

**UMKC Faculty Senate
Special Meeting
June 8, 2004**

The UMKC Faculty Senate convened on June 8, 2004 for the purpose of discussing with Chancellor Gilliland the proposed restructuring of the Provost's Office.

Opening Remarks -Chancellor Gilliland

The Chancellor thanked the Senate for the opportunity to discuss the proposal for restructuring the Provost's Office and explained that the initial model was circulated as a "straw man" to initiate a campus wide conversation about the need for the restructuring and the form it should take. She stated that what is needed is a structure in which form follows function and that the structure of the academic division is critical to the vision and mission of the university. The structure of the academic division needs to be effective, efficient, and fully supportive of the missions of teaching and research. She asked the Senate to help her be sensitive to the issues which restructuring will raise at the unit and campus level.

The Chancellor indicated that she has been considering the need to restructure the Provost's office for over a year but had not addressed the issue because Provost Ballard was working within the structure he had agreed to when he accepted the position at UMKC. Provost Ballard's departure provided the opportunity to initiate the campus-wide consideration of a restructuring.

Since the issue was first discussed with the faculty officers and Deans in early May the Chancellor has received many e-mails which indicate that there is perception across campus that the proposed restructuring is the only option and that a final decision has been made. Chancellor Gilliland made it clear that the proposed structure is not the only structure that can be considered but what is certain is a clear need to restructure the Provost's Office to effectively address the key functions of the academic mission. She is asking the faculty to share with her what they feel are the academic functions which should be addressed by the Provost's Office. Certainly the Provost's Office needs to be highly supportive of the academic units, their action plans, and their need for resources, partners, and for overall guidance and coordination. In order to focus resources and support enhancement of resources for each of the mission areas-life sciences, arts, urban, and undergraduate education-a second academic officer is needed.

The Chancellor concluded by asking the faculty to think with her about, 1) the possibilities for restructuring, 2) indicate what issues she needs to be sensitive to, and 3) suggest the most appropriate communication strategies for the campus wide conversation which must take place as the plans for restructuring evolve and are finalized.

Senate Response

At the Chancellor's request each senator spoke to the issue. The following questions/points were made by one or more senators.

- * Costs – questions exist about the cost of the position and accompanying support staff, since money is tight and the units need the resources
- * Place of the Libraries in the New Structure - to which academic officer would they report?
- * Place of Undergraduate Education-which exists in both the life sciences units as well as other academic units
- * Balance of Social Sciences and the Life Sciences- as regards resources and importance to "education first" mission, would the restructuring marginalize the social sciences?
- * Possible Separation of Teaching and Research - which must be mutually supportive, a caution was made about regarding teaching as only clinical in some units.
- * Dilution of the Authority of Provost – the effect of a second position on the Provost's authority was questioned.
- * Provost's Responsibilities – several questions were raised regarding the Provost's Responsibilities including:
 - who are the 25 people who report to the Provost?
 - can't Vice Provosts take a greater share of the responsibility?
 - is the Provost overburdened because of micro-managing unit level issues?
 - what responsibilities would stay with the Provost?
 - shouldn't the major academic responsibilities be in the units where the resources are administered?
 - shouldn't there be a study of the responsibilities of the Provost before a decision is made about restructuring?
 - why is there a need to restructure the Provost's Office when he is no busier than most professors?
- * Separation of Volker and Hospital Hill Campuses – would the restructure cause a separation of the two campuses that would lead to competition for resources, poor communication, and alienation between the two campuses?

- * Blocks to Interdisciplinary Work – would the restructure hinder efforts at interdisciplinary work and re-establishment the silo mentality?
- * Poor Timing – the point was made about the introduction of the proposal for restructuring at the end of the academic year when many faculty are away for the summer and not able to participate in the discussions.
- * Agreement of Deans – are all of the deans in agreement with the need to restructure and supportive of the initial proposal?
- * Danforth Study – how will the recommendations of the Danforth Study play into the restructuring, would the freedom to select areas of research be impeded?
- * Deans' Access to Provost – will the new structure ensure that Deans have greater access to the Provost and to support for the units' action plans?
- * Relationship of Academic Division to Other Divisions – shouldn't the organizational chart for the proposed restructuring show that academic division as higher than the other divisions since it is the primary mission of the university?

Chancellor's Response

Chancellor Gilliland offered the following responses:

- * Some level of restructuring must occur and must result in greater access to the academic officer(s) for the deans and greater support for the units' action plans.
- * The medical and life sciences unit take a great deal of time to administer and a second academic officer for those schools is warranted.
- * The search for the Vice Chancellor for Research was not successful because the position does not have line authority in the current structure of the academic division and that will deal with external partners who want to deal with someone who is part of the Chancellor's Executive Cabinet.
- * The list of individuals currently reporting to the Provost will be provided to the Senate.
- * The initial model for restructuring is intended to maximize efficiency and minimize the silo effect. It was compared to other administrative models at other institutions.

Open Discussion

Following the statements from each senator and the Chancellor's responses the discussion was opened to all persons in attendance including several faculty from the School of Biological Sciences. Many of the points given above were restated and the following points were added:

- * That maybe the academic division might better be divided between graduate programs, undergraduate programs , and libraries.
- * That the initial restructuring proposal created defensiveness because it was poorly communicated.
- * That responding to the initial proposal was difficult because it was not clearly explained contained insufficient information to allow faculty to have a clear picture of how it would affect the campus.
- * The proposal needs much more faculty input and the faculty needs more time to Discuss and consider the proposal and possible alternatives.
- * That the chancellor should present the restructuring proposal to each academic unit.
- * That the recommendations of the Danforth Study might met by other administrative structures as yet unexplored.
- * That is may be appropriate to continue the search for the Vice Chancellor for Research and not assume it is an undesirable position.
- * That most universities with two academic officers have strong medical school and we don't so the proposed model may not be appropriate for UMKC.
- * That a problem in the Provost's Office may not require a restructure of the whole administration.
- * That we need to find out how many other institutions with medical schools and separate life sciences schools use a administrative model like the one proposed and how successful that model is.
- * That the faculty needs to have major input into any change which affects academic work and the faculty senate must protect the rights of the faculty from the influence of outside partners.
- * That maybe a new Provost should be found before the proposed structure is considered.

Chancellor's Closing Remarks

Chancellor Gilliland reiterated that the primary reason for restructuring is to ensure the greatest support possible for deans, and the action plans of the academic units. It is intended to provide the units with the support and resources they need to move forward. To get an accurate picture of the work of the Provost it needs to be measured in terms of the number of issues to be dealt with, not the number of individuals who report to the Provost.

The Chancellor indicated that she would be glad to discuss the restructuring with the individual academic units. She believes that the restructuring will provide even greater support to creative activities on campus. She understands that the timing and the cost of the restructuring are important issues to the faculty. She will ensure that it is clear how the Divisions of Finance and Administrative Affairs support the academic mission and assured the senators that the Chancellor's staff works as a team to support the academic mission.

Chancellor Gilliland reminded the senators that her own concerns about the need to restructure the Provost's Office were supported by the recommendations from the Danforth Study to create a life sciences leader, and from the perspective which Steve Ballard offered as he left the Provost's Office for his new position. She offered to provide the Faculty Senate with a full description of the duties envisioned for the Vice Chancellor for Research to facilitate understanding of the new position proposed.

The Chancellor assured the senators that there will be a process for student input as the discussions of restructuring continues and that she is aware that many issues including the IS training and on-line course support also need to be considered in the restructuring.

Chancellor Gilliland concluded by stating that a decision will be made about the new structure for the Provost's Office before the Provost search is begun next fall. She hopes to have the Provost search underway by October 1, 2004 and this provides the time line for the discussion and decision making on the restructuring. She is aware that the units will need time in the fall to consider the issue and should have adequate time between the beginning of the semester and October 1.

Final Discussion

Following her remarks Chancellor Gilliland left to attend another meeting. The senate meeting concluded with these final points:

- Jacob Waterborg, chair –elect of the Senate, announced that a General Faculty meeting may be held in the early fall to discuss the restructuring issue and he asked senators for advice on the timing of the meeting.
- Kathleen Schweitzerberger announced that there may be another senate meeting this summer tentatively scheduled for July 20th.
- A question was raised about the search for the Provost and the opinion was expressed that the search committee should be all faculty and not be diluted by outside partners or a search firm.
- The question was raised about the possibility of a resolution being presented at the General Faculty meeting concerning the proposed restructuring and the effect it might have on the Chancellor's decision. It was suggested that such a resolution could be sent to President Floyd since he would need to approve an administrative restructuring. It was also suggested that any resolution presented to the full faculty on the restructuring issue and/or on the representation of faculty in the Provost search process should be framed in positive terms. It was also suggested that faculty check with colleagues at other institutions which have two academic officers to see how effectively that model works.
- Since attendance at all faculty meetings is often difficult it was suggested that we consider having each academic send their faculty officers as representatives of the unit.
- The budget committee will meet Tuesday, June 15th.
- Each academic unit decides when newly elected senators replace current ones.

Adjournment

Kathryn E. Loncar, Secretary Elect