**Regular UMKC Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)**

**Tuesday, October 3rd, 2017**

**Plaza Room, Administrative Center**

**3-5PM**

**Present:** Linda E. Mitchell, Gerald Wyckoff, Stephen Dilks, Viviana Greico, Jacob Marszalek, Tom Mardikes, Ken Novak, Greg Vonnahme, Erik Olsen, JoDee Davis, Dale Morehouse, Roger Pick, Marilyn Taylor, Tara Allen, Ed Gogol, Deb Chatterjee, Ceki Halmen, Melanie Simmer-Beck, Eric Gottman, Michelle Maher, Christopher Holman, Jenifer Allsworth, Eduardo Abreu, Valerie Ruehter, Sybil Wyatt, Sandy Rodriguez, Jen Salvo-Eaton, Drew Rogers

**Also Present:** Provost Bichelmeyer, Mark Johnson, Melissa Wharton, Ted Stahl, Chris Popoola

**Absent:** Da-Ming Zhu, Nancy Murdoch, Irma Russell

**Excused:** Ken Novak, Margaret Brommelsiek

**I. Call to Order [Mitchell] (5 minutes)**

Meeting called to order at 3 pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

The agenda for today’s meeting is approved.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

The Minutes from the last meeting are approved with one abstention.

**II. Curators Meeting [Wyckoff / Dilks] (10 minutes)**

Past Chair and Chair-elect Wyckoff and Dilks discuss the Curators’ Breakfast and Meeting. The breakfast included a presentation by Dr Jane Greer on the SEARCH program and other efforts to sponsor student research, which was well received by the curators and guests. At the meeting, the Curators approved funding to an outside group, 160over90, to promote the “branding” of UM-Columbia to help improve its public image. The Curators are working diligently to repair MU’s reputation nationally and we need to support these efforts; however, we also need to ensure that the strengths of each campus are not occluded. To that end a discussion ensued among the Curators about what similar branding opportunities would accrue to the other three universities in the System. There is no clear consensus on the part of the Curators about what will be done following the UM-Columbia branding campaign. Past Chair Wyckoff, who attended the meeting, also expressed concern that some of the new curators are referring to the idea of the University of Missouri System as “antiquated” and that there might be other pushes—such as a visit by UM-Columbia with the Stowers Institute in order to look at greater collaboration between the Columbia campus and Stowers—that might have an adverse impact on UMKC. As no conclusions or policies have been altered, this remains very much in the form of speculation, but it is important for the IFC to remain vigilant about policy changes coming from the Board of Curators.

**III. Provost’s Update [Bichelmeyer]**

Provost Bichelmeyer elaborates on UMKC’s identity in the UM System. UMKC is different than MU and brings different strengths and values not only to the state of Missouri, but also to students. The provost describes strategies to make UMKC stronger and more competitive, such as research-infused instruction and preparation of students not only for careers and education but also for lifelong learning. Although UMKC needs to be stronger independently, as a university, we still need to support MU. The provost sent a letter to President Choi to ask for a system-wide conversation, so UMKC can be involved in the rebranding conversation and be part of the campaign. If this campaign goes to cities only and does not respond to challenges and competition from MSU and UCM, then we will be balkanizing our institution. Unfortunately, President Choi’s response to the letter stated that MU is more important now as MU tries to repair its reputation. As a campus, UMKC needs to take control of its own future and organize for expansion and success. To ensure System-ness, the faculty voice needs to insist that the role of UM System is designed to support all FOUR institutions, making sure they are all strong and robust. The faculty voice is supremely critical in this matter.

UMKC needs to become more strategic as a university. We are working on controlling our controllables (finances, enrollment, research, and community service). MU is currently in an existential crisis and UMKC needs to avoid having a similar crisis.

UMKC went into the 2017 financial year with $4.5 million deficit budgeted, but unfortunately, we have not been strategic in scholarships and enrolment management, which has led to a $6.8 million gap.

The administrative portfolio review is underway and we are looking to coordinate our retention strategies. We need to address retention because tuition is our critical source of revenue. We will be initiating student focus groups; the Climate Study suggests ways to work and positive experiences for students. We need to get serious about recruitment. The results were presented to the deans on October 2nd. We are well positioned to get started in the upcoming spring and summer semesters. The Academic Portfolio Review will definitely help with enrollment management. A campus wide academic development group was made of associate deans to propose ways forward. Also, non-credit bearing programing is a way to raise revenue: we can control such courses internally.

Regarding the downtown arts campus, we need to hold on to donors who have already committed. We will take this project to the Curators in November.

The report from Mike Alden, the outside consultant who was engaged by a group of donors, and his group concerning Intercollegiate Athletics is scheduled to be completed late in 2017; the CIE Task Force Report will be shared with him but we do not yet know any recommendations he might decide to make.

Repairs to the Oak Place apartment complex will be financially significant; we are still gathering information and working out who is responsible and how to fix the problems so that there is minimum inconvenience to residents.

Decisions as to how to begin implementation of the new Gen Ed 2.0 program will be announced sometime around October 15th. The Provost/Interim Chancellor will address some of the concerns raised by members of the faculty about the implementation model, but emphasizes that there are specific elements to the program that UMKC must demonstrate as existing in order to be competitive with other institutions, to be able for both the university and students to have the tools to measure success (such as e-portfolio systems) and that we must maintain our commitment to operating from an understanding of data analysis in order to provide the best results for students.

Again, the Administrative Review is in process and will provide goals and feedback. We need to generate revenue and cost cutting and create a financial margin so we can take better control of our own destiny.

**IV. Government Relations Search [Grieco / Marszalek / Mitchell]**

IFC Representative Grieco states that the Government Relations search is going well. We need someone who has a positive relationship with the current government. We need someone who can track legislation and who can generate legislation that is beneficial to the UM System. Five top candidates have been identified and President Choi is getting feedback and is going to choose. There may be one more stage of candidate review. The process is strictly confidential to protect the careers of candidates. We are also working with a firm that lobbies at the federal level. We will be following President Choi’s lead, but there is some urgency because we are already behind with this; the state legislative session is already underway.

**V. FS Budget Committee [Mark Johnson]**

The FSBC met to review the September 14th presentation on the Academic Portfolio Review. There were 200 slides of data. The data is unit by unit, and program by program. There were some problems with the way RPK evaluated teacher/student ratios and capacity analysis because room capacity was used to evaluate “fill ratios” when this does not actually reflect the ways in which class size is organized. Still, the data shows that we are vastly under capacity and suggests that we need to have larger sections for many undergraduate and graduate classes. If we increase sections by 20%, we can generate significant dollars. We have a large part-time faculty. We are 30% below national average for full-time faculty. It is worth noting that one-on-one instruction is excluded from the data, as are research-classrooms: this means that the numbers may look better than they are.

Johnson shares with senators that if their unit does not have a functional budget committee, it is time to organize one because there are a lot of data to be processed. The FSBC is currently awaiting final financial numbers. The FSBC is not sure how many pieces or what the overall picture looks like, but every unit needs a budget committee to process this data to be more open and transparent. This impressive amount of data will first come to the Faculty Senate budget committee and Dean’s office. The FSBC is looking to open the process to the units so that the unit is responsible for distributing data to the department level. Chairs need to have the conversation and work with the data and reinforce the need to distribute and analyze this budget data.

**VI. Annual Enrollment and Changes to the PPO Plan [Ted Stahl] (20 minutes)**

Ted Stahl’s presentation is currently on the Faculty Senate website. Active enrollment remains. Annual Enrollment meetings are October 9th and 11th-13th. Vision care is changing to EyeMed ([www.eyemedvisioncare.com/locator](http://www.eyemedvisioncare.com/locator)).

**VII. Discussion of Possible Changes to Scheduling Grid [Mitchell] (30 minutes)**

Chairperson Mitchell shares that the scheduling grid needs to be part of the strategic plan. The grid should be pedagogically and student driven. Also, the grid should accommodate research.

The grid should deliver education in most effective ways. Suggestions for ways in which to alter the current standard grid include more times for 2-day-aweek classes on MW, TR, and WF. MWF class times will be included in the grid to accommodate units that need that schedule. One-day-a-week classes could be offered on Fridays from 10am-12:45pm and 1pm-3:45pm. Evening schedules, which are already fairly flexible, would not have to be altered. Saturday sections could be added to accommodate student needs as well. This schedule grid needs to be coordinated with units that have received waivers (such as the Conservatory, the Bloch School, and the Law School). Current policy about the space/occupancy breakdown is that ideal occupancy is 40% at 7-10am; 40% at 11am-1pm; and 20% at 2-4pm. This breakdown does not meet the pedagogic or preference needs of the students. Classroom space needs to be a matter of pedagogy. Senators are encouraged to ask schedulers what might work best. Chairperson Mitchell will develop a number of draft grids and will distribute them for discussion at the November senate meeting.

**VIII. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.