UMKC Faculty Senate

Meeting of 22 January 2013

DRAFT Minutes

**Present**: Ebersole; Ward-Smith; Fieldman; Stancel; Wyckoff; Burnett; Holder; Ellinghausen; Grieco; Dilks; Solose; Morehouse; McCall; Butner; Luppino; Sykes Berry; Hermanns;Krantz; Kumar; Bethman. Excused: McArthur; Plamann; Petrie; Nickel; Gerkovich; Pennington; Flowers; Igwe. Absent: Richardson; Van de Liefvoort; O’Brien.

2. Draft agenda APPROVED.

3. Draft minutes of meeting of 27 November 2012 APPROVED

4. Provost’s Remarks:

 Provost Hackett made two announcements: First, that the Faculty Accomplishment System (FAS) currently used by the System to document faculty activity and serve as input mechanism for annual reports, is slated to be replaced. Two other instruments are being evaluated for possible purchase. Second, she is directing that all of the next University Budget Committee (UBC) meeting be devoted to financial issues surrounding the strategic plan.

7. Chair Ebersole, expecting that this item will be uncontroversial, asks that it be considered ahead of the agenda’s more expansive issues. The item asks for discussion of proposed changes to the CR & R; summarizing, Chair Ebersole notes that the changes are not large, but have been requested for the Rolla campus because the small size of some departments there means that current requirements regarding promotion processes are difficult to meet.

There was no opposition to the suggested changes.

6., 5. These items, being clearly interrelated, were opened to be discussed simultaneously.

 To Senator Burnett’s offered proposal, Senator Sue Sykes Berry wonders if community-college and other transfering students might be disadvantaged? Senator Wyckoff responds by noting that the new GenEd program must meet specifications put into place by the Missouri Office of Higher Education, and, likewise, must the articulation agreements that have been developed between 4- and 2-year institutions. Thus issues that concern GenEd regarding articulation agreements and vice versa will need to coordinate through that office. Senator Wyckoff suggests that students meeting MOHE outcomes before transferring in to UMKC cannot be charged with meeting UMKC requirements re GenEd as well. He denies that “native” UMKC students would be at a comparative disadvantage with transfering students re the GenEd requirements; and in that vein also notes that even native students retain the ability to petition for GenEd exemptions when these are somehow at odds with an individual’s course path. We must be able to show the public that the general education experience at UMKC is much better qualitatively and quantitatively so that students want to begin their education experience here. Hence the across-the-board requirement for an Anchor 3, so that every student will experience the team-teaching approach. This is a student learning outcome model and we need to develop outcome data, especially for A&S students, to compare outcomes in the discourse classes to those coming from the community college experience. Roowriter will be able to help us do this.

In additional comments, Senator Wyckoff notes that far more proposals for GenEd courses have been approved than denied. Some course proposals are being submitted with numbers other than 1-, 2-, or 300, apparently for curricular reasons specific to a unit or department. When this occurs, the proposal must contain an explanation for a course level that is discrepant with the GenEd-required levels. The idea that there is a cap on the size of anchor courses is debunked; rather, because anchor and discourse courses are tied in, the size of the anchor-course enrollment determines how many discourse courses need to be attached to that anchor. Overall, there is still need for Anchor I courses. Five Anchor II classes have already been approved, along with a few Anchor III classes. February 15th is the deadline to submit courses for the fall catalog; there will be sufficient courses available to accommodate the incoming class.

Senator Luppino reminds the Senate that the UMKC Budget Model anticipated the need to have special tuition sharing arrangements for interdisciplinary courses, and expressly provides a mechanism for the Deans of schools involved in interdisciplinary courses to get together with the Provost and reach agreement on reasonable sharing that overrides the general tuition sharing rules in the Model.

There is now a General Education Coordinator, Lynda Plamann, who is assigned to the Provost’s office; her full title is Associate Vice Provost for University College and Undergraduate Advising. She will be interacting with many groups to make the public relations portion come together; there is also the need for public relations materials to explain the outcome-based education model to guide parents when they visit classes. The advising of students is key to the success of the new model; to that end, Kim McNeley is coordinating the professional development for advisors, who meet once a month. Senators expressed the need for faculty advisors to also have more direct support from her office. Finally, it is recommends that faculty attend the FaCET programs; many of these, through February, are speaking to various GenEd issues. FaCET has its programs listed on its website.

7. Discussion of Proposed tech transfer, patents, faculty research committee (s), tenure, and related issues for IFC follow-up with System V.P. Mike Nichols:

Mike Nichols (V.P. Research and Economic Development) has three questions for each campus: 1) How far along are you in developing an advisory committee/ or what is the success of the established committee? 2) What can the System office do for faculty in regard to commercialization efforts? 3) Expresses the need to have a discussion about tenure. In this regard, he asks what is the “temperature” on campus when it comes to counting patents and commercialization in tenure reviews? Chair Ebersole has contacted Lawrence Dreyfus (V.P. of Research and Economic Development) about this, and will inform IFC members about what UMKC has in place to handle these issues at the next meeting. The UMKC campus committee met in summer 2012, and there was no clear charge for the committee at that time. It is noted that the current committee was appointed, not elected; Senators would like to see an effective faculty advisory committee as a forum to communicate the needs on intellectual property issues. Currently, Senator Wyckoff is the committee’s only tenured faculty member regularly available, and is serving as Interim Chair. Members without tenure feel vulnerable and are unwilling to chair the committee; discussion indicates that the Senate favors having one tenured person from each unit serve on this committee. The current committee did put together a list of twelve issues that need resolution; Senator Wyckoff will send that list to the Faculty Senate. [ADDENDUM: That list has been provided to Senator Fieldman, Interim Secretary, who will attach it as an appendix to these minutes. Chris Holman has resumed his role as regular chair of the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee.]

8. The Faculty Senate went into closed executive session in order to discuss dossiers of candidates nominated for honorary degrees.

Special thanks to Senator Stancel for considerable assistance in providing the minutes for this meeting. Errors or other inaccuracies are the responsibility of Senator Fieldman, the Senate’s Interim Secretary.

APPENDIX:

Tech Transfer Advisory Committee Suggestions for Improving the function of the TTO:

1) Include high-level representation from each Academic unit in the Council while keeping the council at a workable size.

• Ensure representation by schools with most patentable activities.

• Perhaps ensure integration with other Research related committees.

• Ensure there is elected representation, or perhaps appointed representation from the Faculty Senate.

• Make sure that UMKC Deans, Directors, and PIs understand that UMKC has significant local authority related to Tech Transfer and IP pursuit and therefore their involvement is crucial.

2) Discuss the potential for ensuring that the development of intellectual property is properly acknowledged and rewarded during the Promotion and Tenure review process.

• This would involve interfacing with the Unit- and University-level P&T committees.

• This really should be University wide, as IP development affects all units- this would be in line with UM System-level initiatives towards Economic development.

3) Develop an active method for promoting and marketing University IP development and licensing opportunities.

• Possibly with help from neighbor institutions such as MRI.

 • Discuss opportunities with University Communications.

 • Discuss opportunities with UMKC Foundation?

4) Re-design the TTO website.

• Include some anonymized short case studies of successful technology commercialization at UMKC.

• Clearly explain royalty distribution policies to potential and actual inventors.

• Develop a “Process Document” so potential users of the TTO know who to talk to, what to expect, what to have ready, and timeframes for various phases of work.

5) Ensure tighter integration and coordination between the TTO, ORS granting activities, and SBTDC.

• Perhaps have quarterly meetings to coordinate activity.

• Formalize a communication method, such as a listserve/website or mailing list.

• Create teams of interested faculty/students related to IP development and formalize seminars related to their activities.

• Discuss how we move forward with compounds/small molecules that are at the "pre-clinical" or lead phase of development.

 • Integrate community partners

 • perhaps develop a pathway to market

 • discuss alternative uses (antibacterials, supplements, etc) that require less stringent oversight?

6) James Brazeal, ORS’s technology transfer person, needs more exposure across the University.

• Mr. Brazeal should get some time during orientation sessions for new faculty to introduce the TTO and explain the procedures faculty go through to disclose an invention.

• Information sessions on grants and grant communications should include information about the TTO and how to interact with it.

• James should be meeting with Units, Deans, and Directors directly, potentially at faculty meetings

• This could include the creation of a promotional video that describes the process on how to disclose an invention and the benefits to the investigator.

• This video can be shown at Dept. meetings so that James does not have to go to all the meetings.

 • We could also show in the video on the web.

7) Increase staffing at the TTO office; Mr. Brazeal is currently alone.

• An internship program for lawyers, business students or other interested students could be appropriate in this case. It provides additional expertise at little cost. In the longer term, when the deal flow is stronger, James needs to have some permanent help.

8) Ensure sufficient frequency of TTO Advisory Council meetings

 • We'll try to meet quarterly from here on out.

 • Ensure there are agendas for each meeting and that minutes are posted on the TTO website (or elsewhere?).

• Perhaps occasionally publicize meetings so that faculty external to the committee but with interest in IP development show up; perhaps center these around specific action items with broad faculty appeal.

9) Develop proper goals and assessment metrics for tech transfer activities at UMKC.

• These metrics need to be both qualitative and quantitative.

[Notes provided by Senator Wyckoff]