

THE UMKC FACULTY SENATE

REPORT

Date: Feb. 17th and March 16th, 2004

Note: This is a report on two meetings. A third meeting, which should have taken place on March 2nd, was cancelled. I apologize for the delay, but have been swamped. Happily, the March 16th meeting was, in many ways, a continuation of the February meeting, so a report on the two makes sense.

There were several issues discussed at the meetings. Of course, we discussed the budget (not too cheery). There isn't much money to distribute in salaries – a pool of about 2% is planned – so the Provost has suggested some other alternatives. These center on one-time awards given for outstanding teaching, research and service. The Provost's office would like feedback on these proposals.

We also looked at policy recommendations for the library/information center, discussed child-care centers and had a report on the diversity workshops that have taken place and are being planned. At our February meeting we voted to suspend Senate rules to select an interim Vice Chair without having a general faculty vote, and briefly discussed space utilization policy.

THE BUDGET, RAISES AND SPECIAL AWARDS

At the February meeting the Chancellor circulated a draft of a future compensation plan. The draft had also been presented to deans. It isn't for the immediate future (given the university's budget) but for 3 to 5 years from now. Gilliland argued that at some time we will have funds to adjust our compensation package, and we should plan for that time. A thought-out plan will also give guidance in the near-term. She emphasized that it was a compensation plan: it would include benefits. The UM system has an unusually good benefit package, and the Chancellor said that is often overlooked when salary is focused on.

The draft plan would collect market data by department and by rank. It would be kept up-to-date and would give an idea of what adjustments were needed. In discussion, questions were raised about part-time salaries, and the Gilliland said that market data was needed on these too. Some Senators noted that there were already salary databases compiled by organizations like the AAUP, and the Chancellor said that these would be used when they were adequate.

As of the March 16th meeting the final university budget had not been set, and the UM system was still discussing tuition increases ranging from 5% to 9.5%. Since each percentage point makes a difference of about \$500,000 in the budget, planning is difficult.

What apparently is determined is that there will be a 2% salary increase pool, paid for at the system level, from increases in tuition and enrollment. Units can exceed the 2%, but they will need to find internal funds via reallocation or fund-raising.

The Provost said that we are far below our peers on the amount we give on promotion to associate and full professor. We give \$1,250 (which is supposed to be matched by the central administration, so it comes out to \$2,500) for promotion to Associate and \$1750 (again matched, so it comes out to \$3,500) for promotion to Full). With the matches we are number 8 in the urban 15, but the matches don't always happen.

The Provost has developed a draft policy, and said he would welcome comments. It calls for a three-year plan to identify faculty whose salary should be adjusted on the basis of merit, market, "contribution to the purposes of the organization," and salary compression. After that,

- UMKC would provide a one-time salary supplement to faculty members who generate income from grants and contracts. The policy is modeled on a Pharmacy School plan. Under it a proportion of indirect costs could come back to the individual as a one-time salary benefit of up to 10% of the researcher's base salary.
- There would be annual distinguished teaching, service and research/creative activity awards of \$5,000 (one-time awards) for people with outstanding achievements in these areas. Up to 10% of a unit's faculty could be nominated, and a committee would review the nominations and forward recommendations to the Provost.

Some Senators questioned the reliance on deans for the awards, since some have favorites. It was suggested that people other than deans be allowed to nominate. Ballard said that one check on favoritism would be a review committee of 3 to 4 distinguished faculty who would review all nominations and make recommendations to the Provost. He thought deans were a logical conduit, but didn't rule out the possibility of nominations from others. [*Note: The compensation plan was discussed at our April 6th meeting, and a fuller (legally padded) version of it was distributed. It is on the Faculty Senate website at <http://sbs.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/X040406b.pdf> }*]

LIBRARY TASK FORCE

The library task force gave a generally upbeat report. They thought the architect was good and was working well with the faculty. They knew what they wanted (high tech ability as well as chalk, databases and some classrooms). About 5% of the needed funds had been raised, and the university hoped to leverage its resources. Asked why they were discussing a building and not the collection, the task force representatives (Senators Joan Dean and Laura Gale Green) replied that there was money available for the building. The task force will make site visits to look at other Library/learning centers

The new library/learning center will have spaces for groups of people and quiet spaces for individuals. It is also supposed to have classroom space, especially for large classes. They hoped that some of the student computer fee could be used to purchase databases. There is an interest in these, of course, but there are problems also. Some are expensive. If a subscription to a database is cancelled, everything is lost. Unless the journal is archived, there is no more access since the library doesn't own hard copies.

DAY CARE

Discussion of the development of a drop-off day care center for faculty/staff/students was on the February agenda, but was postponed until the March meeting. There was a brief

discussion of the issue. There is interest, and the Staff Assembly is anxious to cooperate. It was also argued that the Berkeley Center was not a model for what was wanted. We needed something much cheaper and more informal

In March Deb Lewis and Lori Reesor (Assistant Dean in the Education School and Chair of the Day Care Center Task Force) came to the Senate meeting. As a background for our discussion they gave a brief report on the history of child-care at UMKC. We had a child-care center for about 10 years, but it closed in the 1990s. It was open to the community, as well as to staff and students, and had about 80 full and part-time kids. There was no drop-in service available. Income came from fees and a \$10,000 subsidy from the university. The facility was closed because of costs, dwindling student use and the start of the Berkeley Center. There was no student outrage when the child-care center closed, and the administration only gets about one call a year concerning the issue.

A committee was created to examine the issues and see what was possible and desired. They wanted to understand the needs and potential student and staff usage if a center were created. They also intended to look at what other universities were doing, and had to examine funding issues. [Most other schools seem to have a subsidized center that is only partially paid for by fees.]

The Task Force will do a survey of both students and faculty/staff to determine if there is interest, and if people would be willing to pay for a child-care center. [There were questions raised about reaching potential users, since many students don't check their university email. An article or ad in the university News might help, but most students didn't read that either. Additionally, there might be students who would come to UMKC if they knew there was child-care available. If so that would generate tuition income – but how could we find out the size of this potential group? Certainly not by putting a questionnaire on the UMKC site or in the U-News. There probably are ways of reaching potential students, but the expense would be prohibitive.]

Other issues were discussed. It was expensive to have part-time drop in care, but that was probably one of the things that was needed. Some wondered whether we just wanted child-care or some pedagogy. [A pedagogical/training approach is desirable, but also expensive.] There was a suggestion that UMKC partner with other area institutions as a way of holding down costs. Another Senator raised a question about the dominantly female composition of the committee, since there were issues with males that had day-care responsibilities. He was afraid that these would be overlooked. The committee said it was open to these concerns.

DIVERSITY WORKSHOPS

So far there have been 32 workshops, and the feedback has been positive. On the other hand, there are many faculty members who haven't come. One problem was that the workshops took a whole day. Some Senators said that another problem was the bad reputation workshops had gotten previously (with some faculty, at least) because of the transformation process.

Pamela Shane-Dillard, Coordinator of the Diversity in Action program, and Joe Seabrooks, administrator of the Minority Student Affairs Office, spoke with the Senate. They denied that there was any attempt to make the workshops mandatory. Shane-Dillard said the workshops led to an awareness of self, and people thought that they had learned a great deal. She knew it was a tremendous commitment of time, but didn't think a smaller exercise would succeed, and

was dubious about running the workshops over several days. Possibly the workshops could be at a different time – perhaps meeting before classes started.

ELECTION OF DURIG AS VICE CHAIR

At the February meeting we elected a Vice chair. Ever since Ellen Suni resigned (to become an associate dean at the law school) the Senate had been operating without a Vice Chair. The rules-mandated mechanism of a general faculty vote on this position seemed impractical, since it would run into the upcoming vote for permanent Senate officers. Finally, the Senate decided to suspend its rules and elect a Vice Chair from within Senate ranks. Four people ran, and Jim Durig (Chemistry, A&S) won.

SPACE UTILIZATION

(Feb. 17th) Some of the space configurations on the campus are inadequate for current research and teaching needs, and sometimes the available areas are just poorly utilized. Units often consider spaces and classrooms their own, and are not willing to share them with other units that need them, even if they aren't using them at the time. On the other hand, some units, like nursing, had invested \$600,000 in the development of new modular units that suited their needs, and they didn't want to see these areas just thrown into a general pool. The issues were complex and needed to be studied, especially as enrollment grows and schedules become tighter. Some said that an annual review of space utilization might be needed, and thought space review questions should be a part of future COPE reports.

ODDS & ENDS

The faculty welfare committee will ask the Provost if a pool of money to pay units for maternity leaves could be set aside. It is going to try and make some assessment of the amount that would be needed. They are also still looking at the issue of adequate compensation for part-time faculty.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,
Faculty Secretary