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
      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\textsuperscript{rd}
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\textsuperscript{th} 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\textsuperscript{st} 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