

## THE UMKC FACULTY SENATE

# REPORT

---

---

September 16, 2003

*Secretary's Note: Though the official documents of the university remain relentlessly optimistic, in this session of the Senate we began to grapple with the information that the budget news was gloomy this year and was likely to get considerably gloomier in the next several years. The administration has reacted to this by appointing a committee, chaired by Frank Horton, which is supposed to make recommendations about academic programs that are to be enhanced, changed, reduced, merged or eliminated. This process and committee were never discussed with the Senate or faculty, though the issues lie at the core of traditional shared governance. Additionally it seemed like something that should have been discussed by the faculty if we followed the Core Values so prominently displayed on the campus. The Senate is requesting a special meeting with the Chancellor on this issue. We also supported, with a sharply split vote, a letter to the President protesting the large salary increase given to the Chancellor. It was an interesting debate – read both sides in the Report.*

## The shrinking pie

The Senate discussed the budget with Provost Ballard. He said the worst is yet to come. This year (so far) there has been a \$2.1 million cost cut for UMKC. Academic Affairs' share of that cut is \$1.4 million. Ballard's office will absorb between 25% and 50% of the cut. The rest will go to the units. They won't get across the board cuts – the percentage cuts given to units will vary according to a formula being worked on by the Provost and the deans. The cuts will come out of one-time (cost) money: reserves might be brought down temporarily, there might be some cost savings in startup funds and in funds committed to positions not yet filled.

This year the state has used one-time money (like tobacco fund dollars) to pay for budgeted items. According to projections there isn't any of this left, and state funds will go down for the next two to three years even if the economy picks up.

## **Viability, the *Resources For Our Vision* Committee (RFVC) and UMKC's core values**

A committee has been set up (Frank Horton, Chair; Deans Osborne, Pembroke and Drees; Profs Durig, Mobberley, Dermann, Jones, Eick, Skidmore, Kauffman, Haddock; and Steve LaNasa from the Provost's office) with a charge to evaluate all programs by unit, and

categorize them as essential, improving and non-essential;<sup>1</sup> to complete viability audits on ULAPSE (School of Education), Physics, Political Science and Sociology (College); to identify degree programs with insufficient students, demand or quality, and recommend which degrees should be eliminated. The original charge (the one on the website, and the one discussed in the Senate) stated that in its final report the committee “must include” a rank ordering of departments and/or divisions by academic unit, “with recommendations on the programs that are least central to our vision, values and goals,” but *according to subsequent statements by Provost Ballard this was superceded by the Chancellor’s letter to the faculty which dropped the requirement for a rank ordering and stated instead that the intended outcome of the committee is to “evaluate and categorize academic programs in accordance with the extent to which they fulfill the Deans’ criteria as those criteria support the five goals.”*<sup>2</sup> The charge to the committee said it is to have recommendations for those under viability audit (including termination) and it is to have “recommendations for incentives that will improve the productivity and efficiency of our academic programs, emphasizing inter-disciplinary programs, alliances with other institutions, and departmental mergers and consolidations.”<sup>3</sup>

The Chancellor and Provost appointed the committee, and it reports to them. It obviously is dealing with curriculum issues that have traditionally been the concern of faculty. There was no discussion with faculty or the Faculty Senate about the committee or its composition or charge. The Senate wasn’t even consulted about who the Senate representative should be. We didn’t know what the procedures for implementation of the committee’s recommendations would be, or whether their recommendations will even be discussed with the Senate or the faculty in the various units. [Note: At a subsequent meeting of the RFVC Chair Horton said that he

---

<sup>1</sup> The categorization is to be based on the six “Deans’ criteria”: “Centrality to UMKC’s mission, vision, and goals; Quality of program (as measured by the 5 goal measures); Importance to the community; Efficient (recovers a significant percentage of its costs); Centrality to student success; and Builds campus partnerships.”

<sup>2</sup> The Chancellor’s letter to the faculty stated: “I have asked Provost Ballard to form a committee to recommend how best to focus academic departments and degree programs toward our vision. The specific charge to this Committee, *The Resources for our Vision Committee*, is three fold:□

1. evaluate and categorize academic programs in accordance with the extent to which they fulfill the Deans’ Criteria as those criteria support the five goals.
2. complete audits consistent with UM System directives for the ULAPSE Division in the School of Education and the Physics, Political Science, and Sociology Departments within the College of Arts and Sciences.□
3. complete a degree program inventory for UMKC.”

<sup>3</sup> The original charge: The specific mandate of the committee will be to:

1. Evaluate and categorize all academic programs by unit (for example, the Committee develop three categories: essential; improving and non-essential). The groups must be based on the six "Deans Criteria" and the relationship of each program to our 5 goals. All programs should be categorized no later than February 28, 2004;
2. Complete viability audits consistent with System Directives (December 16, 2002) for the following programs: ULAPSE (School of Education), Physics, Political Science and Sociology. Audits are to be completed, including recommendations from the Committee no later than June 1, 2004.
3. Complete a degree program inventory of all degree programs, by academic unit by June 1, 2004. The goal is to identify those degree programs with insufficient students, insufficient demand, or insufficient quality, and recommend which degrees should be eliminated.

#### Products

The Committee on RESOURCES FOR OUR VISION should submit a report to the Provost and Chancellor by June 1, 2004 addressing the three mandates above. While the report format is open to recommendations from the Committee, it must include:

A rank ordering of academic departments and/or divisions by academic unit, with recommendations on the programs that are least central to our vision, values, and goals (mandate #1);

Recommendations for each department or division under Viability Audit. Recommendations must include either: (A) a clear plan so that the unit will become clearly viable and the expected date by which that will happen; or (B) a plan for program merger, discontinuance, or elimination.

A list of degree programs to be eliminated; and

Recommendations for incentives that will improve the productivity and efficiency of our academic programs, emphasizing inter-disciplinary programs, alliances with other institutions, and departmental mergers and consolidations.

*intended to have broad discussion of recommendations, both with affected departments and with the deans of the units, before he submitted recommendations to the Chancellor and Provost.}*

Senators thought that the Chancellor's/Provost's procedure violated the most basic and well-established principles of shared governance. It also went directly counter to the atmosphere that the Chancellor claimed that she wished to establish on this campus, and was not in keeping with the stated goals of the institution. One Senator observed that the administration apparently did not think faculty could add anything of value to the discussion.

The discussion veered off into the viability criteria. The Delaware formula was being used to make decisions, but was not understood on the campus. The formula might also be more appropriate for large residential campuses (like UMC) than to urban universities. Additionally, though a "total cost per student credit hour" formula is being applied to departments, that is apparently an inappropriate use of a something which is meant to apply to large aggregate units (like the whole College or the Law School). There was confusion as to whether overhead costs are attached to departments. Extensive discussion of the two formulas was clearly necessary. [Note: After the Senate meeting it was announced that Bob Mullen, from UM System, is coming to the Horton Committee to explain the Delaware and the cost formulas, discussing how they weight various factors. He said, among other things, that the cost formula did not include overhead. A link to the Committee minutes is at <http://www.umkc.edu/provost/resources/> ]

Senators strongly argued that the actions of the administration threatened the central values of the university. The Senate unanimously requested a special meeting with the Chancellor to question why we were bypassed and to discuss where we go from here.

## **Letter on Chancellor's large salary increase**

Senators Mcaninch, Mirkin, and Schweitzberger were charged by the Senate to draw up a letter on the Chancellor's salary increase. They submitted the following:

Dear Dr. Floyd:

The UMKC Executive Committee wants to thank you for meeting with us on August 26 to discuss campus concerns about the large raise given to Chancellor Gilliland.

After discussing this meeting with several key senators, we feel that it is still necessary for the UMKC Faculty Senate to express its deep disappointment with the UM System administration in awarding extremely large salary increases to the Chancellors of the UMKC and UMR campuses. We recognize the importance of market forces, and realize that there was a possibility that the Chancellors of these campuses would have left the university if their salaries were not equal to the salary offered to the new Chancellor of the UMSL campus. We also are not disputing the merit of the two Chancellors.

In 2002, UMKC established five goals to be attained by or before 2006. They include being a workplace of choice and having the resources to fuel our vision. The UMKC faculty sees the decision to raise the salary for Chancellor Gilliland by 35% as being in direct conflict with those goals. This is a time of great financial stress for the university's faculty and staff who recently received a 2% pay increase that many were willing to forgo for the benefit of the university. It is the same for its students who have had to pay large tuition increases. There have been cutbacks in graduate aid and in the number of classes. Class size has grown while at the same time the growth of important new programs has been slowed or stopped and the maintenance of faculty able to teach basic programs has suffered. UMKC has deferred needed repairs. Library acquisitions have been slowed and computing infrastructure updates are on hold.

There is little new money flowing into the university. We question whether the maintenance of Chancellors'

salaries should be the highest priority of the university, so that private funds are raised for that purpose rather than other needs that support UMKC's core value of "Education First." We believe the salary increases send the wrong message to the community and politicians, and send a demoralizing message to faculty, staff and students.

We are most concerned with the process by which the salary increases were decided. In the units large academic and staff expenditures and salary increases are reviewed by numerous committees. Faculty, staff and administrative inputs are sought. Detailed justifications are developed. In this case none of that happened. The decision was arrived at quickly and with no discussion by the larger university community, and resembles the process in which large salary increases have been voted to corporate CEOs. We don't think that there was an emergency that necessitated bypassing even minimal review and justification.

The UMKC Faculty Senate has several requests for the President's Office:

We would like to know the system administration's strategy to raise additional funds for the faculty on the four campuses.

We would like to know the President's vision for funding the operating budget in the next three-five years.

We would like you to share your views on the widening salary gap between faculty and upper administration, including the potential for the next fundraising priority to be raising salaries of Vice-Chancellors and Provosts at each campus in extreme increments.

The Senate was sharply divided about the wisdom of sending the letter.

**Arguments against sending the letter:** the letter wouldn't do any good, since the decision has already been made; the Chancellor was good, and it was important for Pres. Floyd to keep her; it was a bright pre-emptive move to keep a good manager in place; *The Star* would misinterpret any letter as an attack on the Chancellor; the President didn't need to discuss the issue with faculty before making an executive decision; if Gilliland left it would cost more to replace her. Some Senators argued that we should applaud the salary increase for the Chancellor and argue that if the university wanted to keep good faculty it was also necessary to give salary increases.

**Arguments for sending the letter:** Many faculty members had given up their 2% pay increase to help lower paid people and the Chancellor seemed to be simply focused on herself, not the university; the part-time faculty had not pushed for a pay increase this year because they thought it would hurt the university; it violated the core values of a community of learners, etc.; it was like a commanding officer sending troops into battle while they stayed in a 5 star hotel; it sends the message that it isn't education first, it's administration first; that the Senate never had a chance to react before the decision was made, so it could only respond *ex post facto*; that we wouldn't be having this discussion if we knew the Chancellor had donated a large part of the salary increase to some university purpose; that Senators had an obligation to represent the views of faculty, and most faculty were angry about the issue.

The vote to send the letter was 10 ayes, 7 nays and 2 abstentions.

## **Comments on *The Momentum is Building***

Many Senators had not yet read the draft of the campus' annual report, entitled *The Momentum is Building*. Those that had looked at it made the following suggestions/comments:

- The report badly needs editing;
- It focused mostly on staff accomplishments and projects, not teaching and research;
- There was no reality check in which we were compared with similar institutions;
- There was no assessment of what our graduates were doing;
- It discussed only grants research, not articles, books and presentations;
- It paid no attention to the academic service activities of faculty;
- It should give some comparative yearly data on progress towards goals.

## **Faculty workload policy**

The IFC is working on a faculty workload policy and measurement instrument. The current policies and reports assume that faculty only do teaching research and service in fairly fixed proportions, while faculty are engaged in various activities. Online reporting, so that reports could easily be kept up-to-date, might be substituted for the current end-of-the-year paper report.

The workload components for each academic unit are to be agreed to by faculty, dean and Provost. One interesting feature of the new policy is that departments and units can average things – a researcher who teaches very little can be offset by someone who teaches many students and does little research.

## **Odds & Ends**

There will be an all faculty meeting on October 8<sup>th</sup>. One topic will be the viability/reallocation process. Announcements will be sent....There will be a Campus Open House on Oct. 17<sup>th</sup>. They are looking for volunteers to help “live the mission.”.... There was a brief discussion of the day of Learning, and Senators are to send comments to Chair Kathleen Schweitzer.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,  
Faculty Secretary