The meeting was opened by Faculty Senate Chair, Jakob Waterborg. Approximately 75 faculty members were in attendance. The Chair began with an overview of the meeting agenda indicating that he would give an update of the proposal first introduced by Chancellor Gilliland last spring and the changes that have occurred over the summer. The Chair assured the faculty that there would be opportunities for all viewpoints to be put forward during the meeting, and that the ultimate goal of the meeting was; 1) to come to a common understanding of our need to address the issue of reorganization pro-actively, 2) and, if we agree that a reorganization is necessary, the faculty should plan to put forward a well thought-out proposal.

The Chair reviewed the proposal suggested by Chancellor Gilliland. He included a review of:

- the possibilities it offers of enhancing our strategic mission including; 1) the deepening and expanding of the visual and performing arts, 2) initiatives and collaborations in urban issues especially education, and 3) leading in the life sciences,
- the intended outcomes of the proposal include; 1) a unified UMKC vision, 2) more effective decision making, 3) more efficient infrastructure support, 4) quality life sciences as outlined in the Danforth Report, 4) similar emphasis for the visual and performing arts, 5) expanded partnerships, 6) expanded support for interdisciplinary research, creative works and urban education,
- the important questions the Chancellor posed when she presented this initial proposal last May were:
  - what are other potential outcomes of the revised structure,
  - what problems does it address,
  - what problems does it not address.
- the organizational chart offered with the Chancellor’s initial proposal, and the reasons given for it including: 1) too many report lines to the Provost, 2) the ability to make the life sciences mission possible.

The Chair reviewed some concerns that have been expressed about the proposal including:

1) the danger of splitting the campus into “haves” and “have-nots,”
2) jeopardizing the academic integrity of the institution,
3) and the possibility of only addressing one of UMKC’s missions.

The Chair reminded the faculty that the report of the June 8th Senate meeting is available on the Faculty Senate website which contains details of the concerns faculty have expressed regarding the initial proposal.
The Chair then reviewed the changes which have occurred in the initial proposal over the summer including:

1) postponing the timeline for response and decision making from Oct. 1, 2004 to fall of 2005,
2) response from several academic units, especially SBS, urging an extended and thorough analysis and discussion of reorganization,
3) the appointment of Bill Osborne to a two-year term,
4) changes made by Provost Osborne in the distribution of responsibilities within the Provost Office,
5) discussions by life sciences deans regarding the advantage of having a top quality scientist lead the life sciences research mission rather than an administrator, and
6) the recent request of President Floyd that Chancellor Gilliland review the role of the School of Medicine in life sciences research.

The Chair again urged all faculty members to focus their discussions on what changes we may need to make in the structure of UMKC to reach ALL of our academic missions and to maintain and strengthen our academic core. Do we accept the goals the Chancellor has cited for the reorganization? Do we need to add goals? Can we reach our goals with the current organizational structure? What must change?

Chair Waterborg asked for a show of hands to determine the distribution of faculty representation from the various academic units. Speakers from several units then made brief statements.

School of Biological Sciences – concern expressed about external forces we aren’t being told about; clear reasons are not given for why we should reorganize; suggested that if reorganization is necessary, we need to look at a variety of ways.

College of Arts and Sciences – concern expressed about the timing of the proposal’s presentation after the end of the academic year; it is not clear in the proposal how graduate studies and research would be handled; not enough information is given about reasons for reorganization; trust is an issue; faculty felt like they were treated like children and not given frank explanations or open conversation; suggested that silos are not necessarily negative and should be seen that way.

Conservatory of Music – let life and health sciences know we share their excitement about new initiatives; not many concerns exist in Conservatory; some concern is expressed about splitting academic units, concerns more like business concerns than academic concerns; faculty appreciate the time to think and consider the issue in depth.

Dental School – recommended we have a faculty meeting on Hospital Hill so Volker campus faculty can see it; questioned whether the plan might generate greater need for resources so that a battle for scarce resources could result; glad that the process is slowed down; appreciates that the Provost is staying two years; no strong feelings in dental school.

Libraries – urged faculty to look at the website that shows the library plan and to participate in focus groups; libraries do need to be in the conversation because all units need library support; if academic units are split, libraries would be split and that raises questions about what happens to libraries services; noted that any new high level position will require staffing and asked who will sacrifice for that.
Following these statements the floor was opened to any speaker. The following comments were made by individuals.

- Speaker was against reorganization; the split of academic units will cause bigger budget fights; timing was bad for offering the proposal; many upset about the direction of this university; need a referendum on Chancellor’s leadership; much energy and productivity was lost fighting the proposed move of law school to 811 Grant.

- Thought the purpose of this meeting was to address the erosion of our faculty rights and governance – gave examples i.e. library, School of Education; faculty has lost the capacity to determine what this campus will be like; encouraged the collecting of evidence of erosion of faculty rights; questioned why sociology program was forced to do program audit which showed the department doing good work but is still being forced to consider reorganization of the department; a great social scientist was on campus and was not used properly because he was not available to faculty and students in sociology; the administration isn’t thinking about what is happening in the trenches, makes top-down decisions; faculty are not involved in decision making; people are afraid to speak out for fear of retaliation; we need to pool evidence of lack of faculty voice.

- Why are we wasting our time on this?; central administration needs to justify their budgets like academic units do; it is clear that the mentality of this administration is that we are employees and not partners in shared governance; there is fear of retaliation for speaking-out; some think the Chancellor should be replaced.

- The decision of the Chancellor to support the health sciences is driving the budget and policies and is not in keeping with the “Education First” goals; the university needs to protect its space as a place for critical reflection, and should not be blown by others’ political whims or used for other purposes; faculty are not making the decisions; faculty don’t have a real voice, even in faculty positions; we are not partners; we do not put education first at UMKC.

- Should be having a discussion about what kind of administration faculty want at UMKC; need a motion about a committee of faculty to look at reorganization proposal, and the Chancellor should receive from this body a clear statement.

- Faculty want to know the reasons the Chancellor suggested the proposed reorganization.

- Many faculty find themselves supporting many of the goals of the university but there has been wide-spread concern about the methods of carrying them out.

- This body should not make a motion now since many have had to leave and we are over the time limit set for the meeting.

- Suggestion that we make a motion: leave it floating and open.
• Agreement that there are public and private goals; we support the public goals but we don’t know what the private goals are.

• We should place the onus on the Chancellor for explaining the reasons for the proposal, since the campus did originally have this plan for two academic leaders and it was changed: why are we changing back to it?

• There has been a lot of time spent on a plan that may not need to exist; we need to forward to the Chancellor the question: “Why?”

• We aren’t speaking with one voice as a faculty because our governance is eroded.

• UMKC has fallen into a pattern of the Chancellor spiking ideas and the faculty being forced to block them, and although we like what she has done in part, we need to start spiking and turn this relationship around.

• How was the permanent Provost selected? Was it a function of our asking for more time to discuss the reorganization proposal? The decision lacked a faculty voice: there should have been a faculty committee because a permanent Provost should not have been appointed without a faculty committee.

• The Chancellor’s leadership needs to be examined. The 5 year evaluation is not widely known yet.

The Chair reviewed the academic missions of UMKC and asked the faculty to consider if they agree with those missions. The Chair urged the faculty to work with the administration, and work together as a faculty, so that our voices can be heard. “We want to work through the Faculty Senate to start discussion around campus for faculty to be heard.” The Chair agreed that there needs to be widespread faculty participation. If the faculty asks that the Chancellor come to meet with them, then the faculty needs to turn out, not just a few members.

Following this discussion, the following motion was made:

“The faculty resolve that the Chancellor explain to the faculty the reasons and consequences of the proposed reorganization.”

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously, with one abstention. The Senate Chair and Secretary did not vote.

Adjournment
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