

THE UMKC FACULTY SENATE

REPORT

Date: Nov. 4th, 2003

Secretary's Note: In some ways this is an easy meeting to report on, since much of it was off the record. We discussed administrative salaries and raises with the Chancellor, and the specific amounts paid to individuals don't appropriately belong in the Senate Report, even though they are public information and are available in the library. We agreed that the general thrust of the discussion could be reported on. The tone of the meeting was more acrimonious than normal Senate/Chancellor dialogues, and the Chancellor bristled at some of the comments, claiming that she had striven to make the budget transparent. Of course the issue wasn't transparency, but amount. {There has been more discussion of this issue at subsequent Senate meetings, and since the discussions were on the record the reports will be fuller.} At the end of the meeting, in another largely off-the-record session, we discussed some of the comments President Floyd made about the budget problems of the UM system. In between these we focused on the proposed Institute for Urban Education. What was it supposed to do? Why was the Education faculty largely kept out of the discussions that led to its creation?

EXCEEDINGLY HIGH ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES AND RAISES?

The discussion was largely off the record, though your own Senator might be able to provide some additional information. What can be said here is that Senators thought the raises given to the administration and their staffs were extremely high, many exceeding 10%, and that most of the raises were far higher than the 2% average that had been allotted for faculty. In addition to the high raises, some of the individual salaries seemed very generous to many Senators. Some commented that there seemed to be two different budget worlds: one for the administration, with relatively loose constraints so that high raises could be given¹ and pet projects implemented, and another – much more constrained and supervised budget world – for faculty in the units. Some Senators argued that the distribution of pay raises contradicted the core values statements. Gilliland argued that many of the high salaries were possible because the administration had saved money in other areas. Several of the Senators who spoke were from the College, and Ballard said that the College had been unusually severe budget constraints last year because it was paying off past debts.

Towards the end of the meeting there was an IFC report, which included comments on a discussion with President Floyd. Many of the comments were confidential, but what can be said is that the President thought the budget was likely to get much tighter over the next two

¹ The argument wasn't that high pay raises weren't deserved – that would involve a closer study than the Senate had done. It was that many other people, outside of the narrow circle of the top administrators and their staffs, were also deserving of high pay raises, but were told that the funds were not available.

years, and he believed money should be targeted towards academic, not administrative functions. Cuts needed to be made in the administration. He thought that this, often, was not being done on the campuses. In line with this thinking he is seriously considering the possibility of consolidating the positions of System President and UMC Chancellor. Though the IFC thought that there were significant problems with this arrangement, the President believes that it may be the only way to send the message to the legislature and others that the UM budget problems are severe. The President is also severely downsizing the system level UM staff, and the IFC is discussing whether there should be an administrative audit.

INSTITUTE FOR URBAN EDUCATION

Both Gilliland and Ballard spoke about the Institute, though only Ballard stayed for questions. They said the Institute was a response to the problems of the urban school districts. Most teachers that graduated from UMKC went to the suburbs. Though the administration recognized that we had only a limited influence in this area, and that many of the problems were societal and political, they thought UMKC had an obligation to do what we could. It was what was expected of us. Some Senators said the distinction between urban and suburban was outmoded, as suburban and rural areas increasingly experienced urban problems.

Both Gilliland and Ballard said the Institute had no design yet. Gilliland said she believed structure needed to follow function, and that the function was to serve the urban area. Structure would follow. The Institute was to be multi-disciplinary, and they thought it should result in a significant change in the urban schools. Gilliland said she didn't think of it as a threat to the School of Education – she thought students and faculty in the school would find the Institute appealing. Its design, they claimed, went along with the best practices developed to help urban schools. Would the Institute grant degrees? Ultimately. [There was speculation about whether Institutes can offer degrees under UM rules.] Many of the positions would follow the clinical education model used in the Medical School, and would not be tenure track.

Senators noted that the faculty in the Education School felt they had a very limited role in the process of developing the Institute. That was why they felt threatened. Many of them were committed to urban education and wanted a more active role. They wanted to be a part of the conversation, and didn't understand why they had been excluded. Gilliland insisted that nothing had yet been designed – the Institute was simply a group writing a proposal. Education School Senators said the faculty in the school would like to see the proposal.

ODDS & ENDS

The Faculty Welfare Committee is going to look at the structure for part-time pay. Several Senators found that dealing with their deans on this issue was terminally frustrating.... A motion was made to put a resolution on the next agenda to restore academic awards back to the original levels. Reward amounts have been reduced because of budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin, Faculty Secretary