

THE UMKC FACULTY SENATE

REPORT

Date: Oct. 7 and 21st, 2003

Note: This is a Report on two Senate meetings. The General Faculty meeting took place between them and focused on the Viability Process. Both Senate meetings also centered largely on viability. At the Oct. 7th meeting we also discussed the new Vice Chancellor for Research position, and the Institute for Urban Affairs. At that meeting the Chancellor wasn't physically present, but tried to have an audible presence via a remote phone hookup. We could hear her voice, but she couldn't make out what we were saying, so it was an experiment that failed. At the second meeting both the Chancellor and the Provost were present. They had several announcements, and we had an extended discussion on viability. We also discussed the traffic/student interaction in the campus area. The Senate requested that it be brought into policy discussions earlier, so that it wasn't simply reacting to decisions that had already been argued out. The Chancellor agreed and seemed quite willing to cooperate. The Provost said he would send the agenda from the Dean's Council to the Senate. After the Chancellor and Provost left we had a discussion about Roo Prints. They have been copying completed exams and putting them on reserve for students – Senators questioned the legitimacy of that. But people also didn't want the employees of Roo Prints acting as censors.

VIABILITY

In answer to a number of questions, Provost Ballard said that the professional programs were not escaping the viability study, but he thought their situations were unique and comparison was often difficult. There might be some programs in the professional schools that would be closed. Ballard did say that even though three of the four programs targeted for a viability study were in the College and the fourth was in the Education School, the purpose of the study was not to shift money from these schools to other areas, and he denied that this would happen. Asked why, if the purpose wasn't to shift money between the units, there was such an elaborate university-wide structure to look at what were essentially problems within the College and the Education School, Ballard only said that the campus-wide committee was mandated by the system.

Asked how the four units undergoing the viability study were selected, Ballard said that it had been a long process. Vice President Lemkuhl had originally selected 14 or 15 programs, including areas in the Conservatory and Nursing. The Provost said he had a long series of conversations with the deans before identifying the four programs that were to undergo the study. There were a number of considerations, including the unit's priorities and strategic plans. There was a question about the role of the deans in the negotiation process, but it was only answered by a comment that the deans discussed the priorities and action plans of the units.

One common objection to the viability studies is that the selection process has relied on faulty data. Ballard said that a result of the whole process should be a better data system, one that everyone agreed was accurate, so that problems could be easily spotted. There was some discussion of when enrollment figures should be fixed – one Senator argued that they should be set at the point when no refund was available to students, rather than at the current point of the last day to drop without academic assessment.

The Senate had also discussed the viability process its Oct. 7th meeting. Apparently the underlying problem is that the UMKC campus is more expensive than the UMC campus, even for comparable programs. If we are going to grow, in a time of limited funding, we had to shift resources from some programs to others. Cost was clearly a factor in this decision. In the discussion one Senator said the Extended Cabinet had appointed a committee to develop criteria for identifying the top programs. Both the viability process and the attempt to identify the criteria for the best programs would potentially play a major role in the distribution of resources, yet faculty was barely involved in the discussions leading to the creation of the committees, and many of the important decisions were being made by the administration with little faculty input. Certainly the Senate had been outside of the loop. Some Senators argued the administration had clear plans to fund growth in certain areas, and that faculty participation was simply a cover – the claim is that there is faculty participation, but instead we have a strong top-down approach. At a minimum, Senators thought, we had to be involved in discussions at an earlier stage. The Chancellor indicated that she is amenable to that.

OTHER ITEMS DISCUSSED WITH THE CHANCELLOR & PROVOST

Deans: There are two searches going on, in the School of Nursing and the Law School. Ted Sheldon is retiring as Library Dean in June. John Cleek is leaving his position as Education School Dean on Friday, Oct. 24th on a sabbatical to investigate possibilities for distance and continuing education. When he returns he will be involved with that program. Ballard denied that he was recreating the old Continuing Education position held by Kerry Kerber, and thought there wouldn't be the funding conflicts that existed then. He mentioned the possibility of partnerships in the Northland and in Northwest Missouri. Cleek had only been recently appointed a dean of the Education School, and there were some questions about why he was leaving that position so soon. Ballard reiterated his previous statement that he had a high opinion of Cleek.

Student Learning Centers: These are being studied and a task force has been set up with facilities people and system people that know parking. Senators commented that it would be appropriate to have librarians and faculty on the committee.

Retirement options: There was a way, under the tax laws, of deferring tax on retirement funds. Up to \$40,000 could be put into a retirement fund annually. Individuals could put their own money in, but they had to be a steady annual commitment that couldn't be changed. The university could put one-time money in, and that raised the possibility of using the fund to reward people or use it as a recruitment tool. Several Senators pointed out the possibility that the fund could be used inappropriately by the administration, to reward favorites, etc. The Chancellor said that she agreed, and thought the problem had to be

carefully studied, and policies developed. There was also some question about the source of funds. Could end-of-year funds be doled out simply at the discretion of the dean? This should be addressed in the policy also.

Traffic around the university: Last year a student was killed crossing Troost, and there were students crossing all the major streets around the university. The combination of students and vehicles was potentially dangerous. The Chancellor said that she is well aware of the danger, and has been negotiating with the City. Senators suggested road bumps, but the City isn't likely to install these on major thoroughfares, nor are they willing to put in new traffic lights at this point. They are willing to put in major new striping. Some Senators suggested that the area be put under a 25 mile speed limit, like other school zones. The Chancellor said that she would look into that and would continue to work on the problem.

VICE CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH (OCT. 7, 2003)

A Vice Chancellor for Research is to be appointed. S/he was to be a person with a knowledge of the research system, so that UMKC faculty (especially in the Life Sciences) could be linked up with resources and funding opportunities. This involved dealing with the Kauffman Foundation and the community as well as working with the N.I.H., F.I.P.S.E. and other Washington sources of funding. The person should be active in research, and should know the research networks. If they saw opportunities that fitted faculty interests they could try and alert faculty members. An example was the Homeland Security Initiative. No faculty member on this campus had responded to it, though several might have been interested if it had been brought to their attention.

When asked if we didn't already try to link faculty to research opportunities, the response was that an effective point person was needed. There was a short window of opportunity for UMKC to be a part of the life science initiative in Kansas City, and we needed to act. UMC appointed a person to a similar position and funding there almost doubled. Why couldn't it be a Vice Provost for Research, since the Provost was supposed to be in charge of academic issues? Because outside perceptions were important, and a Vice Chancellor would be more respected. Also, the administration expected a different quality of applicant for the Vice Chancellor position. Could it be a Vice Chancellor for Research and Creative Activities? Possibly, though the focus was clearly on the life sciences.

Some Senators were clearly dubious about the creation of a new, high-level, administrative position but the Chancellor and the Provost argued that it was necessary if UMKC was to succeed in a very competitive arena. They noted that the Danforth Report on the Life Sciences had called for the creation of a position like this, but they had let it sit for a while.

INSTITUTE FOR URBAN EDUCATION & OTHER URBAN EDUCATION INITIATIVES (OCT. 7, 2003)

This was a somewhat confusing discussion because two items pertaining to UMKC's involvement in improving urban education were discussed together:

- A memo creating an Institute for Urban Education was signed, but the form, function and role of the new structure isn't clear – it is something of an institute in search of a

purpose, or a structure in search of a function. It did get grant funds from Kauffman. *{Note: The Kansas City Star, on 10/29/03, wrote that Gilliland said "she does not know exactly how the new institute will be organized... or how its creation will affect the current School of Education.... 'Most assuredly, the School of Education, will not exist in its current form,' Gilliland said...." "(She) said the institute will focus on quality in-classroom experience for prospective teachers...." Apparently the College and the Bloch School will also be involved in the project.}* The Institute is supposed to help address the needs of the urban schools in the area.

- The Staff Assembly proposed a UMKC Tutoring Initiative in which faculty, staff and students would help schools, youths and families. Senator Ukpokodu (Education) brought the item up in the Senate for discussion, and proposed that the faculty might consider adopting a school and working intensively with the teachers and students. She said many of the schools were failing, and some teachers lacked subject matter or pedagogical skills. She thought UMKC ought to be able to help in this area.

While Senators were generally sympathetic to the needs of the district, there were questions about the proposed solutions. They noted that UMKC had done several things in the past, like the Math and Science Institute. These were successful, but were discontinued because of lack of funding. This had been a relatively successful program. We also had a creative writing workshop during the summer that would be of interest to many teachers, and there were some other programs. Since we had an administrative structure without a clearly defined purpose, and faculty programs operating without an administrative structure, perhaps we could bring the two together and use the Institute to fund, coordinate and advertise relevant programs more effectively.

Some Senators said there were many problems in the educational system of the area and it was naive to think that we could just step in to solve them. There seemed to be agreement that we should try and see where we could actually make a useful contribution. Since the Extended Cabinet had discussed UMKC's initiatives to assist the KCMO School District, we thought that it might be worthwhile to ask them to make recommendations in this area, taking into account existing programs and looking at past programs that had been effective. Senator Luppino (Law) agreed to draft a resolution on this, and Senator Mirkin (A&S) said he would help. *[Note: Subsequently Luppino followed up on the Executive Cabinet discussion. He was told that the Institute is being encouraged to make coordination of the various projects a key component of its mission, so he thought a Senate resolution seemed premature.]*

ROO PRINTS & EXAMS

In Pharmacy students have brought old exams, with answers, and teacher's comments, down to Roo Prints. These have been put on reserve for other students to look at.

There was a question of policy. Should a university sanctioned copy center appear to condone the behavior by making reprints generally available, or should Roo Print employees refuse to copy the exams and/or put them on reserve? Should a record be kept of students who looked at the exams? Were there privacy issues (since grades and comments were on the exams) or questions of professional conduct? Should only faculty members be allowed to put tests and quizzes on reserve?

On the other hand, did we want to make Roo Print employees into censors? It was also easy to get around any Roo Print ban via the Internet, so any ban would be largely symbolic. Additionally there were privacy problems if students had to sign up to get copies of things on reserve – did we want to start a policy like that at a time when other institutions were erasing records because of the Patriot Act?

Michael Johnson of University Communications was at the Senate meeting, and took part in the discussion. We recommended that only faculty members should be allowed to place academic material on reserve, and that Roo Prints should maintain a log of people who place other types of material on reserve. Johnson was in agreement with these recommendations and said that he would implement them.

FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICY

A faculty workload policy is under consideration by the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC). It attempts to set a workload policy for the university, while allowing unit variation. It is an attempt to get beyond the traditional statement that professors have a nine-hour or a six-hour load, and measure the teaching, research/creative activities, and service activities that are performed. Jakob Waterborg, Senator and IFC Chair, asked for comments on the document and a vote from the Senate as to whether they supported it. Senators thought the policy was vague (as an all campus document had to be) and might not set the right measures. For example, should a large lecture class count for more than a smaller class that has essay exams and papers? Waterborg said these issues had to be worked out within the units. [The proposed policy is on the new faculty senate website at <http://sbs.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/X030916a.pdf>. The current policy is at <http://www.system.missouri.edu/uminfo/rules/bylaws/310090.htm>] The Senate supported the policy 11 to 2, with 5 abstentions. [Note: The Workload policy was also discussed at the Oct. 7th meeting.]

ODDS & ENDS

The *Senate Report* does not normally identify Senators by name, preferring to focus on the flow of arguments. A new student newspaper, *The Aurora*, did cover a previous Senate meeting and attached names to arguments – and it messed up some of the arguments that were made. Some Senators were upset, but we were mindful that Senate meetings are open. We finally adopted a policy that said visitors to Senate meetings should be identified, and that there be no taping of Senate meetings without our explicit knowledge and consent. Your Secretary also said that he would talk with the *Aurora* reporter and explain why he normally leaves names out of the *Reports*. Senate meetings are not always exciting :-)) and there was no *Aurora* reporter present at this one.... At the Oct. 7th meeting the Senate voted to support the SGA resolution on adding sexual orientation to the UM discrimination policy. We did support the resolution, which was subsequently approved by the Curators.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin, Faculty Secretary