**Regular UMKC Faculty Senate Meeting (MINUTES)**

**Jan. 17th, 2017**

**Plaza Room, Administrative Center**

**3-5P**

**Present:** Gerald Wyckoff, Kathleen Kilway, Linda Mitchell, Nancy Stancel, Viviana Grieco, Kathy Krause, Ken Novak, Greg Vonnahme, David Van Horn, Dee Anna Hiett, Dale Morehouse, Marilyn Taylor, Ed Gogol, Deb Chatterjee, Ceki Halmen, Melanie Simmer-Beck, Michelle Maher, Jacob Marszalek, Christopher Holman, Jennifer Allsworth, Eduardo Abreu, Bi-Botti Youan, Valerie Rheuter, Nara Newcomer, Jen Salvo-Eaton, Sybil Wyatt

**Also Present:** Leo Morton, Provost Bichelmeyer, Sharon Lindenbaum, Sungyup Kim

**Excused:** none

**Absent:** Jerzy Wrobel, Roger Pick, Leo Dobens, Jack Nelson, Phil Bryne, Navia Sane, Margaret Brommelsiek

1. **Welcome and Informational items (Wyckoff) 2 minutes**

Meeting opened at 3:01 pm.

1. **Approval of Minutes and Draft Agenda (Wyckoff) 3 minutes**

The agenda for today’s meeting and the minutes from the last meeting are approved.

1. **Discussion in re: CIE for upcoming year (Chair Wyckoff) 30 minutes**

Chairperson Wyckoff encourages the senators to review the ORS taskforce minutes which are currently on the Faculty Senate website. The goal of the ORS taskforce is to discuss how the ORS is functioning and to review generally those functions. Wyckoff further discusses how the CIE will be restructured in the upcoming year. The goal of the CIE is to data driven organization that completes regular reviews of operational and administrative units. These reviews should be completed within a year. To complete reviews in a timely manner, the taskforces should have about 3 to 4 members (currently, taskforces have 4 to 10 members). Wyckoff proposes that the SOP used for the CIE needs to be radically redone. He proposes three-membered taskforces which have a set process that they follow. Moreover, there should be a CIE chairperson that oversees the taskforces to make sure that they follow the set process.

Furthermore, the feedback from the ORS survey is needed to establish standard questions for a faculty survey. THE CIE standardization document is currently on the Faculty Senate website. Wyckoff asks senators if the 3-membered subcommittees/taskforces should be all Senate members or just one senator. To have the subcommittees work more efficiently, further discussions about how to pick members, handling conflict of interest, etc. must be done. The four taskforces include: ORS, Athletics, Student Affairs, and Advancement. The Advancement taskforce has to be rebooted. Senator Gogol is the current chair of the CIE and wants to resign. His replacement must be a senator and his or her role would be to make sure the taskforces run efficiently, the SOP is well formed, and meetings are on a regular basis. Wyckoff proposes that the CIE should run January to December.

The taskforces are charged with knowing what functions the administrative body (ORS, Athletics, Student Affairs, and Advancement) is carrying out, how efficiently the administrative body is carrying out these processes, and how that administrative body is helping the university. In the past, taskforce reports have been given by the heads of the taskforces on a rotating basis via a presentation. Moreover, major issues include: knowing how administrative unit budgets are spent and being able to make recommendations to alter the mission when there are budget discrepancies. Senators suggest a written annual report which may result in increased workload for many people, like the CFO. Also, senators hope that the new Vice-Provost of Institutional Effectiveness will build a conduit between administration and Faculty Senate to allow for a more efficient work to be done by the CIE. Provost Bichelmeyer suggests the need for strategic data development and a database/dashboard where standard/general questions for administrative surveys could easily be accessed. The provost suggest that these questions should be faculty driven, but that the Vice-Provost of Institutional Effectiveness could be of assistance as well. Furthermore, Chancellor Morton suggest that the survey of the units at the UM System level should also be implemented here at UMKC.

1. **Provosts Update and Questions (Provost Bichelmeyer) 25 minutes**

Provost Bichelmeyer’s presentation is currently on the Faculty Senate website. The current political landscape in Missouri includes the new president, governor, and 5 curators on a board of 9. The recensions in funding are due to legislation and not the governor. There is more financial competition at the state level. The provost also discusses SB389 dealing with tuition and fees at the undergraduate level. Budget cuts within the next six months include: $150 million state, $55 million core costs, $31 million UM System (with a $10.5 million UMKC cut). Although the legislature emphasized the need for collaboration, due to scarce resources, the UM System has to prioritize its collaborations. UM System collaborations have faced a major cut. State cuts include: UMKC/MSU Pharmacy Program $808,331; UMKC/MSSU Dental Program $404,166; UMKC Neighborhood Initiative $215,556; UMKC Free Enterprise Center $3,300,000. Core cut value is $5.8 million.

The provost emphasizes that despite the budget cuts, there is no need to panic. In order to combat this hardship, members of the UMKC community have to work and think differently. For example, there needs to be significant pushing back on SB389 dealing with tuition and fees. Opportunities for growth involves analyzing the academic portfolio review that will be out this spring. There will also be a resource allocation model review in the future. The provost has met with various committees on campus to ask for feedback about the budget model.

Chancellor Leo Morton emphasizes the needs to fight for every dollar the State allocates despite the fact that the State can pull funding at any time. 80% of UMKC’s costs is in salaries and therefore, as a university, we have to make sure that we have a solid revenue to support those financial commitments. We receive about $75 million from the state and the cutting of $5.8 million is about 1/3 of our revenue. Net tuition is about $120 million. The core cut is about $1.6 million in revenue loss per month. The cut in the pharmacy program is very significant because it is in its third year of operation in Springfield. The commitment from the state for the pharmacy program was originally $2 million a year.

According to Chancellor Morton, UMKC is currently reviewing shared services, the academic portfolio, CIE initiatives involving administrative functions. There will also be a tuitions and fees structure review in the future. The hiring committee is helping to manage 80% of costs. The chancellor suggest that in order to combat this financial situation as much as we can as a university community, we have to pay attention to costs. He is open to suggestions because transparency is key.

On Thursday, January 19th, the provost will meet with general officers of the UM system to discuss revenue opportunities. The provost suggests implementing innovative programming and other revenue opportunities, such as non-credit bearing courses and having a corporate college. Because UMKC is on the border of Kansas, it is in a “free trade” zone and UMKC cannot compete with community colleges. Prices are depressed because of lack of competiveness. To combat this, we need to educate the public about education. Retention rates are a number one issue for maintaining numbers. As a university, we need to be more engaged in order to tell the UMKC story better. Senators suggests that scholarships, like Bright Flight need to be included here at UMKC. Also, we must encourage more undergraduates to engage with graduate and professional schools.

1. **Upcoming Agenda Items (Past-chair Kilway) 30 minutes**

Past-Chair Kilway’s presentation is currently on the Faculty Senate website. Kilway reviews the discussion items from Fall 2016 that include the Chancellor’s Report, MCOM, and Graduate Student Health Insurance. The Dean’s Evaluations, Values Statement, CR&Rs, five-year post-tenure review, and the Reorganization Taskforce are all ongoing discussion items in the Spring 2017 semester. Upcoming discussion items also include: CIE review committees, budget model presentation and feedback, academic portfolio review, and General Education 2.0 taskforce. Other suggestions from senators include having P&T evaluations of research and scholarships, Faculty Senate’s roles and duties, resolution of student insurance issues, a roundtable discussion with master teachers that can be coordinated through FaCET, and having ORS at a senate meeting.

1. **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:19 pm.