

Report

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

October 19, 1999

oops....

We might have unfairly blamed the Provost

The Senate assumed we were on her calendar. Maybe we weren't. See p. 5

Note: The Senate met with Interim Chancellor Lamb and, later in the session, with Vice-Chancellor Jensen. The meeting with Lamb was, at most, moderately productive. He has many strengths, but engaging in a dialogue

with the Senate is not one of them. He allows too little time for the Senate visits, discourages questions, and gives very brief and superficial answers to those that do get asked.

On the other hand, the Chancellor did present some interesting ideas when he discussed the Urban and Life Sciences Initiatives. (See p. 3) Unfortunately, since Senators did ask some questions in the early part of his presentation, he did not schedule enough time to fully explain these. Apparently he has been heavily involved in developing these programs.

The discussion with Jensen (on parking policy and the proposed parking structure) was worthwhile, and there was a good exchange of information and views.

AAUP

Representatives from the national and State AAUP organizations will visit the Senate on November 2, from around 3:00 to 4:30. Senate meetings are in the Plaza Room of the Administrative Center and are open to all faculty, so come to the meeting if you are interested. Please try to call the Senate office at 1027 so we have an idea of the number of people that intend to come.

Additionally, the AAUP representatives will be able to meet with interested faculty at 2:00, before the Senate meeting, in the Plaza room.

¹ This is just my opinion, of course. One Senator commented on the Senate Mailing List (Senate@umkc.edu):

[This paragraph] is an ad hominem slap.... I suggest the following changes:

(1) Drop the sentence "He has many strengths, but engaging in a dialogue with the Senate is not one of them." (If you put this wording to a vote of the Senate, I doubt that it would receive a majority endorsement. I think that many Senators find his directness and willingness not to just say what we want to hear refreshing.)

(2) Change the sentence "He allows too little time for the Senate visits, discourages questions and gives very brief and superficial answers" to "Although his answers are direct, he allows too little time for Senate visits and consequently gives very brief answers."

As the letter states, other Senators might disagree with me too. I think that most would agree. The italicized portion of the Report is my personal opinion. I try to keep the main part reasonably objective.

MEETING WITH INTERIM CHANCELLOR LAMB

The Interim Chancellor started the meeting by congratulating Ed Mills, Senate Chair, on his selection as Educator of the Year by the Missouri Governor's Council on Disabilities. He then touched on a number of issues in brief answers to Senate questions:

Continuing Education: The problem wasn't that the policy was vague or flawed -- it was getting things in conformity with the policy. Various issues are being looked at.

Plans for Administrative Budget Reductions: There will be budgetary reductions in this area, but we are talking about the year 2001 and specific reductions had not been decided upon. Lamb said that the cuts would be substantial, larger than in the academic area.

Strategic Plan Core Values: A letter is out asking people to come to 2 different conversations to discuss the core values that underlie the Mission and Visions statements.

Sports Program Costs: The Interim Chancellor didn't remember saying there would be a technical audit, but he did want to improve the budgeting procedure. The new athletic director, Bob Thomas, is charged with doing this. Lamb said that the program had not gone over its budget.

Grievance Committees: The Interim Chancellor said that Grievance Committee Reports were recommendations to him. He took them seriously but didn't always go along with their recommendations.

Improving Faculty/Administrative Communication: There was actually some discussion about this item, and the Chancellor paid attention. Several Senators argued that the University should not be hierarchical, like a corporation. Rather there were separate administrative and faculty spheres, and the two groups needed to work together if the university was to function effectively. For example, when budget decisions were made by the administration these impacted the faculty spheres of curriculum, teaching and research, and it was important that there be coordination and consultation.

The Interim Chancellor said that he did work with the faculty -- through the deans and directors, ☺ who were the highest academic officers. His assumption was that they were talking with the faculty. He did want to involve the Deans and Directors more in decision making, and apparently does expect them to consult with faculty.

An example of lack of communication, one Senator said, was that the Physical Facilities Planning Committee had never been told of the money that was to be spent on refurbishing the Chancellor's residence. The Interim Chancellor replied that no decisions had yet been made -- the Kansas City Star article was written on the basis of a study of the repairs that were needed, not a proposal to spend money. When a proposal was to be made it would be sent to the Physical Facilities Committee.

Mission Enhancement Money Spent on Endowed Chairs: The Chancellor denied that the money was inappropriately spent, and said that the Senators who knew about the issue should meet with Bill French. There was some discussion of the search committees for the Endowed Chairs. Lamb thought it was appropriate for deans to appoint the faculty members of search committees, but as a normal rule he did not think they should chair them.

Jerry Jensen Appointment as Vice-Chancellor: Lamb said that he was important to have some sense of stability in the administration as the new Chancellor came in, and he thought that Jensen was doing a good job of pulling things together. The appointment was a limited term appointment until December 31, 2000. After that his term is up and he would need to be reappointed. (All administrative appointments were at the pleasure of the Chancellor, but the limited term appointment made it more crisp.)

Urban and Life Sciences Initiatives: These were issues that the Interim Chancellor really wanted to talk about, but he ran out of time. They sounded interesting. The initiatives were an attempt to work with the city, to develop projects that would benefit both the urban area and the university. In the Urban Initiative 5 or 6 different task forces were developed, and the groups would focus on various topics. Contact Bill Eddy for more information. The Life Science initiative is similar, in that it seemed important to coordinate some of the research activities that were taking place in the city. Provost Smelstor is the contact person for this. The Chancellor said would benefit the city and the university if we could draw together a scientific agenda and share in the research.

VICE-CHANCELLOR JENSEN

Jensen came to discuss parking. He showed several pictures of a proposed parking structure that he hoped could be built on the 52nd and Rockhill student parking lot. The structure would create about 1,000 new spaces and would alleviate or solve current parking problems. The problem is that it would cost about \$14 million, and \$900,000 a year would be needed to pay off the 6%, 30-year bonds. The funds couldn't come from the state but had to come from parking revenues. It would be necessary to raise student parking fees about \$40 to \$50 a semester, and to raise faculty fees from \$15 to \$25 a month. The increase would not go into effect until September 2001, when the structure is scheduled to open. A recommendation needed to be made by December 1, 1999 since the university issues its bonds in January. Jensen thought that if we waited another year construction costs would go up. In the short term enough parking spaces could be found in the area to alleviate the parking problems while the structure was being built.

The faculty/staff increase would be for all faculty and staff, including those on hospital hill, but it would soon generate a surplus that could be used to alleviate parking problems

in that area. Jensen said that many other alternatives (like satellite parking) had been looked at but he didn't think that they would work on this campus. People here were used to parking close to where they were going.

Jensen had gone before the student government and they thought it was necessary to go ahead with the plan. The Senate did not have a formal vote, but most Senators seemed to think the structure was needed.

Discussion then turned to general parking problems on campus. Jensen said that he was trying to create a more cooperative atmosphere on campus, and the police were instructed to be flexible and civil. On the other hand there were some parking rules that needed to be enforced, and it wasn't fair to students if faculty used their spaces. There is a Parking Task Force and suggestions for alleviating parking issues should be made to one of the committee members² or to Bruce Bubacz, (Philosophy) Chair [Tel: 2814, e-mail: bubacz@umkc.edu]. Several suggestions were made at the meeting, and Jensen thought many of them were worth study. Among the ideas:

- Use differential fees to encourage people to use satellite parking.
- Have some kind of system so that faculty with unusually tight schedules at certain times could park in reserved places without getting tickets.
- Have signs in lots indicating where there were parking spaces available.
- Refurbish the spaces in the basement of Twin Oaks so that they were safe and useable.
- Don't let university vans park in prime spaces all day -- they can use satellite areas until they are needed,
- Reduce the number of stops that shuttle busses make, so that people can use them to get from one building to another during the break in between classes.

Jensen urged that faculty in the different units contact members of the Parking Task Force if they had particular parking problems or suggestions. He was also available if people needed to reach him directly. There is a web site for the task force at

² Jagannath Agrawal, Computer Science Telecommunications; Tom Barry, Extended Programs; Bryan Becker, Engineering Program; Bruce Bubacz, Chair, Arts & Sciences; Mary Burgess, University Libraries; Raymond Burich, School of Biological Sciences; Michelle Cone, Manager, Parking Control and Operations; Bill Phillips, University Center; Jerry Garrett, University Police; Gale Hankins, School of Dentistry; Patricia Higdon, Conservatory of Music; Judy Hileman, School of Nursing; Arthur (Gus) Jacobs, School of Education; Jerry Jensen, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs; Agapito Mendoza, Affirmative; Action Randy Pembroke, Associate Dean, Conservatory of Music; Pat Randolph, School of Law; Bill Phillips, Student Affairs; Stacie Sheeley, Administrative Affairs; Joe Singer, Bloch School of Business & Public Administration; Barbara Smith, University Communications; Gary Swanson, Campus Facilities Management.

<http://www.umkc.edu/html/umkc/ptf/19990915min-01.html> but only some minutes are there now.

GENERAL SENATE DISCUSSION

The Senate discussed **how to improve the meetings with the administration**. Some people were reluctant to speak up on issues, while others simply felt unprepared. We decided that it would be best to have questions assigned to designated Senators who could speak for the whole Senate and would be prepared to lead the discussions.

We briefly discussed the role of the **Budget Committee**. The Provost had already agreed to meet on a regular basis with the committee. In the interim Kathy Loncar, former Senate Chair, sat in on budget discussions. We urged the Budget committee to contact Smelstor and make arrangements to meet with her about the budget.

As highlighted in the box on the first page, the Senate discussed the possibility that there had been a **mis-communication with the Provost**. We had assumed, for a variety of reasons, that we were on her calendar. Apparently we were not. So, when the Senate Chair asked her to come to the Senate and had a list of questions that Senators wished to address, what appeared to the Senate to be a normal meeting might have appeared to the Interim Provost to be a hostile, or rude, or arrogant act. We don't know, but Senators will try and contact the Provost and find out what happened.

AAUP: The AAUP is coming to the November 2 meeting of the Senate. Someone from the national office will come as well as the state AAUP chairman. Senators indicated that they were interested in issues of faculty governance -- how other faculty systems work and what we can do to make our system more effective.

The Report of the previous meeting had not yet been distributed through the campus mail, so approval was delayed until the next meeting. Also this Report has not yet been officially approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,
Faculty Secretary