Faculty Senate Minutes  
Tuesday November 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2010  
Plaza Room, Administrative Center, 3 p.m.


Absent: Nilsson

Excused: Alleman, Stanley

Visitors: Chancellor Morton, Provost Hackett, Kim Bray (Dental School), Wayne Vaught (College of A&S)

Welcome and called to order by Chair at 3:01pm

Informational Items

The UM-System level Tenure Committee needs an alternate. This is the Committee that hopefully never meets. If there is a faculty member whose tenure is revoked, this committee convenes. Rochelle Ziskin (College of A&S) has agreed to have her name forwarded as the alternate. Senator Krantz moved to affirm Rochelle’s nomination.

Secondly, we’re looking for volunteers to serve on the Nominations Committee. It’s the only new committee established designed to take pressure off the Executive Committee when appointments open up. If you have any names (not necessarily Senators), we need people with broader contacts, let me or Cathleen know.

The Executive Committee talked Monday morning about the possibility of holding an All Faculty meeting in December. If you have any strong feelings, let me know. We may wait until we meet with Betsy Rodriquez and the actuary on November 9\textsuperscript{th} and get a feel of what’s coming next on the Curators’ discussion on the Retirement plan.

Approval of Agenda

Senator Rice moved and Senator Plamann seconded the motion to approve the agenda. All approved.

Approval of Minutes for October 19\textsuperscript{th}, 2010

The amended minutes were distributed this afternoon, and then a few grammatical changes were submitted. Senator Rice moved and Senator Plamann seconded the motion to approve the Minutes. All approved.
Chancellor’s Remarks: Leo Morton

The Chancellor began with a review of the Program review being requested by the Governor. While the Governor’s focus on economic development makes sense since most state revenues come from personal and sales taxes, directly related to jobs and job creation, our perspective might be to look at educating a student in an area the student is interested in.

Chair Ebersole: This is not a bad issue for the university since there are plenty of statistics about the significant difference that a college degree makes in terms of lifetime earnings.

Provost’s Remarks: Gail Hackett

1. Provost Hackett explained that no programs have been closed under this mandated review as yet. Five programs were submitted reluctantly but none have been eliminated yet. Two important points to remember: there has been no full faculty review and there would need to be five years of inactive status before closing a program. If any programs have demand they can over time have the option of opening up programs. The 2020 Taskforce is scheduled to do a comprehensive review. This effort is not likely to recover any costs. Rather, it is important to demonstrate that higher education is doing its part to trim. One constant is that higher education is never going to go back to previous levels of funding. It is important to find ways to survive at lower levels of funding. One option may be to collaborate with other institutions to retain small programs. Some discussion followed about the German major and how to make the case for interdisciplinary programs.

2. Provost Hackett passed out a draft proposal that Deans and University Budget Committees have reviewed and vetted. It’s a creative proposal for a salary increase for faculty and staff, a possible one-time bonus incentive on top of any permanent salary increase that may be forthcoming.

Senator Wyckoff suggested that this proposal may be sending a mixed message, from a political perspective, cutting programs and then giving ourselves bonuses. It’s not that I don’t appreciate it, or want to reward hard work. To raise salaries after 3-4 years of no or little raises, that’s one thing. No one would shun that, but it’s another thing to talk about bonuses while cutting programs.

Chancellor Morton: When work on this idea began, the notion of cutting programs was nowhere on the radar. He believes that there is a way to position all of this, in saying a lot of people would understand the idea of providing something for folks when they find ways to be more efficient.

Senator Wyckoff suggested that instead putting the money into benefits, or salaries or back into programs to make the university stronger in the long term.

Senator Luppino reported that the University Budget Committee approved this draft proposal unanimously in committee. It seemed that this was more in the nature of using an incremental
increase in available funds from good management of revenues and expense to provide some relief to a workforce that has had to forego sufficient raises to even keep up with inflation.

Chair Ebersole invited senators to touch base with their colleagues and be careful about the language used, to be sure to present this proposal as a draft. This item will be back on the Senate agenda as a discussion item.

Senator Fincham said he thought it’s a wonderful idea because it shows support for staff and whatever can be done to keep the staff is a positive feature.

Chancellor Morton: That’s the spirit in which it was done.

**General Education Reform: Wayne Vaught and Kim Bray**

Dr. Vaught began with a presentation about the efforts under way on campus regarding general education. A year ago, the Provost commissioned a task force to look at general education. The task force looked at education programs across the country and worked on how to engage the campus in general education discussion. One of the recommendations was the formation of a General Education Oversight Committee.

Dr. Bray presented the problem: UMKC does not have a common general education program. Most units have definitions of their own requirements, ranging from 12 to 68 credit hours. There is tremendous variability with only two common courses: English and the State Constitutional requirement. Another underlying issue is the Missouri 42 hour block, an agreement UMKC made with the State that this collection of 42 hours affords students transferability within the University of Missouri. Right now because we accept the Missouri 42 hour block, a transfer student can actually change majors more easily than can a freshman.

Dr. Vaught assured everyone that the process going forward will be open and recommendations will emerge from faculty. There will be town hall meetings, discussions and forums. The Provost’s website has every minute from the task force meetings, the report from AAC&U committee, and ongoing minutes from the General Education Oversight Committee. Most agree that general education reform needs to occur.

Senator Wyckoff noted that there are three Faculty Senate representatives on the Committee. Normally the Senate agenda includes time for a report on the General Education Oversight Committee.

**Definition of Voting Faculty: Peggy Ward-Smith**

Vice Chair Ward-Smith presented draft language to change the definition of Voting Faculty in the UMKC Faculty Bylaws. She explained that PeopleSoft can be used to generate a benefit eligible, ranked faculty list. The need for this proposal is 1) to standardize/universalize who gets
to vote in Campus-wide elections and/or issues and 2) to keep faculty matters under the purview of those with primary duties as faculty (teaching/research).

Constructive Senate conversation led to a revision of the draft to be sent out to Senators, including a separation of the procedures to generate the voting list (placed in the Standing Operating Procedures). Other comments related to the difference between internal unit elections and campus-wide elections and issues (such as Dean’s evaluations); the importance of verifying the voting lists by neutral parties such as a Senator and an HR staff person in each unit; whether or not certain Non-Tenure Track (ranked) faculty should be included; should the title ‘Director’ be included, as in ‘assistant dean or higher’; or simplify by only permitting tenured faculty (as done at UM-Columbia) to vote? Another issue raised was a need for an appeal procedure for units whose internal voting rules might be arbitrary, unfair or in some way constricted by administration.

Senator Krantz asked about the amendment process.

Chair Ebersole explained that the proposal has to come to the Senate as discussion item twice, then approved on a secret ballot after the second reading; if accepted then the amendment is circulated with a mail-in ballot to all voting Faculty (as currently defined) before the general Faculty meeting at which they are to be presented officially. The amendment must be ratified by a majority vote of mail-in ballots with a receipt deadline of 2 weeks after the general Faculty meeting. Then the amendment goes to the General Counsel’s office to be vetted as in alignment with UM System rules. Ultimately Board of Curators has to approve.

Chair Ebersole: This subject will be back on the agenda in two weeks. Cathleen will send out recommended changes, reworked definition, and with your permission move the assembly process of the voting list to Standard Operating Procedures. This revision can get out by tomorrow so the Senators can spend the next two weeks discussing with their faculties. We will not be asking for a vote in two weeks.

**Retirement and Benefits Report**

Senator Luppino offered observations of the Curators’ committee meeting on Nov. 1. Several Curators had done their homework, including referencing our faculty Senate paper and the UMSL paper. The Curators do not appear to be of one mind. Several Curators asked about different options and why not consider altering the existing plan? The key thing: the President opened the meeting by saying that he’s heard the worries about the time frame and he is commissioning a special committee to be responsive to what’s said and to conclude whether the time frame is or isn’t reasonable.

Chair Ebersole asked how the special committee is to be appointed?
Senator Luppino thought that the IFC and the Senate should talk about how appointments are to be made. There is a meeting with Betsy Rodriquez and (by phone) the actuary one week from today, to get information from the Curator’s subcommittee. It’s clear that the special committee is critical.

Chair Ebersole replied that any information obtained will be shared with the Senators.

**Adjourned at 5:02pm**