

**The
U.M.K.C.
Faculty
Senate**

Report

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

Sept. 19th, 2000

Note: There, coming from the middle of the table, was Chancellor Gilliland's voice. Yup -- it was a virtual meeting. Gilliland was out-of-town but wanted to have her regular meeting with the Senate, so we talked via a fancy speakerphone. The meeting was OK. It wasn't as good as a regular, physical, meeting and illustrated some of the subtle changes of tone that take place with distance education. But it was far better than not having a meeting with the Chancellor, and also seemed to be a symbol of her commitment to open communication.

VERIP \$\$, Reallocations and Enrollments

The Interim Provost told some schools that funds would be reallocated because they had lost enrollment. That announcement was premature and the decision has been held up for more study. The Chancellor did say that tuition accounts for 45% of UMKC's general unrestricted funds, and therefore enrollment would be an important factor in the future allocation of money. At this point we do not have an enrollment management plan that has clear goals, and the deans and faculty members of the various units don't have a direct interest in enrollment. In the future that will change, and there will be a tie between tuition dollars and budget. Asked about the role of the faculty in developing these enrollment plans, the Chancellor said that it would need to be a cooperative exercise, with deans, faculty and staff involved.

That said, the Chancellor was careful to qualify the tie between enrollment and unit funding. A three-year rolling average (or some such) would probably be used so that yearly variations in enrollment didn't play havoc with budgets. Enrollment would not be the only element in determining budget, since mission and curriculum needs would be considered, but it would not be an inconsiderable factor either.

In answer to several questions about resources, the Chancellor said that she expected funds to grow. We need to put together a resource development plan that would be linked to an overall strategy for growth. This, in turn, is linked to some of the ideas that the Blueprint discussions are concerned with. Gilliland warned that changes couldn't take place overnight, but she did think that there would be a significant difference in five years.

Asked if there were any immediate projects the Chancellor said that there were about 10 or 12 under consideration, but the list might change and develop. She was at her new grandchild's house and didn't have the plan in front of her. ☺ Gilliland did indicate that

one immediate project would be to fix the “high tech” classrooms so that they worked. The budget for this year is fairly firmly fixed, but tuition revenues had to be accounted for before final figures could be given.

IFC Report

There was a discussion of Post-Tenure Review. UMKC was the only campus that had an operational policy, so we are in a different situation than the other campuses which are facing an unknown. The feeling of the IFC members was that the proposed policy is a significant improvement over the plan that is now in place. Under the old plan there were few safeguards for faculty and the procedure was administratively driven. The IFC members feel that there is a determination to preserve academic freedom, and that procedures will only be invoked if performance is inadequate.

The budget of UMKC is also in reasonably good shape. President Pacheco wants a 5% reserve fund on each campus, to be developed over a 5 year period. Apparently we accomplished most of the job last year, so that is one form of budget cut that we will not have to face. Pacheco wants to see salaries grow by about 4%, and E&E by about 3%, each year.

Some Senators raised a question about disparities in salaries between UMKC and UMC. Other Senators raised the question of whether older faculty, hired when salaries were lower, had disproportionately low salaries. Was there an intergenerational salary gap? The IFC said that they would try and get the information for the Senate.

Tenure and Sabbatical policies

There were several questions raised about the proposed changes to the Sabbatical Policy:

- ❖ Current policies stipulate that a faculty member has to return to UMKC for a year after s/has a leave. If they don't do that the money for the leave needs to be returned to the school. Mendoza indicated that if a faculty member was incapacitated and couldn't return to teach that provision was routinely waived, but administrations change and Senators thought that there should be a provision that there “may be exceptions made for humanitarian reasons.” The Senators working with Mendoza's committee on these policies will make this recommendation.
- ❖ There was a question of how summer teaching would be counted in the sabbatical policy.
- ❖ The changes discussed at the last Senate meeting (full pay for one terms leave) had only to do with the sabbaticals, but there were also some statements that the various leave policies needed to be brought in line with each other. That implies that some changes are going to be made to all three types of leave (Research, Development and Sabbatical). The Senate wanted to see the complete package, and asked the Academic Affairs committee to study the issue and make recommendations.

The changes proposed for the Tenure and Promotion Timetable were troublesome, since they shifted time away from unit and department review and gave more time for the review of candidates by the central administration. Under the proposed timetable faculty would need to be here in July and August to do an adequate job on the proposals, and of

course many were not. Apparently the Interim Provost thought the changes were necessary because some deans did not follow the current timetable, and faculty members were not given an ample amount of time to challenge promotion and tenure decisions. The issue was referred to the Senate's Academic Affairs committee for study.

Ph.D. Executive Committee: Changes in the residency requirements for graduate students were a problem for many graduate students and would make it difficult for them to pursue their degrees. These changes were passed by a small portion of the Ph.D. executive committee over the summer. The Senate thought that the full committee ought to reexamine the issue and make recommendations, and questioned the idea of making major policy decisions when many faculty were off campus. They also questioned the organization of the Ph.D. Executive committee itself, since the Graduate Dean chairs the committee and sets the Agenda. Senators thought that this was an academic committee that should be chaired by a faculty member. This issue was also referred to the Academic Affairs Committee and will be revisited in the near future. We hoped that the Ph.D. Executive Committee would also discuss the issues and make recommendations.

Committee members: The Senate Nominations Committee was created in order that we might have a more orderly way of making nominations for various positions. Committee member are Gary Ebersole (College) (Chair), and Bill Fredeickson (Conservatory) and Ellen Suni (Law).

The committee nominated Louis Potts (History) to replace Robert Willson (English) on the Faculty and Staff Benefits Committee. Jagan Agrawal (computer Science) and Andrew Bergeson (History) were nominated for the Student Computer Fee Committee.

The Report of the Sept. 5th Senate meeting was officially approved. A request was made that the relationship between the Sabbatical, Research and Development leave policies be clarified. (See Tenure and Sabbatical Policies section, above, for clarification.)

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,
Faculty Secretary