

Report

The Voice of the U.M.K.C. Faculty

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.

UMKC EMPLOYEE COUNTS				
Category	FY00	FY01	1-yr.dif	%chng.
FACULTY				
<i>Fulltime</i>				
Faculty with tenure	331	306	-25	-7.6%
Non-tenure on track	139	141	2	1.4%
Non-tenure-track	341	379	38	11.1%
Total Fulltime Faculty	811	826	15	1.8%
<i>Parttime</i>				
Faculty	520	555	35	6.7%
Instruction/R.A.'s	391	387	-4	-1.0%
Total Parttime Faculty	911	942	31	3.4%
FACULTY TOTAL	1722	1768	46	2.7%
STAFF				
<i>Fulltime</i>				
Exec/admin/mgr	182	179	-3	-1.6%
Other professionals	340	330	-10	-2.9%
Technical and paraprof	148	126	-22	-14.9%
Clerical and secretarial	312	307	-5	-1.6%
Skilled crafts	98	105	7	7.1%
Service/maintenance	202	204	2	1.0%
Total Fulltime Staff	1282	1251	-31	-2.4%
<i>Parttime</i>				
Exec/admin/mgr	7	11	4	57.1%
Other professionals	31	47	16	51.6%
Technical and paraprof	45	48	3	6.7%
Clerical and secretarial	106	104	-2	-1.9%
Skilled crafts	2	4	2	100.0%
Service/maintenance	83	115	32	38.6%
Total Parttime Staff	274	329	55	20.1%
STAFF TOTAL	1556	1580	24	1.5%
All Fulltime	2093	2077	-16	-0.8%
All Parttime	1185	1271	86	7.3%
TOTAL A L L	3278	3348	70	2.1%

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

Avg. Salaries FY 01							
UMKC	Asst. Prof.		Assoc. Prof.		Full Prof.		
A&S	\$ 44,141	62	\$ 50,893	48	\$ 74,247	63	173
BPA	\$ 72,167	4	\$ 75,138	17	\$ 98,186	18	39
Dentistry	\$ 58,769	28	\$ 69,731	37	\$ 100,589	17	82
Education	\$ 45,318	26	\$ 49,223	10	\$ 82,656	9	45
Law	\$ -	0	\$ 76,047	11	\$ 98,317	17	28
Conservatory	\$ 37,605	15	\$ 53,073	21	\$ 82,631	9	45
Medicine	\$ 32,422	6	\$ 68,030	8	\$ 64,478	3	17
Nursing	\$ 55,459	4	\$ 60,715	6	\$ -	1	11
Pharmacy	\$ 57,475	26	\$ 70,303	11	\$ 89,030	5	42
Biological Sci	\$ 61,102	13	\$ 72,751	17	\$ 130,078	6	36
CST	\$ 60,754	4	\$ 72,751	8	\$ 103,433	5	17
		188		194		153	535
MALES							
A&S	\$ 44,649	29	\$ 52,110	34	\$ 74,369	51	114
BPA	\$ -	2	\$ 70,785	14	\$ 97,644	15	31
Dentistry	\$ 63,230	17	\$ 72,200	23	\$ 102,821	15	55
Education	\$ 47,261	8	\$ 45,578	3	\$ 82,090	8	19
Law	\$ -	0	\$ 72,188	6	\$ 100,021	14	20
Conservatory	\$ 38,508	10	\$ 56,073	11	\$ 85,688	7	28
Medicine	\$ 38,175	4	\$ 68,537	7	\$ -	1	12
Nursing	\$ -	1	\$ -	1	\$ -	0	2
Pharmacy	\$ 56,316	14	\$ 65,659	9	\$ 89,030	5	28
Biological Sci	\$ 60,980	11	\$ 70,180	12	\$ 130,278	5	28
CST	\$ 59,672	3	\$ 77,897	7	\$ 103,433	5	15
		99		127		126	352
FEMALES							
A&S	\$ 43,695	33	\$ 47,937	14	\$ 73,727	12	59
BPA	\$ -	2	\$ 95,452	3	\$ 100,895	3	8
Dentistry	\$ 51,875	11	\$ 65,676	14	\$ -	2	27
Education	\$ 44,455	18	\$ 50,785	7	\$ -	1	26
Law	\$ -	0	\$ 80,678	5	\$ 90,367	3	8
Conservatory	\$ 35,797	5	\$ 49,773	10	\$ -	2	17
Medicine	\$ -	2	\$ -	1	\$ -	2	5
Nursing	\$ 52,262	3	\$ 61,932	5	\$ 87,568	1	9
Pharmacy	\$ 58,827	12	\$ -	2	\$ -	0	14
Biological Sci	\$ -	2	\$ 78,923	5	\$ -	1	8
CST	\$ -	1	\$ -	1	\$ -	0	2
		89		67		27	183

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. Where was the money coming from? What were the priorities?

There was concern that none of the BluePrint committees seemed to be discussing the degree programs that we currently offered. How were their need to be met? There were also questions about the criteria for measuring excellence. Much of the program was supposed to be funded by an increase in enrollment, but how would this increase be generated?

Senators were somewhat sensitive to the charge of being negative, but thought that these questions had to be raised and openly debated. They were certainly discussed in the various schools. The Senate had appointed a committee to set an agenda for a proposed retreat about these issues. The committee recommended a half day workshop on April 6th. We had issues to discuss among ourselves, though we might want a full-scale retreat next year. Senators agreed that we did not want the BluePrint facilitator to run the meeting, but some thought that we had faculty that were trained to do this and that we should call on them to help.

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. What 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