1. Using data to support faculty and better understand each university
   a. Purpose:
      i. Internal and externally we want others to see what we are doing
      ii. Find people doing work like yours both internally and externally
      iii. The URL can be used to show people what you do
      iv. Automatically population so faculty don’t have to update all the time and
          would only do that for those that are not publically curated
   b. Department can see a profile view including
      i. Faculty data
      ii. Grant data if desired (MU included this, but is up to each university)
          1. This currently includes internal grant data but not internal awards
      iii. Provides a snap shot of strengths and weaknesses
      iv. Provides comparisons both full national mean/median and AAU public
   c. Report set up
      i. Could vary by department but also by campus
      ii. Constantly re-evaluating the definition to ensure it is included in these
          summaries
      iii. Can see strengths and weaknesses across the university as well
      iv. Research and teaching overview
      v. Research interests – curate from topics but can add as desired
   d. myVita
      i. The goal is to integrate the data with myVita so that you can enter
         information once
   e. Collaborative networks system-wide
      i. Single platform to present research productivity
      ii. All publically available data and integrating an academic analytics award
          database, faculty can add their own if it is not curated
      iii. All publications
      iv. Related terms and people – looks within the system to find who you could
          collaborate with….can look at nationally
      v. Grants – PI on federal grant, internal grant data (PI and eventually co-PI)
         1. Items can be hidden if you don’t want them seen
         2. The site is publically viewable
         3. Going to add internal editorships
         4. Can add a research summary (if desired)
   f. This is set up system-wide for those with a research appointment and others with
      significant scholarship can be added
      i. It will be introduced to faculty in September
      ii. Chris is happy to do presentation at the universities if that would be
          helpful to demonstrate how they use this tool at MU
   g. Action items:
      i. Look into if Fulbright would be included in award data or the dollars
ii. Look into showing co-I's instead of co-PI's as it is more inclusive

iii. Can this link to MOspace?
   iv. Can it show the value of who overlaps with you the most?

2. Board of Curators
   a. Curator Sundvold met with the group
   b. The Curators support the president, he is very forward thinking and a fast mover
   c. High priority initiatives:
      i. A focus is on the collaboration across all 4 universities – build up strength areas
      ii. Online education for our non-current students
   d. Getting to know the curators personally has been very important to IFC
      i. Understand who and what you are investing in
      ii. Importance of faculty and staff who are dedicating their time and are the consistent forces behind the work
   iii. Where do you see IFC’s relationship with the Board
      1. The group discussed the changes of the Board meetings to one day and committee meetings are held via phone in preparation for the meetings. The committee chair now reports at the meeting which creates a more efficient meeting.
      2. Are you concerned you are losing some of the informal time?
         a. No the layout allows for two receptions per year and the ability to talk throughout the day on breaks.
         b. New curators know that it is important to listen in on all the committee meetings to understand what is going on
         c. Annual meeting is for two days in June
   e. How do you feel the budget situation will be?
      i. Not sure if there will be a reverse trend
      ii. We are looking for ways we be more profitable
      iii. We are different and we need to find ways to deliver that message

3. Promotion & Tenure/Mid-Career Faculty Development Taskforce
   a. This was a very good group
   b. A draft was shared for IFC’s review that includes a summary of literature and good set of recommendations
   c. See if comfortable – make tweaks as needed
   d. Once IFC approves this work it will go to the Provosts and then the General Officers
   e. What recommendations do we want to make
      i. This is a national issue
      ii. CR&R currently has a lot of flexibility so don’t think we need to change
      iii. Categories of scholarship – ways to demonstrate
         1. Be purposeful to do this in a meaningful way
         2. Work to define with the faculty
         3. Know what you need to do to demonstrate your work for P&T
         4. See if there is a way to tie in to the open access taskforce
   f. Implementation
      i. Evaluating Teaching
         1. President had the chancellor and provosts agreed to it
2. Provost developed a plan of how they are going to do this differently

3. Semi-annual report
   a. How many implemented
   b. Process for approaching faculty with issues
   c. Need Chair and Dean on board for it to happen

   **ii. Action item: Identify things that have been implemented or in process and send to IFC**

4. CRR
   a. Diplomas and Certificates
      i. Formal certificate always had to have approval CBHE
      **ii. Decision: IFC approved the changes to the CR&R**
   b. Promotion and tenure
      i. There was a sense by the provosts and vice provosts that there were faculty going up to promotion early against the advice of their chair and dean with the idea if they go up again
      ii. Concerns:
         1. Not a thorough and complete case
         2. The eye towards what is extraordinary
         3. Hold people accountable
      **iii. Action items:**
         1. IFC members to take this to your senate and councils
         2. Reconvene about this CR&R in September
   c. Emerita/Emerita
      i. NTT don’t currently go through the same process to be designated as emeritus
      ii. On occasion people who aren’t faculty weren’t given faculty status
      iii. Only administrative appointment voted by the faculty senate/council (chancellor, dean emeritus)
      **iv. Action items:**
         1. Add in good standing at time of retirement and/or resignation
            a. 2nd line and later at time of...
         2. IFC members to take this to your senate and councils
         3. Reconvene about this CR&R in September

5. Chair and Dean Development
   a. Included in the change to CR&Rs earlier this year it was said that resources should be provided
   b. Academic Affairs and Human Resources have been working with the Provosts and a taskforce on the initial plans that were presented
   c. Discussion
      i. Faculty may have concern on costs associated with the coaching
      ii. Coaches will be on boarded on UM’s expectations
      iii. We will only get information on the themes the coaches are seeing, not specifics
      iv. Is there a feedback loop of things not seen?
         1. The work will start with 360, how I view myself and how others see me, provost meeting, DiSC assessment.
2. Consider if we should do a 360 again after coaching has occurred
   v. Will there be objective indicators?
   vi. There should be a coaching and evaluation process – needs to be separate
6. eLearning update
   a. There is a governance structure that was created including:
      i. Oversight Committee
         1. Provost
         2. Vice provost
         3. 4 faculty members
         4. Set strategic direction
      ii. Advised by 12 faculty members that have extensive online experience or
          they research in online learning advice to the oversight group
      iii. Academic Council
          1. Faculty
          2. Vice Provost
          3. Teaching and Learning
          4. Instructional design
          5. National standards – how to implement
          6. What to put forward for the system wide initiative
          7. RFI – for collaboration
          8. Degrees conferred by the universities
      iv. Curriculum Coordinating- make sure collaborating in the way it is intended
   b. Discussion
      i. Recommendation to ensure those involved have online experience
      ii. Infrastructure needed in student services to expand
      iii. $20 million launch
      iv. Make sure whatever we do is quality
7. Next year
   a. Meeting dates to be sent out after the meeting today
   b. Jake Marszalek is the IFC Chair for 2019-20
8. Roundtable in June
   a. 1 meeting per year they would have a special interaction with IFC – in June (2 day meeting)
   b. 2 times per year we would have BOC members with President and IFC members