MU Task Force on International Partnerships and Agreements

Date: July 11, 2017  
Time: 1:00 pm – 3:30 pm  
Place: 105 Jesse Hall – Chancellor’s Conference Room

Attendees: Gay Albright, Miguel Aylon, Cooper Drury, Sarah Edwards, Casey Forbis, Bryan Garton, Ryan Griffin, Paul Ladehoff, Jim Scott, and Rui Yao.

Visitors: Kerri Urban

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome and Review – Paul Ladehoff  
   Ladehoff welcomed the council and announced that Lisa Wimmenauer and Ken Finley were now retired and Casey Forbis was replacing Lisa Wimmenauer.
   a. Minutes from June 6  
      Minutes from the June 6, 2017 meeting were reviewed and approved.
   b. Update from “Process Mapping” subgroup  
      Ladehoff announced that Melinda Adams was leading the project of “Process Mapping” subgroup. This subgroup for “Process Mapping” is looking at how the processing of the IMOU’s, in how that might be beneficial both to our task force in terms of helping us spot pitch points or duplication or redundancy. It has been helpful for us to spot what changes should be made to improve the new process.
   c. Ladehoff made mention of the subgroup that was working on data base for storing of the contracts:  
      Ladehoff explained that Casey Forbis would be holding a meeting with the subgroup of Ladehoff, Scott, Adams, Forbis, Urban, and O’Neal to take a look at the data base in the Business Services office that stores all IMOU’s, contracts, etc. This subgroup will be viewing the data base of all documents to see how it can be made available to all units to look up all existing contracts, it also has an electronic signing method for the signatory and reviewing of all contracts while in the approval mode. This meeting is to be held on August 23, 2017. Forbis will do an overview of all activities the software is capable of, for the subgroup to view. Forbis explained that the Business Services software stores all contracts at MU in their data base and it can be made accessible to units.

2. Guidelines, policies and procedures for submitting, reviewing, signing and evaluating  
   a. Continue and complete review and discussions of Handbook draft 6  
      Ladehoff asked the committee to begin reviewing draft 6 of the Handbook, beginning at Section 6. Components of an agreement.
- **Section 6.1 Institutional and/or organizational information:**
  - Does this information need to be in the Handbook, or not? The partner is looking for the scope of MU and it is not required by MU to provide this information.
  - It helps to get partner information, as well as, provides the partners information on MU. The background information on MU needs to be somewhere in the Handbook, just not sure if this is the correct place for that information. Would it be better to put this somewhere else in the document?
  - Do keep in mind that the originator may not know how to describe MU.

- **Section 6.2 Goal(s) and objectives of the agreement:**
  - No concerns, this section is fine, as is.

- **Section 6.3 Terms and Conditions:**
  - What should be in an IMOU versus what should be in a service contract, needs to be clarified.
  - Admission requirements needs to be added
  - TOEFL scores needs to have a description and to be referred to a website of each unit on what their requirements are. It would be important to not lock in specific information, but reference more generic information, with flexibility
  - Be cautious and make sure there are no language in the contract that binds MU to a foreign law.

- **Section 6.4 Institution Responsibilities:**
  - Logos has restrictions and they must be approved.
  - Proactivity using the MU logo, needs to refer to our Trademark Office. Trademark is MU’s right to use, and no one else’s.

- **Section 6.5 Contact information:**
  - Clarify what contact information is required, such as: name, title, phone, fax, and email. Be consistent in all documents. Commit to update information if there is a change in staffing.

- **Section 6.9 Extension or renewal through 7.2 Agreement Review Routing Form**
  - No concerns

- **Section 8. Evaluation and Renewal**
  - **8.1 Evaluation** – Task Force to make a recommendation on who holds the responsibility of the evaluation.
  - **8.2 Renewal**
    - Currently a message goes out from Business Services to the IMOU MU contact that the IMOU is expiring.
- End of year reports – anything we can do to automate the process would be helpful
- When should IMOU’s be evaluated for renewal? Annually, every 3 years? How often do evaluations take place? We want to retain some flexibility on evaluation reviews.
- Should we focus on the IMOU’s that need a review more often than 5 years?
- What about a rule on the IMOU’s that need to be evaluated?
- Possibly the Provost Office could measure the programs progress.

b. Check in with subgroup examining preparatory questions
Ladehoff asked Miguel Ayllon to report on the status of the “Preparatory questions” subgroup which Lisa Wimmenauer and Miguel Ayllon were heading up.

Ayllon reported that Wimmenauer sent documents of the collected recommendations to him, and he is to do his part and report back to the committee. Ayllon explained that Scott provided him with a Rubric form from the University of California, Berkley. Scott recommended the importance of adopting the Rubric process as a mechanism tool to evaluate agreements. It is a good tool and the IMOU Review Committee should use it for the IMOU approval process, going forward. The Rubric has 5 different criteria asking members to score the proposals 1 – 5, on to the Provost’s for their recommendations. Scott will provide the Rubic process on the SharePoint site for members to review.

Ayllon will complete his part on the project and bring back the recommendations in the upcoming TF meeting. Ladehoff asked if Ayllon needed help, since Wimmenauer has retired, to let him know and maybe someone on the TF committee could volunteer, if more is needed. Ayllon asked committee members to bring any information forward to be considered. Ayllon suggested the importance of including all fiscal officers in the process of resources when creating an IMOU, it was important for the funding of IMOU’s to know what funding was going to be allowed by each unit, while developing an IMOU.

Ladehoff added the goal was to know how we tracked the resources and the end result of all IMOU’s being created.

3. Implementation and Outreach
   a. Communication
      - Discuss talking points that TF members may use to update their Dean or Nominator
• Task Force to make a recommendation on who holds the responsibility of the IMOU’s.
• Who should we update, and what do we tell them?
• Should we recommend clarifying the roles and responsibilities?
• Handbook is too long and needs to be condensed
• Should the expiration and renewal be put together

Ladehoff reported that it looks like the TF committee is going to meet the Fall goal to have something to present to Provost Stokes, their findings on the IMOU process, and required changes that need to be made.

• Update to Faculty Council, others?
The next Faculty Council meeting is being held on July 28, 2107. It would be a good outreach to present at the Executive meeting a few days before the Faculty Council meeting and report to them, our findings.

4. Drafting Recommendations
   a. Identify recommendations that have emerged from review of handbook and other discussions.

   Topic headings for the recommendations that were made:
   • Clarify roles and formalize the responsibilities for the review and approval process.
   • Do we want to require that the only way to an IMOU, is to follow this process?
   • Strategic priorities.
   • Carefully articulated.
   • Adequate resources to carry this out
   • Making sure there is access for all the contracts available internally at MU departments, and communication piece on the MU storage data base to public
   • Should be written policies and procedures for all international agreements
   • Several of our peers are trying to decrease the number of IMOU’s

   Standalone recommendations we would like to make for the Task Force:
   • Should be a way to store and retrieve all contracts.
   • Highly recommended to have topic headings of the process, as it should be criteria that has to be!
   • Business Services data base has all contracts stored as far back as 2000.
• Do we make all our agreements available to public?
• Internally, we need to make contracts accessible to MU departments.
• Are there agreements that are not for MU?
• If we write a General Agreement it opens the door, which is good.
• Public viewing is a good idea
• Documents should not be available to the outside public?
• Contract names are geographically mapped
• Who do the resources need to be made available to, Financial Aid?
• Recommendations – what resources should the university supply?
• Confirming roles and responsibilities
• Resources – storing of data and how it can be used.
• Should be a written policy and procedures on how to prepare an IMOU.
• Do we want to speak to whether we want more or less? What are the numbers? MU should have more or less?
• All agreements should hold a high quality, that have substance and that are profitable. High quality that brings benefits to MU.
• Currently, the IMOU Review Committee does not include any faculty.
• A policy needs to be written for the IMOU Review Committee to follow, it should have responsibilities written on the roles and specific areas of the responsibilities.
• The importance of strategic IMOU’s, not supporting contracts that bring no benefit to MU. We want high quality IMOU’s that bring benefits and we want the process to encourage that.

b. **Identify subgroup to draft language of recommendations for TF consideration.**

5. **Next Steps**
   a. **Check in re Progress and Plans for:**
      • **Guidelines?**
        Scott mentioned that if we adopt the “International Agreement Planning Form” it will resolve a lot of the unknown questions.
      • **Monitoring and Management Process?**
        Who should monitor and manage the IMOU process should be discussed and recommendations be made.
      • **Implementation and Outreach?**
        On “Outreach”, we need to ask folks on the TF committee to take on the responsibility of getting the information out their deans what has been discussed at the TF meetings on the IMOU process. We
could share the SharePoint site with the stakeholders (deans, department heads, and faculty) of units.

b. Suggestions for next steps and future agendas
   - Information Needs or Discussion Topics
     These committees are made up of non-faculty, we need faculty representation.
     - The current IMOU Review Committee was developed by the previous Director of the International Center, they were not chosen by any administrators to fulfill the institutions needs on international agreements.
     - Bryan Garton agreed to take a look at the report before moving forward on any presentations.

c. Preparing Report and Recommendations.
   - Scheduling additional meetings?
     Ladehoff announced that additional meetings would be needed. We will set upcoming meetings and post them on the SharePoint site.

6. Adjourn
   Meeting adjourned.

7. Next Scheduled Meeting:
   Tuesday, August 1, 2017, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm, 105 Jesse Hall.

Respectfully Submitted by,
Rebecca O’Neal