

The
UMKC
Faculty
Senate

Report

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

January 7 and 21, 2003

MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR AND THE PROVOST

THE BUDGET, DEAN APPOINTMENTS AND POLITICS

The Budget: As you undoubtedly know, higher education has escaped a current budget cut - at least temporarily. The Governor's proposed budget uses revenue generated by borrowing against the tobacco funds, and the Republican state legislature needs to agree with this proposal. There is cautious optimism that this will happen. If not, there will be a cut in the UMKC budget of about \$7,000,000. This would come at the end of the current term and would be difficult to implement. Hopefully, it won't happen. Next year presents a more troublesome scenario. The state's portion of the university's budget is likely to be cut, though tuition and fee increases may soften the blow for the institution, if not the students. Additionally, the value of the retirement fund has decreased from \$2.3 billion to \$1.6. When the Stock Market was going up campus contributions to the retirement fund decreased, since the capital in the fund was invested and was generating revenue. Now the campus contribution to the fund will have to increase by about 3% of the payroll. The money won't come out of our checks, since the university pays for retirement, but it does come out of the university's budget. If there is a pay increase next year (the curators are discussing a 3% pay pool) that would also need to come out of the university budget, since there are no additional funds coming in. [The political situation is tricky. The state does not want to give employees raises, and might view raises as an indication that the university has plenty of money, but the UM administration is afraid that good people will start to leave if raises aren't given.]

The CBHE and the Delaware Study: Missouri's Coordinating Board of Higher Education in Missouri (CBHE) passed a resolution saying that the UM system is adequately funded. There apparently wasn't any discussion. A footnote saying that UMSL was *not* adequately funded was included in the report. [The chair of the CBHE is from St. Louis.] Some opined about Board politics, but there was little hard information about the politics behind the resolution.

UMKC has a special problem. By all the economic tests the state uses, UMKC comes out poorly. Our SCH data is low compared to the other campuses, our results on the Student Engagement questionnaire are poor, we have a fairly low graduation rate, and it takes our students a comparatively long time to graduate. These indicators, combined with the CBHE statement, have led to the perception that UMKC is not doing well with state resources. Ballard said it was partly in response to the low SCH data that he wrote his memo stating that small courses should be cancelled. The courses can remain if they are justified, and Ballard said that he has only a monitoring role.

The Senate discussed this issue fairly extensively. The Delaware Study, on which much of the information is based, is rooted in large central campuses, like UMC., and it excludes professional schools. It is probable that its assumptions don't apply to urban campuses like UMKC. Senators suggested a committee to study the Delaware formula and its assumptions. They thought UMKC could use a formula that better suited to urban universities. There may be formulas among the urban 13, or perhaps UMKC should develop one. Ballard agreed to look into the issue.

One Senator raised a question about the formula for hiring part time instructors in the College. Several departments had all their sections closed. Since the University made money on these, it seemed as if it would be in its interest to supply more funds for instructors so that new sections could be opened up. Would Ballard do so? Possibly.

Dean searches: There are currently 4 dean positions open: Medicine, SBS, Nursing and Education. The budget is a constraint on national searches, since these usually cost \$50,000 to \$100,000. Also, a new line is sometimes required, and new deans often want extra resources for their schools. An additional problem that needs to be considered is that UMKC has twice as many administrators at the dean's level of any school of comparable size.

In Medicine, the school is moving ahead since accreditation is coming up. People seem to like the current interim dean, so there is a question about the desirability of a national search.

School of Education: Interim Dean Cleek has had the "Interim" removed from his title. His term as Dean is either 1.5 or 2.5 years - Ballard said he had not yet decided. He would discuss the issue with the SOE Executive committee when deciding on a time frame. Ballard knew his decision to remove the "interim" was controversial. He said he was guided by several things:

- * A small majority of the faculty wanted the "interim" removed, though there was disagreement on details.
- * The title change was supported by the academic leaders of the university.
- * Ballard thought that some stability in the SOE was needed, after 3 deans in 4 years.
- * Budget realities restricted the ability to do a national search.
- * Cleek was involved in a project with the Kansas City School System. It was an important project, and Cleek seemed to be doing a good job.

In SBS, an internal search has been initiated. The person appointed will be a regular dean, but it is not yet decided how long s/he will serve.

Politics: The administration is attempting to strengthen its support with area politicians and business leaders. It initiated some meetings, and has hosted a lunch for 70 area legislators. [The lunch was paid for by the UKC Trustees.] Additionally, several UMKC faculty members have participated in the program to write legislative briefs on various issues facing the state, and the visibility should benefit the school.

Senate issues: Several items related to the Senate itself. At a previous meeting the Senate voted to join the **Extended Cabinet (EC)**, and many Senators applied. All those who applied were accepted as members. The decision to join the EC came at the end of a discussion - it was a spontaneous resolution that wasn't on the Agenda. Dissenting Senators raised two issues, one substantive and one procedural.

Prof. Stuart McAninch (Ed.) raised the **substantive issue**. He gave three reasons for wanting the resolution reconsidered: 1. he thought the Senate should be the formal body for faculty interaction with the administration, and rather than joining the Extended Cabinet he thought we should reinvigorate our dialogue with the administration; 2. he thought there was a conflict of interest since the Extended

Cabinet's purpose was to promote the changes envisioned by the Chancellor, and the Senate didn't necessarily agree with her perspective; and 3. he thought the time demands were excessive.

Various points were raised in the discussion. Some said the membership in the EC was experimental and we should see how it worked. We could always rethink the issue next year. Faculty often argued that the trouble with the EC was that it had no accountability, and members weren't elected. Senators helped change that dynamic since we had been elected and were appointed because we were elected. We would also be able to report on what the EC did (there have been no formal reports, and few informal ones). We would increase the mix of faculty on the EC. We would look foolish if we recanted before we even tried.

Senator Hali Fieldman (Conservatory) raised the **procedural issue**. The resolution on joining the EC was not on the Agenda. It arose spontaneously, and was poorly worded since it looked like the Senate, and not individual Senators, were joining the EC. [A better worded resolution will be on the next agenda.] It was probably not a good way of conducting Senate business. Some Senators thought that items should be discussed at one meeting and then voted on at the next, after Senators had a chance to consult with faculty in their units. Other Senators thought this was cumbersome. There was general agreement that, barring emergencies, we shouldn't vote on resolutions unless they were on the Agenda.

* A second issue revolved around **Senate appointments to the University Budget Advisory Committee**. The Senate had been asked to appoint two people. We thought Jim Durig, the Chair of the Senate Budget Committee, should serve ex officio. We also nominated Gary Ebersole (A&S) who is a member of the Senate Budget Committee but not a current member of the Senate. Ebersole's nomination was rejected because he was not a current member of the Senate. We thought that the Senate should be able to nominate who it wanted as its representative. Who set the rule that the Senate nominee had to be a Senator? What was the rule? Senators were suspicious that a rule was formulated to keep a feisty faculty member off the committee. Chair Schweitzberger was asked to investigate and report back to the Senate. [Note: Apparently the Chancellor was not the person who made the decision not to appoint Ebersole, and she agreed to appoint him. The rule is that the Senate can nominate the person it wants to nominate.]

Other issues: Senator Skidmore noted that currently the only title available for long term, non-tenure track teaching faculty who are neither *clinical* nor *research* (salary paid by grants) nor *adjunct* (salary paid by outside source) is "Visiting Professor" It is not an accurate title for permanent people. The Faculty Welfare Committee was asked to study the issue and make a recommendation.... Though university rules call for annual evaluations of non-tenured tenure-track faculty, so they have guidance as to how well they are doing, these rules are not always followed. A mentoring process would be useful, but it also isn't always used. Senator Glaros (Dental School) introduced the following resolution:

The Faculty Senate recommends that academic units and the Provost jointly develop standards that insure frequent, regular, and formal evaluation of probationary faculty on their progress toward continuous appointment.

Some Senators argued that a Senate resolution on the issue seemed irrelevant, since it was already part of the rules and regulations of the university. Maybe the university rule should be tightened, or perhaps specific procedures should be incorporated into it? The issue was sent to the Academic Affairs Committee for study and a recommendation.... Dean Evaluations are underway in Dentistry, Pharmacy and the library.... The university does not use race in determining admissions, though there are some scholarships that use race. It is closely monitoring the Michigan case.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin, Faculty Secretary