

Overview – School of Pharmacy – Positions on New Senate Representation Model Compiled by Mark E. Patterson, Associate Professor SOP – 02/16/22

In summary, the School of Pharmacy favors 2 senators per unit is the best model. Some of the rationale provided includes making a more “even playing field” across large versus small units; especially focused on ensuring that small units get represented in “equal” weight as other units across campus. Furthermore, School of Pharmacy feels that 2 Senators are sufficient for our unit. With regards to building in representation for non-Tenure track, most responders mentioned that NNT representation would be ideal, but not necessary, contingent upon the elected Senators were representing all constituencies (i.e., NNT and TT) at our school. Multiple faculty members mentioned that NNT representation could be achieved by NNT faculty selecting to serve as a Senator, and that requiring some type of ‘quota’ may not be necessary, unless currently we are experiencing an issue with NNT under-representation. If that is the case, some mechanisms were suggested, such as creating an ‘at large’ member representing NTT of UMKC faculty as a whole, a mechanism that could be built into proposed as a new bylaw. More detailed responses are below.

Question 1: Do you believe 2 senators is sufficient representation for the School of Pharmacy?

- *2 Senators (“US Senate model”) is better compared to representative model (“US House of Reps”)*
- *Two senators per unit is far preferable to avoid under-representation of smaller units.*
- *Doing it proportionally tips the balance needlessly to the large units. Two people in a large or small unit are sufficient to convey the will of their faculty on a given issue.*
- *I think 2 reps/unit provides enough of a voice for faculty and will keep it more of an even playing field*
- *I don’t support increasing beyond 2 the number of senators per school. I think if the senate has an ever-increasing number of reps – then it becomes unwieldy and larger schools would have more influence potentially.*
- *I don’t think that the creation of additional schools with the increased representation of 2 senators will dilute the power of our senators. The influence of a given senator mostly comes from the individuals that represent versus the numbers....*
- *I prefer the Faculty Senate structured as a Senate, rather than as a house- so I think units should have a fixed number of reps. I’ll note several issues: By the book, the School of Medicine has enough faculty to be weighted very heavily- we actually had to do an exercise to determine how to count “voting” faculty in SOM and it was painful process.*
- *I favor the idea that there is a fixed number of reps per school- I think 2 is fine, and I don’t think any school regardless of size or composition should have more. The College claimed 4 seats (1 rep for each “division” and an at large member) and, to my mind, it caused a number of issues.*

Question 2: Do you believe we (as School of Pharmacy) need more representation from non-Tenure track?

General Comments

- I think it would be good to have more representation from NTT
- It would be optimal if one rep was tenured, and one was non-tenured.\

Ideally nice, but not necessary b/c Senators represent the voice of all – both NNT and TT— within unit

- It would be nice to have NTT representative; however, I think if a senator is doing their job correctly, they can represent the views and opinions of faculty from either track. I don't think it's necessary to put "rules" on who can run for the senate positions within the SOP.
- Although I think it might be useful to have one senator from each track b/c there is no substitute for personal experience; ideally any senator would fully represent all constituents through input from those constituents, so the required representation may not be necessary.
- I think it is incumbent on the senator to represent the views of the constituents and understand the needs of the faculty of the school. I don't think there is an inherent benefit to specifying one as NTT.
- Units should be internally selecting appropriate senators who will be representing our unit for both NTT and TT faculty.

Incumbent upon the unit to encourage NNT to run for Senate if these views want to be represented

- Senators elected should be able to ensure that NTT concerns or views are considered as issues arise on Senate. I feel if NTT wants more representation from the SOP then they should consider running
- In terms of NTT v TT – this is an elected position – if we want NTT folks to represent – then we need to be nominating and electing such folks.

NNT vs. TT in theory shouldn't be relevant

- I do not think tracks should really play a role. Academia needs both tracks to serve all its missions. The senate should be a representative body for the faculty, and a senator should be considering issues on the basis of what is good for the faculty body at large, not one segment vs. another.

NNT vs. TT representation mechanism should only be instituted if there is indeed a problem.

- All that being stated, if NT views are not being represented at the broader level, then that is unfortunate, and a mechanism should be developed to help ensure equal representation.
- If there is a desire to have more representation from NTT faculty, I /would/ favor the creation of an "at large" member representing NTT elected by voting-eligible NTT faculty on the Senate- that member could be, by bylaw, on the FSEC.