

Faculty Senate Minutes
Tuesday September 29, 2009
Plaza Room, Administrative Center, 3-5pm

Present: Ebersole, Ward-Smith, Luppino, Pick, Davies, Williams, Stancel, Potts, Wyckoff, Gardner, Plamann, Yang, Ziskin, Johnston, Hopkins

Visitors: Provost Hackett, Murray Blackwelder

Excused: Foxworth, Krause, McArthur

Absent: Madison-Cannon, Humrichouser, Nilsson, Carbone

Welcome-3:01, Called to order by the Chair Gary Ebersole

Information Items

Chair Ebersole sent an email from Ken Ferguson at the Law School in regards to the Intercollegiate Athletics Council. It needs of a representative from the Faculty Senate. Chair Ebersole asked for a volunteer and Senator Krantz said that he would serve in that capacity.

Betsy Rodriguez will be on campus on November 10. She will be holding a meeting for the faculty at 3:00pm in Royal Hall 111 which is the large lecture hall that seats about 400 people. Other times are being set for the Deans and for the Staff.

John Pinkston II, who is a doctoral student from the Bloch School and works with Senator McArthur, will be filling in for her while she is in Africa.

Minutes

The revised minutes from the September 15th meeting were approved with a motion from Senator Fincham, seconded by Senator Fieldman, and all present voted in favor.

Agenda

Chair Ebersole asked to add one item to the agenda. The committee that was tasked with reviewing the draft of awards has prepared a report for the senate. The agenda item was approved.

Provost Report

Provost Hackett did not have a report, especially given her long report at the last meeting. She noted that they were getting ready for homecoming and the upcoming accreditation visit.

There was a comment for the Provost that there is interest in a day care facility on the hospital hill campus. Senator Davies noted that there is a need for one on the Volker campus as well. Provost Hackett said that she would look in to this.

Chair Ebersole mentioned that the pattern was to have one senate meeting a semester on the hospital hill campus. It was noted that the room preference would be something like the Plaza

room and not a theatre style room. Senator Ward-Smith will work on setting up a room that fits these requirements.

Senator Fieldman asked a question about donations to area campuses. She noted that there was a recent article in the Star that talked about private donations being up but did not say anything about state funding. She commented that without that perspective the article portrayed a skewed view of campus finances. She asked if there was a way of balancing this perspective, or if it was needed. Provost Hackett said that she did think that anyone received a skewed impression of state funding, but she will look into it.

Chair Ebersole asked about the response to the Bloch School rankings. Provost Hackett said that there was a good feeling and not just for the Bloch School but for UMKC in general. Barb Shelly wrote a good editorial about UMKC recently in the Star. She met with the Chancellor and picked up on the good feelings.

UMKC Awards List (draft)

Senator Wyckoff was taking the lead on this committee. In general the committee thought the awards are pretty well thought out. There is a good emphasis on teaching and research. For the community engagement award the committee wanted to make the nomination process clearer. They added an award for lifetime service to the university. This is not an award that is intended to be given every year, but given as necessary to people that have made a significant contribution to the university. The committee suggested a stipend of \$10,000. Provost Hackett thought that this was too high and that it would not be possible. Senator Wyckoff suggested that it could be funded from alumni donations. Provost Hackett noted that in that case it would need to be included in the capital campaign. The committee feels that a larger award is needed to demonstrate its significance.

The committee wanted to make the concept behind the diversity award clearer and changed it to cultural enrichment. They wanted to avoid the award having a head count quality. They also feel that the changes they made better reflect diversity as a core value to campus and not just a necessity.

Overall the committee tried to standardize the terminology that was used in the awards. They also put a limit on the frequency that someone could receive an award to every four years. This would mean that most undergraduate students would be able to receive an award once in their career and everyone else would have multiple opportunities to receive an award. The committee felt that it would be better for there to be a single selection committee for the awards and that the committee self select a chair. Provost Hackett asked if this included the research awards, most of which are already established and have selection processes in place? An extended discussion took place covering questions about the composition of the selection committee. The award committee had questions about the number of selection committees. Their understanding was that there would be a committee for each award and they felt that would be too many which precipitated their recommendation of one selection committee. Provost Hackett noted that the intention was for there to be one committee for each of the areas of teaching research and service and that there would be communication between these committees. Senator Wyckoff suggested that it would still be a good idea for the committees to self select their own chair. Provost

Hackett noted that her office needed to maintain some control over the composition of the committees.

Provost Hackett reminded the Senate that the Trustees were working on three community engagement awards that are coming out in the next year. Senator Wyckoff noted that the committee took this into consideration and that they tried to focus this award as coming from the University so that there is not overlap with what the Trustees are planning.

During the discussion Senator Yang noted that the key things the committee accomplished were modifying the diversity award and creating the lifetime commitment award. Senator Fieldman asked a question about the lack of language describing the lifetime commitment award in the draft document that the committee provided? Senator Wyckoff noted that this was a clerical error and would be corrected. Senator Fieldman asked question about the possibility of a group being able to receive the lifetime achievement award. Senator Wyckoff said that the committees intention in creating this award was to recognize the service of an individual. There is a minimum number of 15 years of service to the University before someone would be eligible. It was noted that there were other awards that are open to groups that would be more appropriate than this award.

Sense of the Seante Endorsing the Draft of UMKC's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Senator Fieldman introduced a resolution endorsing the Strategic Plan outlined by Provost Hackett at the September 15th Senate meeting. Chair Ebersole, who helped co-author this resolution, noted that the most important part about what they were doing with this motion was that it showed that the Senate was on board with this plan which takes on another level of importance due to the upcoming accreditation visit. Senator Ziskin raised a question about the importance of the second paragraph. Her concern was that the Senate made very minor changes to the overall plan and that this paragraph exaggerates the Senate's role. Chair Ebersole said that what this paragraph does is show the process that took place in developing this plan and that it was inclusive in bringing together the important constituents of the University. Senator Fieldman noted this shows an exchange taking place between the authors and important groups. Senator Fieldman moved that this Sense of the Senate be approved. Senator Davies seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one abstention and zero no votes.

The Sense of the Senate reads as follows:

Whereas the Provost shared a penultimate draft of the document outlining **UMKC's Strategic Goals and Objectives** with the UMKC Faculty Senate on September 15, 2009; and

Whereas members of the Faculty Senate made a number of suggested changes to the wording of this Plan, which have been largely incorporated into the final version;

Therefore on this 29th day of September, 2009, the UMKC Faculty Senate does hereby endorse the Strategic Plan as edited on September 29, 2009; and

Commends the administration and, in particular, Provost Gail Hackett, for enlightened leadership at all stages of the Plan's development and for having included a well-considered group of invested constituents in the process.

Question About Deans' Evaluation

Senator Hopkins raised a question about approval percentage of his Dean. He was interested to know how it compared to the other Deans on campus. Provost Hackett said that it was a bad idea to compare those percentages across schools. The purpose of the surveys was not to give data back to the people who were evaluated but to give feedback to the deans. It was noted by the Provost and others that the results are not comparable across schools due to different response rates among the faculty of the different schools. Senator Hopkins noted that there are others that would like to know the meaning of the percentage. Provost Hackett said that she did not want the summaries to be as detailed as they were. She understood that things are different here and so she compromised. Chair Ebersole said that the reason why the executive committee wanted the summaries was because there was a history that these evaluations did not play a large role in the evaluation of the Deans. His sense was that as the University is moving into a new model that the faculty needed to see that these evaluations are being used. Senator Beard stated that their school has their own evaluation mechanism and wanted to know what role it should play? Provost Hackett said that their survey was one part of a more comprehensive evaluation and that what is important is for all of the important constituencies to be a part of the Deans' evaluations in the future. Senator Johnston said that the real question is how to increase the response rate among the faculty. Senator Ziskin said that the concern behind Senator Hopkins question is that the faculty be heard and that it might be a good idea for Provost Hackett to be the next faculty meeting. Provost Hackett said that she was already planning on being at that meeting. Senator Williams said that transparency is important in getting others engaged in the process and that if the faculty see that their voices will be heard then the evaluations will gain credibility.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Discussion

At the last Senate meeting Vice-Provost MacQuarrie reported on where the schools were in relation to putting together policies for evaluation and promotion of NTT faculty. The UM System expectation is that these policies will be in place down to the department level. Chair Ebersole noted that from Vice-Provost MacQuarrie's report that there are 200 NTT faculty and that number does not include clinical faculty which would increase that number. As a group they are disenfranchised as they do not have a seat on Faculty Senate and the by-laws of each school determine whether or not they have voting rights. The Senate currently has a non-voting seat for a member of the Staff Council, filled by Senator Bethman, and a seat for a representative from the part-time faculty. However, there is a large group that is not at the table. Does the Senate need to think about the status of this group, and do we want to invite this group to get together and elect a representative? Senator Williams stated that at the Dental School there is not a separate distinction for NTT faculty and so this would not affect them. Senator Ward-Smith agreed that this is true for the School of Nursing as well and that they have had NTT faculty representing them on the Faculty Senate in the past. Chair Ebersole noted that at the College of Arts & Sciences is only open to tenure track faculty. A question was raised about if this was a discussion about having someone represent NTT faculty as a group or have a representative from each unit? Is there a body that represents the NTT faculty? Chair Ebersole said that he is waiting for information from human resources to see a breakdown on the location of NTT

faculty. Senator Krantz commented that since NTT faculty are going to be evaluated in a similar process as that of tenure track faculty that the feeling is that they are not a separate group. Chair Ebersole responded that there is a major difference in that NTT faculty are only evaluated according to one criteria. He further commented, and several others agreed, that some of the NTT faculty feel intimidated and feel that they need a voice. Chair Ebersole also noted that there is a large number of clinical faculty in addition to NTT faculty, that number is growing, and we need to figure out how to work with this changing demographic.

There was a discussion about the role and definition of NTT faculty. One of the points that was made during the discussion was that NTT faculty are hired under irregular circumstances and hired for specific purposes. Because of this many are not qualified for tenure track positions and trying to move them into those types of positions is not advised. It was noted that they would be able to compete for tenure track positions. Another point in the discussion was that the role of NTT faculty have changed over the years and that there are many faculty who are coming on now that are electing to come on as NTT faculty. A comment was made that mechanisms should be in place to help NTT faculty make the transition to tenure track positions. Provost Hackett said that there is a mechanism in place, but that it is hard to use at the moment due to the hiring freeze.

Senator Beard commented that the discussion about NTT faculty having a seat on Faculty Senate is premature and that the first question that needs to be addressed is NTT faculty being disenfranchised in the schools. Chair Ebersole said that the Senate cannot dictate to the schools who can be a voting person and in that regard the first step would be to provide them a seat on the Senate. Senator Ward-Smith raised a point that giving them a token seat on the Senate would not take care of NTT being disenfranchised. Senator Ziskin said that even if it does not take care of the problem it would still help. She noted that Staff Council exists and provides a larger voice and that adding one person would give a larger voice. Chair Ebersole said that once he has a list then they can decide how they would like to be organized. He has heard that while they are not organized yet they are looking for a place. Senator Wyckoff asked that if NTT faculty are intimidated in talking to other faculty, would they speak in a larger forum, especially if the things they say may come up in their reviews later? Chair Ebersole noted that there are already existing statements to protect against this. He encouraged senators to talk to NTT faculty at their schools and get a sense of what they are thinking.

Murry Blackwelder, UMKC Foundation

Mr. Blackwelder noted that he has been on the job for 75 days and that he is here to give an update on the UMKC Foundation. The affiliation agreement was signed on August 1, 2009. He has a twofold purpose, 1) he is a campaigner and enjoys raising money, and 2) to speak with the 501(c)3's on campus and try to consolidate resources. He believes that there is a stewardship problem perceived by donors and that having a unified presence will encourage more donations. He noted that they have re-organized some. There is a Vice-President to run the fundraisers and everything else has stayed the same for the most part. He wants to work closely with alumni, the development office, and public relations department. The foundation is currently working on a budget and accounting system. They have developed goals and objectives for all 50 employees which are metric based. A question was asked if these 50 individuals had been shifted from the University to the Foundation? Mr. Blackwelder said that the foundation is providing the services

now. Chair Ebersole said that while the services have been contracted out the employees are still paying into the pension system. Mr. Blackwelder said that they have developed policies for fundraisers for the next five years.

The next step in the University Strategic Plan is to put movement beneath each of the goals. The Foundation is going to work with the Deans to put together fundraising projects in each of the areas. Mr. Blackwelder wants to have all of these projects together so that feasibility studies can be put together for the first of the year. He is hopeful that by October or November of the next year they will be moving forward with the capital campaign. Last year there was a total of \$29 million in total production. To date last year there was \$13 million and to date this year there is \$7.2 million. Mr. Blackwelder noted that on the million dollar list they have 20-30 people who are able to give in excess of \$1 million.

Senator Fincham asked if there were giving levels established? Mr. Blackwelder replied that they had not had a million dollar giving level in the past. This is the first level. The second is \$100,000 then \$25,000, and then \$1,000. They need to have recognition at the million dollar level. They have already had several million dollar gifts made and they are working on a \$5 million gift. They are working to establish a sense of urgency to help build momentum. Senator Fieldman asked Mr. Blackwelder to clarify the relationship between the amount that is asked from the donor and the needs of the internal constituencies, and what triggers the search for gifts. He replied that there are two responses. The first is that they may find donors along the way that want to do something specific that is not in the plan. On the other hand it usually comes down to a dean saying that they have a specific need. The Foundation would then find lead gifts to start the fundraising process. He stated that 98% of all capital campaigns are given from a very small number of people. Lead gifts are necessary and that the people they are looking at for these gifts are not as affected by the current economic problems. Senator Krantz asked if the Foundation worked primarily with private donors or if they also went after government money? He responded that they do not go after government money nor do they give out other money. The money that currently funds the operations of the Foundation is the money that was allocated for the same purposes last year only it is going to the Foundation now and is expected to raise more money this year than last year. Senator Wyckoff asked if having a foundation was the way things are done now? Mr. Blackwelder replied that concentrating resources in one place is a more efficient use of resources and that he can do things that the University cannot. Provost Hackett noted that creating a foundation was one of the major recommendations that they received and that the funds raised at UMKC will stay at UMKC and not have to go to the UM System and that this is a big deal for the philanthropic community in Kansas City. Senator Fieldman asked if faculty were going to be asked to contribute ideas? Provost Hackett said that the ideas will come through the schools but that Mr. Blackwelder will be working through the implementation plans. Provost Hackett said that the funds raised will be going for big overarching plans and not for little things. Senator Yang asked what the funding percentages will be? Mr. Blackwelder replied that there is not a strict percentage needed but that leading gifts are what they are looking for and that as a nucleus of funds forms, then projects will move forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm. The next meeting is October 6, 2009.