Meeting with CIO Craig Klimczak

Academic computing needs and problems

Some faculty members have been critical of decisions in the academic computing area, and have charged that the decisions were capricious and were made with little meaningful input from faculty. A recent example was the distribution of new computers, with a basic computer being supplied from the central administration at no cost to the units receiving the computers. However

Post-Tenure Review: There has been some concern about when Post-Tenure Review reviews would begin. The document sent to President Pacheco contains no implementation date. In an accompanying letter the committee suggested that all tenured faculty have a 5-year review the first year (except for those tenured or promoted less than 5 years ago). That might be done, or the implementation may end up being delegated to the campuses, or the timing may be mandated by Pacheco.

If a complete 5-year review process takes place next year, a small fraction of faculty (in previous Senate sessions said to be less than 2%) might be recommended for a 5-year development plan. A recommendation that dismissal for cause proceedings begin could normally not take place before the end of that period. It is also possible that there would be a 2-year extension. For most faculty, assuming that their yearly reviews have been satisfactory, the initial process would be pro forma.

If a faculty member has been promoted or has received tenure within the last 5 years, his/her initial review would take place five years from the granting of tenure or promotion.

Campus without Borders discussion with Dean Reed.

Bill Eddy, the incoming Interim Provost spoke briefly and introduced Dean Reed. Eddy said that Chancellor’s dream was to define the new standard for higher education in the 21st century, and she thought that urban schools like UMKC would be the leaders in the paradigm shift. He said we needed specific projects, and have to decide on the criteria for success.

Reed said that we needed to look at UMKC and see its influence on the city and state. Some things the Blueprint committee is talking about:

- Have teams of health science people go out into the city and state to provide care for those who can’t get it. Possibly in cooperation with the Center for the City have students assess health, social and legal needs of the community.
- Erase some of the borders within UMKC so the various units can cooperate more closely.
- Move the campus onto a 24/7 basis and keep it safe, well-lit and clean.
- Have a greater presence on the web.

Both Eddy and Reed emphasized the importance of a continuing dialogue on campus.
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units had to pay steep upgrade costs if they wanted more powerful computers, portables and Macs. Departments and units were often unable to pay these upgrade costs and couldn’t get computers that suited their needs. Many faculty members also thought that the choices were inappropriate.

Klimczak said that the program that was put into place this fall was a temporary fix to get new replacement computers out into the campus quickly. About $400,000 was supplied for this purpose from the Provost’s office. The computer options weren’t set by Klimczak but by the unit IT liaisons. The program was designed to maximize computing funds by negotiating mass buying contracts, and the university was able to negotiate large discounts on computers that were suitable for most users. He agreed that there were problems with this year’s distribution, but it was intended as a quick fix and options will be modified in the future.

There seems to be an elaborate computer committee structure, but people didn’t know whom they should contact if they needed help. There is a website (at http://www.umkc.edu/is/cio/govern/manage.htm) that should be helpful. At least people could learn the name of their IT representative. Senators argued that academic computing needs could not be served by a top-down structure. Faculty needs were different than staff needs, since for the most part we were doing our own work and not working on cooperative projects where common programs were needed. Additionally, the various units of the university required different hardware and software configurations -- English did not have the same computing needs as Engineering. Faculty members used special software, even if their preferences sometimes seemed idiosyncratic and didn’t make sense to IT people or CIOs who sometimes seemed to want to mandate the use of certain programs. Faculty should be able to work with the software and equipment that they thought best.

Klimczak seemed to agree with these observations, but said that at this time he had very little flexibility or money. He did want to get some new computers out to the campus as rapidly as possible and, meanwhile, he wanted to work with the faculty, and with faculty committees, to develop reasonable options for the campus and the different units. The use of the student computer fee was also being re-examined. A suggestion was made that some of the options that were being considered should be put on the webpage so that those interested could comment.

At the end of his discussion Klimczak passed out a brief report from Greg Black (Communication Studies). Black is the coordinator for the Blueprint project designed to get our “high tech” classrooms up to standard. A survey is being sent to all faculty to provide an initial assessment of needs and dreams.

Committee Reports:

The Academic Issues Committee is examining the structure of some of the major University committees, like the Ph.D. Executive Committee and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. They wanted to review the charges of the various committees, and see if the membership on them is appropriate. In general they thought that committees concerned with academics ought to be chaired by faculty, but they were not yet ready to offer a firm resolution. The report was tabled until the investigation was completed.
The Committee is also going to examine the alternative commencement plans that have been proposed, and they are getting information so that they can determine whether there is age, gender, sexual or longevity discrimination in salaries.

The IFC discussed university copyright rules and policies, especially as they related to web based materials. A special study of this problem will be done. Under current copyright policies faculty normally own the rights to intellectual property unless a separate deal was worked out with extra compensation. If you need information on copyright policies the websites for the UM intellectual property policies are:
http://www.system.missouri.edu/uminfo/rules/business-mgmt/100030.htm

The IFC is also concerned with system wide committees like the Research Board, the Jefferson Award and the Copyright and Patent Committees. They are looking into appointment policies and trying to discern whether there is a reasonable turnover on these committees. The issue of fee remission for faculty and staff was again discussed. The President expects a large influx of new faculty in the next 3 to 5 years, and fee remissions were discussed as something that would help with recruitment. Finally the IFC is collecting some data on PeopleSoft, so if you have had problems with the software, or good experiences, please contact the IFC representatives (Ed Mills, Max Skidmore and Jakob Waterborg).

Other Business: Senator Linda Voigts met with Bill Scott, Interim Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services. They discussed how UMKC complies with City safety ordinances, putting smoke detectors in University houses, etc. She said that Scott was helpful and cooperative. The University does have a smoke detector policy, and they should be installed in all UMKC houses. However, records are incomplete, so a letter is being sent to all tenants informing them that free smoke detectors are available. Apparently the international students in UMKC housing are especially at risk, because they don’t know how to turn on the furnaces, and are unfamiliar with policies on smoke detectors. They will be given information on these matters through International Students Affairs orientation. The Faculty Chair of the School of Education has not yet made arrangements for the special one-year evaluation of their Dean. The Senate Report of Nov. 14th was formally approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,
Faculty Secretary