UMKC Faculty Senate
Draft Minutes
Tuesday, 17 April 2018, 3:00–5:00 PM
Plaza Room, Administration Center


Also Present: Diane Filion, Sheri Gormley, Jakob Waterborg, John Herron, Jess Magana, Bob Simmons, Lawrence Dreyfus, Sarah Dallas, Jennifer Ingraham, Anthony Caruso, Abdul Baba Ahmed, Susan Hawkins, Jay Wilson, Chris Brown

Excused: Ken Novak, Jennifer Allsworth

Absent: Da-Ming Zhu, Deb Chatterjee, Irma Russell

I. Opening Business [5 minutes]
   A. Call to Order
      Meeting called to order at 3 pm by Chairperson Mitchell.
   B. Approval of Draft Agenda
      The agenda for today’s meeting is approved with no abstentions.
   C. Approval of Minutes for 3 April 2018
      The minutes from the last Faculty Senate meeting are approved with no abstentions.

II. Space Allocation Policy Presentation and Discussion—30 Minutes [Dreyfus / Caruso / Dallas]
Lawrence Dreyfus is the Vice-Chair for Research and Economic Development. The Space Allocation policy was developed in 2004. Space is controlled by the Chancellor and then allocated by the Deans followed by the Chairs. Although some units do not have space, the procedure applies to those units with research space; the College of Arts & Sciences units with research space are Physics, Chemistry, and Psychology. The policy document is currently printed on the Faculty Senate website. There needs to be a more efficient way to define productivity in terms of research space. MyVitae is being used to gather data. Core facilities are defined as protected. Faculty offices are not research spaces so this space allocation policy does not apply; this model only applies to coded research space and any decision on protected space has to be done in collaboration with units. Moreover, vacant spaces will usually be retained by the unit for faculty recruitment. The audit proposed is a two-year audit with space becoming open to re-allocation with consultation with the dean of the unit.

This allocation procedure does not define the transfer of space between units. If an academic unit has a research space that is inactive, we have a procedure for identifying spaces that are
available for discussion. One concern is how we decide who pays for empty space that had been assigned to a specific unit. The new budget, when it comes in, will make it so there is no rent for space, but now units are being charged and research space is a commodity. The procedure is designed to protect deans from charges of capricious uses and faculty from charges of neglect; it establishes procedures for space allocation. Workload policies assess productivity on a five-year plan; this procedure is a 2-year and 4-year plan currently. Perhaps we need to synchronize with the workload policy so that the two chains of command (ORS and Promotion & Tenure) are directly connected. Space allocation will become a compelling issue in the new workload policy.

The space allocation policy could make it so each unit takes responsibility for incorporating the template into the annual evaluation process, giving Deans and Chairs the ability to optimize space while giving them flexibility. Overall, we need to establish standards while avoiding being prescriptive. Procedures need to be ratified by deans. There is Deans’ Council representation of both ORS and Facilities, but this needs to go to the Chairs and Deans before it comes into effect. Moreover, units need to define their own metrics with respect to undergraduate and graduate research. We need discipline-specific criteria and objective metrics that prevent deans from gaming the system. We must identify the faculty who are not making productive use of research space. The faculty members, Chair and Dean of a department need to agree on the terms of research space to help normalize the relationship between different departments and disciplines. This procedure is intended to give deans a template for negotiating.

III. Board of Curators Meeting Report (April 13, 2018 —20 Minutes [IFC Reps and Mitchell])

Day one of the Board of Curators meeting included a roundtable discussion between IFC and S&T faculty representatives, Curators, and some System Administrators, which focused on faculty development and productivity. This conversation developed out of Curators’ wanting to manage workload policies dealing with research, scholarship, and service. The budget situation is unclear because there are two: one from the House of Representatives and other from Senate. It looks as though there is commitment in both houses to higher education and recovering 2017 budget levels (including funding lost). There will be funding at a minimum of 60% for line items for collaborative pharmacy and dental projects. The Conservatory was not discussed.

There is interest in changing how the university operates, but there is also a commitment by President Choi to protect uniqueness of each campus. The university task force is looking at a document from 1963 that provides a loose definition of the university: CRR 20.010 uses the term “One University” and we are now trying to figure out what that means. Topics include: multiple flagships, role of vice chancellors and vice-presidents, curator authority, accreditation, combined programs, system-ness, and the relationship between the president and chancellors. It must be noted that the AAU designation at MU would be jeopardized if we had one accreditation. We need the IFC to be involved in this process. The fear is that this might be decided in the executive session without faculty input. This will be discussed at IFC on April 20th. We need to discuss open meetings policy.
IV. UMKC Foundation Report—20 Minutes [Jay Wilson]
UMKC Foundation is undergoing changes and new leadership. We are coordinating to support the Conservatory capital campaign and Spencer Chemistry and Health Sciences lab renovations. Extension of Flarsheim is also taking place. UMKC Foundations engage with alumni officers and encourage faculty and staff to share ideas for major projects. The last campaign ended June 30, 2016 and we expect the new Chancellor to bring innovative ideas for renewed fundraising. The Conservatory decision is likely to be postponed until the next legislative session. Senators appreciate UMKC Foundation’s sustained efforts to build and maintain relationships with the community.

V. UMKC Strategic Plan Presentation—30 Minutes [Chris Brown]
We are currently in the vetting stage and looking for input. Co-chairs of the Strategic Plan Committee are Chris Brown, Carol Hintz, and Ted White. The Strategic Plan is a 5-year plan with drafting starting November 2017. The final draft should be complete by May 15th in preparation for the general summit on strategic planning in June. The Strategic Plan has six UMKC commitments plus Chancellor’s Pillars; these are also connected to the President’s 5 Compacts, which are components in the system-wide strategic plan template. We have appointed people to lead each commitment. We have also identified goals, objectives and tasks needed to implement this plan. Moreover, we need to identify numbers that are connected to what is possible considering aspirational and peer institutions. Comments on the Strategic Plan need to be sent to Chairperson Mitchell, so they can be forwarded to co-chairs by April 26th. Because UMKC’s Strategic plan is very different from the other campuses, it needs to be formatted to be consistent with the other campuses. The Executive Summary needs to be readable by Curators, while we retain a sense of our individuality. The more complex document can be retained for UMKC, but we need to have an Executive Summary that meets President Choi’s requirements while allowing the new chancellor room to grow.

VI. Adjournment
The open Faculty meeting is May 1st and will discuss RIM and budget. Meeting adjourned at 4:58 pm.