing the information we need.

**Michael Strait (UMKC-Director of Academic Assessment) - LAMPE**

LAMPE is a voluntary group of 2 and 4 yr colleges. Its work is mandated by a charge
from Robert Stein, the Missouri Commissioner of Higher Education. His commission
makes recommendations for state-wide assessment policy in Missouri. The curriculum
alignment initiative (a 2007 state bill, the basis of H.B. 389) addresses the number of
students who arrive at college but are not sufficiently prepared for college level work.
Secondly, it addresses the complexities and inefficiencies of transferring credit between
institutions, especially single courses that serve general education needs, not completed
within a single 42 hour block. The first effort of LAMPE was to examine entry level
competencies (core areas) & exit competencies. There is concern that the state has
mandated competencies for curriculum. It can state what classes satisfy the prerequisite
and articulation agreements mandated for general education classes. This would include
standards for college entry classes taken in high school, and exit standards from higher
education institutions. There needs to be agreement as to what students should be able to
do after completing a common introductory course. LAMPE tries to provide useful
information to the state on these competencies. It has been meeting since October 2008
(only 2 meetings due to travel restrictions). It will deliver a progress report by June 1 to
Commissioner Stein but it is not ready to make specific recommendations on state-wide
standards as of yet. For instance, what does “student-ready” mean, especially when
discussing poorer areas in the state? For IFC members, there is more concern about the
post-secondary requirements and exit competency tests. The state should not be giving us
a prescribed curriculum—that is what faculty should be doing. IFC would like to know
what measure will be used to assess this and how is LAMPE addressing this. We need
broad guidelines, not specifics, so what has been seen so far is troublesome. We need to be able to vet this issue and are not in favor of a recommendation going to CBHE until our campuses can comment. Dr. Strait said that there clearly needs to be more ownership of this entire process by college faculty. Faculty need release time to help with this. There is concern about classroom instruction quality because many classes are taught by adjuncts. We do not want acceptance of transferred courses to be forced on us if they are not high quality. The UM system faculty needs to be leading this effort. Provosts on each campus need to be involved in LAMPE’s assessment efforts.

Campus Reports
UMSL
Chair Matt Keefer said that his campus had a visit from President Forsee who, among other stops, visited our School of Nursing. The campus had a visit from Vice-President Joseph Biden, Jill Biden, Governor Jay Nixon and Senator Claire McCaskill, and Secretary of Education Arnie Duncan and their Middle-Class Task Force that focused on making higher education more accessible. The systems of shared governance at UMSL continued to be very active, including an important meeting of the Program Audit Committee that convened to set goals and consider the information required for the next AY.

UMC
Chair Tom Phillips said that the women’s softball team is going to the national championship. Athletics in general, is doing well in the rankings. Things are going smoothly on campus now. There is a small group of faculty who has angst about budgetary issues and understand that the problem has only been deferred. For other faculty members the issue has gone off the radar screen.

UMKC
Chair Gary Ebersole talked about UMKC being in the best position as a campus in many years. We have a good leadership team. The Strategic Plan was not done in time to have it vetted in all the places it needs to go. This should be done by the fall. The open Dean position at the Bloch Business School has been filled by an international hire. President Forsee was able to spend about hour with him and was inspired by him. The University Budget Committee meets tomorrow. We are moving ahead with the budget model, but the four year timeline for rolling it in has been rolled back by 15-25%. The Deans are very aware of what they need to do to meet the budget model goals.

MS&T
Chair Doug Carroll said that they made it through the semester okay. There was not enough seating at graduation so that was bad. There was a Special Faculty Senate meeting concerning the tenure policy. It has been updated and approved. The faculty bylaws have been revised and will go to the BOC by the July meeting. The campus is anxious about any “secret meetings” the BOC may have concerning benefits. There is still some concern about budget and enrollment numbers in conjunction with hiring restrictions.
Discussions with President Forsee and Vice Presidents

President Forsee was able to get to all 4 campuses for commencements. He stated that we have a strong team to represent us in Jefferson City. He would like to get the bonding issue resolved this summer. We have a window of opportunity to capitalize on this. We won’t get funding for academic buildings for a long time without this bonding. The Caring for Missourians initiative is funded by one-time money so we need to be careful how we utilize it should this money not be available in the next budget year. On the capital side, we got reauthorization for the Lewis & Clark projects. For mid-Missouri projects, Columbia was able to transfer the mental health facility to the hospital. The immigration bill has been revised and passed. President Forsee is working with the campuses on how we support fund-raising without using state appropriations. Many institutions are using a fee on endowments to recover some of that cost. In the next two weeks we need to figure out how to present this issue to the BOC. The issue is cross-subsidy. Do we put a fee up front on the endowment money coming in? MS&T has been doing this. Access Missouri did not pass. We need to consider a new scholarship approach. There was some movement on the Curator-at-large legislation. It will be moot if the state does not end up losing a legislative seat. He asked V.P. Steve Graham to set up a general officers retreat in mid-June to think through, and be more effective on addressing the issues we have, and getting the message out. Right now, there is no feedback loop as to who got through to whom on education issues. As a result, we don’t know how effective our actions are. The retreat will be one to 1.5 days. The focus will be on how affective we are in areas such as E-Learning, distance education, and the P-20 task force affect on early childhood (K-12) education. He is working with the systems office to identify priorities and value-added factors. There has been some “reshaping” of the systems office. David Russell’s (Chief-of-Staff) responsibilities will expand to include the Board Office, corporate communications, and other office functions. He will also take on the COPHE and Department of Education relationships that were spread out before. V.P. Steve Graham’s responsibilities are also expanding to include areas such as E-Learning and distance education. There are open positions in the systems office that will be held open, and some of those may be redirected to the campuses to deal with such issues as economic development, E-Learning, technology transfer, developing a marketing business plan, legal support for IP, and basic transactions support. We will continue with the forced hiring freeze and expense constraints (the 5% withholding for campus budgets). Campuses have been given the authority to determine what positions should be filled. The state has held back one billion dollars to deal with a continued drop in revenues. The General Assembly is working on how to preserve dollars for the 2011 budget. President Forsee will send out a general letter to employees to describe what is happening with budget thus far. There may not be enough stimulus money to cover us next year due to dropping revenues.

V.P. Nikki Krawitz

Implementation has been completed for E-Procurement and the ShowMe Shop. Initially, we looked at E-Procurement independently from the technology. There are several ways you can approach this, and most are paper intensive. The goal was to have in place, 3 methods of procurement: the procurement ProCard, bids, and requisitions. At the same time, we knew that the technology was evolving to deal with procurement issues. The
ultimate goal is to do the majority of purchasing online in real time. This will be a faster approach and we can negotiate contracts with vendors at lower cost. We will continue to have the ProCard for some purchases, but most purchases will be done through E-Procurement.

Associate V.P. Bill Cooper (Management Services & Chief Procurement Officer), E-Procurement update:
Initially, the system was too difficult and complex to use. There was no length to negotiated contracts. We had a 30% contract compliance with low-cost savings. As a result, the use of the ProCard grew exponentially. One problem associated with using the ProCard is that there is no spend visibility when it’s used. In other words, there’s no way to get a handle on how and what people are purchasing. The ShowMe Shop E-Procurement can handle non-catalog items. If a non-contract item is not in the catalog, then you purchase it using the ProCard. An IFC member said that if you have to be trained, then the system is too cumbersome (i.e. look at Amazon.com). Another comment was that there is an additional approval layer which we don’t have with the ProCard. It’s difficult to find the website online—why is that? It was mentioned there is now an online tutorial. The ProCard actually adds work because you have to reconcile the monthly charges. You don’t have to do that using E-procurement because the approval is done on the front end. An IFC member asked if we can delay the July 7th date for limiting the use the ProCard. Yes—that is not a firm date. The biggest concern for faculty is the ease of use. V.P. Krawitz will set up a mailbox to take questions, etc. on this new purchasing system. V.P. Graham asked that the concerns about E-procurement be an agenda item for the next IFC meeting.

V.P. Gary Allen
A draft handout on the “Acceptable Use Policy” was distributed. In the CRR, a 4th element was added in the A. subsection of CRR, dealing with privacy. People are informed if data on computers are going to be checked. Concern was expressed that the revision was overly broad. IFC asked that the policy include language for an annual reporting on activity to the appropriate people. There was still a question of procedure if a person is alive but refuses to allow access to his computer.

A motion was made: IFC asks that the revised policy be implemented for one year. At the end of that year, the required report is to be made to each campus’ faculty governing body, and that the system CIO will visit the IFC to review those reports. There was one “nay” vote, the rest were “ayes”.

Intellectual Property Rights Committee
V.P. Graham asked that IFC forward 2 names from each campus (he will select one person from each campus’ submission) and he will put together a committee to discuss IP issues. He distributed a handout of CRR 100.030. The current policy is seen as an impediment to research (i.e. patents and inventions). Much of the focus for the new committee will be on classroom IP instruction.
V.P. Deborah Noble-Triplett
COACHE – this is the survey of junior faculty. She was invited by COACHE, on behalf of the system, to be a participant in a user workshop to learn how to make use of the data.

Adjournment 2:50PM