

Faculty Senate Minutes

Tuesday, March 19, 2024.

3:00-5:00 p.m.

Zoom

Present: Bloemker, Brown, Byrd, Ganesh, Hunter, Jackson, Keeton, Leal, Lynch, Mardikes, Niemi, Olsen, Peterman, Riggers-Piehl, Shiu, Salvo, Smirnova, Torres, Weber, Wellemeyer, White-Lewis, Wooten.

Excused: Bethman.

Absent: Belcher, Dallas, Ferguson, Gottman, Likins, Mukherji, Smith, Song, Turla.

Guests: Gomez

1. Opening Business—Shiu

a. Call to Order and Approval of 03/05/24 Minutes; motion passes.

b. Approval of Agenda for 03/19/2024 Faculty Senate session; motion passes.

c. Announcements & Updates—Shiu

a. The FSEC and select Senators have provided feedback to VP Diane Filion on three new documents: a Faculty Handbook, a campus-level guide for ranked NTT faculty promotion, and a campus-level guide for third-year review.

b. Tuesday, April 2, 2024, All-Faculty Meeting.

d. UBC & FSBC Update—Olsen

a. The Provost gave some financial updates regarding the faculty and staff salary compression plan—hybrid compression plan/market rate. This plan is moving forward for FY25. There's been a million dollars per year for the last 2 years allocated to different schools to raise salaries. They have been making calculations by taking into account the schools that had the largest deficit or those whose salaries were below the disciplinary norms. Once the budget committee finishes its work, the amount of money available to fund salary compression will be known.

b. In the meeting, Olsen raised the issue concerning the UM System Voluntary Separation Program lines that haven't been replaced at UMKC. Therefore, faculty numbers continue to trend downward.

c. Chancellor's update concerning tuition revenue for FY24 is about \$8 million below projections. The university had anticipated a significant operating surplus—3 to 5 percent—which will end up being a 1 to 2% surplus. Undergraduate enrollment is up, but graduate enrollment is down—especially international graduate enrollment.

d. Margin will be lower than anticipated for this year, which will restrict one-time investments in infrastructure.

e. The governor's proposed a 3% increase in the core appropriation. The university received 20 million dollars more in funding for the healthcare delivery and innovation building, which the new building on Hospital Hill is.

f. Legislature will approve a final budget, including the budget for the University of Missouri in May. UMKC is working with the UM system to determine tuition increases for next year because of inflation.

g. Vice Chancellor Reeder's update on FY25 budget development. There is not much detail. Instead, it was some very big-picture items about budget development and the expectation that there would be an increase in revenues through tuition and an increase in the core appropriation from the State.

h. The university leadership is going to continue to devote about 1 million dollars in the coming year for workstation replacement, 1 million dollars for graduate students' stipends, and 2 million dollars for raising faculty salaries. There will be \$500,000 for new faculty and new faculty lines.

i. Questions and comments from Shiu, Brown, and Torres elaborated on:

1. Based on the information shared by the Provost all the VSP (Voluntary Separation Program) money has been reallocated, and those hires have been made. The Provost indicated that part of the VSP money was not necessarily going back to the academic units where people retired. Instead, there was a reallocation of faculty lines.
2. When it comes to merit raises, leadership comes with a percentage of the total salary for each school. The money is allocated to the schools based on the amount that is approved. The Dean decides how the money is going to be distributed.
3. In terms of the salary adjustment plan/compression market rate plan, university leadership tries to estimate which schools the faculty were paid the furthest from their disciplinary norms. The committee working on salary raises used the information collected from the survey and market rates to rank different schools and determine the percentage of faculty salaries that will be raised.

4. If the university is looking at R2 standards, R1 criteria should be taken into account to be consistent with the new accreditation approach. However, since we're still R2, criteria for salaries, should follow R2 guidelines.
5. Some faculty work in academic fields that do not make a lot of money compared to other fields. When it comes to equity, it is important to reiterate those issues when meeting with the Provost for salary equity.
6. Equity can be addressed through the pot of equity money each unit/department gets.

2. Campus- and System-Wide Elections—Mardikes

- a. There are few nominations to solicit now for the upcoming election.
- b. Chair-Elect of Faculty Senate is a 3-year term. The position serves on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and spends one year of service as Chair-Elect, one year as Chair of the Senate, and one year as Past Chair.
- c. Ideally, the Chair-Elect should have some experience in the Faculty Senate or similar experiences.
- d. Intercampus Faculty Cabinet is a 3-year term position. The IFC serves as a liaison between the President of the UM System, his staff, and the four campus faculties. It communicates to the President and his staff the views and concerns of the faculties. This position also serves as a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- e. University Faculty Committee on Tenure is a 2-year term position. This position serves at the pleasure of the President of the UM System and shall be a full professor.
- f. University Faculty Committee on Tenure (Alternate) is a 2-year term position. This position serves at the pleasure of the President of the UM System and shall be a full professor.
- g. Nominations and/or self-nomination may be sent to one of the officers below by email:

Anthony Shiu, Chair (shiua@umkc.edu)

Tom Mardikes, Past Chair (mardikest@umkc.edu)

Theresa Torres, Chair-Elect (torresth@umkc.edu)

Shannon Jackson, IFC Chair (jacksonsh@umkc.edu)

Thiagarajan Ganesh, IFC Member (ganesh@umkc.edu)

Lee Linkins, NTT Faculty Representative (linkinsfl@umkc.edu)

h. The Calendar for the Election is as follows

- a. March 29, 2024, at 5 pm, nominations are closed. Short bios are due.
- b. April 2, 2024, at 3 pm, each candidate has the opportunity to speak at the All-Faculty Meeting.
- c. April 2, 2024, at 5 pm, voting begins online via password password-protected data-collection system.
- d. April 16, 2024, at 12 pm, voting closes.
- e. April 16, 2024, at 3 pm, winners are announced and introduced the Faculty Senate meeting.

3. Ad Hoc Committee Report—White-Lewis.

- a. The conversation about advertising Active Shooter training sessions is still going on with Campus Police.
- b. Each institution puts together a response team and works with FEMA to get some training concerning what FEMA does in the field. Jackson and White-Lewis will be in communication with people who have specific talents/skills to assemble a committee/team to work with FEMA to be trained on preparedness for disasters.
- c. Questions and Comments from Shiu, Johnson, and Leal clarified:
 - a. When it comes to the kinds of specialties or specializations FEMA seeks people out for in terms of disaster response Medical, Logistics, Economics, and Business staff are usually the kind of professional skills that FEMA requires.
 - b. Depending on the type of disaster, certain people with certain required skill sets, from the UMKC Response Team can get deployed.

4. Physical Accessibility Survey Report—Torres.

- a. The Physical Accessibility survey responses were shared. Most faculty participated in the survey. Very few staff members participated in the survey.
- b. Most answers were from Volker campus personnel. Few from the Health Science campus.
- c. Some of the most common issues/areas are concerned with parking, disability parking spaces, bathrooms, and security cards.
- d. These results were shared with Vice Chancellor Sean Reeder, who supports this initiative.
- e. Questions and comments from Shiu, Wooten, and Wellemeyer were related to:
 - a. Recurrent complaints about bathrooms in the basement of the Performing Arts Center.

- b. In the meeting with Reeder, there was a sense that these were reasonable and possible changes that could result in making the necessary infrastructure changes based on the answers from the survey.
- c. QR codes for handicap accessibility was mentioned. Reeder welcomed that suggestion.
- d. The Google form is going to remain open for additional suggestions or reports in perpetuity.
- e. It is important to share this form with the Health Science building in Saint Joseph.

5. A.I. Turnitin Update—Jackson.

- a. All four MU campuses will adopt an additional tool to detect AI content (plagiarism) that is going to be built into Canvas. Even though Turnitin is a strong product, there are still problems with the number of false positive reports.
- b. The new tool initiative to detect plagiarism is on hold because more data is being collected to be able to solve this problem. In April, there will be a meeting about Turnitin and the possible solutions they have come up with based on false positive reports.
- c. Questions and comments from Shiu clarified:
 - a. Missouri Online provides support to faculty to establish the kind of processes to put in different courses. For example, it is important to flag the student's work and follow up with Turnitin to help determine the procedure to address/handle possible plagiarism cases and determine if there was plagiarism.
 - b. More information at <https://teachingtools.umsystem.edu/support/solutions/articles/11000122721-ai-student-code-of-conduct-syllabus-information>

6. MU P&T Report: Discussion—Shiu.

- a. 2023-23 MU P&T Task Force Report is on Canvas for future reading and reference.
- b. Concerning CRR 320.035 Policies and Procedures that reads “satisfaction of minimum criteria at the college school or department levels is not sufficient to ensure promotion or continuous appointment language should be consistent among campuses,” also mentioned in the Chancellor's Memorandum #35.05.

c. The P&T Report discusses the language that was introduced into the CRRs about minimum standards. This report also highlights that although there is a recognition of unit or school standards, there is some vagueness in terms of what is beyond the minimum requirements/criteria to ensure promotion for tenure. This should be revised for clarity.

Section II—Topics and Recommendations:

a. The lack of clarity and implied tension and disagreement between the articulation and application of standards across multiple levels of the review process, as described in the CRRs and the P&T Call Letters.

d. Based on previous practices at MU when it comes to using Academic Analytics to deny or grant promotion and/or tenure, it is not a good practice unless there is clear language as to how and when it should be used. Likewise, it should not be used if faculty have not included information/date from Academic Analytics in their portfolio.

e. Questions and Comments from Brown, Lynch, and Torres clarified:

a. There isn't clarity when it comes to why the minimum P&T criteria are insufficient for P&T decisions. These criteria are developed by faculty and approved by the CPTC, Provost, and Chancellor.

b. It's important to list out other comments presenting different issues to let the university's leadership know to add to what the COACH survey suggests.

f. Motion to approve Professor Lynch's suggestion to work with MU Faculty to have some clarity about the tension between minimum criteria for promotion or tenure and their “insufficiency” within the current CRR—Motion passes.

7. Bylaws Revisions: Discussion—Shiu

- a. MU and UMSL Bylaws include sections on authority, which includes sections on the different types of faculty authority: Primary and Direct Authority; Shared Authority; and Advisory Authority.
- b. For future meetings and Faculty Senate sessions, it would be productive to revise and add these kinds of sections for the sake of clarity and given the widespread support expressed by Senators in previous meetings.

Questions and Comments from Mardikes, Niemi, Torres, Keeton, and Wellemeyer clarified:

- a. Some small changes in the Faculty Bylaws don't require a vote or a long and complicated process. However, those changes should go through the Board of Curators.

- b. It would be a good idea to revise based on what MU and UMSL have in their bylaws concerning shared governance since there could be differences and opportunities for improvement at UMKC.
- c. The impact of revising the “Authority” section is to communicate very clearly to all faculty—old and new. The secondary audience for these changes would be leadership and administration.
- d. There is more presence and participation of the Faculty Senate in processes such as budgeting and curriculum, which attests to shared governance changes.
- e. There is value in revising and adding specific categories of Primary and Direct Authority, Shared Authority, and Advisory Authority.

4. Motion to adjourn passes.