

IFC Retreat Minutes

August 4-5, 2020

1. Information Technology – Beth Chancellor
 - a. Discussed recent implementations including multi-factor authentication, Microsoft365 and Google GSuite
 - b. Planning in progress to transition from Box to MS365
 - c. Email security initiatives
 - i. Policies: looking at various options to enhance email security including no level 4 data, stricter adherence to email quotas and deletion of old emails beyond certain dates.
 - ii. Technology solutions: might include common password reset cycles across the system (180 days), data loss prevention, external email tagging, tools to eliminate level 4 data in email and process change in how information/data is shared
 - iii. Feedback from IFC
 1. “External email message” on phones is difficult to manage because you currently have to open the email to be able to identify if it is needed. Consider changing to just a warning color bar versus text?
 2. Email for retirees and others who have left the university potential policy changes
 - a. Feedback is needed from retirees’ association and faculty senates/council
 - b. Looking at various options
 - d. IT Strategic goal planning – trying to do things more similarly, and to use centers of excellence to leverage the expertise systemwide
 - i. Next steps: follow up at a future meeting on the external emails and creating a group of trusted outside senders
2. eLearning update – Matt Gunkel and Heather Hunt
 - a. eLearning has been working on the governance structure, services to provide, and overall strategy with the Universities
 - b. During COVID 19, eLearning has helped respond and assisted faculty in the transition to remote learning. They have created a [keep learning website](#) to inform everyone of new [tools](#) and training available to them
 - c. [Certification](#)
 - i. Teaching [seminar course](#) offerings available
 - ii. Certification completion date is different at each university
 - d. Size of class recommendations (engagement and faculty load) is dependent on the discipline
 - e. Course Template – located in Canvas commons designed to put content in
 - f. Feedback
 - i. Is there a way to triage information and provide the 5 key tools and discipline specific support?
 - g. [Course Quality Standards](#)

- i. Standards fulfill federal regulations and HLC accreditation is the framework
 - ii. Courses to be reviewed from Summer pivot to online courses (instructional designer and faculty peer review from your discipline) eventually faculty will be prompted, but do not worry currently
 - h. [Proctoring](#)
 - i. Alternative assessments when possible (preferred path)
 - ii. Proctorio and Examity online proctoring options for Fall 2020
 - i. [Scaling nomination process](#) is now available online
 - j. Next Steps: eLearning to come back to a future meeting
- 3. Finance – Ryan Rapp
 - a. Facing uncertainty around revenue streams
 - b. 60 to 90-day horizons
 - c. Enrollments have held pretty steady
 - d. Missouri ranks last in revenue per FTE student growth since the great recession
- 4. IFC Group Discussion
 - a. Policy changes – what is involved?
 - i. Full vetting process includes IFC, Provosts, General Officers and General Counsel
 - b. Promotion and Tenure CRR revision:
 - i. Confirms the role of the department chair and provost in the P&T process.
 - ii. Makes the language consistent for each level of review throughout the process.
 - iii. Requires that the summary letter/recommendation is sent to the candidate after each level of review.
 - iv. Provides an opportunity for a response by the candidate at each level of review.
 - v. Adds language to indicate that departments should publish their standards and the unit standards should meet “university-wide standards” found in “Section B Policy.”
 - vi. Different levels of committee reviews should ensure that the departmental standards meet the broader university-wide standards.
 - c. IFC/ISC – The group felt the meeting had good discussions over the summer and the group believes we should meet with ISC one to two times this year.
 - d. Organizational Structure changes
 - i. Council of Chancellors – Recommend having the chair rotate
 - ii. Advisory body – Recommend having faculty representation in the group
 - iii. Curators – Recommend having the curators have a campus to get to know better and help represent their perspectives more when considering changes
 - iv. Recommend putting checks in place to evaluate how the change in organizational structure is going
 - v. Is there a way to get curators represented across the four universities?
 - e. President Conversation
 - i. Merging of roles
 - 1. Chancellors will have more of a role in system decision and more autonomy
 - 2. Council of Chancellors will decide what parts of the former role of the president will not continue, and what will be the role going forward.

3. The chancellors will be working together to encouraging collaborations, more state funding, activities to benefit faculty, students and staff

5. Discussion with the curators

- a. How do you plan to continue to support the missions of all four universities?
 - i. This was an overarching part of the discussion since the beginning and they believe the governance structure and Council of Chancellors will help with this.
 - ii. Every curator is aware of the issue and has each committed to making sure that in redefining the governance structure that nothing is done to take away from the importance of all four campuses but instead enhance each campus and see that each of the campuses can do more

6. Next Steps

- a. Meeting Technology– use zoom instead of telepresence
- b. Course Sharing
 - i. A new taskforce has formed and they need feedback on barriers, opportunities and best ways to get feedback from faculty at each of the campuses.