

## IFC Minutes

November 15, 2019

1. Discussion with President Choi
  - a. NextGen Precision Health Institute
    - i. The Precision Institute is an initiative – not just a building
    - ii. We need the help of the faculty to make this happen
    - iii. We are developing a new mission to define areas of precision health
      1. Where can we make a contribution
      2. Are there emerging areas we should focus on
      3. Bring about more collaboration
    - iv. The committee structure is being revised
  - b. Tier 3 Proposals
    - i. Two phases of the roll out to support:
      1. Meaningful collaborations in arts, humanities, social and behavioral sciences
      2. Precision Health – Hold off until the vision statement is revised
    - ii. Annual investments at about \$1 million per year, which is higher than in the past
    - iii. Match is 25% of the total on top of the million – the handling of matches vary by areas
    - iv. Reconstitute research board for Tier 3 and in future for Tiers 1-2
    - v. Timeline
      1. Announce awards by the end of the academic year
      2. Working backwards for setting the appropriate deadlines
      3. Questions contact Cooper Drury or Ashley Berg
  - c. Mission statement
    - i. Took IFC input as well as ISC and ISAC
    - ii. Kept the bulk of the mission statement that existed
    - iii. Values of academic freedom and freedom of expression
    - iv. Mission statement will go to the Board of Curators in November
  - d. Strategic Plan
    - i. There is some push back on metrics with a fear of them being unattainable
      1. What investments are we going to make so they are achievable
      2. We have a lot of strengths that we can leverage
      3. We are in this together
      4. Help faculty see the plan to get there
2. Information Technology – Beth Chancellor
  - a. Full cloud based solution was the best model (email and collaboration tools)
  - b. Microsoft – all faculty and staff
  - c. Google – students (change for MU, UMKC and S&T)
  - d. Technical hurdles to work through
    - i. Calendaring (between students and faculty/staff)
    - ii. The terms and conditions of student emails will be treated like corporate emails
    - iii. 2 factor authentication

- e. Set of tools available to all faculty and staff (offer more than one choice)
  - f. Hiring a marketing and communications person that can help with better messaging
  - g. Email for life
    - i. As faculty or staff retire the university is still supporting them and those numbers add up in support and licensing cost
    - ii. Students – migrate to an alumni account if they want one affiliated with their campus
    - iii. Emeritus faculty should keep email
    - iv. Consider forwarding email for a defined amount of time or forever
3. CRRs
- a. Vetting process: IFC, UMAO, GO and OGC
  - b. Intercampus Faculty Council
    - i. Changes: make changes to clarify this is a cabinet versus a council and add that it serves in an advisory capacity
    - ii. **Decision: approved after minor edits**
  - c. Conflict of Interest
    - i. The change is to streamline the adjunct faculty reporting process
    - ii. **Decision: approved after minor edits**
4. Faculty Leave
- a. This change was made to add NTTs to also have rights to a sabbatical leave
  - b. Spell out the difference in compensation for taking 1 semester versus 1 year
  - c. Added NTTs
  - d. Look at research leave and development leave language
  - e. **Action item: Make edits and come back to IFC**
5. Executive Philosophy
- a. Added the role of the provost
  - b. Chancellors are chief executive officers
  - c. **Decision: approved after minor edits**
6. Students with Disabilities
- a. Spells out what faculty can and cannot do in regards to student accommodations
    - i. Faculty cannot evaluate the diagnosis
    - ii. Faculty can negotiate the accommodation
  - b. **Decision: approved**
7. Faculty Performance
- a. Currently the timeframe for reviewing the faculty holding primarily administrative or department chair positions are not clear. These changes will make that clear
  - b. Will return to 5 year clock if leave their administrator role
  - c. Change to Administrators to be evaluated according to their workload distribution
  - d. There is no definition as that is left up to the provost and dean and they will put the determination in their appointment letter
  - e. **Decision: approved**
8. Emeritus Designation
- a. Removed the extra step for NTT
  - b. Administrative titles who have faculty rank
    - i. Vote of faculty senate/council, makes recommendation

- ii. Final decision by chancellor
  - c. Adding curator titles
  - d. Decision: approved**
- 9. Promotion and Tenure
  - a. Changes: Go up for tenure once only and add a clear role for the chair and provost
  - b. Candidate should know the background of department chairs if they are writing a letter – could go in call letter/ SOP (i.e. if NTT faculty chair, etc.)
  - c. Remove the “one and done” language
    - i. Clean up processes and if it remains a problem, if so they will consider it again
  - d. Decision: Delete the one and done language and then approved**
- 10. Ability to Work
  - a. There is a loop hole for extended delay – no time limit on healthcare delays
  - b. Change from 3 to 5 days
  - c. 3 to 5 names
  - d. Action item: make changes and bring back to a future meeting**
- 11. Dismissal for Cause – **bring to a future meeting**
- 12. Benefit Rate (see attached slides)
  - a. Changes implemented in July 2019
  - b. All money goes into the benefit plans (as it did before, no change)
  - c. Calculate the two components
    - i. Total cost/benefit eligible employee
  - d. Per person rate is different for 9 & 12 month appointments
  - e. Shouldn't be charging per person (if on 9 month) instead of percent of pay
  - f. Does not affect what the faculty take home
  - g. Does this impact calculating for grants
    - i. Stayed the same as it always has been (% of pay)
  - h. Eric to double check summer research**
- 13. Elsevier
  - a. UC system cancelled Elsevier contract last year origin of a taskforce on open access
  - b. 3 different issues
    - i. Elsevier subscription \$3.5 million
    - ii. Library funding – flat with increased cost
    - iii. Push for open access publishing
  - c. Conclusion we should not cancel Elsevier
    - i. California bought the journals ... we are only “renting” so would lose 15 years of past journals
    - ii. Cost per use is less than \$10 Elsevier but the average is \$30 for all journals
    - iii. Our current contract ends December 31 so we need to push to get a decision soon
    - iv. Elsevier came back with a deal to keep it flat instead of an increased fee
    - v. \$1.4 million for MU and \$500K for UMKC, S&T and UMSL combined
    - vi. Moving forward the library funding should be part of the research mission
  - d. Move more towards open access
    - i. Institutional repositories
    - ii. Open access journal that have good impact factors
    - iii. Raise awareness

- iv. How do we get more creative about how we gain leverage
- 14. Last date of academic related activity (LDA) email
  - a. Checked for clarity in the email – IFC recommended switching the order of the first two sentences but otherwise approved the letter