

Report

The Voice of the U.M.K.C. Faculty

March 7, 2000

Issues inside:

- Salary increases (p. 2)
- Post-Tenure Review (p.3)
- English Language Proficiency Program (p.3)

Secretary's note: This meeting wasn't one of the Senate's best, but there were some interesting aspects to it. The Interim Chancellor asked if he could attend the beginning of the meeting, together with Interim Vice Chancellor Smelstor and a reporter for the Kansas City Star that was shadowing him for a day. Ostensibly he wanted to hear a report about the AAHE (American Association of Higher Education)

conference that had been attended by the Interim Provost and a number of UMKC faculty. We also got a brief report from the Interim Provost on a lecture series that was being put together. The Senate had no questions or comments after the reports, and the Interim Chancellor, Interim Provost and the Star reporter left. Presumably you'll hear about both the lecture series and the AAHE conference through official university channels.

Bill Eddy, Director of the Urban Initiative, was supposed to come to the Senate to discuss the program. A major concern is that there has been so little faculty involvement in the process or in the selection of people for the various committees. Unfortunately Eddy never showed up. Perhaps he forgot, but it seemed symbolically appropriate. Various committee reports and discussions, including a discussion of post-tenure review and the academic calendar rounded out the meeting.

VERIP: Interim Chancellor Lamb reported that the VERIP (Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program) had generated \$5.5 million for the UM system. He said that the administration will be meeting with the deans and directors to discuss how to apportion the money.

AAHE: Three of the faculty members who had attended the AAHE conference gave a report on it. Briefly, the conference focused on broadening the concept of research so that it included teaching (as long as you wrote about what you did) and the application of knowledge within the community. Much of the theory of the conference came from

Ernest A. Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.¹ A press release from the conference discussed the UC San Diego's effort to initiate a "dialog between UCSD faculty and the... community, with the aim of better integrating the university's research and teaching expertise with community needs and interests." At USCD the effort would include "the development of a community based research agenda, academic seminars and community roundtables, neighborhood dialogues and consensus building." There was no discussion of how the program would function at UMKC, but apparently Incoming Chancellor Gilliland (who was at the conference) is interested in the program.

Great Ideas Project: The Interim Provost, together with a faculty committee, is putting together a lecture series. It aims to capitalize on Lewis and Clark, and will be "A New Journey of Discovery." Four "frontiers" will be explored over the next 2 years (earth, space, mind and spirit). Steven Ambrose will kick the series off on October 18th.

Salary increases: Since there were no appreciable salary increases last year, should salary increases this year be based on two years work? The sentiment of the Senate was that it clearly should be, but it was hard to come up with a neat formula. We finally passed the following resolution and directed the Chair to write to the Interim Provost suggesting that she inform the deans that it was both possible and just to consider the work of the last two years in apportioning raise money.

The Faculty Senate Recommends: Since there were no meaningful salary increases during the 1999-2000 academic year, that salary increases for the 2000-2001 academic year be based on the faculty members achievements over a two year period.

Academic Calendar: The academic calendars for the years 2001 to 2004 were set by the IFC. Spring break will come in week 9, so it won't be as late in the term as it is this year. There was a discussion of whether we should start on Monday, Aug. 19th or Wednesday, Aug. 21st in 2002. The sentiment in the Senate was for the August 19th date, but we agreed to discuss the issue with the faculty in our various units.

Transfers: The proposed new General Education Transfer Agreement was discussed by the IFC. Under the agreement each campus can design its own General Education program, but 42 hours has to be designated as transfer hours, and receiving institutions have to accept them. A receiving institution can require more than 42 hours if native students are required to do the same work. A student does not need an AA degree to transfer the 42 hours as long as s/he has completed all of them. If only part of the 42 hour block is completed the receiving institution can decide what to accept.

¹ People with long memories will remember that the book's ideas have been previously discussed on campus, but they have never been implemented.

Post-tenure review: The committee is meeting and studying various plans and proposals. President Pacheco argued that if we do not come up with a post-tenure review procedure the legislature will impose one on us. It isn't an option to simply stick with current policies. The aim is to provide developmental support for floundering faculty, not to punish them. Two general models are under consideration:

- ❖ **The trigger model:** If a faculty member receives no pay increase, or a very low pay increase, for a number of years a review of the faculty member's job performance would be initiated.
- ❖ **A bundling approach:** Every 5 years a general report on a faculty member's job performance would be developed. That is somewhat similar to what is currently done on this campus, but there would have to be a special review and a different structure of some type.

The question of whether faculty could be rewarded for outstanding performance came up. Apparently the committee does want to do this.

Odds & ends: The Senate's Academic Issues committee will soon nominate people for the various university tenure and grievance committees.... The Senate is having trouble recruiting officers, and the feeling was that the job was too demanding and the rewards too low. The Senate Chair needs more released time and a salary supplement. Also, the Senate doesn't have its own budget, and operates out of the Chancellor's budget. We thought that, at least for some functions, we should have our own budget line. We decided to discuss this with Incoming Chancellor Gilliland at a future meeting.... President Pacheco feels that the campuses have not dealt adequately with the question of English Language Proficiency and that the Legislature might move in unless we correct the problems.... The Senate Report of Feb. 15th was approved. This Report has not been officially approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,
Faculty Secretary