Intercampus Faculty Council
Telepresence Meeting
Minutes - October 26, 2011
(Approved 11/17/11)

[IFC Faculty Attendance: Harry Tyrer (C), Leona Rubin (C), Michael Murray (StL), Gary Ebersole (K.C.), Carole McArthur (K.C.), Michael Davis (R), Joe Parcell (C), Steve Moehrle (StL), Nancy Stancel (K.C.), Susan Feigenbaum (StL)]

Agenda – approved, Minutes Approved
The Chair brought up as an informational item, the changing of status of ranked faculty librarians (I-IV) to Academic staff. It was suggested that we get the information that’s pertinent in writing for the IFC to review. The question was asked “are all librarians considered faculty?” The answer is “yes, for those librarians who are ranked. We need to clarify the language of the controlling documents so it is clear.

Discussion with V.P. Academic Affairs Steve Graham, Deborah Noble-Triplett
Beth Chancellor, UM Chief Information and Security Officer outlined her role of building an information security plan. About one year ago, we created a section in the Business Policy Manual for IT. We are now replacing policy 108 that dealt with security issues with a revised section. It includes the current policy about accessing personal faculty/student electronic information. Chancellor remarked that she is not trying to establish ownership – it is about the responsibility to protect it. The question was asked about the repercussions for someone using email, etc., that is not for university business. Chancellor commented that the policy does not address that issue but it needs to. Social networks such as Facebook have become a concern for IT. There was discussion of what is considered online ownership and that we need to define ownership rights. We need to separate out “device” from products & services. There was concern expressed that from a business perspective employees will have to give up some rights to some data. The policy should make certain we are covering the students as well and that students need to be made aware of the policy. The revised policy brings into the IT section the use of assets by non-university entities (like USDA) in order to make the policy read more clearly. This is for educational and student purposes, unlike private businesses. It offers clarification about the types of organizations that can use university IT. IFC will forward suggestions to the policy to Chancellor. V.P. Graham asked that IFC get the word out to the faculty about nominations for the President’s Awards. The Faculty Accomplishment System has been problematic and there is discussion about changing software.

Discussion with Interim President Steve Owens
The BOC has been busy in the presidential search process. It is narrowing the field and will hold a second round of interviews in St. Louis. It appears to be a good pool of candidates. He complemented the Kansas City campus on its hosting of the BOC breakfast. Owens said that two curators were reappointed today and need to be confirmed by the Senate.

Policy on Academic Freedom and course discussions
The President brought up the academic freedom statement for faculty and he clarified why it was written. IFC members felt it was a substantial improvement. One campus did not receive the policy and need to review it. The main concern of the statement addressed the making of unauthorized audio. We need another sentence about unauthorized use. The campuses have just received the statement and faculty need to review it. The President would feedback to him in a week.

**Domestic Partner Benefits**

The President was pleased to bring up this topic to the Board but it was not an agenda item for the last BOC meeting. He thought that BOC member Bradley may be chairing the Benefits Committee next year. The IFC is continuing to collect support data for DPB. A draft letter of support from the Missouri Association of Faculty Senates (MAFS) on domestic partner benefits has been received and there is also one from SPRAC. We have permission to place the MAFS, SPRAC, and Deans Councils letters on the website. IFC was in favor of this. It would be helpful to have letters of support from other higher education institutions. A letter of support from COPHE is being drafted.

**Campus Reports**

**MS&T**

It is quiet on campus. The educational agreement with China has been postponed. The campus is working on a policy for the Internet program.

**UMSL**

There have been two meetings of the Faculty Senate and one meeting with the entire faculty. It has gotten reports on its celebration year and from its Safety and Violence Committee. The campus has a five-year review coming up. The campus is looking at enrollment issues. This past fall the campus had a record number of parents visits to the campus.

**MU**

The student body has grown from 21,000 to 32,000, including international students. This is challenging and it makes the campus’ ability to absorb multiple streams of students difficult with such space issues. The campus is discussing, do we have the capacity/capability to make all classes like the Nursing student/faculty ratio? The campus continues to work on its strategic plan. There are real challenges with the new and broader issue on performance based funding with the strategic plan. The campus is pursuing/continuing diversity issues, domestic partner benefits, student experience issues, cleaning up the faculty handbook and its own rules in regards to the statement on the sunshine laws.

**UMKC**

We have filled two administrative positions on campus. The campus is in the middle of discussions on general education reform. We lack general education classes and there is some push back from units about the general education curriculum. There are on going discussions with administrators about the approval process for general education and how can the Faculty Senate best assist the university in getting a general education program.
The second issue is about ranked librarians. For 40 years ranked librarians I-IV have been considered faculty. There is a movement to reclassify these individuals to Academic staff. V.P. Graham said that he believes there is confusion on the issue and we will discuss this at IFC. There will be an all day budget committee meeting next week. The Deans will be present at a retreat.

**V.P. Human Resources Betsy Rodriguez**

An IFC member asked if the health plans are standing on their own this year and is the intent to have more people use the low plan?-- “yes.” V.P. Rodriguez needs to see how many people enroll in the new catastrophic plan this year. She wants to test plan out for one year, and will continue to look at this again. There is concern for aging faculty that they are being steered into a high deductible plan. IFC members urged Rodriguez to continue to track enrollment in these plans because this drives how premiums are set. It appears that in the new medical insurance plan, there are a number of subtleties and could have a long-term impact. An example is if younger workers choose the high deductible plan, will system allow employees to move from plan to plan? This could skew premiums we are using the initial calculations. There was concern that the all-inclusive plan may disappear as this has happened elsewhere under similar circumstances. V.P. Rodriguez said that we can survey people in the third quarter to help determine if people are accurately accessing their health risk. She is urging everyone to use the computer model tool to access their needs. Concern was raised that there are problems with this tool as most people don’t want the risk of being in the $1,000 deductible plan and for the lower paid employees, they shouldn’t be in it at all. Any premium increase affects the lower paid employees as well.

**V. P. Finances Krawitz**

**Performance Based Funding**

She had just attended a MDHE committee meeting. A report will be going to the COPHE Presidents. There were three items for reporting but UM may want to report on six categories. V.P. Graham mentioned that in this assessment institutions are competing with themselves, not other institutions. The Community College Association met first. Their three categories included, 3-year completion rate; high success rate of students academically; and high success rate of students who completed their licensor exams. An “affordability” measure was off the table. V.P. Krawitz stated that the University of Missouri is different from other institutions in the state because all four of its campuses are autonomous. What UM will be assessing is: graduation rate; job rate; and retention rate. There has been a big decrease on funding rate as all institutions have lost ground because of inflation. Performance funding should be limited to 1-2 percent of the base and is only for new funding. However, if you have an increase to the base she questioned how do you get it as part of new funding? She is submitting a report to MDHE for base funding, then she will add on performance funding (funding from prior years). We need to establish a rational model and we want educational institutions to agree on what it should be. One question was, what was the dollar allotment to this institution? V.P. Krawitz said they are still determining how to distribute the financing. She will send IFC the Indiana study.
Revisions to the Executive Order on Program Assessment/Review
V.P Graham talked about the guidelines for program reviews and asked if IFC was ready for a consensus. Moehrle suggested that the document still needed wordsmithing.

Faculty Civility
V.P. Graham mentioned that this was topic that is being handled by Deborah Noble-Triplett. She told IFC that she recalled from last year, the IFC sentiment was that faculty chairs should have tools available to be used before situations escalate into incidents. The feeling was that a policy would be ineffectual unless there were resources that could be readily utilized. On the UMKC campus, there is now has an Ombudsmen position that can help with such disputes. There have been meetings on the St. Louis campus with the Provost to discuss this. It will be the campus Provosts who will identify what will be available to his/her faculty. IFC felt that this is the right approach.

Meeting adjourns 4:48 PM