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
   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