

The
U.M.K.C.
Faculty
Senate

Report

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

February 19, 2002

Note: The Chancellor fights to hold on to her optimism. Since the present budget situation isn't the cheeriest, the alternative is to look towards a better future when we are freer from the vicissitudes of state budgets. Then, she argues, because of greater fee income and money from other sources, we'll be more in charge of our own fate. Unfortunately, as the Chancellor acknowledges, the near future comes before the distant future, and the near future is rather bleak.

Everything is on the table. Sort of.

The Chancellor thought the long term future looked better than the short-term. We needed to find new sources of revenue and/or reduce unnecessary expenses. If we could do that we would have the funds to move in new directions and get over the current financial crisis.

According to the Chancellor and the Provost we got into the present crisis partly because off-budget items exceeded projections. At the beginning of the year a 3% fee was imposed on all units to meet projected off budget costs. But that didn't take account of the growth in off-budget, as

programs were started in the present with hopes of generating future income to pay back their startup costs. Most of the programs were worthwhile, but perhaps some of the future estimates were optimistic, and some startup costs were higher than projected. In sum, we have been simultaneously confronted with a new accounting system [which is supposed to add greater clarity to the budget process and transfer power and responsibility back to the units], greater than projected expenses, and shortfalls in income. It isn't a great combination. :-) Additionally, accreditation demands have sometimes placed new economic burdens on the system. Finally, if the central administration mandates a salary increase pool¹ (method of

GENERAL REVENUE ALLOCATION

The first column is the percent each unit had under Bill Scott's calculations, the second column is adjusted by Larry Gates' calculations, and the third column is the percent after the decision not to reduce the amounts for utilities and scholarships. The fourth column is the \$\$ figure of a 3.6% cut.

Name	Scott	Gates	Util.&Schol.	Amount
Chancellor	.4%	.6%	.6%	\$34k
Public Affairs	.3%	.5%	.5%	\$28k
Athletics	.0%	1.3%	1.5%	\$79k
Student Affairs	3.3%	3.6%	4.0%	\$215k
Advancement	1.2%	1.9%	2.1%	\$113k
Admin.	10.2%	10.3%	11.7%	\$620k
Academic	61.9%	62.8%	71.4%	\$3,794k
Reserves/Misc.	22.6%	19.2%	8.1%	\$430k

¹ The amount isn't decided, but a 2% pool is the number most frequently mentioned. Most likely there wouldn't be extra

distribution to be decided on by the campuses) that would add to the projected deficit, and would need to be covered by reallocations from other areas. On the other hand, a fee increase would reduce the deficit somewhat, as would enrollment & retention increases.

That said, there is some room to maneuver. One possibility raised by Senators was to use Continuing Education more creatively, since those courses paid for themselves and therefore don't need to be funded out of the regular budget. There were some interesting possibilities, but at this point off-campus space has to be rented when university rooms are available. Even if rent were paid to the university at least we would be paying the money to ourselves. It might be possible to have Continuing Education weekend courses, mixed courses and courses early in the morning or late at night. Ballard said that he had set up a Continuing Education Task force, chaired by Education Interim Dean John Cleek. They are looking at ways of increasing Continuing Ed income, through distance education, the use of the Northland campus, reaching new groups, etc. If you have any ideas contact the committee or Chair Kathleen Schweitzerberger.

Other possibilities were also discussed:

- * We currently are using commercial firms in all dean searches. Perhaps we can cut back and use them only when needed? [Ballard said that search firms save the committees a lot of work. He also hoped that in the future there would be fewer dean searches.]
- * The athletic teams seemed to drain money. Even though we were committed to athletics, perhaps we should rethink the commitment. [Gilliland said that the program self-funded about 2/3 of its cost, and that there was a commitment to increase the revenue generation. She was willing to look into the issue, though she didn't exude enthusiasm.]
- * Perhaps less money should go into new capital projects, so that the research and teaching missions of the university could be maintained.
- * Some programs could be reduced, or perhaps some searches for full or associate professors could be changed to assistant professor searches. The faculty might decide to stop some programs [Ballard was emphatic in saying that these decisions would need to be made at the unit level, and that there would have to be heavy faculty involvement.] If units decided not to replace some retiring faculty they would keep the money -- it wouldn't be swept up by the central administration -- and the unit could decide what to do with it.
- * Central administration costs might be reduced.
- * Salary increases would raise the size of the deficit. In the past, when faculty has received no salary increase or a minimal \$400 one, administrative increases have been considerably higher. These are decided upon by the Board, and administrators argued they had no choice. Additionally, at a time when the faculty got small increases, the Board had given the President a large salary increase since they thought it important that his salary be raised to the average of the big 12. When asked about administrative salary increases if the faculty got no increase or a minimal one, Ballard said that he thought it would clearly be bad policy. His view and statement were unambiguous.

Meeting of all voting faculty

The bylaws call for 2 general faculty meetings a year, though obviously that provision has been ignored. Senators thought that either we should have a meeting or revise the bylaws. If we did have a general faculty meeting, what would be its purpose and how would it be structured? We were sure that people would not money coming to the campuses to fund the mandated allocation.

want to hear a lecture on the budget, and some Senators thought the faculty would rather not talk about the budget at all since there was discussion in most units and people were sick of the topic. Others disagreed. Some Senators thought the faculty from different units would like to hear what was happening in other units since, outside of the Senate, there are few inter-unit faculty meetings. It would be a faculty to faculty rather than a faculty to administrator discussion. If we did that how would the meeting be structured? Some Senators thought a virtual meeting would be worthwhile, but that idea didn't generate much enthusiasm. Others thought that the faculty wouldn't want much structure. If there were food and tables, people would just talk with each other.

By the time you get this *Report* an all faculty meeting will probably be set. The Senate Executive Committee will develop a proposal to present to the Senate at its March 5th meeting.

Odds & Ends

We didn't have too much time for several issues on the Agenda. We will revisit the PRIDE Report. Some thought the committee itself had to be altered, so that there was representation from all the units. At this point the committee is a self selected and largely unrepresentative group, and that clearly harms their legitimacy.... Ballard said he should have a report on the growth/non-growth of the administration soon. He said that preliminary data indicated that much of the administrative growth had taken place at the unit level, but he didn't want to discuss the issue until the research was complete.... The University System is being sued by someone because the Missouri Constitution says it can't charge tuition, it can only charge fees. Please remember to use *fee*, rather than *tuition*, in all official documents.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,
Faculty Secretary