Senate Minutes
Tuesday, May 3rd, 2022
3-5 pm, ZOOM

1. OPENING BUSINESS:
    a. Call to Order & Approval of April 19th, 2022 minutes – Grieco
      i. Shiu listed several corrections to spelling including the guest list.
        Ii. A friendly amendment was introduced by Turla to adjust the wording of her
        question.
        ii. Motion with stated amendments passes.

    b. Approval of Agenda – Grieco
      ii. Motion Passes.

    c. Completion of Shiu's IFC Term: Introduction of Candidates – Grieco (15 minutes; 3:05 – 3:20)
        i. Grieco introduced Thiagarajan Ganesh, Julia Pluta, and Karen Brown, who
        then introduced themselves to the senate. Grieco also introduced Kimberley
        Bray, who was unable to attend.

2.PRESENTATION:
    a. FSBC Report – Olsen (20 minutes; 3:20 – 3:45)
        i. Olsen the FSBC asked for and eventually received the report from
        HelioCampus concerning spending at the school. Not included initially was
        information about administrative spending. But this spring they received the full
        report.
        ii. FSBC has 5 discrete concerns about the HelioCampus report. 1. UMKC admin
        spending is below the average of their benchmark peers. It's significantly
        underestimated in the helioCampus's analysis. #2 The HelioCampus
        methodology is based entirely on benchmarking, but the selection criteria of
        benchmark universities is not adequately described. #3. Faculty were not
        included in the review process of the draft HelioCampus analysis. Faculty must
        be allowed to meaningfully participate in decisions about the allocation of
        resources at the University, including reviews like that carried out by
        HelioCampus. #4. The analysis identifies areas where UMKC overspends
        relative to the selected benchmarks. This spending should undergo further
        review to determine budget reallocations are warranted. #5. UMKC has many
        more Vice Chancellors and Deans than benchmark Institutions.

        Q Is there also a question as to whether all these schools are increasing their
        administrative expenses too much? - Keeton
        A: A good question. As a benchmark analysis, if we're compared against
        benchmarks who overspend of course we're going to look good. This is a new
        methodology. - Olsen
        Q: Is there no explanation as to why there's such a high difference in the number
        of chancellors and deans? - Ferguson
        A: The report is documented but provides no further analysis. - Olsen
        Q: Are you going to request an explanation? - Ferguson
        A: Our job is to report our finids to the senate. We have recommendations in the
        accompanying report but it's up to the senate to implement it. The senators

should read it before we decide what to do. I'd also recommend that the senate formally say something about not being included in this review. - Olsen

Q: How would we even know if those five benchmark principals are enough to make an analysis? We aren't provided enough information about the analysis to know whether or not it's a fair comparison. Are five schools enough to compare? It doesn't seem like enough to me. Our task for the next senate should be looking at shared governance. - Torres

A: Right now, this is a missed opportunity. It's hard to look at this and feel comfortable with what they did. I wish we were involved at the draft stage. We could have put this issue to bed then. - Olsen

Comment: We need to raise objections to keep this from continuing to happen. - Torres

Q: Can you also include the HelioCampus report file along with the FSBC report? - Wellemeyer

A: We asked for the report in November of last year and were told no. It wasn't until December it was actually provided to the chair of the senate. I don't know if we have permission to circulate it. - Olsen

A: We will check to see if it's possible to circulate it. -Grieco

3. DISCUSSION:
   a. Proposed modifications to faculty bylaws. Summary of proposed changes followed by discussion & vote – Van Horn & Keeton (60 minutes; 3:45 – 4:45)
      i. Van Horn presented the first set of modifications.
      Ii. Keeton Presented the second set of modifications.

   Comment:: When I was on the committee for the new school of humanities and social sciences, we kept the principal in mind that we didn't need to define and delineate every specific element. Too much detail can prevent the tradition of the community evolving. I'm in favor of having an at-large NTT member on the executive committee. - Torres

   Comment: I would like to see if both proposals could add the NTT on the FSEC. It's an important role. Not enough NTT faculty get elected into senate positions. - Riggers-Piehl

   Q: Could you give some concrete examples of unranked NTT? - Van Horn

   A: There is a system regulation that lists the various titles of ranked NTT. In a footnote it lists possible unranked NTT titles as well. Instructor and lecturer among them. - Keeton

   Comment: The Bloch School needs to rectify that issue. I really like the proposal. We're trying to be as forthright as possible in how our changes reflect the shared values of the senate. I ask you to think about responsive representation. We don't think serving in the senate should be an onerous proposition. Expanding the number of senators based on the number in the school is important. I've served in FS for 4 years and have not heard an issue concerning primarily NTT issues. I think our proposal expresses the value of NTT representation. A dedicated at large position can provide crucial information to the FSEC. - Shiu

   Q: Are there proposed amendments to the 2 proposals? - Grieco

   Comment: I like the generic naming in Bill's proposal. I propose we put that into the first proposal. - Riggers-Piehl

   Comment: Seconded- Keeton

   Comment: Motion to adopt generic definition of schools by Shui, Kador and Van Horn's proposal .- Grieco

   Comment: I want to draw our attention to the CRRs. - Van Horn

   Comment: I can't imagine many changes being made to this in the near future. -S hiu

In the event that we have a donor who wants to offer a gift and the school wants to make a name change that would save us from going through the entire process of naming. There'll be opportunities to better define senators as we update the senate SOP -Grieco

Comment: Name changes are simply routine. The key changes on the table here are NTT reps, and 2+ representation. - Van Horn

Comment: The reason I'm in favor for adding the language from Bill's proposal to the 1st proposal is that it saves our body from having to go through this process again.Reducing minutia allows us to focus on more important issues. - Riggers-Piehl

Comment: Motion to adopt the generic definition for schools by the Shiu, Kador and Van Horn proposal. - Grieco

Q: There are structural differences between these two. I think we should select a proposal and then focus on making adjustments. - Ferguson

A: This is the approach to FSEC proposed at the beginning of the meeting. - Grieco

Comment: 9 in favor, 13 against, 1 abstention - Mardikes

Q: Any suggestions for the keeton proposal? - Grieco

Comment: Point of information. What we meant to do was to only remove the "at large NTT faculty representative" from CRR 300.020.e.2.d.- Shiu

Comment: I think that we need to make an amendment regarding how we define the unranked NTTs. -Kador

Comment: Unranked NTTs — lecturers, instructors, and visiting faculty — Assistant/Associate/Full Professors, who are visiting. Not over 7 years renewed. Post docs aren't considered faculty members. - Torres

Comment: But they are considered so during the hiring process. - Kador

Comment: Full time research positions are considered faculty. - Hankins

Secret Vote occurs

Comment: Kador, Shiu, and Van-Horn's proposal has 13 yes, 9 no, 2 abstentions. The Keeton Proposal has 9 yeses, 12 nos, 1 abstention. – Leiter

Comment: Thanks for your hard work creating both proposals (and the third that was created previously)! - Riggers-Piehl

4. LAST 10 MINUTES

Q: I've gotten Feedback about ineffective software packages. Does anybody have knowledge of other programs having to deal with these issues? - Shiu

A: My department had a similar problem. - Grieco

Comment: We had the exact same experience in the Dept of Earth & Env. Sciences. I am on the scholarship committee for the department. - Adegoke

Comment: Working with myVITA caused me problems. - Torres

Comment: myVITA might be the 4th system I've worked with since joining UMKC. Joining another system will be another onerous use of time for all faculty. - Barger

Comment: I didn't get the impression that Choi was going to replace myVITA. Problems include that software is not optimized. We don't receive any training any more. He agreed that all faculty need available virtual training. - Shiu

Comment: I think the lack of training for systems (myVITA is a great example) is problematic. Trying to do my packet for promotion the last few weeks but not really having a lot of confidence in its capabilities is troubling. - Riggers-Piehl

Comment: Slate, Canvas; Pathway - Kilway

Comment: I agree that Canvas needs better training and helps with staff to assist us. - Torres

5. ADJOURNMENT

a.   Motion passes