Intercampus Faculty Council  
January 8, 2008

Attendance: Gary Ebersole, Alex Holsinger, Tim Farmer, Kurt Kosbar, Frank Blum, Frank Schmidt, Teresa Thiel, Doug Carroll, Nancy Stancel, Steve Neal

Approval of agenda - approved

Approval of minutes of 11/20/07 meeting: approved as written

Additional agenda items - none

Discussion with Interim Vice President Graham, Assistant Vice President Smith, Assistant Vice President Noble, Faculty Fellow Akers

Code of Conduct: Fraud Hotline

In previous conversations about a financial code of conduct, the understanding that it applied primarily to financial actions seems to have broadened. President Lamb issued a letter about conduct for fiscal misappropriation. A big concern is the issue of anonymous reporting. If a faculty member is the focus of an investigation, what would happen in that case? The concern is, is it part of your permanent file? Supposedly, unless you have been found guilty, nothing goes in your folder. Another issue is the concern is the anonymous nature of the complaint. If a student doesn’t like a professor, he could send an anonymous complaint to make trouble for the faculty member? Is it is appropriate for us to have anonymous complaints? An IFC member brought up the opposite view. If a supervisor is abusive how can an employee issue a complaint if it is not done anonymously to protect himself? But, how do you confront your accusers if the complaint is anonymous? We were reminded that the fiscal code of conduct was a response to an audit and many universities do this. It was highly recommended that our university do this as well.

Bunky Wright and Blake Danuser: – Does the complaint go into your personnel file? No, nothing goes into your file. The hotline is for financial misconduct and other complaints shouldn’t be sent through the hotline, though you can’t prevent people from doing so. Whatever complaint is sent, it cannot be ignored and the complaintee will be spoken to about his complaint. Nothing goes into a personnel file unless it is substantiated. Staff is still working through the new process. The complaints are anonymous. At some point, the anonymity will have to go by the wayside and the complaintee will have to step forward in the process. This is done through a third party not associated with the university. All of this began because of the Sarbanes Oxley Act to prevent corporate malfeasance.
**Intellectual Pluralism (as a segue from the complaint hotline discussion above)**

Is the grievance process enough? On the UMKC campus, a grievant has not won a case in 14 years. At UMKC, student complaints are issued anonymously and there’s no intervening level. A faculty member must justify his actions to an HR administrator who’s never been in the classroom, rather than at the Chair or Dean level.

Does the action depend on the type of misbehavior? What does this mean for faculty and freedom of speech where certain language is appropriate? If a student knows that they can talk to a chair, it might encourage them to report misbehavior rather than taking it to a higher level (ie HR or Provost’s office). Curators wanted students to have one place to report an issue whether it is a concern about disability issues, racial infractions, sexual, misconduct, etc. That concept would work if the person to whom incidents are reported has the proper training and understands where to send a particular type of complaint.

Faculty have been told that in cases of plagiarism you can’t fail the student – you can only fail the student for that piece of work. That is true on all campuses. This information should be on the syllabus. A professor may give them a zero for a piece of work which may fail them if it’s a significant part of the semester’s work. It occurs to faculty members that students have far more rights than they use to have. When complaints are made to administrators about a faculty member, he usually sides with the student, so students have learned to complain directly to the Provost. It’s not just over plagiarism but also over ethical issues. For instance, submitting work for another student is not necessarily considered a bad thing. We need a broader dialogue on this. Students have different ideas about what “cheating” is. We need to talk with administrators about who is responsible for giving this information. We can talk about professional ethics on the faculty side, but there are no clear principles for students. Faculty members are basically guilty until proven otherwise. We respond to the pressure of the Curators brought on by such incidents as the Emily Brooker case. This is not the system we intended. At UMKC and St. Louis there is to be one contact person who guides the process through the correct procedures. It may be that individual campuses are not following the rules and there appears to be no protection for faculty. This issue was not discussed with faculty according to memory. We need a similar process to the fiscal misconduct reporting so that complaints are routed back to the unit. Concern over such policies seems to undermine faculty freedom. The Board of Curators need to have the ramifications made clear before such mandates are put into place without faculty input. This has a chilling affect for faculty.

**Discussion with President Lamb** – Several examples of “Intellectual Pluralism” in the classroom were given to President Lamb. There was discussion of what is a proper complaint for intellectual pluralism and what is the proper procedure? Many felt that the complaints should be confidential, not anonymous. The BOC wanted one box for any complaint and the campuses responded to it with websites. But, should we consider a more tiered approach? For instance, we could state that, within the comfort level of the student, a complaint should be taken to the faculty member the complaint is about, then to the chair and/or dean, Provost, and then a formal grievance could be initiated.
President Lamb thinks this is appropriate though you sometimes have the unusual complaint. He feels that the best place to resolve an issue is at unit level. We may need guidelines how to implement such resolutions.

President Lamb would like us to document professors leaving so that we can have ammunition to talk with legislators about why professors leave. This is one earmark that’s visible that we can use to help with faculty salaries. The flip side to the issue is, faculty are choosing not to come here, especially minority professors.

**SB 389 Implementation Consumer Information piece**

Assistant V.P. Kandice Smith handed out an information sheet describing the how the university is handling the implementation of Senate Bill 389. UM staff met to discuss what information is appropriate to post on the Internet. For example, there will be information about whoever teaches students in any capacity in the university. The University will be able to construct a separate free-standing site that does not allow tracing back to any of our PeopleSoft databases as a security precaution. Faculty information will include name, credentials and rank. Each faculty member can go into PeopleSoft and update his personal information. Personal faculty webpages cannot be linked back to PeopleSoft databases for security reasons (ie. no hotlinks). This process will allow the university to include the required basic information keeping the upkeep of the database hassle free and low in cost. Course listing is a separate database from the faculty profile database. This will let parents know, for instance, how many GTA’s are teaching classes. If a faculty member is not paid by university will they be listed? Yes, but they are working out how this will be done. Students who help with grading will not be part of the faculty database. The DHE definitions includes GTAs although our CRR does not define GTAs this way so that is why they are not included. We will still have student surveys of faculty – that’s not public information. That’s a separate set of questions that will be provided to comply. It was suggested that a disclaimer be attached explaining how the information is used.

**Discussion with Vice President Knorr – Government Relations Update**

V.P. Knorr distributed a two-page summary of legislative priorities for the 2008 session. The Governor has proposed a 4.4 % increase to the higher education budget. Last session, the $450 million bonding bill for capital projects blew apart on us but it got people thinking about capital improvement issues. The Lewis and Clark Initiative emerged from this. It is important to keep capital projects on the radar and we need to do the same with faculty salaries. The faculty salaries issue is a new topic for legislators and it will take awhile to move this along. The “Preparing to Care” health care initiative is not new. It is in its third year. We asked for a $20 million dollar request and we funded it ourselves for the first two years. A concern was expressed that we expend a lot of energy to promote low funding on issues such as this. The Coalition of Higher Education Schools is working together on continuous funding for the project. UM’s portion would come to $8.5 million. In 1981, 1991 and 2001 we had budget cuts and we need to take advantage of any rate money we can get now and we need to push capital projects and
keep them in the forefront. In three years there will be a total change of legislators due to term limits, particularly in leadership roles. All of that historical knowledge is gone and that’s why it’s important to have an ongoing plan for capital expenses. We are running out of bond money that’s available. We need to present capital projects every year regardless if we get them or not and keep this issue in front of the legislators. Chair Ebersole asked if Steve could replicate the student alumni list by districts. He said his office is working on this.

**New Bills Being Introduced**

**SB 830** (Coleman) and **HB1307** (Day) combat tuition waivers. If this bill passes we would have to pick up the tab for it. It limits the amount of tuition public institutions can charge to post-911 combat veterans to $50 per credit hour for undergraduate courses.

**HB1518** (Cunningham) addresses survivor grants. It is more of a scholarship/grant approach and it’s a better way to go for higher education rather than SB830 if we can persuade the legislature to do so. It establishes 25 grants for survivors of those killed in combat since September 11, subject to appropriation. It can be expanded to higher funding if needed.

**SB873** (Graham) would add a student seat to the Board of Curators. If we add a student curator, we would then need to delete one curator position because the Constitution dictates the number of seats on the Board.

**SB858** (Rupp) and **HB1463** (Nolte) is an immigration bill concerning the admission of illegal aliens to universities. Steve finds this bill disturbing in that we would have to certify a student’s immigrant status at the point of application, even if he doesn’t end up coming to our university. This is a massive undertaking.

**HB1315** (Cunningham) Cunningham has come back with the same bill as last year concerning intellectual diversity and requires that institutions post on the web how they are ensuring intellectual diversity. We’ll be monitoring this bill closely.

**Campus Reports to Interim President Lamb**

**President Lamb – Comments:**
President Forsee will begin Feb 18. President Lamb will stay on through the calendar year 2008.

The “Preparing to Care Initiative” was put together last summer and fall. The Governor has put $13.4 million into the initiative and every higher education institution in the state will benefit. UM will get $8.5 million. We graduate 78% of professional health care alums. There is much interest in this initiative. The Legislature can add funds to it this year if its wishes.
UMR
It’s quiet on campus. UMR has officially changed its name. The name change has gone smoothly. The transition of not having Deans has been less smooth but faculty have done well anticipating what the needs are especially in areas of promotion and tenure. As a result of eliminating Deans, UMR now has a faculty senate instead of a faculty council. It is more independent in terms of its composition. Previously, Deans were members of the faculty council. There is concern over losing qualified professors and the various kinds of reporting required in SB389, especially faculty evaluations. Faculty are also concerned with the continuing trend of being held to significant workloads but receiving unfunded mandates for the additional reporting that is required.

UMSL
It is quiet on the UMSL campus. The faculty senate is working on reviewing the curriculum for the upcoming HLC accreditation due in November. The self-study is being worked on by a steering committee comprised of administrators and several faculty members. Various senate committees are gearing up to review policies. There will be a major rewrite of bylaws to make them more flexible with a dynamic organization as a result of a five year administrative review. Huge changes have been made to the bylaws in order to remove the operational language from bylaws and make them separate from the CRR so that the operating bylaws are more manageable.

UMC
It is quiet on campus. The Curators intellectual pluralism website is seen as problematic on its campus. There will be a meeting with the Provost and Vice Provost to work out procedures to deal with this issue. Faculty are hoping that there will be formula funding procedure and take into account technical aspects. Compliance costs are a concern. It is estimated that on the UMC campus, it will cost $200,000 to $250,000 to deal with compliance issues to SB 389. UMC is trying to analyze the buried costs that will result from this bill. There was a renewal of the interim grievance procedure that has been in operation for three years. The internal representation on the grievance committee will be updated.

UMKC
It is quiet on the UMKC campus. Gayle Hackett will begin her position as Provost beginning February 15th. She has made a few visits to campus already. We are gearing up for a campus-wide accreditation that occurs in eighteen months. We will be implementing the new budget model in phases, beginning July 1, 2008. It is a responsibility-centered model that pushes finances down to the unit levels of schools and the College, making them self-supporting. The Chancellor and Provost will meet with each Dean next week to go over recommendations from the consultant to go over implementation and discuss success strategies. There are concerns about student complaints being sent immediately to the Affirmative Action Office or the Provost’s office with faculty then being summoned to a meeting about an anonymous complaint. This does an end run around the standard procedures that are in place for reporting complaints. The faculty are made to feel guilty until proven innocent. A Faculty Senate subcommittee will submit a report in January about the campus wide grievance process.
We will probably be adopting much of the MU model but use shorter time frames for the process. We are moving into the next stage of sexual harassment case that was in papers last summer.