

Faculty Senate Minutes
Tuesday October 6, 2009
Plaza Room, Administrative Center, 3-5pm

Present: Ebersole, Ward-Smith, Johnston, Krantz, Stancel, Rice, Beard, Wyckoff, Alleman, Dinakarbandian, Potts, Yang, Hopkins, Humrichouser, Bethman, Williams, Fieldman, Ziskin, Holsinger, Pick, Wang, Luppino, Bethman

Visitors: Cindy Pemberton, Drew Bergerson, Shannon Jackson

Excused: McArthur, Davies, Foxworth, Hunter, Plamann,

Absent: Gardner, Krause, Madison-Cannon, Nilsson, Carbone, Fincham

Welcome-3:01, Called to order by Chair Gary Ebersole

Information Items

The Accreditation site visit team will be here next week. They will be meeting with the Faculty Senate on October 12, from 1:15-2pm in the Plaza Room and the Faculty from on October 13, from 2:15-3:15 in the Plaza Room. The faculty meeting time is for faculty only, not anyone with supervisory roles. Please let faculty in your schools know about these times.

Minutes

The revised minutes from August 25 and September 29 were presented. A motion was made by Senator Krantz and seconded by Senator Rice to accept the minutes. All present voted in favor.

Agenda

Provost Hackett could not be at the meeting today. Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs Cindy Pemberton from the General Education Taskforce is here in the Provost's absence to give a report.

Drew Bergerson and Shannon Jackson, from the Social Sciences Institutional Review Board, are here to report on the new form for Oral History and Ethnographies.

Senator Luppino will give a primer on the University Budget.

Senator Krantz will give a brief report from the Academic Issues committee.

Provost Report

Vice-Provost Pemberton is here to give a report of the General Education Taskforce that was assembled by Provost Hackett. One of the first things that she did when she came on board last fall was to look at the general education requirements. What became apparent was a concern for student retention. The first place she looked was on the UMKC website and typed in "general education." What she found was that every time she would perform that search she would get different results. Over time it became clear that each school generated its own set of general education requirements that ranged from 20 hours to 60+ hours depending on the program. What she could not find was a single place that someone could go to find a description of why UMKC does things in the way that they are done.

She noted that in 2001-2002 the state of Missouri asked each academic institution to put together a plan to smooth the transition for students coming from community colleges and transferring into the institution from other schools. Eventually she found the “Coda Matrix.” It is a 42-hour block that has broad content areas that students in Missouri should have met educational requirements in. Each institution has classes that addressed each of the content areas. UMKC has this, but it is full of footnotes that showed exceptions to this. There is a whole other section that identifies assessment for students to know how they succeed in these areas.

Vice-Provost Pemberton’s basic conclusion is that UMKC has lots of issues with general education. Some of the issues are centered on programs that do not meet the 42-hour block. The accreditation group coming next week will be looking for a coherent articulation of general education requirements and assessment for students to see if they are learning what they are supposed to be learning. She also spoke with individuals at the state level and there are pending issues there as well. The Curriculum Alignment Initiative (CAI) are looking at the competencies of students coming out of public schools so that we know how we can best move students through the general education requirements. This has been ongoing for a couple of months and will inform us about what K-12 students are coming to us with and help us figure out what we will need to be doing.

Vice-Provost Pemberton went to the Provost with her findings. It became apparent that it had been a significant amount of time since the University as a whole sat down and talked about general education. There is not a preconceived idea about how to go forward. The Provost put together a group of faculty to figure out what the process will look like going forward. Also, conversations have started on campus about what is going on nationally in regards to general education. Yesterday the General Education Taskforce met for the first time and received their charge from Provost Hackett. They will frame a strategy/plan on how to go through the process of putting together a new plan. This is a very diverse complicated task and needs a frame of reference to move forward. Other institutions have talked about a 2-3 year process to figure out what is needed. The College of Arts & Sciences is a microcosm of what needs to take place.

Vice-Provost Pemberton will provide a list of members (see the end of the minutes for the list of all members). There are representatives from all undergraduate programs and from graduate programs that are screening undergraduates for admittance like medicine. The website will be online by Friday (<http://www.umkc.edu/provost/committees/general-education-advisory-task-force/general-education-advisory-task-force.asp>) that will have the charge and other information about this process. Senator Hopkins asked if it would be possible to send a copy of the text of the charge to the Executive Committee. Vice-Provost Pemberton said she will work on that (see the end of the minutes for the text of the charge).

Senator Alleman asked that if this is a curricular issue why is it being started with a group appointed by the deans? Vice-Provost Pemberton responded that the role of this taskforce is not to make curricular decisions, but it is to establish a framework on how to proceed. A group is needed that can look at what others have done that we can put together a meaningful result. Carol Snyder from AEC&U, who was recently at UMKC, said that the most successful schools started with what they wanted students to know or value when they finish their degree. The least successful schools started with what they were already offering in general education and watched

as the faculty tore each other apart. Vice-Provost Pemberton noted that in the Coda Matrix there is not any way of demonstrating how courses were placed into each category. Another point of interest is that the current model is course driven. However, now there are models, like Temple, that give students opportunities to go to other places to achieve their competencies. Senator Hopkins said that he was impressed with Carol Snyder's presentation and was wondering about faculty involvement. Vice-Provost Pemberton said that AEC&U has a summer institute program that has been in existence for several years, and every year has competitive proposal process where campuses will submit proposals that require faculty and administrators to be sent to this institute and identify the outcomes that they want. If the proposal is selected, then UMKC take a team to the institute. The first half of day is formatted like a traditional professional meeting with concurrent presentations. In the afternoon the team does work where faculty who are experts in particular area work with the teams to develop desired outcomes. One point that is important is how to engage faculty in whole process.

Senator Beard asked to what extent this is an attempt to get uniformity or consistency across programs? Vice-Provost Pemberton said that we don't need a cookie-cutter program. If we look at traditional students, they don't always know what they want and need time to experience a variety of things. Other students come and know what they want, and then change part way through. Part of the problem now is that students are penalized in this situation because they are behind when they switch to new area. She noted that there were two common things from coda. Every unit requires some English and some history/political science. Chair Ebersole said that part of what has changed is the focus from course content to competencies. We want students from different areas to come out with basic competencies then build the rest of the blocks as they move through their programs.

Senator Krantz made a couple of points. He remembers at least half-a-dozen attempts to address this. One had to do with policies in working with feeder schools. It had some policies that had to do with basic coursework beyond English and history. Most professional schools now speak of liberal arts and sciences and general education has a very small number of courses that are in common for everyone. Vice-Provost Pemberton said that Carol Snyder addressed some of this and that AEC&U is working with professional accreditation bodies to work through this issue. In regards to the agreements with Johnson County, we had to sign 11 agreements because of existing complexities. If, as group, we can decide on a core set of competencies, then it provides an easier way of working through these issues.

Senator Krantz also noted that every couple of years there is talk about resurrecting the Undergraduate Council. Chair Ebersole said that it was restarted last year. Vice-Provost Pemberton said that it would not have anything to do with this and that its focus is curricular and to keep from replicating courses.

SSIRB

Drew Bergerson and Shannon Jackson are here from the SSIRB to report on the changes to the IRB to work with ethnographies and oral histories. The IRB is the federally mandated review board for human subjects research. The problem they are fixing through these changes is that in the past all kinds of research were being handled in the same way. This created problems not necessarily for clinical or psychological research, but for social science research. The dialogue

during last three years has been to work out new procedures. The first outcome is an oral history form that is relatively easy form and much simpler than the old review process. Anyone conducting oral histories or interviews with humans would need to go through this process. Drew is the contact person for this

The new challenge is ethnography research. This introduced a series of hurdles for review. Shannon Jackson is ethnographer and will speak to this. It is a challenge because it is not done much, or widely understood. It also does not have a long history at UMKC. When she first arrived, the SSIRB didn't know how to work with this type of research. It doesn't fit because it is a type of research that is embedded in a natural setting. The object of this research is meaning which is everywhere and nowhere. The problem is that the researcher must go to where meaning is being produced. It cannot be determined ahead of time what is taking place in that setting. This is a staged process, and a researcher generally returns repeatedly to the location to gather more data. There is not a clear hypothesis as that cannot be determined until after it has been decided what is going to be hypothesized about. The IRB typically works with protocols that look at the objects of study. If object is meaning then you can't answer protocol. She also noted that there is a growing interest in ethnographic research.

Dr. Bergerson asked the senators to go back to schools and see if they have anyone engaging in this type of research. He noted that if they do not have preconceived ideas about what they are looking for, then it is probably ethnographic. They need feedback for the forms. The SSIRB wants full faculty buy-in and approval. The form is a two-stage form. The normal review would have everything worked out ahead of time. If it was needed then the researcher would come back for a follow-up. With this form Stage 1 approval is a check box that says it is research of reconnaissance. The researcher might only have a few answers for questions. Therefore they have lower standard for answers. The next part is to have more information at later stage. Researchers would have to go through process twice. Senator Krantz asked if this will be expedited? Dr. Bergerson said that almost all are protocols are expedited but there are some occasions when will not be.

Senator Fieldman asked if there was a way of determining beforehand what might be a danger to subjects? Dr. Jackson said that one of the dilemmas is that human subject is an abstract category. What is dangerous to us is not for others. To know ahead of time what constitutes danger is hard. They have a list of vulnerable populations, but it is not always the same everywhere. Danger has to be recognized by populations. Dr. Bergerson said that a pragmatic solution to this is that the SSIRB is developing a group of gatekeepers in each area that know the regulations. They want to train people who can help researchers get everything put together ahead of time to make SSIRB process easy.

Senator Holsinger asked if there were discussions about having people sit on board that know this? Dr. Jackson said that she and Dr. Bergerson now sit on the board to help with this. Chair Ebersole noted that he had experience with students being blocked for misunderstandings related to this issue. Dr. Bergerson said that enormous changes have been made, but they are still behind where they need to be. They need to have people on board who are experts in these areas.

Senator Johnston asked that for clinicians is this going to be in addition to what already do? Dr. Bergerson said that most will still go through same process. It is the kind of research is that is important. Traditional research is not covered under new procedures. Dr. Bergerson said that the important issues are the intentions of researcher. If the goal is to improve clinical procedures then they would go through the old process. If they are looking for the meaning behind something then they would go through the new process. The intent for this type of research is not therapeutic nor intervention based. Ethnographic research has a minimal impact..

Senator Wyckoff noted that if we are doing something under traditional clinical IRB then nothing changes. This is for the gray area for people who shouldn't have been under old process. Senator Dinakarpanian asked how applications are being directed to the right place? Dr. Jackson said that there is a person in place who is directing applications and who is learning more on how to direct applications appropriately. Dr. Bergerson said that the gatekeepers will help with this.

University Budget

Senator Luppino made a presentation about the University budget. About 10 days ago, he circulated a memo that had budget terminology. Also outlined in this memo were basic components of the new budget model. If there are any questions about this they should be directed to him. The point for today is to see where the budget sits now.

For the record the gift fund, and auxiliary services will be looked at later, but they are not the topic of the presentation. The main concern is the operating fund. The projected operating revenues for year are about \$261,626,587, but that is not what can actually be spent. Some funds cannot be spent as they are already allocated for specific purposes, like medical residents. Unfunded scholarships and waivers are viewed as discounts. Non-resident waivers are an example of this. This number has to be subtracted from the total number. The total number is figured without the discounts figured in. One worry is that the amount of unfunded scholarships and waivers is growing very quickly. Chair Ebersole noted that when Chancellor Bailey was here it was \$22 million and now is \$26 million. The problem is that there are good reasons for these waivers. If they were rescinded that doesn't mean that the University would see any of those funds. There is no guarantee that the recipients would have come here anyway. The current number might actually be closer to \$28 million.

The new budget model is being phased in. Discounts appear to be growing more rapidly than the increase in tuition. The high priority is to figure out where this increase is coming from. Senator Ziskin noted that this money doesn't really exist. Senator Krantz asked if this included students who take reduced hours. Senator Luppino said that he believes it does but would check. Senator Ziskin said that we do not have the same level of scholarships that other institutions have so this helps bring students in. Senator Beard asked why the distinction is made between in state and out of state. Senator Luppino said that the distinction is because of the significant portion of our operating revenues funded by State of Missouri.

It is still unclear how many out of state students actually pay the full amount.

There is just under \$200 million left to spend when the operating revenue is adjusted. There are other numbers that are students fees paid for specific things. In addition, there are some misc. revenues that are being studied to determine exactly what they are and what discretion there may be in expending them. The approximately \$6 million in F&A recovery is real money. The other misc. items may not be real spendable cash.

The tuition number is the true tuition being paid. The actual amount of state funding as a percentage is variable. If it is included as a part of the full operating budget then it is about 32%. If it is included as a part of what there is actually available to spend then it is about 42%. Right now, general revenues are about \$173 million. When the model was run in May we actually thought we had more money projected for the current fiscal year. The shortfall is being handled by expense cuts in administrative and support units. In the end we are looking at about a wash in terms of what we are now projecting and what we actually have to spend. We are trying to push the model out several years, but the problem is in not knowing what the state will be doing.

The enrollment plan wants to grow enrollment where it makes sense to do so. The salary initiative appears to be an unfunded mandate where we will need to bring salaries in line with others, but we don't have money to do so. We might need to increase tuition, but there may be concerns about doing that to increase salaries. We might have to have special dispensation to raise tuition significantly in general because of statutory restrictions. The unfunded waivers might be a place to increase revenue, but we don't know how much of that would actually come out. Everyone is trying to cut expenses. The bottom line is that money is tight.

Senator Fieldman said that this is kind of a political question, but is it possible to refuse to create the salary pool? Senator Luppino said he has already asked that. The consensus on the budget committee and others is that they are looking for any other option except for cannibalizing academic programs. Chair Ebersole said that funds would have to be found through increased enrollment, increased retention, and then a tuition increase. Also, areas where efficiency can be increased to save money need to be found.

A question was asked if money could be raised through naming rights and would this free money up for other things? Senator Luppino answered that this is already being done in a number of ways, but that the new UMKC Foundation will also help with this.

Senator Luppino also said that the committee had looked at the six-year assessment and targeted obligations list. Items on this list were promised but there were not funds available for them. Work on this list consists of figuring out what can be accomplished. The new model will help with this. There were two deficit balance numbers that wouldn't have been getting better by themselves. One was the number for underestimate of the unfunded waivers actually given. The other was the deficit for student bad debts. There is a six-year assessment that is in place was to make up those two deficits.

Senator Yang asked about the individual contribution to the pension fund? Senator Luppino said that he doesn't know yet if the 1-2% contribution going to continue, grow, or shrink. Chair Ebersole noted that if and when there was contemplation of changing the benefits, President Forsee would visit the campuses first before it happens. Senator Fieldman raised a question from

a former senator who asked about the money paid to managers of pension, and noted that with the hit that pension took that the contribution won't make any difference. Senator Luppino said they asked that question and received some information but does not yet have definitive informations. He indicated as a preliminary observation that the fees don't seem outrageous. However, the question remains if the plans are to grow the small number into a larger number? A question was asked if having big speakers is a good revenue generator? Senator Luppino said that it could be. It would bring in more potential donors.

Senator Johnston asked that in light of the problems of faculty salaries, if the University were to find a source of revenue, when will issues of salary be addressed? Senator Luppino asked the Provost about this. She did not view this major initiative as an across the board thing, but as something that is more targeted. Senator Luppino views this as something bigger than budget committee. Chair Ebersole noted that if there are active budget committees at each school ,then they should be doing some of this work as they know better what other comparable schools are paying. Departments and divisions should be looking at this and raising the issues. A point was raised that this seemed like an idealistic view of the chairpersons. Chair Ebersole noted that the faculty need to take an active role in this process. Senator Luppino asked the Provost if the budget committee should set out parameters for the deans to follow? He noted that the deans say they need budget projections so they can do salary projections. Senator Williams asked if the Faculty Senate needs to put something together that addresses the issue of compression and inversion? Senator Luppino said that he would send around a copy of the document that was put forward previously to address this issue.

Adjourned at 5:01pm.

See next page

General Education Advisory Task Force Membership

Wayne Vaught, Associate Dean/Associate Professor
College of Arts and Sciences

Lynda Plamann, Associate Professor, Biology
School of Biological Sciences

Deborah O'Bannon, Assoc. Professor in Civil & Mechanical Engineering
School of Computing and Engineering

Tim Timmons, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Conservatory of Music and Dance

Kim Bray, Professor, Dental Hygiene
School of Dentistry

Cheryl Grossman, Associate Professor of Education, Curriculum and Instructional
School of Education

Laura Gayle Green, Librarian IV-Head of Music/Media Library
Libraries

Paul Cuddy, Professor and Senior Associate Dean
School of Medicine

Julie Cheslik, Associate Professor of Law
School of Law

Simon Friedman, Associate Professor
School of Pharmacy

David W. Cornell, Associate Professor of Accounting
Bloch School of Business and Public Administration

Jolene Lynn, Clinical Assistant Professor; Director, BSN Program
School of Nursing

General Education Advisory Task Force Charge

The General Education Advisory Task Force is charged with developing a strategy/plan for the creation and implementation of a “new” UMKC general education program that is tied to our UMKC mission, puts student success and student retention as a focus, includes a premier student learning assessment component and has an ongoing review and revision cycle. This plan will be submitted to the Provost as a recommendation.

The work of the committee will include:

Reviewing current national perspectives regarding general education experiences for undergraduate students in higher education, including: AAC&U’s position statements and publications, reviewing aspirational peer institutions’ general education and assessment programs and reviewing programs at institutions deemed to be exemplars of “best practices” associated with general education and student learning outcome assessment associated with general education programs.

Reviewing current work in the state of Missouri regarding entrance and exit competencies (CAI) and consider this work in the revision of the UMKC general education program.

Reviewing any additional relevant material to assist in the development of an outstanding general education program.

Developing and implementing a plan for engaging the university campus in discussions regarding the revision of UMKC’s general education program.

Maintaining student engagement and student retention concerns at the forefront of general education plans, including the development of a unique “UMKC” student experience in general education tied to the university mission.

Preparing a written proposal for submission to the AAC&U General Education Summer Institute focused on our UMKC campus revision efforts.