**Regular UMKC Faculty Senate Meeting (MINUTES)**

**Dec. 20th, 2016**

**Plaza Room, Administrative Center**

**3-5P**

**Present:** Gerald Wyckoff, Kathleen Kilway, Linda Mitchell, Nancy Stancel, Viviana Grieco, Valerie Ruether, Ken Novak, Jerzy Wrobel, Greg Vonnahme, Jack Nelson, Roger Pick, Michelle Maher, Phil Bryne, Nara Newcomer, Jen Salvo-Eaton, Marilyn Taylor, Ceki Halmen, Ed Gogol, Margaret Brommelsiek, Dee Anna Hiett, Christopher Holman, Deb Chatterjee, Eduardo Abreu

**Also Present:** Provost Bichelmeyer, Dean Medeiros, Joy Swallow, Marilyn Yoder, Beci Edmundson

**Excused:** Kathy Krause

**Absent:** David Van Horn, Dale Morehouse, Leonard Dobens, Melanie Simmer Beck, Jacob Marszalek, Irma Russell, Jennifer Allsworth, Bi-Botti Youan, Sybil Wyatt, Navya Sane

1. **Welcome and Informational items (Wyckoff) 2 minutes**
2. **Approval of Minutes and Draft Agenda (Wyckoff) 3 minutes**

Senators approve today’s agenda and the minutes from the last meeting.

1. **Presentation and discussion of Values Statement (Provost Bichelmeyer) 20 minutes**

Provost Bichelmeyer shares that the General Education 2.0 Taskforce is have concerns about infrastructure and how to best organize the general education curriculum. The provost has encouraged the taskforce to focus on structural elements such as distribution areas and programming.

The provost has spent time in both Jefferson City and Columbia over the past weeks doing work for the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) mission review. The mission review proposal was approved by the coordinating board for higher education and will now go to the legislature. The mission review proposal affirmed the research mission of the UM system campuses. Now, the UM system government liaisons will be working on defining research allocations for each campus and whether the research mission releases the UM system campuses from SP389 to possibly have a tuition differential. Moreover, the UM system campuses are the only institutions that can offer research and first-professional doctorates. 4-year comprehensive institutions are allowed to propose to the MDHE for the opportunity to offer practice doctorates in fields such as nursing and occupational therapy if the UM system is willing to collaborate. If the UM system rejects collaboration with 4 year comprehensive institutions, these institutions can petition to the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) board in a very comprehensive review process to determine if the board will grant a one-time exception to deliver the professional doctorate in question. This process is similar to the proposal of community colleges offering bachelor degrees. There are five key criteria for when a community college can offer bachelor degrees, but first community colleges must seek collaboration for 4-year universities. NCHEMS will only take a maximum of three proposals in the first year starting July 1, 2017 and five proposals in the second year starting July 1, 2018. The board will then review the proposals that have come in during the first two years in 2018 to see how the process is working. Also, sub-coordinating boards will be created in Kansas City and Saint Louis that will consist of a council of academic officers to hear requests about programming. The mission review taskforce determined three concerns in the state of Missouri in terms of meeting bachelor degree requirements/ undergraduate needs:

1. Race in terms of access and equity
2. Geography- North and South central Missouri are underserved for higher education
3. Underserving 25-39 year olds seeking an undergraduate degree.

The provost has also been involved in budget and fiscal review meetings with UM system. The provost further discusses the revisions of the UMKC values statement. The first draft of the values statement was based on input from the four campus listening sessions. The listening sessions workgroup consisted of various faculty and staff groups, such as the Diversity Council and the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate. The revised statement is currently on the Faculty Senate website. The first draft of the values statement was looked at objectively by a consultant. This analyzation took a day and a half and used focus groups composed of faculty, staff, students, deans, and other key constituents, such as the Alumni Council. Based on information obtained from focus groups, the draft was revised and sent to the listening sessions workgroup and was further revised. She has also met with the SGA to discuss the revised UMKC statement of values. The word “diversity” will be added to the preamble of the values statement. SGA suggested that the values statement be given during orientation followed by a discussion of the values. The Chancellor Diversity Council as well as the SGA were very supportive of the values statement. Senators discuss where to put the values statement (syllabi, Blackboard, contract, etc.) and how to enforce the implementation of these values on campus. Chairperson Wyckoff encourages senators to share the revised values statement with their units. Afterwards, by the next Faculty Senate meeting, the values statement should be endorsed.

1. **Discussion in re: Reorganization Task Force proposal (Chair Wyckoff, TF Chair Salvo-Eaton) 30 minutes**
2. **Discussion of feedback**

The reorganization proposal needs to be streamlined to be more workable. Also, either the approval process via administration or the Faculty Senate is acceptable as along as the processes are similar. It was suggested that the proposal is too cumbersome to the point that reorganization may never take place and if it does, it may be too time consuming. There is concern about voting taking place outside the unit that is affected and that impact on the freedom of the faculty and staff within the unit in question. Any additional suggestions or suggestions can be sent to Chairperson Wyckoff and he will relay them to the taskforce. The second Faculty Senate meeting of the semester will discuss feedback to allow time for academic units to discuss further.

1. **Discussion of changes to proposal**

Senators suggest that the proposal should be edited further before being sent to the academic units for further discussions. There are some parts of the proposal that are vague and need to be further elaborated on. For example, senators suggest a clear definition about what a majority vote consists of (perhaps a simple majority). There are also some concerns about the proposed timeline of approval for processes. A senator suggests clear and dynamic definitions for change explicitly stated in the proposal. Senators also question how to determine who will take part in approval processes delineated in the proposal (i.e. alumni representation). Students should be able to make suggestions, but have limited influence in the internal processes of approval. By the next Faculty Senate meeting in January, the proposal will be edited in order to be shared with academic units in their department meeting.

**c. Potential adoption of proposal as Standard Operating Procedure**

1. **Senate Rep for MCOM committee (Chair Wyckoff) 5 minutes**

Senators elect Senator Dee Anna Hiett as the Senate representative for MCOM. Chairperson Wyckoff encourages senators whose academic unit has no representation in MCOM to nominate a representative for that unit. MCOM meetings are either once a semester or quarter.

1. **Five Year Review Policy of Post-Tenure Criteria (Dean Medeiros) 20 minutes (7)**

-criteria has not been reviewed for some time

-some units have specific criteria that can be out of date

-proposing that each unit every 5 years to review policy on P&T

-then submit to academic affairs

-document has a sample cover page

-and includes a 5 year schedule

-periodic review of promotion and tenure standards

-add tenure track faculty on page 2

-may 1st deadline

-need to insert a checklist of what docs need to be included

-maintain standards in terms of higher education

-senators will take back to faculty to discuss at the second meeting of the semester

1. **IFC Report and Feedback (IFC Reps Grieco and Stancel) 30 minutes (6)**
2. **Report from IFC**

-crr review

-received feedback to chair of IFC

**b Initial discussion of Standards of Faculty Conduct document**

-Wyckoff presents: does not exist in CRRS, only at MU It has limitations though.

**c Feedback from CRR Changes**

-electronic documents for signed docs

-average workload standard guidance

-faculty workload policy: 3/3 load reflect workload for non research active faculty

-need to work in working with graduate students as well

1. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:46 pm.