March 6, 2001

Note: The Senate meeting opened with a discussion of the Senate Reports of the last two meetings. Some people felt that it was not made clear that the Dean of the Education School was not present at the Senate meeting, nor was there anyone that presented her view. Your Secretary apologizes if there was any confusion. The Senate heard from faculty members of one division of the School and from the AAUP. The Reports reflected that perspective. Though Senators were sympathetic, they were aware that they had only heard one version of the story. They also thought that the Chancellor and Interim Provost had also only heard one side. As is often the case, people believed the story that they heard. That was why the Senate thought it was important to appoint a fact-finding committee that could listen to all sides. The committee is currently talking with Education School faculty and administration and should issue a report soon.

The Senate also briefly discussed a report that some members of the Blueprint process thought the Senate, and the Senate Report, were too negative towards that process. The general feeling was that we weren’t negative, but we did have important questions and concerns that reflected the views of many faculty members. Senators thought it was our obligation, as the elected faculty body, to express these concerns and seek answers to questions about priorities and implementation. Some Senators expressed surprise that questioning of the Blueprint process would be viewed as hostile. We decided to have an April workshop in which we could more fully discuss these issues.

Salary and employee reports

The Senate had requested some salary and employment information from Jennifer Spielvogel, Director of University Research. She presented more information than can be included here, but some of the tables were discussed at the Senate meeting. The UMKC Employee Counts chart showed that UMKC had 347 tenured or tenure track faculty and 509 full-time Exec/admin/mgr and “other professionals.” It wasn’t clear who was included in the other professionals category. It also seemed interesting that tenure track faculty declined 23%, while the two administrative categories declined only 13%. Non-tenure track faculty increased 11.1% from 2000 to 2001. We thought the issues had to be more carefully examined. Other charts showed the salary differentials between males and...
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females and between schools. There was a report on the
average age of people by rank, but there was not
enough data to see whether people that had remained
at UMKC for a long time suffered a salary penalty.

More information is available from Spielvogel's office,
but it has not been placed on-line.

Blueprint

There was a long discussion of the BluePrint process
and the Senate's relation to it. Senators that were
members of the various BluePrint committees (about
22% of the Senate) said that some people in the
Extended Cabinet discussion viewed the Senate as too
negative and engaged in destructive gossip. Senators,
of course, had a different view of our role, and some
Senators thought that some of the people in the
BluePrint process were almost "true believers" who
wanted 100% loyalty.

Senators were concerned with the huge $$ figures
attached to some of the BluePrint projects. W here was
the money coming from? W hat were the priorities?

Fact-Finding Committee

The committee looking into the conflict at the Education School reported that it was making progress, and
would issue a report in the near future. They were to report back to the Senate, the Interim Provost and the
Chancellor, but parts of the report might involve sensitive personnel issues that should be discussed
confidentially with the Chancellor and Interim Provost. W hat were the Senate guidelines for the Report?
Should the report be released back to the faculty of the Education School, or should it be confidential?
It was difficult to discuss the issues in the abstract. We all agreed that it might be necessary to treat some personnel issues confidentially, and we didn’t want people to be identified. There was also a general sentiment that the faculty members who came to the Faculty Senate for help needed to be informed.

The Senate finally decided that it was impossible to decide these issues in a vacuum. This was the first time that the Senate had created a fact-finding group and we wanted to do it well, keeping an open discussion and respecting confidentiality. We had appointed people we trusted to the committee, and we would rely on the decisions that they made. We recommended that they consult with the Senate Executive Committee if there were issues that they had difficulty resolving.

**Budget**

The budget situation looks fairly grim. Mission Enhancement $$ are currently in the Governor’s budget request, but there are no other increases. It is highly unlikely that the legislature will increase the governor’s request, since they often decrease it. The best guess seems to be that salary increases will be in the 3% range, but that is an all UM system decision. Some Senators questioned the cost of a recent Kansas City Star ad (apparently about $12,500) and other public relations events. They seemed questionable, and some thought the money should have been used to increase part-time salaries. Since we didn’t know the rationale for the expenditures, we put off a discussion of them.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,
Faculty Secretary