**IFC Minutes – 20 April 2018**

Telepresence

Present: IFC members: Anne Alexander (MU), Michael Bruening (S&T), Viviana Grieco, Camila Manrique, MU, Jacob Marszalek (UMKC), Linda Mitchell (UMKC), Tom Schuman (S&T), Sahra Sedighsarvestani (S&T), Pamela Stuerke (UMSL), Alice Hall (UMSL), Jon McGinnis (UMSL), and Bill Wiebold (MU)

UM System Staff: Steve Graham, Carrie Nicholson

Meeting called to order 9:05am via Telepresence room

Minutes of the 9 March 2018 meeting will be approved at the next meeting.

9:05-9:30am IFC members’ discussion

S&T Chancellor search. Faculty positions. CR&Rs that regard tenure (and promotion) decisions as only in a ‘primary’ department: potential IFC issue for next year is to reconsider CR&Rs for joint appointments, especially regarding P&T issues. Grievance procedures could be an issue for IFC to address next year.

[Steve Graham joined.]

9:35-10:30am President Choi (w/ Marsha Fisher) joined meeting

\* Review of discussion with Curators last Board meeting

Pres Choi sought IFC feedback on the Curator-faculty interaction. Jacob M. discussed using retirees as junior faculty mentors. Viviana G. professional development across career. Tom S. shared that Curators stated they want action items with responsibility assigned, specific deliverables, and timeframes for those deliverables for items discussed during our joint IFC-Curator panels. Pres. Choi commented that he was to be the accountable person to get the great ideas done that our discussions were providing/discussing. Pamela S. discussed lack of service counting in promotions and about a lack of professional development for research; cross support of teaching and research. Sahra S. and faculty development issues discussed with Curators Farmer and Brncic. Poor teaching quality: Being able to point Curators to data on university performance; issues with self (University) assessments that are quantitative. Few get mentoring, chair training, deans training, paper pushing, 360 degree need for mentoring (except LDP). Steve G.: will be pausing NFTS to set up formal interactions with new faculty development programs, e.g., CAFÉ. Toward developing mid-career processes; Marsha F. mentioned partnering with HR is possible. Mun C. mentioned possibly using Curators professors as mentors but some felt they as a population would not be good mid-career mentors: Mike B. thought a pilot might be good idea but that Curators professors might not be current with new teaching methods. Camila M. thought the most senior folks also may not still be active in NIH panels or other (funding) agencies and therefore may lack currency in their field. Bill W. discussed a successful mentoring committee structure that is used in his department. Mun C. discussed challenging of the Chancellors and Provosts to provide effective mentoring programs.

\* Strategic plan

Sent info to campuses regarding next versions of strategic plans. Mun C. felt there were still missing pieces. For example, growth goals, though fine, should also provide strategies for how to achieve those goals. The plans need proper introductions with SWOT analyses, which are standard parts of strategic plans. Viviana G. felt that Compacts’ discussions of the plans is rushed and limits ability for successful plan outcomes regarding the current fast track; suggested deeper dives rather than faster work but also perhaps shallower. Short timelines for sharing with campuses have been experienced. Mun C. discussed the prior timelines to campuses that were specific expectations but was confusing plans with Compacts discussions. Sahra S.: that comments to admins being incorporated in their plans appear to have been requested under (too) short timeframes. Linda M. commented that pertinent documents were not available to Compacts at first meeting. Rubrics were provided yet much later and has negatively influenced committee discussions. Mun C. had misunderstood the discussion but then understood the issue to be with Compacts revisions. Bill W. will provide email of issues he sees with the dysfunction of Compacts. Mun C. will discuss with general officers.

\* University Taskforce (page 2)

Mun C brought up Curator conversations about ‘flagship model systems’ that we are not operating as a flagship model. Curators discussed lack of inter-collaboration, not acting as a System, and the lack of benefit to both students and faculty. Are we acting as ‘one university,’ which has different meanings to different people? What did ‘one university’ mean then, when UM System was created via its charter, versus now? Discussion suggested to have more faculty participating in the UM System debate. There was suggestion of bringing many more faculty, not just IFC members, into the discussion to provide a wider perspective of the meaning of ‘UM System’. Mun C. suggests using entire June IFC meeting to discuss System (IFC replied that while we do not usually meet in June, with Curators or otherwise, Camila M. suggested IFC members may be able to join a June meeting with the BOC.) Mun C. suggested having select or as many IFC to join June BOC (breakfast) meeting as possible to discuss the Taskforce of UM System, only. Accountability/effective interactions of System-to-campus’ administrations needs to occur. UMAO is effective and should be continued.

\* Curators participation in May IFC meeting

An invitation to Darryl Chapman and Jon Phillips will be given, to join with the already scheduled meeting with Jon Sunvoldt and Phil Snowden at the IFC ‘in person’ meeting in May, to discuss the ‘Taskforce’ and System.

10:30-10:45am Honorary Degrees

Steve G. presented issues associated with conferring of honorary degrees. Currently there is no standard package and there is a desire to clean up the process and criteria to confer the degrees, including a full vetting process. S&T mentioned that ours is a standing committee under our Senate that would provide feedback for our campus. UMSL has a committee under their Office of Advancement but then candidates are presented to their Senate for approvals.

10:55-11:00am A&OER (Steve G.)

Open educational resources. There is no plan for System to ‘take over choice of textbooks’ from faculty. There are approvals within the textbook adoption process for ‘auto access’ that is strictly voluntary on the part of faculty members. There are grants to support converting courses to open access resources.

11:00-11:30 IFC Subcommittee Updates

\* Evaluating Teaching (page 3)

Comments on breadth and depth and quality of teaching evaluations task force report was distributed. Steve G summarized aspects of the recommendations: Student reviews of faculty should be based on items that students know but should not be used as the sole evaluation entity. A stepwise fashion of improving evaluation methodologies is suggested and the report lays out possible steps for improving evaluation of teaching methodologies. Report has hot links in their appendix to provide direct links to examples or resources for those topics. Jon M. shared a method of course self-evaluations.

\* Non-tenure Track Faculty – Anne Alexander

Sent out rolling contract for campus feedback after the last meeting. Committee desires an IFC endorsement by end of semester (@ May meeting). The UMSL Promotion of NTT committee and Faculty Senate steering committee rejected endorsing the proposal, as presented, due to an anticipated result of NTTs being hired as lecturers if the rolling contracts were tied to rank/promotions for NTTs. They also felt that a rolling contract policy would be divisive rather than supportive. IFC discussed that tying contracts to merit does make sense but how to incorporate evaluation of merit is the key issue given the breadth of NTT position disciplines and job descriptions. NTT faculty data across System is shown on the Sharepoint site of the NTT subcommittee. S&T feedback felt generally supportive but one individual commented that a position with no contact was better (more stable, less readily canceled) than a contract (that could be canceled). UMSL: are losing good NTTs to the community workforce and are forced to keep less qualified NTTs to maintain course loads and are concerned that NTTs of lower quality will be retained using rolling contracts. It was expressed that lower quality (inadequate) NTTs should not be kept as faculty, not retained at all, much less retained by a rolling contract agreement.

Cross-Campus Enrollments (information item).

Presidential Awards [not discussed. To be discussed at May meeting.]

11:30pm Adjourn