Faculty Senate Minutes  
Tuesday March 2, 2010  
Administrative Center, Plaza Room, 3-5pm


Visitors: Provost Hackett

Excused: Plamann, Krause, Madison-Cannon, Humrichouser

Absent: Gardner, Wang, Davies, Williams

Welcome-3:02, Called to order by the Chair Gary Ebersole

Informational Items
Chair Ebersole had an item that needs to be carried back to their respective schools. Sue Sykes Berry has asked each of the schools on campus for an updated voting faculty list. This is needed since there will be an election for four of five members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee which are the only elected campus wide offices. Please note that the CRR’s are clear that a faculty member with a 50% or greater administrative appointment is not permitted to vote in these elections. Thus, the voting list in the unit is not necessarily the same as the voting list for campus-wide offices. Chair Ebersole has asked that everyone look at the rules and regulations for more information on this.

Chair Ebersole shared a letter of support for the District Superintendent of the Kansas City Missouri School District that Chancellor Morton has signed. It will be coming out tomorrow in the Kansas City Star. Senator Yang asked about how much opposition was expected to the “right sizing” proposal? Chair Ebersole noted that opposition is coming from neighborhoods and families that do not want to lose their neighborhood schools. The Senator noted that he is wondering if someone will try to stop this proposal. Chair Ebersole further noted that it will be up for a vote March 10th.

An email was sent out today from Vice-Chancellor MacQuarrie that the search committee will begin to meet for the Ombudsperson. They have one complete application in and are hoping to receive one or two more.

Approval of Agenda
There were no additions to the agenda, and all approved.

Approval of Minutes for February 16, 2010
There were no corrections to the minutes. Senator Foxworth moved to approve the minutes, Senator Wyckoff seconded, and all were in favor.

Provost’s Report
Provost Hackett noted, as she had discussed at a previous meeting, a new email policy with a goal to discourage the use of many broadcast emails. This policy is intended to encourage announcements to go out on Umatters. This is a quick and easy way of getting information out. The Provost noted that you can opt out of Umatters, but there are important announcements that will come out it. The goal is to make it as interesting as possible, but not intrusive. The Provost hopes this will become the primary vehicle for mass announcements. Umatters is open for the Faculty Senate to have a section to make announcements also. Individuals can email the Provost or follow links on the site to send comments for improvements. Comments for improving the site are welcome.

Chair Ebersole noted that when he, and Senators Stancel and Holsinger were at the last IFC meeting, President Forsee asked if each campus had special counseling for faculty and staff members who were being terminated, or denied promotion or tenure. This was in response to the recent shooting at the University of Alabama-Huntsville. Chair Ebersole said he couldn’t think of anything that addressed this issue and asked Provost Hackett to speak to this topic in regards to whether other universities had such a program, or if one is needed at UMKC.

Provost Hackett said that there is some support in Human Resources, and it is the best practice to provide support for individuals who are denied promotion and tenure. Support is provided, as much as possible, through Vice-Chancellor MacQuarrie, Deans, and departments. However, that support is inconsistent and dependent on the individual. For those individuals who want support, then the university does everything it can to help in their transition and provide support. HR also helps to find other positions, if possible. Nothing can be done for individuals who do not want any assistance. Currently UMKC does not have an EAP (employee assistance program) or office. This is usually the office that provides this type of assistance or works with HR to provide it. HR at UMKC has some of that ability, and encourages the Deans to provide support. Senator Wyckoff noted that it seems like one thing to provide HR support, but the issue in Alabama was different. It seems to him that the type of support that President Forsee was alluding to is more emotional. What concerns him (Senator Wyckoff) is that it is not clear to him what should be done if a colleague is a danger to him/herself or others. Provost Hackett said that we don’t have the full range of resources that she wishes we had, or that she has had in the past at ASU. However, we do have more resources than is generally recognized.

Provost Hackett noted that UMKC does have a threat assessment team. One part of it is to provide support to faculty, staff, and students who need it. Another issue is one like what happened in Alabama in regards to what we do when we have someone who presents a danger to themselves or others. Currently this team is most active with students and organized by Student Affairs. Vice-Chancellor MacQuarrie becomes involved when graduate students and faculty are involved. She (Provost Hackett) will call a meeting of that team to talk about making sure that the team is as active as it should be and prepared to work with faculty and staff. Provost Hackett thinks that the team is very capable of working with students. After that meeting has occurred, she will call a meeting with that team, Deans, and the Faculty Senate to provide information about how the team operates and what they do when a crisis presents itself. A part of what might happen is to have two sessions: one focused on students, and one on faculty and staff. Another point is to make sure that there is an up-to-date resource referral list.
What the Provost has learned from all of this is that everyone needs to know one name to call. This person may not be the ultimate person that someone needs to talk to, but this person will know who to call to start the ball rolling. Senator Luppino noted that this issue is also related to whistle-blower protection. If we are encouraging people to spot threats, then we need to encourage confidentiality, as it might be better to be safe than sorry. Chair Ebersole noted that at the IFC meeting there was discussion about the counter case to that—that is, when, due to confidentiality laws and policies, faculty are not informed when a student or other individual is identified as unstable or a potential danger to others. Provost Hackett noted that we do need to know that these incidents like what happened at Columbine, but we tend to grossly overestimate probability of something like this happening. We cannot predict with any degree of accuracy when someone is going to do something. That’s what leads to anxiety.

Senator Ziskin said that she’s had students who were very clearly depressed. Provost Hackett said that this is the most common problem when a student exhibits signs that something is going on. The Senator asked what to do in such cases. Do we go through the counseling center? Provost Hackett said that this is the question that we want to answer. The first thing to talk about is how to help students. After more discussion Provost Hackett said that they do not plan to proceed piecemeal at this point. Rather, they want to put together a comprehensive plan first that is useable and easy to access.

**Academic Integrity Statement Draft**

About 18 months ago at IFC, a discussion was initiated about the interpretation of the Academic Integrity policy in the Collected Rules and Regulations. Two campuses in the UM System interpreted it one way and two interpreted it in an alternate fashion. Since that time the IFC and System officers have been working with the General Counsel’s Office and a new document has been produced. The question for faculty is what does this mean in the classroom? The question over interpretation concerns whether faculty can fail a student for academic dishonesty or not. Some interpret the policy to say that faculty could only fail a student for that assignment and nothing else. Others read it as giving faculty the ability to make academic and professional evaluations. What the new guidelines allow is that faculty can make an academic judgment, but not take administrative or punitive action. This new policy will most likely be approved at the IFC meeting this month and a follow-up report will be made to the Senate and the campus.

Academic evaluation and administrative action (punishment) are different terms. Faculty are obligated to do academic evaluations, as well as professional evaluations of students. Each campus publicizes the rights and responsibilities of students at all levels in regards to academic integrity. Faculty will be able to fail a student for a course as long as the department, division, or school statements on dishonesty have been publicized. This could be in form of an honors code. An example is the School of Pharmacy, that has all entering students sign its honor code. Faculty cannot force a student out of the University. However, if professional standards are violated, then that would fall under faculty prevue as they are the ones in that field who have the professional or ethical knowledge necessary to make that decision. These standards should be published and provided to all students so they have the appropriate standards for behavior. In the Chair’s eyes, this new policy is a great advance, as it takes the decision concerning professional standards away from lawyers and puts it back into the hands of professionals to enforce and to teach those standards to students.
This document cannot be changed as it has taken a long time to put together. Several questions were asked about how the new process would work. It was noted that someone, probably Vice-Chancellor MacQuarrie, would act as the campus administrative officer who would handle these issues for the UKKC. Faculty would report incidents of cheating to the administrative officer to help establish patterns of behavior. The academic assessment of these actions would follow policies that are established within each of the schools. The schools would not be able to dismiss a student from the University, but would be able to dismiss them from the specific School, if that is the policy of the school in question. Other actions would come from the Administrative Officer.

Provost Hackett noted that part of the issue is that cheating is not always clear. Part of the confusion, and the reason for lawyers getting involved, is that to have faculty member make a determination of cheating and impose punishment ends up creating problems. So this policy is trying to disentangle such issues. It is one thing to determine cheating and another to determine what recourse will be taken. This policy would establish the process of what recourse should be taken. Students would still have the opportunity to appeal any decisions.

Chair Ebersole said that what is expected to happen is that the IFC will approve this policy, then it will go onto the Board of Curators and the revised language will be incorporated into the Collected Rules and Regulations. The Faculty Senate will need to craft a university statement on dishonesty, and then Senators will need to make sure that the faculty members in their unit have clear definitions and expectations of what constitutes dishonesty. After more discussion, it was noted that the statements for each unit will need to have any penalties clearly defined especially in regard to any funding that a student might receive.

**Nominations Committee**
The Nominations Committee is a new committee that was set up last year. The call for nominations will be initiated tomorrow from Rochelle Ziskin who is the Chair of this committee. The nominations are for four principal Senate posts: Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary, and one IFC representative. The nominations will be compiled by Senator Ziskin and sent to Sue Sykes Berry by March 17th. She will make sure that those what have been nominated are willing to serve. The ballots will go out on March 23rd and voting will be completed by April 7th. This will be an electronic election. Only people currently sitting as a Senator or who have served as a Senator in the past can be nominated for the IFC position. There will be a description of each post and the approximate time commitment. A short profile about the nominee will be included in the ballot. The electronic election will use Blackboard with only those who are eligible to vote being given access. They don’t expect any problems.

Senator Luppino had a final announcement that the Faculty Senate Budget committee has a representative from every school now.

Adjourned at 4:00. The next meeting is on March 16, 2010 in Rm 106 at the University Center.