UMKC Faculty Senate Report

November 2, 2004
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Information Items

- The IFC election results were shared. The vote count was; Gary Ebersole 94, Bruce Bubacz 79, Kathleen Schweitzberger 58, Phil Olson 38, Nancy Stancel 13. Gary Ebersole is the new IFC representative and will serve a one-year term.

- Jerry Knopp is the new senator elected from Computer Science and Engineering. We are still awaiting the election of a senator from the Bloch School.

- A summary of issues discussed in the Dean’s Council will be provided to senators on the agenda for each senate meeting.

- The Chair thanked the senators who volunteered to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee on Technology Oversight and Privacy Policies.

- Following a discussion requested by the senate secretary the Senate agreed that the secretary can accept addendums or expansion of the senate report as requested by individual senators. This action was moved and seconded and carried unanimously.

Chancellor’s Report – The Chancellor gave a brief report on her recent trip to China to attend the Edgar Snow Symposium. She emphasized the very strong connection between UMKC and universities in various locales China. The Snow Symposium this year focused on research in the medical sciences. The Chancellor remarked on the very positive view of western medicine that is held in China and the interest in integration of western and eastern methods of medicine. Lee Ping Ping is the next Edgar Snow Scholar to visit UMKC and will be arriving here in January of 2005.
**Provost’s Report** – The Provost reported that the search for the Senior Vice-Provost for Research will be an internal search, if an acceptable internal candidate can be found. The position, which will report to the Provost, and will for the time being not be at the Vice-Chancellor’s level, will be filled for two years while the discussion of the campus reorganization is on-going. He emphasized however, that the position should not be regarded as temporary.

The Provost announced the white paper on Campus Reorganization is designed to frame the discussion on reorganization. The Chancellor added that the white paper doesn’t contain any ideas about how to structure the discussion. The procedures for discussing reorganization will need input from faculty. We will need to put forward a “test case,” that is an initial suggestion on how we will proceed with the campus level discussions.

**Resolutions on Promotion and Tenure/Charge to Faculty Welfare Committee**

There was discussion and action on two resolutions and a charge to the Senate’s Faculty Welfare Committee. The resolution as shown in the agenda, was amended to be applicable to all academic units, and not just to the College of Arts and Sciences.

“Be it resolved that the vote count of all P and T committees in all academic units on the recommendation for promotion and tenure for the 2004-2005 academic year need not be reported to the candidates, nor the actual recommendation letter from the committee chair.”

There was extensive discussion on this resolution concerning the insertion of the word “need,” and the limitation of the resolution to the 2004-2005 academic year. A central issue in the discussion was the fact that the support of many senators for the resolution was based on the belief that the clarifications had changed the conditions of the promotion and tenure procedures while it was in process this year in several academic units. The resolution was passed with a vote of 19 in favor, 5 opposed and 0 abstentions.

“Be it resolved (1) that the clarification on the Promotion and Tenure process shall include disclosure to the candidate of recommendations made at all levels, from school committees to the campus level P and T committee and the Provost, and (2) that full information and performance expectations for promotion and/or tenure be given at the time of hiring to any prospective tenure-track faculty member.”

The discussion of the resolution included the expectation that the requirements for promotion and tenure are set at the time of hiring and that the faculty member may expect to be judged by the requirements set at the time of hiring, but would have the opportunity to choose to be judged under any new requirements that may be enacted during the years of employment prior to filing for promotion and/or tenure. The discussion also included the assumption that any yearly recommendations from unit level P and T committees or administrators be shared with the candidate. The resolution was passed unanimously.
“In response to the Provost’s proposal to commit University funds to one-time faculty awards, the UMKC Faculty Senate requests the Faculty Welfare Committee to systematically assess the opinion of the entire UMKC faculty on:

1) whether the faculty would prefer the proposed system of a yearly distribution of up to 30 $5000 incentive/performance awards, to be selected by the mechanism described in the compensation plan draft (or as developed after input from the Senate Academic issues Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Welfare Committee) or

2) whether the faculty would prefer instead to have these funds ($150,000) placed into the salary pool to contribute to merit raises.

As part of the conduct of this survey, the committee is asked to assist the faculty in making an informed decision by outlining:

the mechanism proposed by Provost Ballard in Spring 2004 for selection of yearly one-time awards, and,
the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed awards, compared to merit-based faculty salary raises.

This charge was passed unanimously.

Student Center Project Presentation- Geoff Gerling, Student Govt. Association President and Deborah Lewis, Asst. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

- The following points summarize the presentation given to the Senate on the Student Center Project:

- Project began as a Breakthrough Project which was student initiated and student based

- Input from focus groups and an electronic survey,

- Students indicated their top six priorities were a food court, bookstore, study lounge, post office, computer lab and coffee bar,

- Students voted to tax themselves $85 per semester to begin in the semester of groundbreaking thus no fees have bee collected to date,

- Interim actions include extending cafeteria service, extending library hours, completion of Oak Street Hall, and development of student spaces projects,

- Issues affecting the project are the concurrent library project, the funding delay for the student center, and awareness of the possible relationship between the two projects,
• The current proposal is to add a structure to the existing university center to house more meeting spaces, student activity areas, and conveniences such as a retail services, the barbershop, the study lounge, and space for student related offices such as the Student Life Office and the Disabled Students Office,

• Initial schemes for 4 levels of the new structure were shown,

• Approximate funding is 28M total with 24M from student fees, 3 M from campus funds, and 1M from private donors,

• Total square footage of the new structure is 109,126

• Projected timeline is:
  - student input 2005
  - groundbreaking spring 2006
  - funding in place 2007
  - opening of student center spring 2008
  - opening of library expansion 2009

• Next Steps include:
  - get more input from all campus constituents
  - expand the design committee
  - get curators approval.

UMKC Marketing and Branding Presentation – Mel Tyler, Assoc. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and Sarah Morris, Asst. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

• The following points summarize the presentation given on the marketing initiative:

• The partnership initiative includes faculty, students, staff, UMKC Trustees,
• And marketing experts,

• Kansas City based marketing experts are donating their efforts and a firm called Stamats is working for UMKC at a reduced rate,

• The goal is to develop and implement a standard setting marketing plan that:
  - achieves our enrollment goals, promotes UMKC is a positive way, improves our overall image, complements the capital funds campaign, communicates our strengths,
• The Timeline is;
  Oct. 03   the initiative is developed
  Apr. 04   surveys are conducted
  June 04   focus groups are held
  Sept. 04  marketing plan developed
  Oct. 04   31 person implementation team created
  Campus wide dialogues conducted
  Nov. 04   media plan drafted
  Dec. 04   marketing plan finalized

• Surveys and focus groups showed that UMKC strengths are:
  personal attention from faculty
  convenience
  great academic programs
  great urban location
  wide range of programs
  successful graduates
  good value for cost
  diversity

• Surveys and focus groups showed that UMKC challenges are:
  lack of campus life
  high cost
  only regional recognition
  close to home

• UMKC’s primary competitors are UM –Columbia and KU

• Students rate UMKC higher than employees rate it,

• The media plan will use Cable TV, newspapers, magazines, outdoor signs, and the
  Kansas City Business Journal,

• The next steps are:
  Nov. 04   feedback to implementation team
  Dec. 04   marketing plan finalized and capital campaign announced
  Jan. 05   graphics standards manual distributed
  Feb. 05   marketing plan rolled out
  Mar. 05   media campaign begins
Fund Balance Information

The corrected data on fund balances from academic units is not yet available. The Chair was informed that a decision was made by the Executive Cabinet not to share that information yet. The Faculty Senate had asked for that information in early fall. Senators are encouraged to ascertain the following in regard to their academic unit budgets:

1. How much of the original beginning fund balance is truly, legally committed (i.e. encumbrances, contractual commitments, etc.)?
2. How much of the fund balance is represented as RIF funds obligated to support faculty research?
3. What items identified will not be funded because of the resource reductions to address the funding needs of major capital projects?
4. What items represent short-term (1 year) plans for expenditures?
5. What items represent long-term (2+ years) plans for expenditures?
6. For major commitments (#1) or plans (#4,#5) when were decisions made on these choices in your unit?
7. What portion of the funds will remain as a contingency for unanticipated expenses?

Excused:  S. Neau, C. Tarantino, C. Rice

Adjournment

Submitted by
Kathryn Loncar, Secretary
UMKC Faculty Senate