**IFC Minutes – 9 March 2018**

UM System, Columbia, MO

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

UM System Staff: Steve Graham, Carrie Nicholson

Meeting called to order 10:15am [in the Telepresence room at University Hall.]

Minutes of the 9 February 2018 meeting were approved with changes.

10-10:30am IFC members’ discussion

NTT contract renewal discussion. System review meetings; System Compacts committee meetings. Budget view; are there any changes? Strategic plan objectives that are not reasonable.

[Moved to usual meeting room 215 University Hall; Steve Graham and Carrie Nicholson joined.]

10:30-10:40am Probationary Period (attachment 1, page 1) [S. Graham]

Reviewed changes to Probationary period and 1 year extension language. The clean-up in language required removal of language from the CR&R Chapter 340: Employee Absences. The new language is included in CR&R310.025 Extension of Probationary Period for Faculty on Regular Term Appointment. IFC had a motion and second to approve the wording relocation and policy change. Motion approved.

10:40-11:00am IFC Subcommittee Updates

Non-tenure Track Faculty (NTT) subcommittee report– [Ann Alexander]

NTT committee report was presented. The current transition assistance program (TAP) remains in in place across System until summer. New TAP not yet rolled out.

Rolling contracts for NTTs proposal was discussed using source on NTT subcommittee Sharepoint site. Generalized productivity requirements for all NTTs, e.g., a single set minimum of SCHs per year, were found inappropriate due to the range of normal teaching duties and departments. Feedback regarding the rolling contracts issue was sought to provide feedback to the subcommittee. Rolling contracts for high performing NTTs is clearly desirable. Also, establishing a rolling contract cannot be strictly based on a years of service but policy should allow for a consistency in job performance to be considered. Issue with TT faculty not meeting their performance needs should be met by Workload Policy CR&R, not via NTT. “The standards for performance should be based on specific criteria outlined by the academic division in advance” per CR&R 310.035.I. IFC sees that rolling contracts are needed for the purpose of academic freedom in the classroom. Subcommittee may provide a policy statement for IFC to adopt based on the IFC feedback. Subcommittee will provide proposed policy to IFC members for discussion on campuses. Goal of campus feedback is to advise action by IFC toward endorsing policy action at a future meeting. UMSL expressed issues with a timeline of obtaining campus approval this academic year. Mizzou has already approved the policy. UMKC could present/discuss at April meeting. MS&T should be able to provide feedback by end of March 2018.

Evaluating Teaching (attachment 2, page 6) [S. Graham]

One page executive summary draft (24 Feb 18) was produced by subcommittee and shared with IFC. President’s position is that we let ‘bad teaching’ continue. Idea is to hold ourselves accountable. Pres. Choi may provide context at his meeting with us today. Evaluations should be used for improvement, not for promotion or punitive as it currently is. Student perception is important but is not the only or best perspective, e.g., not reflective of actual faculty qualifications. S. Graham: If we do not like the current practice, we will have to work to change it. Should focus on ‘outcomes’ not ‘likes’. Student “Rating” are not “Evaluation.” The IDEA evaluation system (used at UMKC School of Education) that treats all comments is suggested as a model.

11:30am Board of Curators interaction discussion [S. Graham]

S. Graham summarized critique of the IFC-Curators interactions process and the feedback provided to the President.

\* April Meeting not discussed

\* Curators joining May IFC meeting from 11am-1pm not discussed

11:35-12:00pm Legislative Update [Dusty Schnieders joined meeting; also David Russell and Ryan Rapp]

AY 2018-19 budget information is coming out. The initial goal for the legislative session was to restore core funding cut by the Governor’s budget. $38M is currently potentially restored versus $17M in the core funding if we raise tuition. Variables are still at play, e.g., Governor withholds; possible deals to reallocate Access Missouri budget funding as additional $30M into core funding possible but cannot raise tuition; or, add 60% of proposed line items into core funding but no tuition increases. Discussed the need for campuses to have discussion points, which can be requested from the Legislative Relations group. The reworked format for Legislative day was a success in building support for UM System by showing the activities on the UM campuses. Ban of tenure bill was discussed. Meal plan bill was discussed. Academic fees bill was discussed.

[Marsha Fischer and President Mun Choi joined meeting. D. Schnieders and R. Rapp left the meeting. ]

12:00-1:10pm President Choi

Fireside chat at UMKC was successful, including budget process and status. COFE disagreement; not committing all of COFE funding. What does it mean to be a member of COFE?

Finish interviews for Marketing Coordinator position for UM System but mostly for Mizzou. All good candidates.

\* University taskforce. Curators Professors and System Chancellors and System President. UM System charter states that UM System will operate as “one University,” which can mean many different things, e.g., UI System. Good to act as ‘System’ but also good to have local autonomy. We are 4 separate universities but will need to collaborate more. Chancellors are sharing inputs with the System President. A change of the CR&Rs does not necessarily change the culture of the System; the correct question is “how can we collaborate and cooperative better as a System?” Units with low enrollment will be in trouble due to cost pressure but no current plan permits one “department type” for all four campuses, i.e., closing any individual departments on campuses in lieu of another higher performing (ROI) one. Student Information Systems study found 46 key things are differences (out of 700 total differences) that need to be solved to improve intercampus sharing policies.

\* Review of discussion with Curators last Board meeting [not discussed].

\* Strategic plan

UMKC, S&T, UMSL plans are ready. Mizzou needs about two weeks. High level goals are to be viewed as aspirational and directional and visionary rather than hard (attainable) goals. Actual goals are still negotiable with administration. Discussion of tradeoffs in actual versus aspirational goals and policies and support systems that enable the higher performance goals. Compact committees are to provide realistic feedback to campuses.

\* Student Evaluations of Teaching

Student evaluations are one tool, though there are endemic biases. When looking at bottom 10% of CET: across many terms (4 terms), there are many repeat offenders, i.e., specific faculty individuals. March 31 of low CET scores to be provided by campuses. Faculty conduct gives standards regarding poor teaching performance.

[Brief break; Ryan Rapp and Gary Clapp joined meeting.]

1:20-1:55pm Budget and Administrative Review & Activity Analysis Update (Ryan Rapp)

Balance of long term. Flat state support since 2004. There is a potential for recession issue. Also, keeping pace with inflation is not likely. Chart of comparison of revenue versus income for the future was provided, with assumptions. Expenses are growing at inflation. Administrative review activity analysis will have a ~97-98% response rate (current 92-92%). Combination of Admin cost ↓ of 20% and Productivity ↑ of 20% are changes that could give balance in 5 years. It is the compounding of costs and compounded decrease in revenues that are a big deal. Prior to April board meeting: will reach out to ~200-250 people about System service activity analysis as customer evaluation of service effectiveness. Cooperative cost control process is to occur among finance, HR, and IT office to optimize policy and processes. Looking forward to activity analysis, which is expected to be ‘noisy’ but should bear good fruit, ~$20M, but may not still be enough. “How do we deliver the needed services at lowest cost.”

[Allen XXXX joined meeting].

1:30-2:00pm HR Updates – NTT/Academic HR (Marsha Fischer)

Partnering with campus HR folks.

S. Graham spent time with HR to build academic-HR relationship. Allen XXXX was introduced.

TAP policy being considered and history was presented, as well as practices for other universities. NTT ad hoc TAP policy is set through Aug 2018. [Brenda MMMM joined meeting.] Allen did research on other universities practices for staff (not NTT). Data on current liability (exposure) and levers to reduce costs were presented (time of service and maximum salary reimbursement cap). Are looking at 20 weeks (@ 20 years’ service, 4 week minimum @ 1 year minimum service) and 100k service and salary caps, respectively, for TAP benefits, for NTTs and staff, making sure to be equitable for the lowest paid and longest service individuals, respectively. Actual levels are to be decided by the Board of Curators.

April Board meeting. S. Graham will notice Pres Choi regarding changes to April visit with Curators.

Two Curators will come to our May in person IFC meeting. Topics need to be discussed at Telepresence meeting in April.

2:00-2:20pm SIS ERP – Drop Date, Tuition & Fees and Transferability of Courses (Gary Allen)

[Elizabeth (Liz) LaPointe – Business Technology Analyst, Data Warehouse team, of UM System, and

Dr. Julie Brandt – Institutional Research and Quality Improvement, of MU, joined meeting for IT]

SIS ERP to align academic dates and processes across all four campuses. Evaluated twenty items of 46 differences. A couple need faculty input.

IFC advised standardization of student add/drop date, W; WWF, WD, grade assessment dates across UM System.

Transferability of courses. Already doing this, across campuses.

Cross campus enrollments. Are to streamline processes to avoid needing acceptance and enrollments at each campus. Process seeks to use non degree visiting student enrollments to solve this issue. Financial aid support and other issues remain to be solved. Enrolled if in good standing; goal is to be straightforward. Restrictions? Full record evaluations for prerequisites are to be avoided. No more than 6 crhr per semester cross enrollment at other campuses. Must be degree applicable in order to be financial aid compatible. Timelines for enrollment on campuses are different so competition for courses can be an issue.

2:20-2:30pm Presidential Awards [not discussed. To be discussed at April telepresence.]

2:30pm Adjourn