

## IFC Meeting Minutes

November 2, 2018

1. myVITA
  - a. IFC expressed concerns in the following areas
    - i. Confidentiality: Violates language in places
    - ii. Access: When chairs submit to Deans they can't get it back
    - iii. Time Consuming: lots of work for little return, reproduction of efforts
  - b. Action items requested:
    - i. Circulate permission structure
    - ii. What is the purpose, return?
    - iii. Feedback loop
2. Promotion & Tenure
  - a. The outcome of summary seems to be consistent with what is seen on campuses.

Consensus is provosts are open minded to taking a closer look at the process. If a task force were to come together they have a good start using Reem's research and Tina's report
  - b. Discussion:
    - i. Collected rules should not dictate how we do tenure (should not include restrictions)
    - ii. Consider what happens at department level. How are we looking at faculty performance
    - iii. A lot can be accomplished by paying attention to procedure. P&T policies should follow best practices. Referencing: 320.035 B.2.C. (tenure, not promotion in special circumstances)
    - iv. Key issues to consider:
      1. What happens at the department level
      2. How are we looking at faculty performance
      3. Procedures/best practices
      4. Supporting mid-career faculty to achieve tenure (if desired)
      5. Culture changes needed
      6. What is service? Is being the chair of a department considered service?
      7. Recognizing interdisciplinary work
      8. Training for P&T committee members
      9. If you broaden the criteria the lines get blurred between NTT and TT.

- 10. Cautious about others taking advantage... recommended vs. required.
    - v. Provosts would like to see more flexibility. Flexing the standard to move to professor. There needs to be better metrics, must make case.
    - vi. **Next step:** assign to mid-career task force
- 3. Employee Value Proposition (Marsha Fischer)
  - a. Core elements in onboarding and training
  - b. Changes from Chronicle based on feedback in earlier meetings
  - c. Detailed roadmap on slide 6
  - d. This is not an HR process it must be institution wide
  - e. Tenure – will be faculty driven
  - f. Discussion
    - i. Importance of getting faculty input from the beginning
    - ii. Service functions may need more clarification or needs to be integrated better (slide 3)
    - iii. Research under “transform lives” – why placed there, it could fit under different buckets
    - iv. Is there a better sequence for slide 5?
  - g. Communication is working on putting the information on a website and videos that illustrate the concepts
- 4. President Choi
  - a. Department chair selection process
    - i. The process is varied among the universities and from department to department
    - ii. This is a critically important role
    - iii. Ensure that the selection committee is inclusive
    - iv. Changes being made:
      - 1. Must be an academic with focus on teaching/research but also must have administrative experience
      - 2. Faculty voice must be prominent in selection committees
      - 3. Time with review at will of the Dean
      - 4. This will be a discussion item at the November Board of Curators meeting
    - v. Discussion:
      - 1. Department chairs versus department heads
      - 2. Everyone should be held accountable
      - 3. Search committee selection process should be solidified
  - b. Project Unify
    - i. The project looks at the four university’s student information systems to make processes and deadlines consistent
    - ii. There are 46 recommendations to implement by December 31<sup>st</sup>
    - iii. Rick Baniak is the lead on this effort

- iv. This will require changes in the IT and academic areas
    - v. Input will be gathered from the Provosts
    - vi. The goal is to have one of each of the following: Canvas, Slate, Starfish within one year
    - vii. Discussion: This will require a fair amount of work so the earlier this communication can happen the better
  - c. Online learning
    - i. This is the most important revenue generator
    - ii. Most students take classes online within a 150 mile radius from their home
    - iii. We recently submitted a MoExcels proposal to MDHE for \$20 million from them and a \$20 million match from UM around a new online model where we will work with faculty and workforce in areas of large need in the state
    - iv. Scalability is important and we want to use existing resources when possible
    - v. Rapid action is needed
    - vi. The revenue generated will go to the universities to support critical needs
    - vii. The focus is to reach new students
    - viii. We are working with consultants and each other to determine the best model
    - ix. Discussion items:
      - 1. Importance of the same standards
      - 2. Credentialing requirements
  - d. Academic Espionage
    - i. Thousand talent program
    - ii. FBI came about a month ago to meet with leaders around this issue
    - iii. NIH sent an email to inform PIs about these concerns
- 5. University reports to President Choi
  - a. MU
    - i. Faculty meeting topics for next week
      - 1. Project unify
      - 2. Communication
      - 3. Governance
      - 4. TPMC
      - 5. Research incentives
  - b. UMSL
    - i. Reaccreditation team onsite from Sunday-Tuesday (chair: Ellen Heisel)
    - ii. 23 faculty assembly committees – reviewing this to see if there is a more efficient way to approach the work
  - c. UMKC
    - i. Working on HLC reaccreditation

- ii. General education requirements revision has slowed a bit but still making progress
      - iii. Website redesign will launch on December 3<sup>rd</sup>
      - iv. Concerns on how faculty research counts. UTSA talked with faculty about how to rethink how they do research
      - v. Challenges around the changes about the indirect costs of research – cost sharing is going to be reevaluated
    - d. S&T
      - i. Committee looking at graduate student funding – Policy 226 to have a broader look
      - ii. Revising bylaws – adding deans and other changes where consistency was needed
      - iii. There was a +/- grading rumor but this has been fixed
      - iv. Chancellor search committee is in progress
        - 1. December 4<sup>th</sup> the committee will review candidates
6. NTT
- a. Worked on this last year to give more notice of non-renewal
  - b. All provosts were interested
  - c. Concern with budgets and few degrees of freedom
  - d. General agreement to do something to make progress
  - e. Taking back to the provosts next week
  - f. 1<sup>st</sup> year – 90 days
  - g. 5 years or more – 1 year notice
  - h. When promoted to the associate level, one would receive a two-year contract and when promoted to professor, one would get a three-year contract
  - i. Eligible for another contract
  - j. Group agreed this was a good direction
  - k. Remaining issue – contract issue date