IFC

Meeting Minutes

April 16, 2019

1. Recording Last Day of Academic Related Activity
   a. The Division of IT has been working to streamline processes and/or make systems the same across the universities. In doing so they have had meetings with financial aid and enrollment management to identify areas to address.
   b. When meeting with Financial Aid identified that reporting the last day of academic activities takes a significant amount of time to identify dates for each student. They also reported that this is currently a manual process for staff and faculty
   c. This is an important piece of data because it dictates the amount owed by students and can have financial implications for students and UM
   d. IT can automate this process through technology
      i. This would be done by having their last day exported with grades from Canvas and loaded in PeopleSoft when grades are reported
      ii. It can be manually overridden if there were in person meetings that were later than assignments submitted
      iii. For those who do not use Canvas there will be a field that will be required to be filled in
   e. Action items:
      i. **Liz to find out if there would be any exclusions/exceptions**
      ii. **Julie and Liz to form communications and determine how to distribute to the faculty**
2. Emeritus/Emerita
   a. The MU standing committee on NTT faculty brought it to our attention that they cannot be recognized as Emeritus/Emerita faculty in the same way as tenured faculty. The recommended changes would allow them to do so.
   b. Recommendation was made to add firmer restrictions against administrators getting this status
   c. **Action items:**
      i. **Michael provide some revised language around administrators**
      ii. **Academic Affairs to get input from OGC**
      iii. **Once all pieces are ready then this will be presented to the Provosts, General Officers and General Counsel for additional feedback**
3. IFC Chair
   a. The chair for 2019-20 will be from UMKC
   b. IFC members discussed potential options and will bring a recommendation to the May meeting
4. eLearning

a. The group reviewed the proposed governance structure for eLearning. New programs will go through this structure when programs are reviewed to move to the system platform.
b. It is important to note that degrees will continue to be conferred by the universities
c. Oversight committee
    i. Provosts and Vice Provosts
    ii. Chief eLearning Officer
    iii. Chief Financial Officer
    iv. Chief Information Officer
d. Online Faculty Advisory Committee (previously named Faculty Technical Group)
    i. Comprised of faculty who are well known for their work online
    ii. They will be advising us throughout about the standards for courses and programs
    iii. Informing us if support is needed
    iv. The group that started in January will serve as a direct advisory group to the Oversight Committee
    v. This is a permanent group not just for the implementation phase
e. Academic Council
    i. This group will be responsible for looking at programs to ensure they are well designed and equivalent quality as on campus
    ii. This group will consist of faculty from each university
    iii. IFC or designee
    iv. Instructional designers
    v. Academic Affairs
    vi. Vice Provost
    vii. They would do the vast majority of review of programs to ensure they meet the C-RAC national standards for online that are required but we are not there yet
    viii. Action item: IFC to determine if they want a representative or if they want to leave it with the faculty from the advisory committee
f. Curricular Coordinating Groups
    i. Department faculty or chairs will work together when collaborating on a degree program
    ii. These groups will work through all the details
g. Student Services council
    i. This group will be focused on marketing, pre-matriculation and post-matriculation
5. Data Driven Board Conversation
    a. MU has been active in working with academic analytics with a department scorecard to see how they compare nationally. The other three universities had started to ask for this as it can help faculty find other scholars that do the work they do to identify potential collaborators, grants and avenues for scholarship as all four universities work to increase their efforts in the research space.
    b. How hard is this to implement? IR works with Provost offices and go to chairs meeting and begin to roll out. This is not on the back of the chairs.

      c. Action item: Ask Chris or Matt to come to the May meeting to discuss further

6. Mid-Career
   a. A policy paper has been drafted with a set of recommendations, following the model of the Evaluating Teaching paper from last year.
   b. The research shows that we are doing pretty well until faculty receive tenure but we need to do more once they make tenure to plan the next part of their career and that allows flexibility so research isn't the only thing that gets rewarded
   c. The draft paper should be ready for review by the May meeting but it will likely be finalized in the fall

7. Consensual Romantic Policy
   a. President Choi brought this to Steve and Marsha's our attention
   b. University of Michigan has a policy that is a bit more stringent and we are bringing this to you all to see if you feel changes are needed
   c. Are you seeing this as a problem and where are the gaps?
      i. There was a situation that came up, our current policies did address it and it raised attention
   d. Main distinction
      i. Supervisory or evaluative – Missouri
      ii. Undergraduate prohibited unless exception – Michigan which shifts the burden to the faculty
   e. There was concern expressed around adding more parameters around the graduate students
   f. The group expressed some support in shifting the burden to the faculty in cases of undergraduate students
   g. **Action item: Share your feedback with the President including that there was a diversity of perspectives but no one thought we should move to the Michigan version. More discussion will be needed if we try modifying.**