Faculty Senate Minutes
Tuesday September 15, 2009
Plaza Room, Administrative Center, 3-5pm


Visitors: Provost Hackett, Vice-Provost MacQuarrie, Bob Simmons

Excused: Rice, Williams

Absent: Stancel, Beard, Madison-Cannon, Humrichouser, Carbone, Ward-Smith

Welcome-3:02, Called to order by the Chair Gary Ebersole

Information Items
Chair Ebersole asked if there were any additional items that needed to be added to the agenda. Chair Ebersole did make one change and moved Senator Luppino’s after Vice-Provost MacQuarrie. A motion was made to accept this change, it was seconded and no one opposed. Senator Fieldman asked about having meetings on Hospital Hill. Chair Ebersole replied that the pattern was for one meeting a semester to be held there. The minutes from the May 5 meeting were approved with corrections.

Dean’s Evaluations
Chair Ebersole provided information on the Dean’s Evaluations. They will be posted on blackboard this week. Each will consist of a two page summary of the faculty responses. The summary will be grouped into two sections consisting of strengths and areas for improvement. The executive committee saw all of the written responses for each school. The raw data will not be posted as it is difficult to read and the executive committee reports that the summaries are accurate representations of the raw data. Now that the process has been used once, the next evaluations will be ready much sooner. Chair Ebersole commented that only voting faculty will be able to view the results. A question was asked as to who constituted voting faculty? Chair Ebersole stated that this is determined by each school and includes the faculty who have voting rights there. Provost Hackett has asked each of the Dean’s to respond to the evaluations at the first possible faculty meeting of the semester.

IFC Retreat
Chair Ebersole has recently returned from the IFC retreat and is interested in bringing Vice President for Human Resources, Betsy Rodriguez, to UMKC to discuss benefits. Chair Ebersole noted that she has a condensed version of the benefits report that shows UMKC in comparison to the other campuses, and it is very enlightening. Vice President Rodriguez is pushing for a five year strategy to deal with the benefits situation. A question was asked when this would take place and Chair Ebersole replied that he would like this to take place in the next month. Another question was asked about opening this presentation up to all faculty given the current economic conditions. A follow up question was asked if the report could be made available ahead of time?
The answer was that it can be made available. Another question was asked about how the data was presented. Chair Ebersole replied that the data is presented by institution and that the UM System website has comparison data from other similar institutions available. This data can be broken down to the department level.

**Agapito Mendoza Scholarship Breakfast and Reception**
Chair Ebersole received an email from the development office stating that the Agapito Mendoza breakfast was coming up. Last year it raised approximately $14,000. Faculty are encouraged to attend, or if unable to attend to make a donation.

**Minutes**
The revised minutes from the May 5th meeting were approved (moved/accepted/all in favor)

**Provost Report**
The search for the new School of Pharmacy Dean is ongoing. Dean Lacey-Haun is chairing the search committee. The consultant was in and met with the committee and with the faculty to gain an understanding of what they are looking for in a dean. The search committee met after the faculty meeting. The current timeline is to bring possible candidates in by early in the spring semester and to hire a new dean as soon as possible in that same semester.

Provost Hackett handed out drafts of existing and new faculty awards. The cover page has a brief description of each award and later in the packet are longer descriptions of the new awards. Last year there was a discussion about the convocation. In the old format it was set up as a faculty-staff award recognition. Now the convocation is more like a student welcoming event. However, that means that ceremony is needed for faculty and staff awards. Currently this is tentatively set for February 15, 2010. In planning for this it was noticed that UMKC did not have a full slate of campus awards. There is a good slate of research awards with hefty benefits. Currently there is the Governor’s Award for teaching that is awarded to whom UMKC nominates, but there are no other campus level teaching awards. This draft proposes a range of awards to fill this gap. Provost Hackett noted that this is a starting point for these awards. She would like for Faculty Senate to look at this draft and put together a final list of awards. There are two caveats on this list: 1) is to give a full range of awards that have meaning and are not diluted by having to many awards, 2) nominations are wanted by November 15, so this list needs to be completed quickly. There are several teaching awards suggested: an early career award; an excellence in teaching; a graduate mentoring award; a non tenure track award which would need a better name, like the “Provost’s Award”; and there could be many others, but not so many that they lose meaning. Two or more awards are suggested in the diversity category. These could be either individual or unit awards. There is a community engagement category that could have more than one award. The trustees are working on three awards in this category but they will not be ready for this year. The Staff Council is also working to add staff awards. The community engagement and diversity awards are for students, faculty, and staff. Senator Wyckoff asked if there was a way to interface these awards with the alumni development office. Provost Hackett answered that the first goal was to get the awards done and moving. They are looking to the capital campaign to help endow some of these awards and to other areas to find funding for them.
Provost Hackett presented what should be the final version of the plan unless there are other suggestions. The handout contained the previous draft of the plan and the final version as well as a summary of the feedback. There were a couple of consistent points of feedback that were received and then single points. The mission statement in this plan is the defacto statement and needs official approval of the curators. Feedback has been sought from all levels of the university. The writing committee had a charge to review all the feedback and create a final plan. One part of that was to make sure that the language was consistent all the way through the plan. This included making sure that goals were strategically oriented and not task oriented. President Forsee has seen the plan and has approved it. Provost Hackett noted that Goal 2 was tough to put together as many reports had been put together to address this goal. It was also tough to find language that made it strategic in orientation. Senator Davies asked about specific disciplines being included in this goal and including others like Geosciences. Other questions followed that were similar and looked at language to be more inclusive of other languages. Provost Hackett acknowledged that specific disciplines had been targeted in this goal. She noted that Geosciences had been looked at for this goal and instead was included under a different goal dealing with urban issues. She stated that the challenge in this goal was not making it so broad that it lost any meaning. She reminded the Senate that this was the final version of this plan and that each of these goals had been looked at thoroughly before. Suggestions were made to add “across disciplines” to the goal. She asked that those with suggestions be forwarded on. The language of Goal 3 was changed from previous versions so that it was more strategic and less tactical. In Goal 4 the word “safe” was removed. A suggestion was made that while the word itself has been removed from the goal that it not be removed as an important area of focus. A question was asked about the role of the Chancellor’s Advisory Board and its role. Provost Hackett noted that it was not meant to replace any of the existing boards and organizations that dealt with issues of diversity, but that it was to help facilitate communication between them. Another question was asked about what assumptions were underlying the concept of diversity in this goal? Provost Hackett stated that it included the legally protected classes. A follow up question asked about socio-economic? Provost Hackett said that it is not a protected class, but that it is a part of the land-grant mission of the university. In goal 6 a question was asked about why tech transfer and intellectual property were removed from the previous to current version? Provost Hackett did not know the answer and said that she would find out. A thought that was suggested was so that it would give the goal broader meaning. A draft document will be coming from the system that deals with infrastructure development. The plan from this point is to develop implementation plans and preliminary budgets on varying levels of funding for these goals.

Chair Ebersole asked for volunteers to look at the awards. Senator Wyckoff is heading this group, and Senators Ziskin and Yang volunteered to help.

Vice-Provost MacQuarrie
Vice-Provost MacQuarrie gave an update on the policies for the evaluation and promotion of non-tenure track faculty. Each school needs to have a policy in place. UMKC is the only institution in the system that has not completed this. This is a process that started about five years ago. While there are several categories of non-tenure track faculty these policies deal primarily with ranked full time faculty. There are four groups under this category: teaching, research, clinical, and extension. There are approximately 200 individuals in one of these
positions. As a point of comparison there are a little less than 500 in regular tenured positions. Many of these 200 individuals are in clinical areas including nursing, pharmacy, dentistry, and others. The Curators’ rules and regulations specify hiring, appointment, responsibility, term, and promotion policies. Ranked non-tenure track faculty can have up to three year terms. They must have a primary area of focus and be evaluated in that area. All academic units are asked to develop these policies and Vice-Provost MacQuarrie has them from all but a couple of units. A question was asked about if departments are involved in developing these policies? Vice-Provost MacQuarrie answered that each school or college develops their own policies, however, they are overarching policies for the school and the department should have their own process that works under these guidelines. Another question was asked about if criteria for evaluation was the same for existing persons and for new individuals? This was answered that criteria are individualized for each person based on the reason why they were hired and their area of focus.

Facilities Advisory Committee
The Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Facilities Bob Simmons was asked to make a presentation to the Faculty Senate about the way in which capital projects are developed from idea, to being included in campus strategic plans, and progressing to the build stage. Senator Luppino, who is also the chair of the senate budget committee noted that more information is needed up front about the costs of building and maintaining new facilities before building starts. A new form has been developed to aid in this process. Mr. Simmons continued in his presentation explaining that he wanted to take some of the mystery out of this process. He had two handouts, one was the master plan from October 2008 and the other contained additional notes. He also noted that the facilities advisory committee, which he chairs, was created to work with the facilities and help in this process.

The master plan is not simple and projects found on it can be started in many ways. The most traditional way in which projects get started is that the campus talks about a new facility, makes it a priority and then moves through the system, legislature, and then on to the governor to get started. Mr. Simmons noted that when he started with the UM System that most projects followed this path. Now it is the exception to the rule. Many of the new building initiatives come from outside people. These could be from developers who have land close to the university, funding opportunities from the government, and others. Projects made a priority based on criteria for the strategic plan, program plans, or funding opportunities. Mr. Simmons discussed current projects. The Miller Nichols Library renovation is in process. The new Student Union is under construction and the topping out is on September 28. An addition to the School of Dentistry is in the planning stages. Also, renovations to the School of Medicine are being planned, and once completed it will retie a large portion of the University’s deferred maintenance. Discussion is in the beginning stages for a new building for the Conservatory of Music and Dance. Also, given the current number of students there are needs for more student services, like housing, on the Health Sciences Campus. Currently a wellness and fitness center is being piloted on that campus. Capital building is a long term process. Generally it starts one to two years out from construction starting.

When the new Student Union is completed some things will move from the University Center to the new union, but some will stay like the food service. Things like the student success center may go to the University Center while other things like the student life office will go to the
union. However, any moving is still at least a year away and discussion will take place to
determine what is moving. Provost Hackett followed up on that thought and said that
conversations about what students need will happen first before discussion moving things around
in the facilities.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm. The next meeting is September 29, 2009.