Faculty Senate Minutes

Tuesday October 5, 2010

Plaza Room, Administrative Center, 3 p.m.


Excused: Holt

Absent: Madison-Cannon, Sherburn, Nilsson, Stanley

Visitors: Provost Hackett

Welcome at 3 p.m. Called to order by the Chair, Gary Ebersole

Informational Items

1. Rick Anderson asked to hold his report on Capital Projects since he is not able to be here today. He promises a report sent out this week on capital projects and if we have questions about it we can invite him into our next meeting.

2. At our last meeting, we spoke about the possibility of inviting Warren Erdman, Kansas City Curator and Chair of the Compensation and Benefits Subcommittee, to join us. We have invited him for our next Senate meeting on October 19th.

3. As a follow up to the statistical report on NonTenure/Tenure Track faculty, Senators asked for additional information. We have passed on a request to Larry Bunce for that additional information: how many course sections are taught by NTT faculty vs. regular faculty; the SCH generated by each group; and the unit-by-unit breakdown of NTT /regular faculty headcount. It will take some time, but when we get that information it will be shared with you.

Approval of Agenda

Senator Wyckoff moved approval of the Agenda, IFC representative McArthur seconded the motion. All Approved.

Approval of Minutes for September 21, 2010

The Secretary had received several changes and provided a handout with them for all Senators. With those changes, Senator Luppino moved approval of the Minutes and Senator Krantz seconded the motion. All Approved.

Provost’s Remarks: Gail Hackett
Provost Hackett began with an update on the state mandated program review. There was an MDHE meeting last week, but nothing earth-shattering happened. The Chief Academic Officers are pushing back at little, asking MDHE to combine some programs and to adjust the timeline. David Russell, the Interim Commissioner, used to be President Forsee’s Chief of Staff, and is trying to help in proceeding in a responsible way. There is no desire to use an axe, but rather a scalpel approach to the challenge. The Deans should be working with you, to fill out the form provided. There is no final list yet of low productivity programs. We can request exceptions. We are charged to report to the state what we will do. MDHE is not doing any eliminations. They don’t have that power, but the Governor asked MDHE to oversee this review. We have our own program review process and, we have added and deleted programs on our own. We provided the list to MDHE to show that we do this type of review regularly. Some schools don’t. Question: How many programs are affected at UMKC? 31 initially, but 5-6 were incorrectly listed and then with some combinations we are down to 20 programs. The Graduate Certificate programs are off the table.

Next Provost Hackett provided a four-page Executive Summary of the strategic plan implementation. She is now in the process of filling out each of these groups to move on implementation phase of the strategic plan. The full roster of committees and chairs can be found on the Provost’s website (http://www.umkc.edu/provost/). She will convene a coordinating group to meet with the chairs in order to keep them moving. Question: What is the Emeritus College Working group listed on the handout? Answer: It is a Retirees group. Nancy Mills is head of the retirees group. There is no space for them on campus [neither is there office space for the Faculty Senate, the Chair noted]. The Olson Professorships are approved and the first one is selected. We plan to make a big deal about it, announcing the appointment and hosting a reception in honor of the Olson family. Vera Olson will be there. Next time the Provost will bring that information if it is finalized.

Senator Rice: Who are Emeriti faculty? It depends on specific arrangements faculty make with their Dean. The Olson Professorship recipient receives an honorific title and is able to come back to teach for up to 3 years, with a salary cap at 25%. It is a win-win opportunity because we need money to hire replacement faculty and it is good to be able to retain institutional memory.

Question: How can we improve our national ranking of graduate programs? Reputation matters. UMKC is not ranked in the US News and World Report rankings. What do we need to do to achieve those goals?

Answer: We don’t need to pay attention to the NRC rankings because they are out of date, nobody is going to do them again. These rankings are not necessarily the best, just the most widely known, based on reputations. Lombardies and US News are what most are paying attention to. The Provost will bring in information from Larry Bunce about where we are this year versus the last two years with the USNews ranking. Retention and Graduation are the main things we need to do. Lynda Bonewald (Interim Vice Chancellor for Research) has a draft strategic plan in the works with very specific metrics rankings of US Research Universities in areas of research funding and federal research expenditures, faculty awards, etc. We already have 80 system accountability measures and UMKC accountability measures. We need to get them down to 10 if possible, some smaller number tied to our strategic plan.
that we can use and remember. I will bring in the draft of the subset of accountability measures and the
draft of the research strategic plan. ... At your department and school level you should put all such
information on your website.

**Retirement and Benefits Discussion: Tony Luppino and Gary Ebersole**

Senator Luppino announced that the Faculty Senate Budget Committee (FSBC) now has one
representative from every unit. He gave an update on where the committee and subcommittee study
and discussion is at this time. He got those big projects forms from Rick Anderson.

Betsy Rodriquez and the FSBC committees met for 1 hour before her public presentation. Her
PowerPoint slide includes salaries and benefits, showing UMKC ranks low at 35 of 35 for compensation
packages. Mitigation of risk is the main reason for the proposal to change the Retirement plan. The
committees haven’t gotten any details yet.

Highlights: She thinks she must have details in place for Nov. 1st Curator’s subcommittee meeting.
Sounds like the beginning stages of designing a very complex proposition. The FSBC questions whether
this is on a reasonable time frame? They are trying to take emotions out the decision-making process.
They have asked to have the same information that the Curators will be re looking at. The FSBC is
disappointed in the speed in which they are forthcoming.

At the subcommittee meeting today it was concluded that the IFC should send message that 1). The
time frame is too short for such a complex, and 2). if the time frame cannot be changed at least share
the same data with us.

Chair Ebersole: The IFC was meeting in teleconference and Pres. Forsee walked into room, here on
campus. The IFC made a strong pitch to the President that in order for the Board of Curators to exercise
their fiduciary responsibility they need time to study scenarios. There was no definitive answer. The IFC
is not prejudging any proposal, but needs to have details. Chair Ebersole mentioned some good studies
out on retirement plans as background reading.

A comment expressing surprise that so few came to the Betsy Rodriquez meeting was made. Maybe
parking was a difficulty; maybe another announcement was needed. Nevertheless, the PowerPoint is
public and available. She didn’t tell us a whole lot more. When we get numbers we will get the
attention of faculty and staff. Pres. Forsee’s letter implies we don’t have to worry about changes.
Senator Mirkin asked to have summaries of the several articles or to distribute a list of the best ones.
The issue is what happens when a switch in plans occurs and there may not be many who have done so,
there may not be enough data to research in scholarship. But what happens in businesses? Senator
Gardner: those in the age range of 55-65 are the ones who get hurt.

The Provost noted that no one is talking about freezing the retirement plan, but just closing it to new
employees. Ken Hutchinson’s 2006 report was given the scenario to freeze retirement plan.

Question: What is the difference between closing and freezing? We need data to estimate future
impact of both. In the corporate world, changes are done in stages; closing first, then freezing benefits.
Comment from a Senator: The fallacy is that the change will only impact new employees. Chair Ebersole: Ken Hutchinson said if you have the benefits retirement fund doing too many things there will be problems. The current “social contract” is designed to assure faculty & staff that if and when an individual retires, s/he will know how much retirement money will be received each month. Question: What happens if returns on investments are not 8%? Senator Plamann: There should be an actuarial study available this week.

Chair Ebersole said he will send out the TIAA studies and share other pertinent articles.

**Update from Administrative Affairs Committee**

**On Election Reform**

Vice-Chair Peggy Ward-Smith reported on the work of this committee. They are charged to examine who can vote, how are lists generated, and the election process. Each unit may differ in definition of who votes, but when a campus-wide election occurs the definition should be the same.

The Standing Operating Procedures expect that each unit will report to the Senate what their definition of voting faculty is. The sub-committee found that only the Medical School had sought such approval. Actually, PeopleSoft can help us generate a list of 75% benefit eligible, job code, and job title.

Tom Johnston reported on how UMSL votes. A list of all eligible (at least 50% teaching or research assignment) is obtained from the Dean. Each school elects 2 senators. Then only Senators elect the Faculty Chair and Secretary.

At Columbia, only full time tenured faculty vote, again applying the 50-50 rule. That is, voting faculty must be at least 50% teaching or research.

At Rolla, who can vote? Full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty.

Conclusion: The Collected Rules are interpreted in a range of ways. The Bylaws of very few schools have defined voting faculty.

Question: Do we [the Faculty Senate] have the authority to change the Standing Operating Procedures (SOP)? Yes. Bylaw changes must go to an All Faculty Meeting and then to the General Counsel and finally to the Board of Curators. But who votes for senators is a local decision handled in our SOP.

Senator Carbone: Do we know the history of voting? That is, which units are high or low in terms of participation? Usually turnout is pretty low. Sometimes units have difficulty in obtaining a quorum.

**On Dean’s Evaluation**

Executive Committee member Nancy Stancel reported on the committee’s progress. Every year a 14 item questionnaire goes out. Sue Sykes-Berry of the Administrative Affairs Committee has easily handled it logistically in the past. We heard last meeting that the Dean’s would like an opportunity to have a short letter go out with the questionnaire describing their accomplishments. The current review
process obligate Deans to respond at a unit faculty meeting the following fall to the percentage/summary breakouts. Reports from the different schools indicate that wasn’t the way those meetings played out. Most evaluations are positive.

**Additional Information Item:** Dr. Bethman: The Student Success Center Committee has been meeting and that we are currently reviewing available space, the report from the first committee, and looking at whether the space assessment that needs to happen can be done in-house.

*Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.*