The meeting was called to order at 2:00 CDT.

IFC members:
Steve Moehrle, Chris Spilling, Susan Brownell, Gary Ebersole, Nancy Stancel, Carole McArthur, S.N. (Bala) Balakrishnan, Michael Davis, Mark Fitch, Harry Tyrer, Kattesh Katti, and Dennis Miller.

University of Missouri system representatives:
Steve Graham and Christa Weisbrook

Steve Moehrle called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. in executive session. The first order of business was approval of the agenda. With no discussion the agenda was approved unanimously. Gary Ebersole raised one item of business. A matter had arisen on the Kansas City Campus in which he, serving as liaison between the UM System and the Kansas City Faculty, was unable to send an email to the Kansas City faculty. This is problematic as circumstances may require such communications at times. The Council agreed that this is an important matter and asked Gary to discuss it as part of his upcoming campus report.

Hearing no other additional business or agenda items, the UM System representatives (Steve Graham and Christa Weisbrook) were invited to join the meeting. The orders of business addressed follow.

I. Mentoring
Anecdotal evidence suggests that mentoring practices are variable across campuses and across units within campuses. To address this problem, the IFC agreed that a best practices document be produced that will provide departments with “best practices” guidance regarding mentoring faculty. It is hoped that, once completed, the document will minimize the possibility that faculty members across the system will feel that they did not receive adequate mentoring in their career – especially in their early career years. The IFC concluded that the best approach would be to have a working group of UM System experts and IFC members develop a document that the IFC and other stakeholder groups can discuss and ultimately approve. Many such documents exist at other universities so this is not viewed as an excessively onerous task for those asked to complete the initial draft.

II. Balancing Faculty Workload
Some concerns about workload inconsistencies have been expressed to system administrators. Steve Graham expressed a desire to see the IFC weigh in on the issue.
The IFC conducted an initial discussion about the matter. Themes in the discussion included:

- The typical faculty balance for tenured and tenure track faculty is 40% research / 40% teaching / 20% service. Meeting participants expressed that while this is traditionally analyzed on a person by person basis – it could be viewed by department such that more productive researchers would be able to spend more than 40% of their time on research, while faculty whose research productivity has waned somewhat could help the department by investing more time and efforts in teaching and/or research. Of course, it would be important for such a model to be self-implemented and imposed at the department level.

- Concerns about the departmental workload model described above were expressed including: (1) The human capital market can be a constraining factor for such models (i.e., newly hired faculty will have a conducive teaching load and asking more senior faculty to pick up some of the courses can cause the senior faculty to look to leave); (2) reward systems at the university might have to be adjusted for the model to work; (3) administrators (especially Deans and Chairs) would have to support and manage the model.

The IFC agreed that the discussion is important, but decided to table the matter pending additional information such as whether other universities have developed models for balancing workload that they have found to be successful.

### III. The Faculty Accomplishment System

Efforts to develop a new faculty accomplishment system were described by Steve Graham. Zach March (UM Director of E-learning) and UM system officers collected input via meetings with faculty, chairs, deans, institutional research staff, and librarians. The focus groups have numbered eight to twenty. More forums are scheduled including meetings with grant administration professionals, registrars, and others. Based on input received in these forums, a Request for Proposal (RFP) will be developed by a task force. This RFP will be brought to the IFC for review. From this RFP, a developer will be engaged to produce the new system.

### IV. Shared Governance

The Columbia campus recently completed a report on the UM Press closing. Among the conclusions in the report was that there seemed to be a break down in the shared governance structure. Certainly, IFC is an important aspect of the shared governance structure for the system, especially in the area of faculty input into decisions.

The IFC had already been considering potential efforts to further formalize its role in the shared governance system. The council decided to form a task force to develop best practices to support the purposes and functions of the IFC per the UM Collected Rules and Regulations. The purposes and functions are the following:
The IFC serves as a liaison committee between the President and his staff and the four campus faculties. It communicates to the President and his staff the views and concerns of the faculties. It advises the President on matters of University policy, including academic, financial, strategic, administrative and other matters and performs those functions or duties which are appropriate to an elected intercampus faculty body. It brings to the President and his staff representative issues and opinions of members of the several campus faculties and addresses such problems as the President wishes to bring to the IFC.

Harry Tyrer agreed to head the task force examining this matter and the IFC agreed that a block of time will be allowed at the April meeting for additional discussion on this matter designed to inform the efforts of the task force.

[President Tim Wolfe joined the meeting at approximately 3:00 p.m.]

V. Campus Reports

UMSL
Chris Spilling provided the report for the St. Louis campus. The President attended the most recent faculty senate and university assembly meeting at the St. Louis campus. President Wolfe expressed a favorable view of the functioning of the shared governance practices that he observed. Susan Brownell expressed that many at UMSL were impressed with President Wolfe’s passionate defense of higher education, which he conveyed during his address at the meeting.

Missouri S&T
Bala Balakrishnan provided the report from Missouri S&T. Three matters were emphasized. First, the campus recently completed the exciting activities around St. Patrick’s Day – a time of high energy for their campus. Second, two Missouri S&T faculty were prominently and positively cited in recent CNN reports. Third, the Missouri S&T faculty is discussing a comprehensive policy for non-tenure track faculty promotions.

Kansas City
Gary Ebersole provided the report for the Kansas City campus. Five matters were emphasized. First, UMKC has hired a new basketball coach to lead them as they commence play in the new NCAA conference they will be joining. Second, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Equity has left the University. Third, the Kansas City campus is in the midst of annual faculty evaluations. Fourth, there will be campus-wide elections next month. Last, a discussion was held regarding the matter referred to during executive session. Gary Ebersole was blocked from using a “faculty list serve” to communicate about important matters with his Kansas City colleagues. He was told that he needed administrative permission. He pointed out that this would be problematic were communications among faculty required. Thus, chairs of some or all faculty committees should have unfettered access to their faculty. President Wolfe expressed agreement. Such permission will be available at the Kansas City campus and steps will be taken
to ensure that such issues do not arise at other campuses. Vice President Gary Allen rightly encouraged faculty to use such privileges with appropriate discretion. All agreed that the list serves should be used judiciously, and such matters will be reinforced as new faculty members step in to the leadership positions.

_Columbia_

Harry Tyrer provided the Columbia update. Four matters were discussed. First, the Columbia campus is currently voting on whether non-tenure track faculty will be given wider voting privileges in the shared governance system (similar to policies enacted at St. Louis and Kansas City). That voting is being conducted electronically. Unfortunately, there have been issues in terms of the integrity of the system. A five-member committee from the Council is serving an oversight role. Second, a private foundation recently donated $1.4 million to the Music Department to support initiatives related to composition, and to entrepreneurship in music. Third, the UM-C Provost was asked at the most recent UM-C faculty council meeting whether the MU Press Advisory Board is permanent. He replied that it is. Harry Tyrer also reinforced as a Columbia campus representative that he views the press as a system resource and hopes that all will view it and use it as such.

**VI. Report of the President**

The Show Me Value statewide awareness and education tour was launched. Communication leaders from the four campuses (MoComm) are seeking to heighten awareness of the key role that higher education plays in the quality of life for Missourians. The overriding theme is that the value of investments in students must be recognized and understood. Evidence suggests that this lack of recognition and awareness is most acute in the more rural counties of Missouri. Hence, the system is targeting its communication especially strongly in the rural communities.

President Wolfe and a contingent of system representatives recently visited Moberly and will be going soon to St. Joseph, Farmington, and Lebanon. The group meets with 8th and 9th graders, the age when young people should begin planning their post-high school graduation life. The response has been positive within the participants and the communities. The efforts have also garnered some national attention as the Associated Press and major papers on the coasts covered recent meetings. Besides meeting with students, the representatives meet with civil leaders (e.g., the mayor, key chamber members, and similarly positioned persons) and with local business leaders.

President Wolfe is planning another round of “listening” meetings with faculty. Faculty members in the groups include primarily new faculty at the university, newly tenured faculty, and award winning faculty.

On the legislative front, the mood overall seems relatively positive for higher education. The governor recently recommended a 4% increase in the core appropriation. If the Medicaid expansion doesn’t go through, then the year-over-year appropriation will only be 2%. The $700 million bonding bill may go to voters in fall 2014.

In his State of the State address, the governor brought up the Western Governor’s University. This is a not-for-profit that receives no state funds. It is competency-based rather than credit-based. The emphasis is on competency demonstrated by passing a test. Faculty members identify other people to create curriculum, and they mentor students. Students could be eligible for state scholarships. The organization targets working adults.
President Wolfe shared some data at the national level. Under President Obama, Pell Grants have increased from $18 to $36 billion and the number of students receiving them increased from 6 to 9.6 million. They have federalized student grants and increased them from $62 to $112 million. The average student borrowing over the last 10 years has not changed much - $20k to $24k. The default rate has increased from 6% to 9%. Private universities have a higher default rate than public universities.

Dennis Miller asked the President for a status update on the search for the system number two executive. President Wolfe responded that we have the search firm, the search committee, and have posted the details of the job on the UM website. To date 26 candidates have been identified. The intention is to fill it by June 1. Interviews will be around April 22-23. It won’t be public.

VII. Report of the Vice President for Finance and Administration

Nikki Krawitz provided this report. Regarding strategic planning, each campus is finalizing its strategy statement and the related themes and levers. These will be presented to the Board in April. Chancellors will address five questions:

1) What’s the most innovative aspect of the plan?
2) In what areas is the campus aspiring to be “best in class” and what is being done to this end?
3) How does your plan involve other campuses?
4) What emerging trends is the campus responding to?
5) What will your campus do differently?

The last is important because of the downward pressure on funding.

April and May will be intense as campuses will gather begin to develop the actions around each of the levers in the plan.

The chancellors developed four criteria for strategic financial investment. The new funding will be based on the strength of the strategic plan including:

1) the plan’s measurable impact on strategy (ROI)
2) the high priority nature of the plan as evidenced by campus by an investment match (skin in the game)
3) the impact of the plan on student learning and success
4) the ability of the concept to be replicated and implemented on other campuses.

The process to decide on the allocation will be as follows:

1) Each campus will present a proposal with a budget.
2) The Chancellors from all four campuses review all applications and make recommendations to the President. The President will use feedback from various sources and make final recommendations to the Board.

One IFC member expressed concern that this process has a flaw in that chancellors are being asked to compete for the money yet they are also being asked to get together and recommend who gets it. Are there precedents for doing this in the UM system, or is the
President familiar with these practices in the corporate world? The response was that the benefits of using the Chancellors are perceived as offsetting this concern. Further, Nikki Krawitz emphasized that the competitive aspect will be for only 1.7% of the total budget.

Another IFC member requested an update on the retirement fund. What has happened in the intervening time period? Nikki Krawitz replied that UM continues to build the stabilization fund. The stabilization fund was drawn upon this year and likely will be drawn upon again next year. Interest rates remain low. Thus, our long-term projections for the market (8% return) are in question. There will be a special meeting of the Board on benefits.

VIII. The Role of Patent and Copyright Commercialization in Faculty Promotion and Raises

The system continues to discuss the role that success garnering patents and commercializing the related technology should play in faculty promotion, tenure, and raise decisions. The IFC provided several views regarding this discussion. Mike Nichols led the discussion. IFC members emphasized the need to keep the issue relatively open using wording such as “these accomplishments may be considered.” UMSL representatives expressed that the issue was raised at a recent Faculty Senate meeting and no negative feedback was offered. Columbia IFC members expressed that there is some opposition to the concept there – especially as it relates to the lack of a reliable review process regarding patents. Kansas City members expressed that they largely have the practice in place already and encouraged the system not to make a “top-down” order regarding the matter.

IX. Additional Business

Steve Moehrle made a call for additional business. Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.