UMKC Faculty Senate Meeting  
November 4, 2008


Excused: J. Foxworth, T. A. Humrichouser, A. Alleman
Absent: L. Potts, J. Sheppard,

- Guests: Andrew Bergerson, History; Nancy Day, Student Health Services; Tom Mardikes, A & S; May Lou Hines Fritts, Provost’s Office.

Chair Ebersole convened the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

Announcements:

Chair Ebersole reported that the new Grievance procedure will be presented at the Board of Curator’s meeting in early December and hopefully a new process will be piloted for 1 ½ years. Secondly, the budget committee has determined that there is an approximately 23 million dollars deficit arising from promises by the administration to Deans, some from underestimates of scholarships and bad student debts, and other items. This is a very challenging development and not related to the current US economic situation or stock market demise. Six and one half million dollars comprises commitments by the previous Chancellor. Senators inquired as to whether this figure was clearly established and occurred under a single Chancellor. General comments ensued affirming that financial transparency should occur throughout UMKC, which includes all the units and departments within these. One Senator asked if there was a system in place to prevent deficits and also stated that we MUST have accountability. The Twin Oaks purchase and mismanagement was briefly discussed and the unfunded cost of heating/cooling and maintenance for new buildings. There was also a question as to what funds had been budgeted for Decision Theater. There was further discussion about the rules and that the Chancellor is required to consult with the University Budget Committee when expenditures are being committed. It was emphasized that the Senate and University Budget Committee must exercise rigorous oversight, which includes accountability of budget committees in each of the units. Budget committees within the individual schools have the obligation to know where the funds are and how they are being used. There was the implication that a campus wide, accountable, transparent, integrated financial mechanism needs to be put in place.

Additional agenda items: it was remarked that the new Calendar on the UMKC home page has been improved.
Approval of previous minutes (10/27/08) was unanimous (moved by Fieldman/seconded by McArthur)

**Report from the Provost:** Provost Hackett got tied up in line waiting to vote in the US election, which ultimately led to election of President-Elect Barack Obama.

**SSIRB discussion on oral history review** (continuation)

Dr Drew Bergerson presented a continuation and summary from the last Senate meeting. This potential plan was developed in collaboration with Dr John Baumann and SSIRB Chairwoman Nancy Day concerning how oral histories might be handled in future outside the SSIRB. The main issue was clarified in that there are some oral histories which should be reviewed by the SSIRB and others where it is not necessary. Currently, review of many of these by the SSIRB oral histories is extremely time-consuming and clearly unnecessary. Thus it was suggested that this could be done within the units in many cases and still maintain transparency and protect the individuals involved and the institution. There was concern that because of the back-log, researchers were becoming increasingly frustrated enhancing the possibility that research might occur which had not been subject to any review. The presentation included a system of colored flags which could be applied within units to establish what type of oral history should be subject to routine SSIRB review and others which should not. The goal is to facilitate research, but still maintain ethical standards, as well as to protect UMKC, its faculty, and administration.

The presentation provided for a 4-stage process, which required recording of all decisions at each step including exemptions or those which occurred at a “lower level” within a School. It was clear that each school would need to seek and identify expertise willing to manage the green/yellow/red flag system within each unit. It was suggested that this could be incorporated on the web site with links for each discipline. One Senator raised the question of who would take the approval “risk” and it was generally agreed that this would still lie with the institution. It was stated by several senators that the envisioned process would at least be a forward step and facilitate research in an already over-burdened system which is currently obstructive and possibly puts us at risk. The model would appear to improve efficiency, but requires further discussion and review by the Provost/Deans/Chairs and the necessary resources for it to function.

**IT Privacy:**

Senator Alex Holsinger discussed the IT privacy document provided to Senators which outlined UMKC procedures in place to document requests from outside (e.g. FBI) to intercept or monitor e-mails. Mary Lou Hines Fritts remarked that a legal warrant would be required before interception would be allowed by IT, except in the cases of an emergency, immediate threat, or something of a similar nature. The procedure would protect IT staff, but it was noted that, as part of the network, everyone is vulnerable to hackers. There were questions about the need for education in this regard and whether a person being investigated would be informed. This document would be circulated for further faculty review and input before being adopted.
COSCO report:
Tom Mardikes presented the eagerly awaited COSCO report; the committee included Senators Nancy Stancel and Jeff Price. This has been a long and difficult process and the annual report regarding the current status and number of grievances at UMKC from Dr Ron MacQuarrie is pending and will be provided to Chair Ebersole by this coming Thursday. Senators were provided with the COSCO report and the planned “pilot document” developed by the UM system as a replacement.

Tom described the shortcomings which they had documented. Findings clearly depicted a “Kangaroo court” which negatively impacts faculty. The process generally operates so that it obstructs faculty and makes it very unlikely to obtain a satisfactory resolution. On the other hand, the new “Pilot” process planned to be reviewed at the next Board of Curators meeting in December, appears much more equitable. Chair Ebersole stated that this may be implemented at the system level eventually and faculty should review this promptly and provide input ASAP. This “pilot” is planned during an 18-month study and it was suggested that this could be undertaken at UMKC in parallel since the Provost is supportive of improving our process for all involved. Comments by Senators included questions as to the kinds of things which might be processed as a grievance and what efforts should have been made first to find an acceptable resolution. It was generally agreed that the current system is “broken” and that this must change along with the internal cultural approach surrounding these difficulties.

Reboot update:
Mary Lou Hines Fritts said IT was ready to move forward with plans for PCs but was concerned that she had had few requests for exemptions, even from faculty members she knew should be requesting this.

Data security was also discussed and the updating of machines. There are several programs being piloted by IT currently such as Tegrity, Foliotech, and Moodle.

Mary Lou also reminded everyone that it is mandatory to report the loss of a lap top, since this could compromise our whole system. Moreover, she urged faculty not to save SSNs, student IDs, or grades on lap tops.

President Gary Forsee has arranged that the CISCO teleconferencing system be purchased for each campus which will be very useful for international collaborations because it provides face-to-face communication. He has donated $1,000,000 for this. The site at UMKC has not been identified at this point.

The meeting ended at 5.00pm.