

Minutes
UMKC Faculty Senate
Tuesday, May 4, 2021
3-5pm, ZOOM

Present: Fields, Godley, Torres, Hunt, Wellemeyer, Kilway, Mardikes, Pluta, Grieco, Bhat, Grimes, Kador, Turla, Maher, VanHorn, Keeton, Shiu, Olsen, Berkel, Dilks, Robinson, Hiett, Boots, Lynch, Gottman, Ferguson, Patterson, Chatterjee, Wooten, Burrus, Nguyen, Weiler
Absent: Morello, Zhu

Guests: Liu, Blanton, Jefferson-Jones, Filion, Popoola, Hankins, Petri

1. OPENING BUSINESS:

- a. Call to Order & Approval of April 20, 2021 minutes---Mardikes
 - i. Motion carries
- b. Approval of Agenda----Mardikes
 - i. Motion carries
 - ii. Chair Mardikes introduced Tim Ngyyen and Abbey Weiler, new student representatives to senate
- c. RAC F&A update----Patterson (3 minutes)
 - i. RAC spoke to Provost Lundgren during their monthly meeting; there will be time spent in gathering data before the reallocation of F&A is rolled out; VC Liu has been meeting with Deans and PIs to get a better sense of how RIF is being spent; it appears that these conversations went well; there is no specific timeline but the provost said that the chancellor is eager to roll out the new formula in FY23; provost did not mention there will be input from other stakeholders but Patterson believes that is an issue that needs to be addressed by senate; in the information gathering process, they found contracts that may not fit with the allocation of F&A.
 - ii. Another related development is that the UM System successfully negotiated a higher indirect rate for federal grants, with an increase of 1.5 percent reaching 55.5 percent now.
- d. FSBC & UBC update----Olsen (10 minutes)
 - i. FSBC update. This year's was a survivor's budget due to state cuts of 10M. Most of the agenda revolved around that in SP2020 and, last fall, we discussed the financial analysis that informed UMKC Forward and the uncertainty regarding possible cuts of programs and faculty; SP2021 discussions revolved around implementing the RIM budget model; FSBC members did not fully understand how the budget worked and so the VC for finance and provost gave presentations about the budget runs for FY20 and FY21; members put forward how they perceived both, they budgeting process and the results of that budgeting process; while the FSBC receives reports, it does not function as a consultative body in the budgeting process; this concern will be put forward.
Q: How is the budgeting affecting decisions that will impact graduate studies? For example, faculty who retired or left UMKC have not been replaced; the Social Sciences Consortium cannot carry without faculty as courses are not being offered – Torres;

A: Courses in the Social Sciences Consortium will be offered by different faculty. Regarding graduate studies, those issues should be addressed at the unit level budget committees; FSBC needs to make sure that each unit has an active budget committee which, to this point, has not been the case – Olsen;

Q: Can you comment about the handful of programs that will be phased out? And, regarding retirements, a faculty who produces a very high number of SCHs will retire and will not be replaced due to the lack of agility in the process of replacing faculty – Van Horn;

A: I understand that the programs that will be phased out are those that faculty had already agreed to phase out due to having a fewer students; I do not know if other programs not recommended for closure ended up on that list; if that is the case, it was not what was recommended by the program review committee set up by the senate; Under RIM funds should be allocated according to SCH production; we learned that it is not the case; but, RIM has not been implemented and it is not clear when it will be as, after three years, its implementation is far from complete – Olsen.

3. PROMOTION & TENURE TASK FORCE---report---Blanton and Jefferson-Jones 3:30pm (30 minutes)

- i. Blanton and Jefferson-Jones co-lead a task force staffed by representatives from all the units and charged by the provost to develop P&T campus-wide guidelines; the task force was charged with looking at guidelines for the tenure- track; there are guidelines in the CRRs and in the individual departments and, sometimes, at unit level (college or school). But, currently, we do not have campus-level guidelines; since there was no existing document, the task force developed a document that is completely new; we will present to senate what is in this document and bring it to the units to consider in the fall;
- ii. The university encourages that we have a regular engagement with P&T guidelines, that is that we periodically review them, assess them and update them. And, since the CRRs concerning P&T have been recently updated, we are offering a document that allows units how to move forward to make sure disciplinary standards are in alignment with the CRRs.
- iii. The task force studied the CRRs, Chancellor’s Memorandum no. 35, the Standards of Faculty Conduct, and UMKC’s Statement of Values and aimed at making sure that units had very transparent guidelines (meaning that they are written down, fully accessible, they need to be known to a candidate long before a candidate engages with P&T; there are many units that have robust P&T policies although there are some that do not (instead, they have global expectations that are hard to interpret); it will be important for units to adhere to these guidelines as a template and make sure that their own guidelines are in compliance with the CRRs and UMKC’s Statement of Values, which makes it different from the other universities in the UM System.

Q: Who will adopt this document? (Van Horn);

A: it will be up to faculty senate and the provost to approve these guidelines and disseminate them; from the provost, they should be disseminated out to the units –(Blanton)

- iv. Jefferson- Jones noted that, in the introduction to the document, in addition to the above-mentioned documents, the task force included AAUP’s statement of collegiality; collegiality has been used as a buzzword to exclude those faculty who “do not fit.” The introduction includes a summary of UMKC’s Statement of Values as well, and there is a statement that shows how the P&T process will reflect our statement of values; the

document includes a statement of diversity, equity and inclusion.

- v. Blanton continued with procedures; once guidelines are sent out to the units, they will be asked to work on their P&T documents and make sure they align with all these documents; in addition, there should be a process for mentoring candidates as well (some units have great mentoring programs for junior faculty but none at the associate level; some have none at all); units should state how annual evaluations and third year evaluations are part of the P&T process; there will be a new electronic system for putting together dossiers but we would like to provide guidelines for writing P&T letters authored by committees, chairs and deans; currently, these letters are not consistent across the units either and some of the components that the campus P&T needs to see are missing from some of these letters; there will be guidelines for rebuttal letters as the new procedure allows for them.
- vi. The body of the document contends with the three categories that get evaluated in the P&T process (research and creative work, teaching, and service) and encourages units to spell out their standards. For instance, if a field values collaborative work, the development of open access resources, professionally related social media presence, etc. those standards should be spelled out on the guidelines; also guidelines should include how we measure achievements and what it means to be a professional in a field; for instance, expectations for assistant, associate and full professors need to be different; they cannot be the same; terms need to be defined for specific fields; for example, “impact,” “significant contribution,” “productivity...” need to be quantified and/or defined; if a field ranks PI and co-PI and authors and corresponding authors, that needs to be spelled out in the P&T guidelines; an important term that requires a definitions is “exceptional” as opposed to “met criteria,” especially for those who go up for tenure sooner; in the case of teaching, “high-impact learning” has to be defined as well; there should be more than one metric for evaluating teaching; teaching evaluations are notoriously bias and so other metrics are needed; the same model has been followed in the three areas; overall, these definitions will allow for making the process more transparent as the expectations will become clearer; units need to make explicit all aspects of evaluation; that is what this document recommends. Feedback can be sent to Blanton and Jefferson-Jones.

Q: this is a draft and the expectation is that units will start revising their policies in the fall; did the P&T committees have a chance to look at these guidelines yet? – **Mardikes**;

A: the task force worked with members from all units; the document did not go to P&T committees – **Jefferson-Jones**; the expectation are that revisions will align with the CRRs and other documents attached and that units revise their guidelines often, even after reorganization – **Blanton**;

Comment: Suggestion to include more explicit language about guidelines concerning only Tenure-Track faculty – **Keeton**;

Comment: recommendation to include language concerning internationalization – **Lynch**, which **VP Filion** noted as needed;

Q: Libraries have NTT faculty but they follow closely the P&T procedures designed for TT faculty; do these guidelines apply to the libraries as well? – **Wellemeyer**.

A: Language can be added to the introduction to the document stating that the guidelines are for TT faculty but they can be used as a model or template by the libraries and for NTT faculty - Jefferson-Jones;

Q: How does this apply to interdisciplinary departments? Should they draft dual standards? – Torres;

A: Guidelines will have to be discipline-specific; REGS as a department will have to develop its own guidelines -Blanton;

there will be a parallel document for NTT faculty as well as a campus level review for NTT faculty – Filion;

Q: Is senate expected to distribute this document to units or is the task force going to do that? – Grieco.

A: We want this document to be distributed widely and we will appreciate if senate can help with that - Filion;

Chair Mardikes will send an email to senators reminding them that they need to distribute this document to their units; feedback should be sent to task force leaders.

4. Update on UMKC Forward process for Graduate and iPhD programs----Dr. Chris Liu (30 minutes)

- i. Overview of the existing data of the existing data from IPED; UMKC has about 3,000 full-time graduate students and about 2,000 part-time; class of 2018-2019 (graduated), predominantly white students, in master's, doctoral and professional programs; although Hispanic students are becoming the largest minority, our population does not reflect that; health-related disciplines produced the highest numbers of doctoral students; regarding science and engineering (NSF data), from 2007 to 2019, health-science related fields produced the largest numbers of graduates, followed by psychology, which has a stand-alone Ph.D. program (not included in the I.Ph.D.); followed by computing and engineering and the physical sciences; for education, humanities, business and communications degrees, between 2007 and 2019, not doing well; graduate education directly related to the research strength of the university so that if there is a strong research component, graduate education is also strong; research expenditure reveals the money the university spends on research; when research expenditure goes down/up, the number of doctoral graduates goes down/up as well; rankings from US News reveal that, nationwide, our pharmacy program ranked very high (#31); time to degree completion reveals that, between 2014 and 2020, I.Ph.D. students, on average, took 4 to 17 years to complete their degrees; while some programs graduated their students within a number of years regarded as "normal," others took too long to graduate just a handful of students; explanations for these trends need to consider multiple issues including academic program design and quality assessment, faculty mentoring and faculty research productivity (which should be measured using Academic Analytics), quality of infrastructure (i.e. labs), inadequacy of financial support for students, interdisciplinarity (what do we mean by that beyond the I.Ph.D.); in November 2020, an internal task force ranked the graduate programs (ranking available on slides shared by Dr. Liu); but since internal reviews can be bias, the next steps will include the assessment of an external consultant as well as the hiring of grant writing specialist and a grant developer to help graduate programs engage in national competition for resources.

Q: in order to understand numbers we need to understand the history and context of the institution; the

I.Ph.D. program was created because there are disciplines in which MU does not desire to have competition; also, there have been attempts to fund graduate students by engaging them in the discourse sections of the general education program, but this proposition did not gain traction – Dilks.

A: I.Ph.D program was created for the reasons you've stated and because there were departments that were too small to have stand-alone doctoral programs that could fill in doctoral committees; the consultant will help us assess and redesign – Liu;

Comment: in some cases, departments became smaller because they were not allowed to hire after retirements, as documented by the academic program review performed last fall; this review additionally revealed that lack of investment in academic programs was the norm – Dilks;

Q: Was the external consultant identified and what is the timeline?

A; UMKC wants to identify the consultant soon and perform the review over the summer; does not have a budget yet and the consultant will be identified from the Council of Graduate Studies – Liu;

Q: Will the I.Ph.D. program be terminated?

A: before engaging in a thorough review, I cannot answer that question although I find the program valuable; complex problems need interdisciplinary solutions and so sciences, which bring a lot of funding, should incorporate the humanities into their projects, which bring unique perspectives – Liu;

Q: Do the numbers displayed on the time to degree completion slide correspond to that particular year or do they represent rolling averages? – Van Horn;

A: I do not know how the numbers have been put together but, it seems that in the sciences, the trend is to graduate faster; students are engaged as RAs instead of TAs; music education seemed to have done a good job at graduating their students fast;--Liu

Comments: students take a long time to graduate because they work full time jobs while getting their doctoral degrees due to lack of funding; in some cases, students have to work under the mentorship of multiple directors because one does not want to commit to the end; graduating fast does not necessarily imply quality of education research shows that some schools will not employ doctoral student who graduated too fast simply because a short time at school implies that they did not receive sufficient training; in my department, there were faculty who were willing to carry along students who were not moving fast; there should be time limit to complete landmarks and programs; when you capture the situation exclusively in numbers, it could be that the numbers only reflect the experience of a handful of outliers instead of the situation of the entire department; please make sure the consultant understands nuances; it would be really important that the consultant gathers quality information by interviewing those engaged in the doctoral programs;

A; Dr. Liu noted that lack of data is one of the problems that graduate programs face and so it is hard to fully assess them without engaging in thorough data mining.

5. Adjournment

- i. Motion to adjourn
- ii. Motion carries