Faculty Senate Minutes  
Tuesday February 16, 2010  
Law School Conference Room, 3-5pm


Visitors: Laurie Goldstein (Program Manager-UMKC Healthy for Life: TE Atkins UM Wellness Program), Vice-Chancellor MacQuarrie, Beci Edmundson

Excused: Yang, Williams, McArthur

Absent: Davies

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

Informational Items
Chair Ebersole noted that it had been brought to the Senate’s attention that last week Bob Simmons had informed the Facilities Committee that the company managing the Oak Street Dorms is in financial difficulties. The dorms have a low occupancy rate. The company has approached the University to buy them out. Ebersoles’s announcement is to inform the Senate that Student Affairs and the Chancellor are putting together a business plan to take to President Forsee. As soon as something has been approved it will be shared with the Senate. Chair Ebersole said that his guess would be that the University will probably not let the company go under, but take over management of the dorms somehow. Once we know what the situation is, the University Budget Committee will probably be asked to consider the matter.

Approval of Agenda
Senator Hopkins asked if there was any more information about the benefits survey. Chair Ebersole noted that it was out and everyone should have seen it. He doesn’t see anything happening as immediate result of the survey. As far as he can tell, it is an attempt to get an idea of what sorts of things faculty and staff value. There won’t be any attempt to cut benefits, but if a different weighting seems better, then the overall package might be changed to reflect this. Several noted that it was a very poorly designed survey, and worded so that it did not have much meaning.

There was one change to the agenda. The Provost will not be present to make a report so everything else in the agenda will be moved forward.

Senator Krantz moved to accept the agenda with changes, Senator Wyckoff seconded, and all were in favor.

Approval of Minutes for February 2, 2010
There were two changes to the minutes as distributed via email. Senator Foxworth was present
at the meeting, and Jan Randolph should be Jan Brandow.
Senator Foxworth moved to accept the February 2 minutes with corrections, Senator Krause
seconded, and all were in favor.

**Laurie Goldstein-T.E. Atkins Wellness Program**
Chair Ebersole started the discussion noting that T.E. Atkins was a curator at end of his term
when he (Ebersole) started going to BOC meetings. Atkins spent his term encouraging the board
to shift from paying for benefits when serious health problems arose, to covering preventive
medicine up front and establishing a wellness program. This shift has, apparently, saved a lot of
money since it was introduced. Laurie Goldstein is the program manager for the T.E. Atkins
Wellness Program at UMKC.

Ms. Goldstein said that what they are trying to offer are free or low cost programs to maintain
healthy lifestyles, or make changes to unhealthy habits. She noted that most of the Senate has
probably heard of the Healthy for Life program. It focuses on four core health risks: smoking,
weight, stress reduction, and physical activity. She is also promoting other programs going on
through the wellness program.

In the weight management core, UMKC is partnered with an MU program that can give a faculty
or staff member one consultation with a dietician. They also have a Weight Watchers and an Eat
for Life program. The latter does not focus on nutrition or diet, but encourage individuals to be
mindful of what they eat, and when they eat. This food-awareness program has also been
developed into a blackboard course to reach more people.

The exercise core has a millionsteps pedometer program which works to increase awareness and
motivation for individuals to increase the numbers of steps they take. There is also an odometer
program for bicycles which includes stationary bikes. This program is open for family members
and retirees. Also, walking clubs will be established in the spring.

For the stress core there are classes offered in different places on campus to promote relaxation
and stress relief. Ms. Goldstein’s hope is that there will be faculty and staff members who will
take an interest and host these classes in their own units. A question was asked if this program
was open to students, and Ms. Goldstein responded negatively but mentioned that there are
similar programs offered through the student life office.

For the smoking cessation core there is not an existing program. However, the UM System does
offer Quitnet which is free for those who have benefits and individualized to the person. For
those who do not have benefits Ms. Goldstein noted that she has Kansas City area contacts that
can help.

Ms. Goldstein noted that there were two health fairs in November. At the earlier program they
had almost 500 people turn out. There is also a wellness ambassador program. One big
challenge for these programs is getting the word out. There are about 140 ambassadors who
share information in the best ways they have available.
She said that she is available to talk to departments and programs. She has info sheets for those interested in learning about different programs. She noted that the UM Choice program is underutilized and that there is something for everyone. She is very appreciative of any feedback that faculty have, so that she knows what works and what doesn’t work. Chair Ebersole noted that she should get together with Senators Fieldman and Davies to discuss ideas for converting UMKC to a pedestrian campus.

**Intellectual Property**

Senator Luppino started by giving some background information on why his ad hoc committee is looking at the Intellectual Property (IP) policy. The Senate formed a small group consisting of Senators Stancel, Luppino, Wyckoff, Susan Gardner, and Phil Needles who works with the Entrepreneurship Institute. Senator Luppino distributed a draft memo to be sent to the System. He noted that the draft had been changed to narrow the understanding of students as employees. Second, most policies the committee surveyed get down to the point that if a property originated not as part of an author’s job, but that author did make significant use of university resources, then the property is covered under the IP policy. This needs a better definition. Senator Luppino said that a third need is to get an expeditious-ruling mechanism in place for campus use, so that there is a process that either waives rights or get clarification up front on a situation, even if the project eventually has to go higher up the ladder for a decision to be made. There are existing mechanisms in the current policy, but they are not laid out clearly.

The next step is to look at faculty, and not only students, as there seems to be a lot of overlap between the two groups. The small committee has been of two minds about the scope of what they needed to do—whether to focus on students or broaden the policy to the faculty as well. As compared to other universities we have a favorable split for revenues of patents as such. It seems like most things are working well, informally; and the committee doesn’t want to make any waves. Even so, several committee members think that it would be a good idea to clean up the policy with regards to faculty as well.

Ms. Gardner agrees that the student IP portion needed to be clarified. It was necessary to do that. However, she has recently participated on a task force to make changes to a different set of rules and regs, and it is very hard to do. There is, currently, a working understanding of these collected rules that makes her think that doing a complete rewrite of IP policy would be risky as it would open the policy to other changes that might not be beneficial. One possible change of this nature would be to the revenue sharing, but she would not recommend that as it would be counterproductive to the university mission.

Chair Ebersole agreed that cleaning up students’ IP policy will sell. Also, when the Curators were here in fall they saw students who were making use of inventions and were impressed.

Senator Potts moved to send the memo to the System officers. It was seconded by Senator Luppino, and all were in favor with no one opposed.

**Budget Committee**

At their last meeting Senator Luppino asked the Chancellor to give the University Budget Committee (UBC) an update in regards to the budget. The Chancellor noted that there is going
to be the 5.2% cut in FY2011 that has been talked about in the past, but also noted that because state revenues are lagging behind projections, the following year could be worse. In the last several months there has been talk about an unfunded salary increase mandate. Currently there is no mandate being planned due to budget problems. The main solution to the current budget problems is to increase enrollment and retention.

There was a productive two-day budget retreat including the UBC and deans last week. Each unit reported on itself in some detail. There will be a UBC meeting on February 25 to talk about questions that were raised. One question was in regards to scholarships and waivers, and who is credited for them when students change programs. UBC will meet again with the deans on March 18th. They will also be having a meeting to look at costs of central support services and how they compare to other schools that are similar to UMKC. The biggest worry is that money for the year after next could be very challenging. Chair Ebersole noted that $52 mil in stimulus funds will be running out around that same time.

Senator Luppino noted that he was very encouraged from the retreat with deans and what was learned about each of the units. Chair Ebersole agreed and noted that they didn’t have any dean trying to undermine the budget model. Some of the schools that are most challenged by this model came in with hard numbers and plans to show how they will move out of debt and into the positive in 3-5 years.

A question was asked about how enrollment and retention is going? Both are improving Senator Luppino also commented on a recent study of space utilization and said that the university could grow by 25% and not have to build.

Senator Beard asked that if there is no mandated salary increase, does that mean that no one will get a raise? Senator Luppino commented that it doesn’t mean that there will be no increase, just no mandated increase. Chair Ebersole noted that salaries could be moved, but deans have to be careful about increasing someone’s base as once changed it would have to be maintained at the higher level.

Senator Luppino noted that some of the deans were unsure about the impact of giving non-resident waivers. Their question was not about whether to give them, but rather whether they had to give out full waivers. What was demonstrated was that there was more freedom available for deans than is often assumed. As an example, units can choose to give partial waivers; not all must be full. Chair Ebersole stated that he came away from the meeting convinced that a little economic duress results in much more creative thinking.

Senator Fincham commented that several weeks ago there was a press release coming out of Columbia indicating that President Forsee had set aside University money for business development. The Senator is worried about the political ramifications of that for the year when financial matters decline. Chair Ebersole noted that this is a difficult political two-step; the system [has in its mission that it] is supposed to act as an economic engine. The set-aside came from savings in central administration. There are lots of empty desks there now. The Chair also noted that if there are others who feel strongly about this, then they should contact the President and let him know of their concerns.
Senator Hopkins noted that there are still some who are skeptical of the budget model and need more reassurance, especially in regards to highly respected units that will not be able to pay their way. Both Senator Luppino and Chair Ebersole noted that ours is a flexible model and that schools that are having problems will have help, and the most important thing for the Senate is the level of transparency so that these problems can be tackled. A question was asked about the likely percentage of the cut in the year following the 5.2% cut? Senator Luppino noted that he did not have a number, and no one is sure what it might be at this point.

**Electronic Portfolios & the P&T Process**

Senator Ziskin noted from the start that the electronic version of the annual portfolio would be great, and much better than the existing method. Vice-Chancellor MacQuarrie agreed and continued by saying that many other institutions are already doing this, especially since so much of faculty information is already in an electronic format. They also recognize that some people have items that are not easily moved to electronic forms, so any solution needs to be able to use mixed media. The School of Graduate Studies looked to other schools and also to the School of Dentistry, which has been doing this for awhile with NTT faculty.

The new process uses Adobe Professional 9.0 which is much more cost efficient than working with the current method using three-ring binders. Part of the attraction with Adobe is it can put all the pieces together in one file using many different types of media. It is easy for faculty and for P&T members to use. This portfolio method also has the advantage of being able to be used with Adobe Reader to view final copies. Any document one needs can be dragged and dropped into the portfolio. This makes transporting the file easy. It is easy to send out to all the people who need to see it. The user can add or remove files easily and can also secure them.

Currently the administration is proposing that those who want to go electronic can go electronic. What they don’t want to do is add more stress to the P & T process. The administration is working on creating a template that will be available on the Provost’s website. For hard copies of items that aren’t available electronically, there will be prompts in the electronic portfolio that will instruct reviewers where to find the hard copies. Senator Krantz asked if the user can lock down files. Beci Edmundson said that this can be done, and that the administration is also working on a central repository that will have permanent links so that everything can be loaded there and users don’t have to worry about anything moving. A question was asked about how quickly electronic files degrade over time? Vice-Chancellor MacQuarrie noted that systems are in place to keep degradation from happening. Senator Dinakarpandian asked if this system supports indexes and tagging. Ms. Edmundson said that it allows you to do that and more. Chair Ebersole asked who would be taking care of the $50 cost per seat for this program? Ms. Edmundson said that they are working with units to figure out what each unit might need to provide, and Vice-Chancellor MacQuarrie noted that they might work towards a site license. There was a discussion about other electronic ways of managing portfolios. It was noted that this is just a first step and that there might be other ways of doing this in the future, and to let them know if there are any suggestions. Senator Krantz asked if anyone used it this year? Ms. Edmundson said that they had five electronic portfolios this year, and that they have been loaded onto the blackboard site for P&T to review. The following link, [https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/](https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/), is to an example of a repository system that could be
Several questions were asked about the security and integrity of doing things this way. Ms. Edmundson noted that they are going to err on the side of security to maintain the integrity of review materials.

**Developments on UMKC IT Privacy Policies & Practices**

Senator Holsinger noted that the IT Privacy Committee was formed to provide oversight. They labored in producing an effective policy statement for things the Senate wanted to see happen when an internal or external entity requested access to a faculty member’s email. The committee had the policy ready to go when a change was made at the system level. A concern was raised whether anyone should be given information when someone was being snooped on. It was thought that it might be good for the ombudsperson to be notified when such a request is made. The Ombudsperson is the point person, and will generate a case number to protect the individual being investigated, but will still be able to provide information to the Senate Executive Committee to keep them informed about the case. The IT committee may not be needed in the future, but is still working on the procedure for protecting faculty privacy. Since Vice-Chancellor Hines-Fritts has come on board, there have been six requests for access to faculty email. Chair Ebersole noted that there are policies in place to protect staff from undue pressure and that also defines a legitimate reason to access an individuals’ files.

Adjourned at 4:47. The next meeting is on March 2, 2010 at the Law School Large Conference Room.