

## Senate agenda

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

3-5pm, ZOOM

Present: Mardikes, Dilks, Grieco, Chatterjee, Wooten, Turla, Torres, Petri, Grimes, Shiu, Keeton, Boots, Burrus, Robinsion, Zhu, Wellemeyer, VanHorn, Hiatt, Olsen, Bhat, Hunt, Jefferson-Jones, Pluta, Kador, Kilway, Ferguson, Berkel, Holt, Patterson, Maher, Morello, Lynch, Fields

Additional Attendees: Hankins, Posdas, Popoola, Fillion,

Guests: Provost Lundgren

1. BUSINESS: (10 minutes)
  - a. Call to Order & Approval of September 1, 2020 minutes—Mardikes
    - i. Motion Carries
  - b. Approval of Agenda—Mardikes
    - i. Motion Carries
  - c. Nomination for Vivian Grieco to chair of FSNAC National Award committee
    - i. Motion Carries
  - d. Nomination of Hari Bhat as chair of FSAIC/ Academic Issues committee
    - i. Motion Carries
  - e. Nomination of Deb Chatterjee and Joshua Pluta as members of FSAIC/ Academic Issues
    - i. Motion Carries
  - f. Nomination for Hari Bhat and Ken Ferguson for FSOC Oversight committee  
Hari Bhat: 2020-2023  
Tim Lynch, chair: 2020-2022  
Ken Ferguson: 2020-2021
    - i. Motion Carries
  - g. Approval of Program Evaluation and Reorganization Task Force membership:
    1. (Remember, there are parallel processes for reorganization. The Senate is submitting a recommendation, but the Chancellor makes the final decision.)—Dilks

### **PROGRAM EVALUATION:**

Joshua Pluta

Tim Lynch

Lori Holt

Mark Patterson

### **UNIT REORGANIZATION AND FUTURE PROGRAMS:**

Michelle Maher

Shannon Jackson

Travis Fields

Dee Anna Hiatt

Anthony Shiu	LaVerne Berkel
Erik Olsen	Karl Kador
Theresa Torres	Peter Morello
Steve Dilks	Kathleen Kilway

- i. Motion Carries
  
- h. IFC report: --Kilway
  - i. Discussion with President Choi
  - ii. Discussion with Government Relations
    1. Dusty Schneider and Stephanie Willis are our state and federal representatives
  - iii. Discussion of Mid-Career Faculty Development document
  - iv. General Counsel – Paul Maccabee
  - v. General IFC member Discussion
2. DISCUSSION: Executive Guideline #6A (9-2020) (Collected Rules and Regulations 320.035) Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure (See Executive Guideline #6A and NOTES attached)
  - i. The updated version is not available on the website. It was included with the Senate agenda — Mardikes
3. DISCUSSION for the Program Evaluation and Reorganization Task Force:
  - a. Overview of meetings and instructions/ request from Provost — Mardikes
  - b. Discussion of the Senate’s role in this process: Open
    - i. We need clarification about what the purpose of the task force is — Mardikes
    - ii. The report will be completed by November 3, giving Senate members time to review and approve the report by November 17. — Mardikes
    - iii. We are presented with an opportunity, as faculty, to weigh in on the possible restructuring process. As a reminder, there is a potential for programs to be cut. The university can cut tenured faculty by dissolving a program. Keep in mind, we were assured by the Provost that they will do their best to keep this from happening. –Dilks
    - iv. How much power do we have? —Chatterjee

- v. The Provost assures us that no decisions have been made at this time. However, the administration has made it clear that the process can lead to the dismissal of tenured faculty. –Dilks
- vi. I will complete a review that makes clear how we ended fiscal year 2020. What we were asked to do by UM System and the realities of the preparation to date. The report will be made available for Senate members. Your role is to provide faculty input during this process. Not only for programs that could shut down, but for programs that need to be subsidized. — Lundgren
- vii. My primary concern is the possibility of dissolving tenured faculty. It is the industry standard that the only circumstance where getting rid of tenured faculty is acceptable is when the university is in a state of financial exigency. It seems to me, that the university is not in this state. I would like to see the administration commit to not laying off tenured faculty. Also, there is very little that has been explained about cost cutting outside the academic mission. For example, athletic spending. –Olsen
- viii. The norm is that tenure-track faculty lines would not be eliminated unless the university is in a state of exigency. It is also true that our CRR allows for the elimination of tenured faculty outside these normal circumstances. I do not think that is what we are discussing right now. I also do not think that the Chancellor is willing to say that the elimination of tenured faculty is completely off the table. We will do everything we can to protect tenured positions, including trying to find another departmental home for tenured faculty if their department is dissolved. I want to remind everyone that if we were to shut our doors and lose even more state funding, in a matter of days, we would be forced to declare a state of exigency. Athletics is on the plan to reduce expenditures. Either we need to be on Division I, or Division III. We need to remember that students and donors love the athletics programs. – Lundgren
- ix. Can you remind us the differences between the two task forces? – Bill Keeton
- x. The goal of reorganization is to eliminate at least two dean positions. This also affords us an opportunity for restructuring. One of the reasons Senate is involved is to have faculty input about how programs could be restructured. I want departments to think about where they want to be housed. –Lundgren
- xi. Are all the UM System schools cutting costs? –Wooten
- xii. Yes, but in different ways. — Lundgren
- xiii. Does UMKC receive an appropriate amount from the state compared to the other UM System schools?
- xiv. It is difficult to answer because what is appropriate? Also, circumstances are changing rapidly. It is my understanding that the way that system will be

allocating funds will be changing in the coming years. We are not clear on what that means.

- xv. Do UM System schools share funding? Ex. If Columbia receives a big grant does UMKC see some of that money? – Wooten
  - xvi. What each school makes they keep. – Lundgren
  - xvii. As a Division I school, we belong to an athletic conference. Do we receive revenue from that? — Wooten
  - xviii. From everything that I have seen there is not a huge share of revenue coming in from the conference. It is important to note that COVID is changing the athletic program's cost. We will have to test 115 students, at 85 dollars a test, on a weekly basis to remain compliant with standards. – Lundgren
  - xix. I have heard it brought up often that we can eliminate athletics to solve financial problems. I want to bring attention to the potential loss of student athletes that are here because this is a Division I school. – Ferguson
  - xx. When the senate reviews the possible restructuring of programs, it is important to look at the overall financial status of the university. Faculty need to have more information to be confident in their decisions. – Lynch
  - xxi. Will potential cuts affect our retirement benefits? – Chatterjee
  - xxii. The larger state of the market impacts our retirement benefits. As of now, system says that our retirement is safe. If we were to ever leave the UM System, it could affect our retirement. – Lundgren
  - xxiii. Will we be looking at other universities as examples for restructuring? Ex. Harvard's model based on degree programs. –Chatterjee
  - xxiv. At this point, all options are on the table. – Lundgren
  - xxv. We have an untapped resource in our community, particularly the black and latinx populations. We need more outreach to these communities. It seems like we are always going outside our community to recruit new students. – Torres
  - xxvi. We have been working with the Chancellor's diversity counsel to improve the recruitment and admissions process. This year we had a 5.9 % increase in our black students, 2.8% increase in our Latinx students and a 4 % increase in our multiple race/ multiple ethnicity students. One thing we learned from meetings with students last summer is that even if we are recruiting students here they are not having a good experience.
- c. Setting Senate report due date and response from full Senate: open
- i. We were asked to hold off on starting the task forces for another week. – Mardikes

- ii. We are unclear on our charge as a task force. Also, I want to note that the language the Provost used today was softened from the language used on Monday. During that meeting, the Provost made it clear that programs and faculty lines will be cut. –Shiu
- iii. The Senate is unclear about how much of this process is subjective opinion versus objective data.
- iv. I am concerned that this cost cutting is pointed exclusively at the academic mission. If the cuts remain focused on the academic division, the effects will be catastrophic. When we cut programs, we give up both the revenue and expenditures. It is mind boggling that we have not seen a commitment to focus on cuts outside the academic mission. Whether or not we remain a research university is what is at stake. – Olsen
- v. Are program cuts going to be made on an arbitrary basis? Are there clear metrics that are employed to make these decisions? I agree with Eric Olsen. – Chatterjee
- vi. The metrics are money. –Olsen
- vii. To clarify, the revenue from the state is used for general operations. The funds do not necessarily go to pay administrators salaries. We need clarity concerning the fixed operational costs versus the flexible costs. Cutting programs does not translate to dollar for dollar savings. –Mardikes
- viii. What is this free pass that the UM System provides that Provost Lundgren mentioned earlier? – Morello
- ix. This pass concerns operational funds. We have less than the 90 days operational funds in reserve that system would like us to have. — Mardikes
- x. It seems that UMKC is attempting to model themselves as a R1 university, meaning, that the faculty could be expected to bring in a large portion of their salary through grants. – Chatterjee
- xi. The prior administration hired outside agencies to figure out the problems of UMKC. How much did that cost? There is an imbalance in the way that we replace our staff. When faculty is dismissed, we do not see their positions repopulated. However, when an administration position is vacant, the position is filled immediately. –Bhatt
- xii. Eric Olsen is preparing a financial update that will clarify cost concerns. He will present his findings during a future meeting. –Mardikes
- xiii. There is a part missing in this discussion. If we find the money, how do we invest it in growth? It comes down to two issues, recruitment, and retention. I recommend that the taskforces look back at the reports from UMKC Forward. – Grieco

- xiv. When we were first presented with UMKC Forward, the goal was to free up 40 million dollars for reinvestment in the restructuring of programs. Now, it has shifted to deal with budget issues. — Mardikes
- xv. My understanding is that the 10 million that we are charged to find is in anticipation of a possible cut. — Shiu
- xvi. Given the current political and social climate, the 10 million dollars probably are not coming back. — Grieco
- xvii. To be clear, the state legislature has not stated that the 10 million is gone. In fact, they stated the opposite. They feel that they have already cut higher education enough. — Olsen

#### 4. Adjournment

- i. Motion Carries