Faculty Senate Minutes
Tu, December 14, 3:00 – 5:00 pm
Plaza Room, AC

1. Opening of meeting, information items

Introductions around
• Additions to or modifications of the Agenda

Information: About a week ago, the Provost circulated a request how to fill the position of the SVP (Senior Vice Provost) for Research and Graduate Studies, the job vacated by Vice-Chancellor Nancy Mills. Although still to be decided formally, the provost and deans all agree that the tasks will be performed by John Bauman and Ron MacQuarrie in the interim. No further decision at this point.

A “Sense of the Senate” resolution was presented to Senate:

The UMKC Faculty Senate thanks President Elson Floyd for his timely, principled and courageous intercession in support of academic freedom and shared governance on this campus. We pledge to work with him during this transition period, and encourage all faculty to take an active role in all aspects of the task of building a great university for a great city.

Discussion: none.
Vote: passed unanimously

2. President Elson Floyd

Thanks us for changing our schedules to meet, and thanks Senate for the resolution. Wants us to get the pain behind us and move forward. Floyd will spend Tuesdays-Thursdays at UMKC in January and February. Floyd will be meeting with various groups regarding an interim chancellor and how to move forward to a chancellor search.

Floyd wants Senate to help identify issues needing to be addressed. Floyd has asked all deans and each Vice Chancellor to pull together a priority list to identify where we are right now and what issues are particularly vexing at the moment.

Wants us to heal and to move forward and continue with important work of the university. Believes strongly in faculty governance. Only way he knows to address this is to physically be here in the coming months.

UMKC has a number of dean searches in progress and he has contacted the chairs of these search committees to keep the searches moving forward.

Floyd consulted with Provost and made the decision to remove the white paper from consideration. A number of committees were associated with the white paper and those will be disbanded after January 1, 2005.
UMKC will continue to be engaged with Kansas City. The relationship must be a two-way street for it to work – reciprocity and collaboration.

Will be available to provide feedback and counsel.

Asks Senate to defer any actions on the two motions on today’s agenda. As to the Budgeting for Excellence motion, Floyd feels that he needs to understand the budget at UMKC, recent budget actions and the initiatives put forward.

Floyd believes in evaluation, and has a rigorous performance protocol for chancellors and vice presidents, which may also be extended to deans. Asks Senate to allow him time to spend with deans and the whole concept of evaluation. Wants to come forward with a good instrument and timelines.

The question was asked whether we could proceed with the scheduled dean evaluations, one formal and three informal. Floyd said to go ahead with that process.

The question was asked regarding the deans evaluation motion – wanting to provide the new/transitional administration with a quick feedback regarding deans already in place. Floyd says that ultimately is must be the pleasure of the Senate regarding how to move forward. When presented with the 14-question evaluation form, Floyd retracts his recommendation regarding not doing dean evaluations – thus, the Senate can move forward with voting on motion 1.

A comment was made regarding motion 2 and its intent. Floyd’s asked Senate to hold off on voting because he wants to get the current budget situation assessed and settled. Senator Hood, who had made the motion and Senator Durig who had seconded, agreed to table the motion for the time being. This does not preclude Senate from having open discussion regarding the proposed policies and the planning behind the budget proposals.

**Floor open to questions (questions are in bold):**

**Any consideration to having an audit regarding budgets and money distributions in the university?** Floyd responds that they are reviewing all finances associated with the university, including discretionary dollars. Must establish a baseline. Not saying anything inappropriate occurred, but needs to know budgetary situation.

Senate Budget Committee would like to be involved as appropriate. Floyd concurs.

**Floyd talked about getting over the hurt. What plans do you have about how to deal with the community perception of UMKC as well as the rift in the university community?** Floyd has been meeting with key opinion leaders in KC and will continue to do so in one-on-one contact, which is important for these emotional issues. Will meet with Civic Council and other external groups. Floyd will be spending a lot of time in KC for the next two months to do this. Wants to have a convocation in January for the internal University audience — faculty, students, staff — at which he will present a “state of the university” and try to get folks excited about the future.

Floyd asks for help. There may be a strong perception that UMKC will no longer be engaged with the community. That is incorrect. UMKC will continue to be engaged. Steps taken and strategies may be different, but there will be no fundamental change. Must have a strategy that can be embraced, and embraced broadly.
Will Floyd meet with faculty in the units? Floyd relies heavily on the deans as an informational conduit. Has gotten requests to meet with various schools and will do that as time permits.

One Senator believes that the business community doesn’t realize how much UMKC has always been involved in the KC community. Possibly did not communicate involvement as well as should have in the past. Publicity helped reinforce/inform UMKC’s involvement in the KC community. Floyd needs all of us to help deliver that message.

Going back to your statement regarding support for community. Can you share with us that you support the initiatives that are already ongoing, for example, the Institute for Urban Education (IUE). Floyd has been supportive. Previous concerns regarding IUE had to do with the pace of the IUE. Floyd had asked the chancellor to slow the process down to allow all constituencies to be engaged. He thinks there is a better product now and that the education faculty are supportive of the IUE. As educators, if we make the decision regarding where we need to go, we will find our own resources if external resources are not available.

You had talked about disbanding of committees associated with the white paper. What about disbanding the various Blueprint committees and extended cabinet groups? Must de-legitimize the various appointed and ad-hoc committees that had been formed. Floyd requests the opportunity to understand these committees better before taking any action.

Is there any way the UKC trustees can be more involved in knowing what’s going on in the University? They were supportive of the previous administration without necessarily knowing what is happening in the University. Is there any way to get faculty working with them and letting them know what we’re all about? There will be a lot of heavy lifting, and there will be possibly a growing role for the Board of Trustees which, he thinks, has some 40 members. Floyd doesn’t know them – thinks these issues are on his “to do” list.

Asked whether an e-mail could be created to allow access to Trustees. Floyd wants to consider this – will look at moving on this issue with Trustees in January.

Among the UKC trustees, there was an arrangement in the mid-90s that 2 or 3 Trustees each would work with each unit. Suggestion to bring this back. Floyd will consider this.

Senator suggested writing an op-ed piece on tenure and why it is important for public policy. Need to quell perception of tenure as an antiquated system. Two senators volunteered.

Floyd thanks us for our work. Floyd will be as available as much as he possibly can. Exception will be when Legislature is in session. Will do the best job he can – will make decisions in a thoughtful way. Looks forward to being a full, active, participating partner in the coming months.

3. Motions

Senator suggested that the Sense of the Senate resolution be sent to the Kansas City Star. A second senator expressed concerns that this may not be a good idea. A third senator expressed that it would be important to inform the public regarding support of Floyd and his action. A fourth senator recommended waiting until after January 1, 2005 to send this to the Star. Senate Chair will contact Floyd regarding publicizing this motion.

A senator requests being informed of the result of the Senate Chair’s discussion with Floyd before any action. The rationale is to keep Senate informed, keep communication lines open.
Question regarding the official University conduit to the press. Response that there are a number of personal contacts with the press as well. The perception was expressed that Senate contacts must be independent of official channels because at times it may be useful to maintain contacts. Another senator states that the reporter will “do what she will with who you give.” Another senator states that if you state that it is a personal opinion, she will be careful. Acknowledgement that the press is improving its reporting.

Discussion ensued regarding issues with press.

1. Moved by Ed Hood on December 7, 2004, seconded by Jim Durig:

“That a formal evaluation of all deans be done this year, using only the 14 item form, with no portfolio required. Interim deans are excluded.”

Background: A senator had asked Martha Gilliland at the time of the previous chancellor search: “How would you as chancellor change our image as stepchild of the system?” President Pacheco had said “How dare you ask that question?” Expressed concerns that Pacheco hired someone who was against academic freedom, and that that person in turn hired folks who shared the same view. That’s why this senator wants to evaluate all deans this year.

Question was asked: “Do the survey questions expressly address academic freedom?” Answer: “No, only implicitly, but written comments are invited.”

Senator asked for clarification regarding how the process will work for those deans who are not part of the regular evaluation schedule this year. Administrative Issues committee will have to address these process issues. Formal evaluation results will be provided to Provost, President Floyd and the faculty governance of the unit – each unit will hopefully deal with this appropriately, sharing the results with the faculty. Senate will help with this access, if need be.

Senator hopes that all regular and all full-time non-regular faculty will participate in this evaluation. Observation is made that each unit decides through its By-Laws who has voting rights and thus will participate in dean’s evaluation. Request is made that updated voting lists from each academic unit are sent to Administrative Issues committee.

Dean evaluation will be issued on paper, not electronically. Evaluations will be letter coded to distinguish evaluations by different evaluation groups.

Vote: 25 in favor
1 opposed
1 abstension

Motion passes.

4. Budgeting for Excellence

The Chair recommends that the issue of replacing faculty representatives on Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) be addressed. The Executive Committee suggests that for each 3-year term group of 3 faculty representatives at least one of the members be elected from Senate and that the other two be elected campus-wide. Question proposed: Are we going to go forward and fill the open positions in the BAC in a combination of senate-based and campus-wide election processes?
Question from Senator why a prior faculty appointment is referred to as “non-faculty”. Answer: appointment is more than 50% administrative. Question – if you are a full-time administrator, you are not considered faculty for this purpose? Answer: Yes.

One senator is ambivalent regarding this recommendation, in part because this committee came out of the blueprint projects. However, we do need to state that the faculty have substantial representation on budget committees as mandated by the system Collected Rules and Regulations (CRR). Another senator wants to have elected faculty ready to fill vacancies, but does not want that interpreted as endorsement of the Budgeting for Excellence plan.

The Chair suggests that the BAC be explicitly made the one that meets the CRR criteria of being the standing budget committee, providing faculty input into the budget processes and concerns?

The remark is made that there are no bylaws recognizing the BAC. The Senate Bylaws that are being revised will need to address various campus committees and their relationship to Senate and official faculty representation.

Another question was raised regarding what the “substantial representation” in the CRR means. Could this be a majority of committee members?

The chair asks for decisions to get the process started before winter break. Is there opposition to getting process started to get nominees? Should the two remaining appointed positions become elected positions?

A question was raised how information gets back to Senate regarding BAC/budgetary activities.

The suggestion was made to ask members of the Senate Budget committee to serve on BAC. Time commitment may be limiting, however, they already have background and have developed a knowledge base.

The Senate Chair asked: Should only Senate elect or should all faculty elect faculty to serve on BAC? Senator suggests that Senate vote at this time and that, in the future, an appropriate full election procedure be defined.

Senator Hood:

**Moves that the election for the 9 members comes from the Faculty Senate and that we seek as broad as possible representation from all units on campus.**

Implicit in motion – candidates do not have to be senators and that all terms would be replaced.

**Vote:** 23 in favor

1 opposed

Motion passes

Nominations:

Jim Durig, A&S
Randy Gardner, Bloch
Gary Ebersole, A&S
Ed Hood, Law
Ed Gogol, SBS
Chris Rice, Dentistry
Steve Krantz, Nursing  
Laura Gayle Green, Libraries  
Patricia Marken, Pharmacy 

The chair will confirm willingness of nominees to serve and will invite faculty governance bodies of academic units to propose additional nominations.

Election process will deal with the term-assignment issue.

5. Committee Reports

The IFC committee report was presented by IFC representative Ebersole.

For the historical record, at the recent IFC meeting, Vice President Ralph Caruso and General Counsel Bunky Wright reported for the first time how the system reviewed and responded to the PC/computer logon that appeared across campus. The initial request for a logon screen came from the Libraries and was very specific and had to do with general public logging on, known as guest users in the libraries. This request was for guest logons only (having to do with inappropriate use by general public). Apparently the logon screen was approved for this use only and not approved for any other logons.

Following its use on the library computers, request came from an internal audit reported to the Board of Curators regarding computer security: some folks deduced it was okayed.

The Ad Hoc IT and privacy Committee will be bringing a new privacy policy draft forward at the January meeting.

Meeting adjourned, 4:57pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Gayle Green  
Senator, Libraries


Senators excused: C. Jones, C. Tarantino, K. Loncar.

Next meeting: 4 January 2005.