

UMKC Faculty Senate
April 5, 2005

Major Topics:

- **Chancellor's Search**
- **Promotion and Tenure procedures - Campus P&T committee feedback**
- **Incentive Pay report**
- **Budget '06**
- **UMKC Ad Campaign**

Information

- All full-time faculty are expected to complete the online FAS by May 15, 2005, providing information going back to January 2004 (<http://fusion1.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/X050405a.pdf>)
- Intercampus Faculty Council: Election for a new 2-year term is scheduled for April 2005: nominees are Gary Ebersole and Phil Olson.
Bruce Bubacz will complete Stuart McAninch's term on IFC until 2006.
- Nominations are requested of full professors for the UM Faculty Committee on Tenure.

- Information on **Chancellor's Search** from David Atkinson, chair of search committee.
The search has started. It has been advertised in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, with a closing date of May 1.

The committee has decided for a closed search process to ensure confidentiality. This is "because the pool will be very different than if the search is not confidential. People already in high level positions (presidents/chancellors) are more likely to apply if the search is confidential." The position offers an attractive salary, a comprehensive university, the Kansas City metro area, and President Floyd – all of these should be attractive to any number of potential candidates – "We want to be able to go after all potential candidates." The search can be opened at the final stage, if appropriate.

On April 20 there will be a full day of focus groups, including sessions for faculty, students, staff and community.

Pat Brodsky, AAUP chapter president, read a statement on the Chancellor's Search Process asking for an open search. David Atkinson responded describing the search process, reference checks, and how assessment on candidate's campuses. Atkinson hopes we have a new chancellor by September 1.

A senator asked the chair about other administrative searches being open. Atkinson responded that the confidentiality was particularly important for the chancellor's search. Another senator commented that he supported AAUP principles, but also trusted the faculty representatives who are serving on the Chancellor's Search Committee.

- U-News and SGA funding, Geoff Gerling
- Information FaCET, Stephen Dilks – in middle of 2 year planning cycle
- Announced webcast on scholarly publishing

Campus P&T Advisory Committee on P&T procedures and on the Roles and Rewards report.

Professor Hank Frankel, a member of the Campus P&T Advisory committee joined Senate to provide feedback from the committee on P&T process clarifications, including the expectation that P&T votes be disclosed (<http://fusion1.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/X050405i.pdf>) and the Roles and Rewards taskforce report (<http://fusion1.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/X050405h.pdf>).

A senator asked the question whether the policy on sharing the P&T vote need to be identical for all units. Units differ in size and other P&T-related procedures and these affect whether it is appropriate to release the actual vote tallies in addition to the arguments leading to the recommendation.

Vice-provost Thomas voiced the concern about a lack of consistency. Would different procedures put junior faculty in different units in an awkward position? In response, a senator remarked that junior faculty in the College would fully understand.

Provost Osborne was not so bothered by any lack of consistency as he was more concerned that the strength of arguments regarding candidate be disclosed and he accepted that each school has autonomy in its internal P&T process within appropriate guidelines.

The following resolution was proposed by Senator Hood, seconded and unanimously accepted:

The disclosure of promotion and tenure case vote tallies within each unit shall be done in accordance with the promotion and tenure regulations of each academic unit.

With the existing campus-wide clarifications on the P&T process, this motion implies that, unless specified in the unit P&T guidelines, campus-wide P&T guidelines apply, including sharing of the unit P&T vote tally with the candidate, in addition with the argumentation that supports the recommendation that is forwarded for campus action.

The Senate discussed what the campus-wide P&T committee does and how recommendations supported by arguments rather than the vote tally are made to the Provost. The campus P&T committee generally comes to broad consensus. Very few recommendations are split and these are the ones where the most discussion occurs with the Provost.

Hank Frankel provided a brief comment regarding P&T committee's assessment of the Roles & Rewards Report, reporting that also in this committee there does not exist a consensus. Hank, who professed to represent the group not in support of the report recommendations, presented some of the arguments:

- concern that the guidelines would be watered down with a lessening of the value of research.
- recognition of the general spirit that units have different requirements and emphases, which is OK to the P&T committee, but the committee does not want research emphasis to be lessened.
- impression that this report was heavily influenced by the former chancellor.
- don't think that we're going to make a university better by defining what makes a good university.

Incentive payment proposal

The report from the Faculty Welfare Committee on Incentive Payment proposal, drafted by senator McAninch was distributed (<http://fusion1.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/X050405c.pdf>). Three units responded to the request for feedback. In general, faculty seem to not be in favor of one-time payments and would rather see that money be added to the raise pool. The same appears to be the view on research incentive rewards.

The Provost pointed out that major medical schools are providing this incentive to their faculty. The response from senators was that we are not "those schools" and that incentives need to be built from within the units.

The motion to accept findings of the committee report carries with 19 votes in favor, 3 opposed and no abstentions.

UMKC budget overview 2002-2005

Overviews of budget changes from FY2002 to FY2005 were provided to Senate by senator Durig, chair of the Senate budget committee, with some clarifying comments, and by senator Luppino, a

member of the budget committee, who also gave an overview of the major budget changes. All budget handouts (including some last minute updates) are available on the senate website.

UMKC budget for FY2006 (July 2005 – June 2006)

Vice-chancellor Gates shared assumptions, constraints and expectations for the FY2006 budget for UMKC in a presentation available on the website <http://fusion1.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/X050405f.pdf> in an updated format with numbers that were presented verbally but that were not in the handout provided to senate. For detailed information, review the OnLine information.

Major factors included a high increase (14.5%) in benefits costs, a temporary adjustment in campus maintenance down to 1%, an increase in PeopleSoft costs of nearly \$700,000, utilities and insurance increases, no change in student aid from the \$22 million level of FY05, a 2% salary raise pool and a commitment to honor tenure, promotion and other programmatic obligations, resources permitting.

All new resources from enrollment and tuition (3.5%) increases are allocated to Academic Affairs, with major reallocations to align base funding for selected academic program and support units. An administrative review to reduce cost and achieve efficiencies is on-going.

To help balancing the budget, President Floyd chose this year to release \$4 million of one-time money which was used in the current year as a match for private money towards scholarships, to the campuses. Of the \$750,000 for UMKC, \$350,000 is allocated to academic affairs will address two existing issues within schools, \$350,000 is allocated to student affairs to support transitional issues related to Twin Oaks (assisted by support from Kansas City), keeping \$50,000 in reserve for the latter issue, if required.

In addition, UMKC received \$90,000 one-time money to provide Cost Of Living Adjustment for retirees, but UMKC will have to find this as rate money within its budget for FY07 and beyond.

A senator raised the question: “This assumes that there is no change in state funding. What if there is a change? Is there a contingency plan?” Gates responded: If this is a one-time event, a withholding, the strategy should be how do we best use our fund balances to accommodate this? Keep in mind that some of those fund balances are already committed, e.g. to the health sciences building on Hospital Hill. If this is a core reduction, which rarely happens in the middle of a funding year, we would be looking at targeted reductions in General Revenue Allocations to all units and thus at some hard decisions.

Another Senator inquired about the Academic Affairs’ budget: “Why are there entries for a Vice Chancellor for Research and for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness?” Gates answered on the latter issue. Functions of the Office for Institutional Effectiveness were split. Academic Affairs acquired the responsibility and the personnel for institutional research. The position for the head of the office was retained by the Chancellor’s Office.

UMKC Ad Campaign

Sarah Morris and Vice-Chancellor Pat Long introduced the new advertising campaign that will be launched at the Fine Arts walkway on We, April 6.

In attendance:

L.G. Green, G. Ebersole, S. Driever, P. Crossland, E. Hood, S. Thompson, O. Igwe, S. Joy, S. Dilks, K. Bame, C. Jones, K. Mitchell, J. Knopp, J. Snell, S. Neau, K. Ballou, C. Rice, T. Luppino, E. Gogol, J. Foxworth (for T. Cole), A. Reece, T. Mardikes, D. Murphy, J. Waterborg