

Faculty Senate Meeting 2/19/08

Present: Ebersole, Driever, Luppino, Rice, Schubert (Staff Council), Honigberg, Foxworth, Stancel, Ward-Smith, Marken, Gutheil, Taylor, Holsinger, Potts, Carbone, Durig, Hopkins, Knopp, Young, Price, Butler, Johnson, Beard, Stein, Stanley, George, Mardikes

Absent: Crossland, Mullaly-Quijas

Excused: Green, Fieldman, Krause

Guests: Simons (U-News), Waterborg (Administrative Issues Committee), Swink (VC Student Affairs/ Registrar), Schlabach (Associate Registrar)

Chair Ebersole convened the meeting at 3:05 pm. Marilyn Taylor, the new senator from the Bloch School was introduced. The chair announced that the new faculty leave policy is up on the University website. The All Faculty Meeting will be on April 7 from 11 am to 1 pm; there will be hot food provided. All faculty are encouraged to attend to discuss some important matters.

Interim Provost Drees announced that for students to submit applications for graduation they must now start the graduation process at the department level. Senator Luppino thanked Provost Drees for her effective work and ability to resolve issues successfully [there was applause].

Foxworth moved to approve the January 22, 2008 minutes, seconded by Honigberg; they were approved unanimously. The February 5, 2008 minutes were moved to be approved by Foxworth and were seconded by Rice; they were approved unanimously.

The Academic Freedom statement that has been proposed was discussed. Senator Yang noted that the document is eloquent but that faculty in his unit (Medicine) believed that the document was hard to understand. A question was asked about the abbreviated statement to appear on the first web page; Chair Ebersole explained that it has not been written yet, but it will be done. The simple statement and the full document will appear on the Provost and the Faculty Senate websites. Another senator wanted the word "staff" to appear in the statement. Two other senators concurred. But Daniel Hopkins, who chaired the committee that drafted the statement, said that such an inclusion would require a rewriting of much of the document. There was a motion to accept the Academic Freedom statement as is by Honigberg; it was seconded it was seconded by Foxworth. Motion passed by 24 to 1 with no abstentions.

Chair Ebersole raised the issue of academic dishonesty and grading policy. He reiterated the existing argument of the Central Administration that faculty can fail the student for an assignment or test but cannot go further as that would be punishing the student. This interpretation is based on a Missouri Supreme Court case that involved the University of

Missouri, although that case occurred decades ago. But Columbia and Rolla have a policy where students who plagiarize can be failed for the entire course. Thus, there is a conflict on the way the Collected Rule and Regulations are being interpreted. Some discussion occurred that perhaps faculty put statements on their syllabi so that a cheating student could be flunked from the course. Yang explained the procedures for handling cheating in the Medical School. Another senator complained that before he could handle cheaters on his own by failing them or giving them a choice to go “upstairs.” Now, he continued, the process is cumbersome and too difficult for faculty, which is why relatively few cases of cheating are reported through our current administrative channels.

Senator Stein discussed the Administrative Issues Committee draft of Standard Operating Procedures (re CRR 300.020). It was noted that Staff Assembly should be referred to as Staff Council, and that change has been made. The Committee suggested that the CRR 300.020 draft should be approved before the Standard Operating Procedures, as the latter are based on the former.

Karen Schlabach and Doug Swink discussed registrar questions submitted earlier by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

- a. Why are grade due dates at the end of semester so soon after final exams? Ans. – Swink said that the due date is the same (2.5 days after the last day of exams) for every campus so the issue should be taken up by IFC.
- b. have students been made aware of the change in application for graduation;? Ans. – Registrar will try to improve the communication. As of now, nothing is done centrally to notify the students to apply as they near the 120 hours required for graduation; the current expectation is that advisors will tell the students when to apply.
- c. Why does the registrar want to review every course that students take to meet major requirements? Ans. – the Registrar will only check for total hour requirements being completed and for students taking courses they indicated they would take on the completed degree-check forms.
- d. Why can't we have printed schedules? Ans. – Swink replied that printable schedules will be available down to the department level of course listings; they are now available at the level of the school. But for cost reasons they do not want to print entire campus schedules for distribution. A senator asked what the cost for printing schedules was back in 2004 when that unabridged schedule was last published in paper (the answer was not known, but Swink said that he would find out that figure). That senator also maintained that there were a number of good reasons for a printed schedule; he also noted that people are struggling with the present architecture of Pathway.
- e. Why do special topics courses still appear only as special topics and not with course titles? Ans. – Swink said that he would be happy to demo what this would look like in your department. He said that the transcript must correspond with what is in the catalog. If the special topics course is designated with a subtitle on Pathway, then that information will show up on the paper transcript. He

suggested that maybe his office needs to make sure that departments provide all the title information needed. Schlabach demonstrated the use of Pathway for enrolling in a specific course. A question was raised about why we cannot have a more sophisticated search engine for Pathway, where, for example, a student could type in a word and find a course that deals with that topic (note: now such a word can be searched for only in the course titles). Swink indicated that this matter would be looked into to see if it would be feasible in the future. Schlabach demonstrated how a pdf file for courses offered in a school could now be accessed and printed.

- f. Can you block students from seeing how many students are enrolled in a course, giving them only the number of seats remaining? Ans. – Swink said that change would require new coding in Oracle.

Swink concluded that he and Schlabach would take the senators concerns back to the Enrollment Management Team. He said that a printable schedule as a marketing tool might be desirable. Swink said that an advising forum has been started on a monthly basis.

Because of time restraints, the Chair moved the discussion of CRR 300.020 to the top of the agenda at the next Faculty Senate meeting in March. He announced that the Faculty Senate Exec. Comm. will meet with the new provost to discuss the proposed Information Technology Council. Stein asked that anyone with concerns or questions about the CRR 300.020 contact the Administrative Issues Committee as soon as possible. Hopkins urged that non-tenure track faculty not be included as voting faculty as they are not protected by tenure; Chair Ebersole pointed out that we in the Senate are concerned with who should vote at the levels of the UMKC campus and UM system.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven L. Driever
Acting Secretary