

**UMKC Faculty Senate
Draft Minutes
September 2, 2008**

Attendance: G. Ebersole, H. Fieldman, N. Stancel, A. Holsinger, J. Price, S. Honigberg, D. Hopkins, R. Ziskin, L. Potts, C. Davies, C. Beard, K. Williams, J. George, R. Downs, A. Luppino, S. Sykes Berry, S. Alleman, B. Yang, L. Stanley, P. Ward-Smith, P. Marken, W. Gutheil, B. Schubert. **Excused:** C. McArthur, J. Foxworth

Announcements:

- We still need to select a PEC representative. Lou Potts was our representative but he will be on leave
- The next meeting will be on September 23rd because the IFC Retreat occurs on the third Tuesday of the month
- Faculty Senators are invited to attend the grand opening of the renovated Swiney Gym locker room, tomorrow at Noon

Approval of the Minutes:

Minutes for March 4, March 18, April 1, April 15, May 6 and August 19, 2008 were approved

Discussion with Provost Gail Hackett:

S.B.389

The Provost asked Mary Lou Hines Fritts to begin the discussion about the call for information on S.B.389. It is her office that is responsible for implementing what is recommended by Faculty Senate. She needs a decision within the next 4-5 weeks to have enough lead time to post the information on the web.

Ebersole: Background: This process has been two years in the making. Gary Nodlar was the author of the bill and leaders in higher education were able to convince him to modify some of the language. For instance, the language changed from having a Senate subcommittee oversee this process, to having the Department of H.E. oversee it. COPHE worked on guidelines to aid institutions in implementing the law. It was decided that each campus would be allowed to devise its own questions. Information gathered is not to be used for purposes of evaluating faculty and for merit considerations. Access would be limited to students who are currently enrolled for credit. We are a year behind the other campuses in implementation. At Rolla, between 10-15% students responded to the survey. The other campuses have a centralized site on the main page or on the Provost's website. IFC members had concern about not mixing up these questions with the student class evaluations, which are often answered at a 90%+ rate.

Law School concerns: there are serious concerns at the Law School about the implementation of this information. The law actually says that COPHE promulgates rules and regulation and that where feasible, there will be instructor ratings by students. The concern is that this is public information to be shared between thousands of students,

and, is it statistically valid? The Law School already has a student evaluation of faculty using a 1-5 scale so why can't this be used? If schools have pre-existing evaluations we should be able to incorporate them. Is there no appeal process for a unit to use its existing evaluation questions? We at the Law School understood that other academic units shared our concerns about avoiding low response rates and have questions that work for all units. Would it possible to have just one question as the statute just refers to ratings of instructors by students? The Law School doesn't want its response rate to the regular class evaluation to change.

Hospital Hill concerns: The School of Pharmacy has unpaid adjunct faculty on clinical rotations. Many of the courses are team taught. The benefit of this evaluation process is not that great. We need to determine what is the most efficient way to get this done. This is true at the Medical School as well. Does the faculty member who is listed in the class course offering bear the brunt of the evaluations? Hines Fritts said that you won't get an individual ranking. You would get a team ranking. Those in the School of Dentistry believe this can impact graduate programs and there is concern over how the results of the evaluations will be used.

The Provost said that she's had the statistical validity question already and it would be preferable to have a statistician evaluate the questions. CBHE gave us guidelines and the chief academic officers and Provosts met to discuss the issues. The Faculty Senate could do something else, including changing the questions. This whole process is not a very good one, nor does it inform its consumers. We are dealing with an unfunded mandate. V.P. Hines Fritts said that one option is to append questions to the regular class evaluations. Senator Gutheil asked whether we can then pull a subset of the current evaluation questions?—Yes. One suggestion was to withhold a student's grade until the survey is taken. It was noted that there is nothing in the language of the law that says that we have to have a specific response rate to the survey. Senator Luppino asked for verification as to whether each school could decide which of the 3 options they will implement, rather than one option being chosen for the whole university.

Yes—it is possible to do that. V.P Hines Fritts reiterated that option #3 states that you can decide to couple or decouple the evaluation questions. Senator Luppino suggested that we ask for volunteers from the Senate to work on this before it is discussed and voted on at the next meeting. Provost Hackett said that she will send out the questions used at all UM campuses to the Faculty Senate.

Strategic Planning:

Provost Hackett stated that we do not have a strategic plan in place and we must have one before our accreditation review next year. Chancellor Bailey had a short-term plan to “renovate” the campus and deal with the tension and financial issues that he saw. We must have a means to set priorities and the direction we want to go. She would like to put together a committee to work on this. Because we've done so much strategic planning in the past, she would like this to be a truncated process so that we don't duplicate what we already have. There are white papers, plans, etc already in existence. We need to pull all of this documentation, go through it, and use what is appropriate for the new strategic

plan. We can also have subcommittees and task forces created as a means to include more people to work on specific topics (such as the urban mission, undergraduate education). She would like a draft of the plan by the beginning of spring semester. She would like to be able to distribute the draft in January or February for discussion and have town halls, surveys, etc. to evaluate the plan. The makeup of the strategic planning committee would include representation from all academic units and be comprised of a majority of faculty. It would also include representation of staff, community members (a Trustee) and all other major units, such as Student Affairs. The Faculty Senate should appoint a couple of members and the Senate can advise her on the makeup of the committee. She has asked Barbara Glesner-Fines (Chair, Strategic Planning portion of accreditation report) to look at other universities and make recommendations to the Provost on how best to proceed on strategic planning. We can have Ex-officio members. The Deans recommended that she be the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, but it doesn't have to be that way. We need to make very sure that we build in mechanisms to revise the document every year so that it doesn't sit on a shelf. It must be a useful, living document, subject to revision. Barbara also suggested that minutes be taken and that they be put online so that they are assessable to everyone.

The Provost said that we don't have a shared sense of what our urban mission is. We never talk about excellent teacher/student ratio, and that we provide an excellent education with a small college feel in a research university setting. We need to raise our academic reputation while serving a diverse population. How does the university market itself? The faculty needs to take control over this. Chair Ebersole suggested we think about who in our units are able to think strategically and bring names forward. We can use Blackboard as an efficient means to go through this process.

Discussion with Rick Anderson and Bob Simmons: Bus Schedule

The Provost asked Anderson and Simmons to comments on the reduction of bus shuttle service between Hospital Hill and the Volker Campus. When complaints began to hit their offices, they looked at schedules, ridership patterns and how the issue was vetted. Simmons said that campus bus scheduling is usually an uneventful process—usually it's the same as last year. Bus service went only to Cherry Street and not Oak Street. When reviewing campus needs, Simmons announced that first they needed to engage the west side of campus (Oak Street) and secondly, they had to consider the closing of the Troost Bridge, limiting access to the 4825 Troost building. The closure would greatly impact our north-south route. To detour around the bridge reconstruction, the bus route would need to go to Volker, Rockhill, 47th Street, and then back to Troost.

After review, it was decided that there would be fewer circuits to Hospital Hill but we would maintain the same number of stops on the Volker circuit with the same regularity at the expense of Hospital Hill students and faculty. They hadn't engaged the campus community in the process. Once the plan was rolled out, their office began receiving complaints about the new bus schedule. Today, they rolled out a revised schedule that adds two more routes to Troost but there are still gaps in the mid-afternoon. They met with School of Nursing faculty to hear complaints. They are working on a solution to address the needs of Hospital Hill and are seeking alternatives. They are committed to continue to engage in the vetting process to handle this issue. As it turns out, the

demolition of the Troost Bridge may not occur this semester and that will allow some flexibility in the bus schedule. Anderson will speak to the Hospital Hill Deans and Student Affairs Office staff. The result of those conversations was that the bus schedule was revised and it is now very close to last year's schedule. It may have to be revised if the Troost Bridge is demolished.

Sample of Faculty Comments & Responses on bus scheduling:

Question:

Gutheil: Volker has a lot of stops every 15 minutes, but there is a two hour of downtown for Hospital Hill students and it is an impediment to getting to class. Can we run a continuous loop every 30 minutes to Hospital Hill?

Response:

Last year's loop was 45-50 minutes and it may be possible to do this again.

Question:

Fieldman: Could we use a second bus to run between Hospital Hill and Volker, perhaps a smaller one?

Response:

Budget constraints don't allow for us to utilize two buses.

Comment:

Ward Smith: In 2006-07 there were 15 stops and now it's down to 7, at time when our student enrollment has increased. The bus schedule was changed here on a "non-event (demolition of Troost Bridge). Could we not go back to the previous schedule since the demotion has been postponed? The lack of service between 1:00-3:36 is huge and not user friendly. Senator Marken pointed out that this affects graduate students as well.

Ebersole: two issues: 1) we have information about course schedules. The Deans on Hospital Hill can gather the information on the blocks of time students are in class in order to schedule bus runs. A peak time could be identified with this information to move medical students from Hospital Hill to Volker. The Registrars' Office would also have this information; 2) We could ask the campus Parking/Traffic Committee to expand its duties to involve faculty and students to recommend potential bus schedules. If it costs more money, we need to deal with it if our educational mission comes first. Scheduling needs to be a convenience for the students, not for the administration. He suggested that we have Anderson and Simmons talk to the Hospital Hill Deans and students and compile a new bus schedule. The Senate would ask for a report in one month. Senators from Hospital Hill could gather student responses about bus scheduling.

Discussion:

Anderson/Simmons: KCATA and our bus service needs to be coordinated. Possibilities may include giving students bus passes. There will be a good opportunity to coordinate services when a transit line is created on Troost. We can create coordinated stops like it is on Main. The Volker campus is easier to walk than the Hospital Hill campus so perhaps the number of stops on Volker could be decreased.

Question:

Provost Hackett: How do we alert people to pending change? When it's something this big, the message needs to get out.

Response:

Anderson: Changes are sent to UMKC Announcements, current riders are alerted; riders who gave contact information are alerted. They are not usually permitted to do a broadcast message. Simmons suggested that we could add a button to the homepage to alert the change. This has been done in the past.

Dennis Cesari – Parking Issues:

Two documents were handed out. One was a parking regulations update, and the second was a FY09 parking operations budget. He explained that parking operations are self-sufficient so modest parking fee increases will be necessary. A comprehensive campus survey was done on parking. Everyone is concerned about increases in fees but he has to make the budget work. There were many questions about the budget handout such as, what is the earnings before debt service? One Senator asked if we have enough parking so that people don't have to violate the parking rules. The answer was "Yes." The next structure that will need replacing is the Oak Street garage. It will cost about \$25 million dollars to rebuild it and parking fees will increase as a result. It costs \$18,000 per parking space. A consultant was hired to determine what is sufficient parking capacity for the campus. We have sufficient capacity at this point. But, what do we need for the future with the building of the new Student Center? When the Cherry Street dormitory is revamped for administrative offices we will need 80 more parking spaces.

The question of tiered parking came up. Since we have new legal counsel at UM, we might consider revisiting this. Also, parking for visitors is very unfriendly. Perhaps a different kind of meter is needed so people don't feel like they are getting milked for being literally, one minute late. Change machines near coin-operated parking would be helpful.

Parking Operations said that it is promoting a meter card. It's not part of the one-card system. If someone comes in with a fine, they can purchase a meter card for \$25.00. \$5.00 is actually for the card and then \$20.00 credit is on each card to use at the meters. The card can credit and debit your account from the meter. No one at Faculty Senate was aware of this benefit.

One Senator asked when the elevator in the parking structure was going to be repaired. It has been out for about a week. It will be looked into.

Tony Luppino - Budget Update:

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee tracks what the University Budget Committee is doing. The University Budget Committee will meet on September 11 to work on projections for the transition phase of the new budget model. There is new information from the Dental School and the School of Biological Sciences on what is the operational cost to the university for those units. On October 2, the Director of Athletics will talk

about his department's budget needs. There's a lot of interest in this since money was promised to the Athletics Department when he joined the university. The Support and Cost Review Committee will be looking at one dozen schools for model comparisons. The Faculty Senate Budget Committee still needs representatives from the School of Education, the School of Nursing, and the School of Pharmacy.

Sexual Harassment Statement:

Chair Ebersole read the statement. A Senator asked that one word be changed: "criterion" for "characteristics" and this was approved. The motion to approve the statement was unanimous. Faculty can attach this statement to the syllabus so that students have the information. It will be posted on the Provost's webpage as the campus statement.

Adjourned: 5:05PM