

Senate Draft Minutes
Tuesday, 20 March 2018
3:00–5:00 PM
Administration Center, Plaza Room

Present: Linda Mitchell, Gerald Wyckoff, Stephen Dilks, Viviana Grieco, Jacob Marszalek, Ken Novak, Greg Vonnahme, Erik Olsen, JoDee Davis, Roger Pick, Marilyn Taylor, Tara Allen, Ed Gogol, Deb Chatterjee, Ceci Halmen, Melanie Simmer-Beck, Eric Gottman, Michelle Maher, Nancy Murdock, Irma Russell, Jennifer Allsworth, Eduardo Abreu, Margaret Brommelsiek, Hari Bhat, Sandy Rodriguez, Jen Salvo-Eaton, Sybil Wyatt, Drew Rogers

Also Present: Sheri Gormley, Susan Hankins, Diane Fillion, Chris Popoola, Robert Delaware, Tamera Murdoch, Joy Swallow

Excused: Dale Morehouse, Valerie Ruehter

Absent: Tom Mardikes, Da-Ming Zhu, Christopher Holman

I. First Items [5 minutes—Mitchell]

A. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 3 pm.

B. Approval of Agenda

Agenda for today's meeting is approved.

C. Approval of Minutes from 6 March 2018 meeting

Minutes from the last meeting are approved.

II. RIM Deans' Roles and Responsibilities Final Document—Presentation and Discussion [30 minutes—Mitchell and Richard Delaware and Tamera Murdock]

The final document has been circulated to the Faculty Senate and is currently on the website. Though the document is comprehensive, it does not include budget information. It outlines the roles and responsibilities for the Deans regarding the development, deployment and management of budget. The document also outlines the process and the sanctions if the budget is not managed as agreed. The document is transparent and establishes a calendar for addressing concerns and is available for those who have fiscal responsibilities. Department Chairs and program Directors are held to the same standard as Deans and there is a process for removal if budget agreements are not followed. Chairperson Mitchell recommends that the document should be circulated and discussed publicly with all units and constituencies. All organizational leaders should have access to this document. This document is linked to hiring processes as well.

Senators asked if the document applies to faculty with intramural grants and if faculty can be removed from tenure for any such aberration. The document does not refer to such grants; it refers to money generated via revenue and non-restricted funds from the state (green money).

The final version of the Resource Allocation Model will be available next month, and the RIF accounts will be part of this model. We are all locked into staying within our budget. Overspending of start-up accounts and funds are included in the RIF document. Any transgression of budget leads to a process to fix problems. Basically, what is given via the

budget is “fixed.” The budget is based on the previous year and not based on anticipated revenues. Currently, UMKC does not know what the budget will be after July 2018.

Funding from any lost position goes into central budget. All current hiring decisions are strategic; there is a university-wide group that prioritizes hiring. As part of the effort to create budget efficiencies, a committee is analyzing the Administrative Survey. Among other things, they are attempting to accommodate outliers that did not fit into the 88 staff categories and the over 300 subcategories on this survey.

III. Reorganization Updates [30 minutes—Mitchell/Filion and others]

A. Clarification of Deans’ Roles Document

The document does not need to be voted on. The Deans will have a consultative Ex-officio role to minimize conflict of interest. The document will be distributed March 21st and will be on the Faculty Senate website. An implementation document currently being developed.

B. Social Work and School of Education: currently in conversation.

C. Psychology, Counseling, and Educational Psychology: currently in conversation

D. Chemistry and School of Biological Sciences: Chemistry has voted and Biology will vote soon.

E. School of Pharmacy: preliminary stages.

F. Theatre and Conservatory of Music and Dance: gathering information before an implementation committee is formed. Voting has already taken place, so these schools are in an expedited process, but reporting still needs to be done.

Timeline does not start until an implementation committee is formed. Logistics are going to be worked out transparently and will involve all concerned parties. We are following faculty governance and are dealing with the complexities as we proceed.

IV. Budget and Legislative Day Feedback from IFC [5 minutes—Mitchell/Grieco/Marszalek]

Budget and Legislative Day went well according to reports by Dusty Schneiders. There were presentations by the four UM System campuses. Overall, feedback was positive. Fortunately, many of the legislators fully appreciate the value of Higher Education to the State of Missouri. The future is still uncertain, but we feel we are engaged in productive conversations. The Board of Curators will meet in Rolla in mid-April. Also, there will be an IFC meeting in April.

The legislation to restore the bond initiatives to match grants for a new Conservatory building stipulates that the building will proceed on the Volker campus. This expansion is not connected to the budget. The current building needs to be renovated to comply with OSHA. We need to make the situation workable. We are not punishing one group to benefit another; we need to protect the institution so it can continue to be a productive part of Missouri’s future. We need to figure out where we can save money in terms of buildings, but our goal is to be the best university we can be as we go forward.

V. IFC Updates [30 minutes—Mitchell/Grieco/Marszalek]

A. Student Evaluations Task Force and President Choi’s Comments

Candace Schlein and Diane Filion are doing a great job. President Choi is providing constructive feedback. President Choi is encouraging taskforce members to flag those with below a 3 over a two-year period (on a scale of 5). Repeat negative evaluations will be addressed. 10% of faculty have evaluations of this nature.

Mentoring should be a priority. Faculty teaching centers are on all campuses, but they are voluntary and function differently; the evaluation of teaching also varies from campus to campus and unit to unit. The SGA needs to be involved in the conversation about ways to evaluate teaching. Student evaluations should be designed so they lead to productive conversations and the improvement of teaching. Because there are many differences between units, we must move towards a comprehensive plan to improve teaching. One of the goals of the IFC is to develop best practices guidelines. There are many paths to becoming a good teacher, but we need to admit that there are some “bad” teachers and that we all benefit from conversations about best teaching practices. This needs to be done in ways that are sensitive to bias, especially in STEM fields. We also need to use peer evaluations and other ways of evaluating teaching success.

- B. Strategic Plan Subcommittees:** The documents will be available in a month.
- C. Workload Policies and CR&Rs:**

This initiative is being driven by the Board of Curators and is currently under review. Teaching release waivers are being analyzed. Current CRR 310.080 guidelines are that the average should be teaching 9 hours/semester, but the minimum for regular faculty is 12 cr./year and 180 SCH. We are having productive conversations with the Board of Curators and Missouri state legislators about what it means to be research active.
- D. NTT rolling contracts and transition assistance pay task force report:**

A taskforce is working to develop a consistent and coherent plan for 2-year rolling contract renewals. This will help protect ranked NTT in the event contracts are not renewed. In the future, those that are in transition will be eligible for compensation depending on years of service, etc. The taskforce is developing a complex formula that is as fair as possible. CR&Rs are being written as the taskforce works because CR&Rs previously did not exist. The new system should be in place in August.
- E. VPs for IT, Finance, and HR report:** the system is working to identify 20 items that can be subsumed under UM System: examples include calendar regularization; drop/add and withdrawal dates; standardizing student information systems; cross-campus enrollment (students being able to take courses at any system campus without applying as non-degree students and being charged for transcripts).
- F. No clear movement on guns on campus issue:**

Lawsuit between MU faculty member and the University is progressing. Active Shooter training is being offered on all four campuses. Protocols are being developed for removal of students for cause.
- G. Admin Review and Activity Analysis**

The survey is closed and analysis is ongoing. Data is being collated and there will be a report at the next IFC meeting. The survey was labor intensive.

VI. Executive Session [10 minutes]

VII. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5 pm.