Dear Colleagues,

Allow me to introduce myself as the new editor of the Faculty Advocate: I am Scott Baker, an Assistant Professor of German in the Foreign Languages department, now in my sixth year at UMKC. In these years I’ve come to know some of you, but of course our decentralized institution in many ways discourages acquaintanceships across units, and so to most I remain a name without a face. I hope that will change, and would like to use this opening editorial note to suggest some possible correctives.

First, though, I would like to thank our outgoing editor, Pat Brodsky, as well as David Brodsky in his capacity as a managing editor, for their years of hard work to create and maintain this newsletter for our AAUP chapter. I knew from the outset that this position as editor required filling big shoes, but I’m learning that I underestimated just how big those shoes are! My intention was to provide at least one issue per semester, and obviously I am tardy—I marvel at the consistency with which Pat and Dave put out the Advocate for the last eight years. I hope you’ll join me in thanking them and wishing them well in their post-UMKC pursuits.

The function of the Advocate is to inform both AAUP members and non-member faculty about current issues regarding the two pillars of AAUP advocacy, academic freedom and faculty governance. To that end I urge each of you to take the hour or two that goes into writing an article of 500-1000 words whenever you are confronted with relevant problems and obstacles to these tenets in your units, on the campus level, or even in reference to national events. A broad spectrum of contributors will help me fulfill the goal of making the Advocate the communicative means of bridging the geographic space between the two campuses as well as the institutional divisions among the many units. I dare say that most of us know little that goes on outside our School or College, which makes action against common threats exceedingly difficult. My suggested word count is intended to allow you to tuck a quick essay or report into your busy schedule—please think of me when things go wrong! Although this issue is late (by my self-imposed calendar, at least), I intend to put out another issue at the end of Spring semester.

Having said that, I also welcome longer pieces, as you will see from this edition. In addition to my report on FaCET, I am printing an essay by Dan Hopkins, Faculty Chairman of the College of Arts & Sciences, on the importance of faculty governance. I am also including a report on the new faculty grievance policy, an issue of serious interest to us all. Finally, I don’t mean to solicit exclusively bad news! As you will see from Roger Pick’s brief, there are reasons to be cautiously optimistic as we move forward with our new administrators—as long, of course, as we remain informed and evaluative of proposed changes.

And now this is really my final word: there will be an Announcements column in each issue of the Advocate. Please be sure to check there for dates of upcoming AAUP events as well as brief items of note. Don’t hesitate to submit your own announcements as well!

Collegially yours,

Scott Baker
My Vision for AAUP
by Roger Alan Pick

My vision of the AAUP at UMKC is a limited one. We are presently the largest AAUP chapter in the state of Missouri. I believe we can thank Chancellor Gil-liland for that. With respect to academic freedom, I believe that the leadership of our system and our campus is benign, or at least as benign as possible under our current situation of limited resources. The role of the AAUP is in these circumstances is to stand guard, ready to protect academic freedom should it again be necessary.

The state of academic freedom at UMKC is good. At present, most threats to academic freedom come from outside the system. For that reason, I urge all of our members and friends to be politically active. In the last few years, we have seen attacks from outside on political scientists and upon biological scientists. Your field could be next.

As is the case for the economy as a whole, UMKC faces some difficult times. I hope that we will get through these difficult times and emerge as a strong scholarly institution. The recent proposal from Governor Nixon gives me hope, but it is unrealistic to think that the legislature will support his proposal in its entirety. I also hope that should cuts be necessary, the administration will move forward in a spirit of shared governance. If needed, cuts should be made after substantial input from affected stakeholders.

Internally, there are problems in a few areas at UMKC. My impression is that these problems are caused by isolated managerial incompetence on the part of a few administrators rather than a systematic problem. They are not attacks on academic freedom, but instead are problems caused by unfair and opaque decision processes and occasional lapses of shared governance. Thus, my vision for AAUP is primarily to remain at ready to protect academic freedom and shared governance should protecting these things become necessary in the future.

If your vision for the UMKC AAUP Chapter differs from mine, please run for president.

The UMKC AAUP Chapter needs for a new generation of leadership to step forward. I am currently webmaster, vice president/treasurer, and president of the chapter. I am willing to remain as webmaster and one other role, but it is not appropriate for me to hold two offices. We need for new people to run for vice president/treasurer or president, or both.

In addition, Karen Bame wishes to step down as secretary of the chapter, and at-large representative Stuart McAninch plans to retire. We need someone to step up to each of these jobs in order for AAUP to remain at ready to protect our academic freedoms.

Governance at UMKC
by Daniel Hopkins

Proper, legitimate governance must, first and last, serve the formally enunciated purposes of an organization: at the University of Missouri, those purposes are expressed in the first sentence of the University's Executive Philosophy: "The University of Missouri exists to educate students of all ages; to promote the life of the mind; and to serve the people of Missouri, the nation and the world" (Article 20.030A of the Collected Rules and Regulations). This—teaching, research, and, necessarily, service—is what the faculty does, and it is to facilitate this work that the university exists. Every professor on campus must (in varying proportions, to be sure) teach and conduct research or otherwise cultivate the life of the mind, and in one way or another serve the common goals of the university, advance scholarship, and promote the general welfare. The Executive Philosophy goes on to say, "In managing the affairs of the University, whether they be academic affairs or business affairs, all of those making decisions within the University community should keep foremost in their minds the reason for the existence of the University": everything else that is done on campus ultimately serves to support the faculty's endeavors to develop and preserve knowledge and to impart it to the citizenry.

The faculty, as the producers and custodians of knowledge, must determine and define how these functions are to be carried out. The faculty cannot abdicate its responsibilities in this regard, although it in effect delegates some of its functions—some of the conduct of its legal and political relations with the encompassing society, some of its extracurricular relations with the students—to a supporting administrative apparatus. (It has been, by and large, and with good reason, a tradition of universities that senior administrators themselves come from the ranks of the faculty.)

Allowing all that, the university is a large and complex organization, and its existence entails many knotty legal and logistical dispositions. The support staff is necessarily quite large, and its operations absorb substantial portions of the university's resources. The ordering of administrative, fiscal, or legal lines of authority is not a straightforward or static matter. The legitimacy and efficacy of the arrangement of these lines must depend on meaningful, effective consultation between the faculty and all other parties involved, on constant and clear communication within the organ-
izational structure, and, in general, on the transparency of the conduct of business in all parts of the university. Knowledge, thoughtfulness, awareness, sophistication, expertise, art, science, technique are central to the life of the university, but the thing we really have in common, no matter the branch of learning we have followed, is rational, orderly, structured communication. We don't deliver goods; we deliver information. Full communication is essential to everything we do, and it has to be the bearing element and guiding principal of our governance.

Properly organized and executed university governance, like democratic government, can be difficult, frustrating, and slow, but it is the only legitimate and also the only truly effective form of administration. If we can consistently and conscientiously consult one another, communicate, and cleave to our central purposes and understandings about the university, it helps prevent the faculty and its support structure from working at cross purposes; it reduces the disruption occasioned by conflicts suddenly exploding into view; it limits the needless duplication of effort; it keeps the peace on campus. Any other arrangement leads to unilateral decision-making, which is antithetical to the university's inherent commitment to bringing expertise to bear from all quarters, to intellectual openness, to frank debate, to academic freedom.

Disagreements and grievances will always arise in an open system of governance, and they must be scrupulously and promptly addressed, not only to resolve disputes or arrive at workable compromises, but for the simple sake of hearing them—to allow all to voice their dissatisfaction, so all can be confident that due process prevails. Conflicts must be aired, not stifled. The possibility of learning from our disagreements and errors is one of the administrative points of orderly and transparent procedures.

The University of Missouri—Kansas City appears to have entered upon a promising era of good governance. In the interest of cementing the foundation that has been laid (in large part through a close working relationship between a succession of administrators and the Faculty Senate), the Steering Committee of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences on the faculty's behalf has extended an invitation to Chancellor Leo Morton and to Executive Provost Gail Hackett to formally discuss governance with the assembled faculty. A set of questions has been sent to them both, by way of focusing—but not limiting—the discussion. The Chancellor and the Provost have been asked to make strong public statements on the following subjects:
1) unilateral decision-making in the academic environment;
2) the need to make all on campus, including chairpersons, deans, and other administrators, strongly aware of the central role of the faculty, not only in teaching and research, but in governance;
3) the faculty's involvement in budgetary decisions at the departmental, unit, and university levels, in the interest of arriving at the fairest and most broadly agreed upon allocation of resources;
4) the need for open, fluid, and transparent lines of administrative communication;
5) the role, if any, of the administrative support structure in the establishment of curricula;
6) the administrative importance of a reliable, and generally respected grievance procedure.

This discussion is scheduled to take place on March 10, at the second regular meeting of the Arts and Sciences faculty this spring. Faculty from outside the College are welcome to attend as well.

Report from the Faculty Senate Subcommittee COSCO (Committee on Organizational Structure and Community Outreach)

COSCO recently issued a report on the need for reform of the grievance process for faculty at UMKC. The report indicts the old policy as a failure and source of frustration for faculty members who tried to make use of the procedures. One result has been the adoption of a shared pilot program for faculty grievance that is also being tested on the Columbia campus. Because this policy is crucial to the well-being of faculty, and feedback is vital for the success of the pilot program, I am reprinting the COSCO report in its entirety. The full policy statement of the pilot program can be found on the UMKC website by clicking on the 'Faculty & Staff’ button and following the link under ‘Policies & Guidelines’ entitled ‘Collected Rules and Regulations’ to Section 370.015. The link on the Faculty Senate website goes only to the outdated policy statement, so please make sure to follow the correct link to view the new policy.—Ed.

Date: Nov 4, 2008

Committee members: James Durig; Steven Driever; Daniel Hopkins; Jeffrey Price; Nancy Stancel; Tom Mardikes, Chair

Charge: A request from Faculty Senate Chair Gary Ebersole to “look at the problems in our own (UMKC) grievance process, check out the pilot program on the Columbia campus, and bring back to the Faculty Senate a set of recommendations for fixing the grievance process.”

The committee also committed to each member reviewing two academic grievance processes from either comparator or regional universities, as a comparison/contrast.

The committee met to discuss these various documents and began our investigation by communicating with Dr. Ron MacQuarrie (Nov 2007-Feb 2008). Dr. MacQuarrie is the current administrator of the Academic Grievance Process at UMKC, his authority located within the Office of the Provost. He did not come to meet with the committee, but was very helpful in providing what documentation his office could locate concerning faculty grievances filed back to 2000. Below (see p. 8) is a chart he prepared for COSCO review. It does not contain actual dates of the grievance, because the date could be used to decipher the name of the grievant and respondent, and would breach privacy concerns. Dr. MacQuarrie informed the committee that UMKC average just over 2 faculty grievances filed per year. Two members of this COSCO committee have participated on the Faculty Grievance hearing committees and their experience here was invaluable.

The committee also met with Dr. Jeffrey Thomas (Feb 2008), who served as Academic Grievance Officer within the Provost’s Office for about four years, from 2003-2007.

The committee met with two faculty members (April 2008) who asked to meet with COSCO and relate their cases and experiences through the process, both quite disappointed and frustrated.

Finally, the committee chair met privately with Professor Mary Kay Kisthardt from the UMKC School of Law (August 2008). Professor Kisthardt serves as the campus mediator and advisor for mediation.

Findings of the Committee: Through our research of other institutions and the review of the UM and UMC Faculty Grievance processes, we marveled at how different and varied procedures could be. Upon reviewing the table provided by Dr. MacQuarrie we were concerned that better records had not been kept detailing the numerous grievances and we were concerned by how many grievants simply left UMKC. Because of records, it was impossible to tell how many faculty approached the Academic Grievance Officer with a complaint, or whether the complaint was settled through dialogue or formal mediation before an actual grievance was filed with the Chancellor. Many grievances took longer than the mandated 180 days, especially when the grievant engaged an attorney and the process was turned over the UM System General Counsel’s office.

The UMKC Faculty Grievance process doesn’t clearly identify what a grievance might be and who respondents might be. 370.010 has nothing to do with grievances filed by regular or tenure-track faculty. Therefore most cases for faculty grievances concern faculty pay or discrimination issues.

Flaws perceived in our current system: COSCO believes that several flaws exist in our current system, 370.010.

1. The Academic Grievance Officer as assigned by the Chancellor is a member of the administration and does not represent the faculty. In the system followed at UMKC we felt that no one was an advocate for the faculty member through the process, and we considered this especially daunting for non-tenured, junior faculty.

2. There is no training or advisor as to what constitutes permissible evidence in a hearing. The Academic Grievance Officer makes these decisions for the Grievant, Respondent and the Hearing Committee. Two COSCO committee members have served on Hearing Committees and both were unsure of what constituted legitimate evidence.

3. The process is loaded with administrative oversight and lacks a corresponding faculty governance oversight. It seems that reports written and decisions coming from the Chancellor’s Office are written by staff, resulting in important final decisions, again with no faculty participation.

4. The current process does not include a mandated initial stage for mediation. Although the campus Academic Grievance Officer will request mediation services from the Campus Mediation Office, and that office will decide whether an internal or external mediator is employed, at this time there is nothing that binds both a grievant and respondent to submit to mediation. Were this the case, many grievances could be settled quickly and simply by bringing the parties together at the outset. This might also reduce the number of lawsuits filed against the university.
The Faculty Advocate/January 2009

(5) COSCO could not find a single case where the Grievant pursued a hearing and the decision favored the Grievant. This result would tend to drive a motivated faculty member to completely bypass the Academic Grievance Process and immediately hire his/her own attorney.

(6) We heard from disappointed faculty who had been through the process. Lost evidence, wasted time, questionable respondents (Dean instead of Chair) and an overall lackadaisical attitude characterized the process. We heard specifically that when entering the process the faculty had no idea what might be accomplished by filing a grievance. UMKC faculty had the intention of being heard in a hearing by a group of faculty peers believing it would do some good, but learned that committee members are selected by Deans and felt the system needs to change to where Faculty Senate creates a pool for hearing committees. UMKC faculty were advised and supervised by the Academic Grievance Officer, the very same person involved in writing the Chancellor’s decision. These same UMKC faculty members have come to believe that filing a grievance has killed their careers.

(7) Chairs of Hearing Committees have a great deal of autonomy where they are able to control and limit time during hearings and control what is acceptable as evidence. These determinations vary from chair to chair. There are no formal rules of evidence; it is a completely informal process where the chair decides.

UMC’s 370.015: Our initial instinct was to gravitate toward the UMC process newly developed in 2005. We liked the fact that a faculty member, trained in mediation was given a teaching load reduction in order to act as faculty advocate and investigator. What we did not like about the UMC process was that it actually extended an already long time frame for the resolution of a faculty grievance. One committee member discussed the process in Columbia with the UMC appointed investigating officer. Based upon that discussion our committee came to feel that their process was unnecessarily complicated and time consuming. 370.015 was approved for a three-year trial, and a new system is currently being advocated by IFC.

Pilot Process: 9/5/2008 Draft—Proposed Alternative to the Current Pilot Grievance Process. This new document is attached as an appendix to this report. (Please refer instead to the Provost’s website posting cited above—Ed.) It was recently approved for adoption by IFC. This might be a seen as an improvement over everything old and recent tried in the UM System. Of interest is

(1) a streamlined time period (proposed model time-length runs 90 days, compared to 180 for 370.010 or 320 for 370.015),

(2) simple statements of facts submitted by grievant and respondent,

(3) instead of a hearing committee, a new Grievance Resolution Panel (GRP) consisting of 2 tenured faculty and one administrator determine the case.

(4) The GRP also determines who will be the respondent

(5) The GRP may elect to mediate a settlement or can summarily dismiss the case as baseless or unwarranted,

(6) GRP renders a decision and forwards to the Chancellor. Grievant has 15 days for appeal. Of interest in this proposed model is that the Chancellor need not respond, and if electing no response, the decision of the GRP stands.

COSCO Recommendations: Based upon our review of the various systems in place, proposed model, and systems used at other universities, COSCO feels the following should be considered in a revised Academic Grievance Process for UMKC:

(1) There should be a faculty member experienced in the grievance process, with mediation experience, and an understanding of permissible evidence available to any faculty member feeling the need to pursue a grievance. Call them an investigating officer or faculty advisor, but counsel is needed for faculty.

(2) There needs to be a list of reasonable instances where a faculty member would file a grievance. At this time, the process excludes tenure-granting and promotion issues. It is also unclear to the committee whether discrimination would truly come under the purview of the faculty grievance process or under another office within the Chancellor’s Office. In fact, it seems most grievances circle around a single issue: salary. Other conflicts have surfaced, such as assignment of office space, lab space, or travel allocations and support. A list should clearly define instances where this Academic Grievance Process is accessed.

(3) There should be a list of possible grievant/respondent categories. Faculty/faculty, Faculty/Chair, Faculty/Dean, etc. Staff and Student grievances are excluded from this process.

(4) Whether a three-person GRP or a multi-member Hearing Committee, training must be implemented so that all chairs of these hearings
follow the same guidelines, and so that all committee members understand established rules of evidence. Without this kind of training and the implementation of rules, we have truly created a Kangaroo Court for our own faculty.

5. A final document for an Academic Grievance Process should contain a list of possible outcomes for filing a grievance. These might include ‘letter of reprimand’, ‘letter of apology’, ‘salary equity adjustment’, ‘accommodation for office or laboratory space’, ‘one-year denial of faculty travel’, ‘probation’, or ‘dismissal’. Who knows what needs to be listed, but other universities clearly spell out the possible results of filing a successful grievance (or unsuccessful grievance). The UM System process is quite open ended, resulting in speculation and wonder.

6. Possibly the most important step in any new system would be to mandate the use of campus mediation services before any grievance may be filed. At this time all mediation before the filing of a grievance is voluntary; therefore nothing compels either side to participate. Once a grievance is filed, the grievant and respondent must attend mediation and talk with an investigator, but the process is not a face-to-face meeting. A two-hour mediation session before a grievance is filed would greatly reduce tensions caused in the grievance process. It is questionable at this time whether the Chancellor or Provost would mandate required mediation for Deans. What must be implemented is a system to mediate between faculty and administrators in a system that is fair to both. At this time, the system is overwhelmingly balanced against a faculty member. The Proposed Model of a GRP with 2 tenured faculty and one administrator is a good step forward. A better step would be to mandate mediation before the filing of a grievance, with fairness and protections for both sides.

7. Whether the Hearing Committee or a GRP, the Faculty Senate needs to be involved in the selection of faculty sitting on these hearing committees.

CONCLUSION: One of the first statements made to the committee early in our process still rings aloud: “I’d file a grievance but it’s a worthless process—I’m better off getting an attorney.”

This kind of statement, heard from several faculty, bears witness to a broken system. It creates hopelessness in the faculty workforce and empowers Deans and Chairs unnecessarily. Supporting such a notion: no record exists of a Hearing Committee finding for a faculty grievant, and said decision upheld by the Chancellor.

Therefore, COSCO recommends that:

- Faculty should have access to experienced counsel to guide and advise through the grievance process.
- Mediation must be mandated as a pre-grievance step, with grievant and respondent participating. Faculty Senate and the Administration must agree upon this.
- All parties should know what is at stake through a grievance hearing, and what possible outcomes might be.
- Faculty should have their grievances heard by a group of peers, selected not by the administration but by other faculty. The administration should be able to select administrative committee members.
- All committee members and chairs must be similarly trained as to the operation and rules of evidence of such committee hearings. Faculty have the right to a timely and fair hearing.
- Finally, COSCO recommends that the severity of the situation warrants action by the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs committee, and that either the Academic Affairs committee or UMKC IFC members might take these COSCO recommendations for integration into the Proposed Alternative to the Current Pilot Grievance Process.

FaCET and Academic Freedom
by Scott Baker

In each of the last two years the Emily Brooker Bill, a so-called “intellectual diversity” law, has been introduced to the Missouri legislature. Last year it never made it to the floor, which hopefully will deter its supporters from trying again this year. The Advocate has reported expansively on the issue to keep our campus informed of the serious threat such legislation poses to academic freedom, and the Faculty Senate approved a statement against such laws (follow the link ‘Intellectual Diversity’ at http://www.umkc.edu/provost).

Perhaps the broadest and most sustained response, however, was a series of meetings sponsored by the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching (FaCET). These meetings were organized by concerned faculty who approached the center’s director, Steve Dilks, to find out what FaCET’s reaction to the legislation would be. Dilks responded by organizing meetings that
included faculty, staff and students to discuss the impact of “intellectual diversity” on UMKC. The series culminated with a symposium at Diastole on May 2nd, 2008, on “Academic Freedom and Inclusion.” In the Winter 2008 FaCET newsletter, Dilks reflected the tenor of these meetings when he unambiguously expressed a fundamental basis for faculty opposition to this bill. Quoting liberally from the language of the legislation, he asserted that “…we surely cannot accept that the ‘general assembly’ will become the arbiter of whether or not we are creating an ‘environment’ that exposes [students] to an abundance of new knowledge, different perspectives, competing ideas, and alternative claims to truth. We are the ones who should be defining the terms in this discussion” (p. 1).

Dilks’ statement represents a politicized role that he did not envision as an element of FaCET’s mission of supporting excellence in teaching at UMKC. In fact, during the first years of the center he intentionally trod lightly around politically charged issues (surely not a surprising strategy, given the Gilliland administration). Even now Dilks maintains that the center avoids pursuing any political agenda. Instead, he intends FaCET to enable multiple constituencies to come together for investigating complicated issues, problematizing traditional or simplistic approaches to such issues, and discussing strategies rather than generalities. This means that the center encourages dialogue about controversial and political issues while refraining from authoring policy statements. Hence although the center contributed significantly to the thinking that went into the Statement on Intellectual Diversity, the responsibility for crafting the statement was rightly assigned to the Faculty Senate. As Dilks puts it, FaCET has the function of a think-tank rather than of a policy-maker.

This means that FaCET can be an enormously helpful resource for faculty across campus who want to contribute to the development of academic freedom and the authentic intellectual diversity this freedom depends upon. Teaching does not happen only in our classrooms, but in many different contexts on our campus; the support for developing excellence in teaching also extends beyond pedagogical issues to encompass the intellectual work of creating and implementing informed beliefs and practices about the mission of higher education. FaCET’s response to the Emily Brooker Bill demonstrates that its resources and mandate can be used to support concrete steps for promoting academic freedom, among other topics. Faculty interested in organizing campus-wide discussions on particular issues are encouraged to contact Dilks at dilkss@umkc.edu.

News Around the Bloch
by Roger Pick

The Bloch School has seen change this year with the departure of Dean Homer Erekson and appointment of Lee Bolman as Interim Dean. In his short time leading the school, Lee has instituted a level of transparency that is without precedent in my fifteen years at UMKC. It is my impression that even in these difficult financial times, this transparency has lifted faculty morale to a level not seen since before Martha Gil-liland was chancellor of our campus. Although nearly all faculty searches for the Bloch School have been frozen, the search for a permanent Dean has been allowed to go forward.

Duties of the At-Large Representative
by Stuart McAninch

The at-large representative of the chapter serving on the executive committee participates in all committee business and meetings and also serves on the executive committee for the Missouri State AAUP Conference. Service on the executive committee for the state conference entails participation in two meetings each year: an executive committee in the fall and the general state meeting in the spring. There is an opportunity to serve as voting delegate for the state at the annual national AAUP meeting in Washington, D.C. The chapter’s representative on the state executive committee will also have the opportunity to develop familiarity with issues of academic freedom, tenure, use of contingent faculty, and higher education finance at the state and national levels. Periodic contributions of articles to the state newsletter are expected.

Announcements

AAUP will again this year provide a panel discussion on promotion and tenure at UMKC. The workshop is scheduled to take place Friday Feb 20 from 3:00 – 5:00 pm. Details will come out via email closer to the date.

Cary Nelson, president of the national AAUP, as well as Marc Bousquet, a member of the AAUP national council, will be in Kansas City to attend the Cultural Studies Association conference and have agreed to participate in an open forum on the UMKC campus on Saturday, April 18. They are both engaging speakers and extremely well-informed about national trends and hot-button issues regarding academic freedom and faculty governance. Specifics of the meeting will be announced as soon as possible.
The newest issue of Academe (Jan.-Feb. 2009) has an article by our own Jennifer Friend and Juan Carlos González on the benefits of a faculty writing group, in particular for junior faculty. I have found such groups to be extraordinarily helpful for my writing ever since my dissertation, and we have at least one group here at UMKC, the Interdisciplinary Faculty Workshop, that encourages feedback on writing samples across departments. Please read their article, and consider participating in or starting a collegial writing group!

I will be spearheading a membership drive in February. I will try to email all non-members to arrange a brief meeting time at your office and share information about the AAUP and our local chapter. I will also be able to answer your questions about the organization and its activities. I hope you will respond favorably to these requests for just a little of your time.

We maintain an email list for distributing news and announcements from the UMKC Chapter of AAUP. If you are not receiving email from time to time, and you wish to receive it, please contact Karen Bame (mailto:bamek@umkc.edu) and ask her to add you to our mailing list.

Our chapter dues are $10/year. If you are a member of the national AAUP, please pay chapter dues as well. To do so, write a check for $10 payable to “UMKC AAUP” and send it to Roger Pick at Bloch 237. Donations in excess of $10 are welcome as well. Please do not send cash.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Type of Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>dismissed by committee, chancellor concurs</td>
<td>arbitrary application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>dismissed by committee, chancellor concurs</td>
<td>arbitrary application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>dismissed by comm, chanc concurs, suit filed</td>
<td>tenure, discrim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no action by grievant, left the univ (retired)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>resolution agreement reached</td>
<td>arbitrary application, pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>resolution agreement reached</td>
<td>arbitrary application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>resolution agreement reached</td>
<td>arbitrary application, pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>dismissed by committee, chancellor concurs</td>
<td>arbitrary application, pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no follow up by grievant? Left UMKC the following yr</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>dismissed by committee, chancellor concurs</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>case dropped by grievant</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>grievant accepted mediation</td>
<td>arbitrary appl. workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>resolution agreement reached with legal counsel</td>
<td>arbitrary appl. workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>suit filed-grievance terminated; left UMKC 3yrs later</td>
<td>discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>settled with attorney</td>
<td>discrimination?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>grievant did not pursue (not UMKC employee)</td>
<td>arbitrary application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>dismissed by committee, chancellor concurs</td>
<td>arbitrary appl. workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>grievant did not follow up, left university</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>grievant did not follow up, left university</td>
<td>termination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Column labeled End indicates if grievance was settled in the same year (0) or a subsequent year
Arbitrary application refers to the an arbitrary application of university policy, regulation, or procedure
This list includes only formal grievances filed under CRR 370.010 by faculty members during the period 2000-2007