

Intercampus Faculty Council
Telepresence Meeting, Thursday, October 19, 2019
Approved November XX, 2017

Present were:

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

UM System Staff: Steve Graham

In addition: Jerry Wyckoff (UMKC), former IFC member and current member of Administrative Performance and Process Improvement Committee

Susan Brownell chaired the meeting in Tom Schuman's absence.

The meeting began at 9:00am.

The meeting minutes from June 12, 2017 were approved. Discussion of the minutes from the IFC retreat was postponed until the next meeting.

9:00 – 9:35am IFC members discussion

IFC members discussed the consolidation of functions between the UM System and MU and potential impacts on campus administration. There has been some confusion about whom to contact. Jerry Wyckoff recommended that IFC consider the idea of rotating certain systemwide leadership positions, in particular diversity and research, between campuses. If it wanted to advocate for such a system, the impetus would probably have to come from IFC itself.

- It was felt that it would be worthwhile to gather data on the ground about any impact of the consolidation on campus affairs.

Members discussed whether the UM System/MU branding campaign is a system campaign and whether the timing is right for such a campaign when the structure of the relationship between UM and MU has not yet been resolved.

9:35 – 9:45am UM HR – Marsha Fischer (CRR 230.070, attachment 1, page 1)

Marsha Fischer reported that three employees who had been separated have been recalled to work on the Educational Assistance Program. The cost was not analyzed up front but going forward analysis will be done and further adjustments might be made.

There are 3 updates on the changes to the tuition assistance program that will be taken to the BOC in December:

- Vesting eligibility will be moved from 5 years to 1.

- If a dependent is enrolled and the employee dies, the dependent can continue to the end of the program.
 - Under consideration is whether a dependent may keep the benefit after the employee retires. It is not clear whether this would have a positive or negative impact on retention. Also, at a time when employees are being laid off and there are no raises, is it appropriate to increase benefits to retirees?
 - Further changes that would make UM benefits more competitive with other state universities are still under discussion.
- Steve Graham and Tim McIntosh said that they would look into the BOC's planned audit of all system CRR to see if it might have any repercussion for campuses which are now looking into their by-laws. S&T and UMSL Faculty Senates had both planned to do their own reviews.

9:45 - 10:00am Title IX under new administration – Emily Love

The Trump administration just rescinded the Obama administration's 2011 Dear Colleague Letter and the 2014 Q&A has been replaced. The Trump administration's main concern is that all conduct issues must be treated the same, and that discrimination should not have a lower standard of proof or in other ways seem to be "stacked against the accused." General Counsel thinks that few or no further changes are required but they are still examining our Title IX CRR.

10:00 – 10:15am NTT Faculty CRR Update – Anne Alexander

The NTT Faculty Committee members are: UMSL – Pamela Stuerke, Larry Irons (NTT), Janet Wilking; S&T – Michael Bruening, Jossalyn Larson (NTT), Joan Schuman (NTT); UMKC – Jake Marszalek, Wanda Temm (NTT), Crystal Doss (NTT), Mizzou – Anne Alexander (NTT), Jennifer Fellabaum-Toston (NTT), Carol Lorenzen

They will be collecting information about each campus, because the issues may be different on each campus. They will review the relevant CRR and campus by-laws; on some issues, the by-laws may be more important.

Steve Graham observed that only 8 years ago IFC pushed to tighten up the CRR. Some campuses got onto it, others did not. Adherence is slippery at best. IFC is the body that should start work on it.

There is a lack of clarity about whether policies at the lower level can over-rule those at the higher level. Where is the final authority?

10:15 – 10:30am Teaching Evaluations/Salary Adjustments – Steve Graham (attachment 2, page 6)

Isabel Montes, a Fulbright scholar from Colombia, will help Steve collect best practices in teaching evaluation. IFC is the best body to take the lead on this.

- A committee will be formed to examine the procedures that are used systemwide to evaluate teaching. It will come back to IFC with recommendations. Centers for teaching excellence across the campuses should be talking to each other about this, but also faculty should be involved to push back against any tendency to impose burdensome evaluation processes

10:30 – 11:30am President Choi

President Choi emphasized that each university is special and unique, and stakeholders must recognize their value. There is some talk from the members of the community of a flagship and three subordinate campuses, but if the Board of Curators wants to go down that path there will be pushback. We have 4 public research universities. If anything, we need to strengthen research.

It was discussed that the way information about the “system” itself is presented causes misperceptions. The message is not getting out to the public.

President Choi stated that it is important for the curators to hear the voices of the faculty. The morning presentations of faculty initiatives to the Board are one-way.

- He would like to have the IFC members meet the curators for a breakfast and have a discussion of substantive ideas so that they understand faculty issues and concerns.

The 160/90 branding campaign started as an MU project to develop and define a brand due to the decrease in enrollment, but he expanded it as a UM system project because we didn’t want a branding campaign that creates confusion. We don’t want to merely redistribute students.

- System will share with IFC updates from the 160/90 campaign.

IFC shared concerns about whether the campaign would benefit the other campuses. MC pointed out that “system branding” doesn’t really work – no one comes to the University of Missouri because “we have a great system.” We need to coordinate efforts.

The Board of Curators’ role is to provide strategic guidance and direction. We need to cut some programs to support programs of strength. It should be left to academic leaders to identify the programs for divestment and investment. The BOC does have the power of program review.

We are looking at what can be done in Procurement, HR, and IT. In some areas we are overstaffed compared to other universities. The processes could be streamlined. Research and Economic Development will be reorganized into Research, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship in the next month. It will not just focus on tech transfer, but also on innovation and support services for new companies formed by students and faculty. In tech transfer, we need to engage industry with faculty, meet with potential investors and match them up. There is very little coordination across campuses; we can standardize compliance, IRB, and processing of proposals and awards. There should be more collaboration.

The UMRB funding is being reorganized. The half million dollars spent on fine arts, social sciences, and humanities is going forward, but the \$1.5 million spent on the STEM disciplines is under examination. MC emphasized that overall the system will spend more money on research than it used to. MC was informed that communication about these changes had been poor and had left some faculty believing that research funding is being cut.

The search for the Director of Government Relations was cancelled and a junior position was filled, the Director of Government Relations, who will work under President Choi.

11:30 – 11:40am Administrative Performance and Process Improvement Committee member report – Jerry Wyckoff

Jerry Wyckoff reported that the scope of the review has been discussed and reigned in, excluding communications after discussion. The firm solicited the names of people to contact and he gave them the names of heads of the Faculty Senates/Council. IFC needs to be engaged continuously.

11:40 – 11:45am Intercampus Course Sharing Committee report – Viviana Grieco

Viviana Grieco reported that she is compiling questions about the course sharing process. She asked IFC to help get the word out to faculty about the course sharing grants.

11:45 – 11:55pm Student Success and OAER Update – Steve Graham

Steve Graham reported that funding will be made available for open access educational resources. He assured IFC that faculty will be in charge of course materials. The prerogative to choose a textbook is a core academic freedom. But faculty could help students knock off hundreds of dollars per book per semester.

11:55 – 12pm Strategic Plan – IFC Members

SG wanted to check that faculty are involved in the Strategic Plans on the campuses.

The meeting was adjourned at 12pm.

Attachments:

- 1) CRR 230.070 Educational Assistance Program for University Employees
- 2) Methods for Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness