UMKC Faculty Senate  
April 19, 2005

Major Topics:

- Blue Ribbon Task Force
- Composition and Election of Campus P&T and Grievance Committee membership
- Program Evaluation Committee

Information

- Optional Summer meetings for Senate have been scheduled for May 10, June 14 and July 12.
- Ballots for the 2005 IFC election will be distributed shortly.
- Athletics committee – Pat Peebles will serve as the new Senate-endorsed faculty representative.
- Please inform chair Waterborg when unit elections for senator or standing committees have been completed.
- To finance the creation of the Hospital Hill parking structure, a 10% increase in parking fees is anticipated for the new academic year. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration (and Parking) Rick Anderson is invited to present campus-wide parking planning to the Senate Budget Committee and to Senate.

Blue Ribbon Task Force initiative of the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation
Information was provided by Larry Jacob, Senior Vice President of the Foundation (http://fusion1.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/X050419d.pdf)

LJ explains why this initiative was made, asks Senate how this can be helpful and how best to work with faculty and students during the proposed timeline over the summer. He notes that many positive things are happening at UMKC right now. The question that keeps coming back: can we continue to have a great city without supporting a great urban university? How do you support (and does KC want) a great urban university?

The task force would provide a useful look from the outside at UMKC from a wide variety of perspectives with the intent to provide that information to the chancellor’s search committee. The task force would also provide input, in the same summer time frame, for the Governor’s reform initiative to review higher education funding in the state.

LJ expects that very divergent views will come out in the anticipated report, just as seen in the City/State report, with recommendations based on what is heard and from experiences in other cities. The task force plans to have one-on-one interviews, small group sessions and open forums.

Questions were raised by various senators. How were the six persons on the task force selected? Answer: The Community Foundation brought in Frank Rhodes several years ago and he was again of help.

The background of task force members suggested to senators, supported by web views, that the task force members all share a viewpoint similar to what the former chancellor “pushed”. The concern was expressed that now is not a good time, that faculty are ‘off contract’ during the
summer, that students are largely gone, that this initiative might disrupt the chancellor search process, and thus that this type of initiative must wait until UMKC has a new chancellor.

The relationship between members of the UMKC Board of Trustees and the Greater KC Community Foundation was questioned. LJ stated that the Foundation took the initiative and asked the Trustees whether this project would be useful, after which President Floyd was included in the discussion.

Concern was voiced about the role of the UMKC Board of Trustees relative to the official role of the University of Missouri Board of Curators. It was noted that Frank Rhodes was a mentor for Gilliland and that the UMKC Board of Trustees has been displeased with UMKC faculty action against Gilliland. To have this group involved in creating this task force raises suspicion that a style of leadership is pushed that was repudiated by at least 80% of the faculty. It was explicitly stated that if this project goes forward as stated, the process and report will have little validation with the faculty.

LJ promised to convey the concerns regarding the timetable and the composition of the task force to the Foundation. When asked, he thought that UMKC could have input in adding/removing task force members even though the task force has started to act (e.g. Dr. Benno Schmidt and President Elson Floyd were reported to have met with Governor Blunt) and also that the time frame of the task force work might be changeable. LJ emphasized that not just ‘fixing UMKC’ but also state funding for higher education is a task force focus.

Resolutions on standing committee composition and membership selection procedures.

The following resolution was unanimously approved:

Resolution D
1. For each "Senate" seat with an expiring term of appointment, the faculty of the unit represented, through their faculty Senators and/or the chair of the faculty governance body of the unit, will be requested by the Chair of the Senate to elect during the preceding Winter/Spring Semester from among the faculty of the unit two (2) nominees.
   For each "Dean" seat with an expiring term of appointment, the Provost will solicit the names of two (2) faculty nominees from the dean of the unit represented.
2. Full-time regular and non-regular faculty members with less than 50% administrative appointments are eligible to be nominated.
3. For each "Senate" seat, the Faculty Senate will forward the names of the two (2) faculty-elected nominees for consideration of appointment under the diversity stipulations of CRR 370.010.G.2.a(1).
4. The Executive Committee of the Senate and the Provost (representative(s)) will deliberate how best to meet the Panel's diversity stipulations among the nominated Panel members, taking into account the diversity among the continuing Panel membership.
5. Selected nominees for "Senate" seats are appointed for a three (3) year term by official action of the UMKC Faculty Senate.
   Selected nominees for "Dean" seats are appointed for a three (3) year term by the Chancellor.

The second sentence of item 3 in Resolution E (alternate text) was discussed. Currently the campus P&T committee, which lacks Library representation but has a non-regular faculty members as a representative for the School of Medicine, reviews promotions of non-regular faculty in the Medical School and in Libraries. Promotions of other non-regular faculty are not subject to campus review. Changes in ‘non-regular’ faculty organization, currently under discussion in IFC, may change what UMKC should do in the future.
It was asked: Why would the Chancellor not have to explain why a nominee is refused? (article 5)  Answer: This could involve personnel issues. However, if a chancellor would ask for reconsideration without arguments, the faculty could just re-elect the same nominee.

Resolution E (alternate) was accepted without changes by a vote of 20 in favor and 1 abstention.

Alternate Resolution E
1. The faculty membership of the UMKC Campus Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee will consist of one (1) elected representative from each UMKC school with regular faculty, headed by a dean, and of three (3) elected representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences.
2. For each Committee seat with an expiring term of appointment, the faculty of the unit represented, through their faculty Senators and/or the chair of the faculty governance body of the unit, will be requested by the Chair of the Senate to elect during the preceding Winter/Spring Semester from among the faculty of the unit one (1) nominee.
3. Full-time regular faculty members on continuous appointment with less than 50% administrative appointments are eligible to be nominated. For academic units where a large fraction of full-time faculty have non-regular faculty status, full-time non-regular faculty with the rank of professor and with less than 50% full-time administrative appointments may be nominated.
4. Each nominee is forwarded by the Senate to the Chancellor for appointment to a three (3) year term.
5. The Chancellor has the right, once, to refuse the proposed nominee and to ask for reconsideration by the faculty of the nominee elected.

The meeting agenda was rearranged by a vote of 20 in favor, 1 against, with the stipulation that the next agenda item would not extend past 4:30 pm.

Discussion of the Blue Ribbon Task Force initiative.
Members of Cosco, who had a meeting with President Floyd discussing the initiative, proposed a Sense of the Senate resolution. Following an extended discussion it was slightly modified to the text below. The resolution passed unanimously.

RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY
At a meeting of the Faculty Senate (“Senate”) of UMKC, held on April 19, 2005, the Senate on motion duly made and seconded, hereby adopts with unanimous support the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation (“Foundation”) has provided funding for the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Task Force to conduct a study of UMKC and the role it can and should play in the future of the Kansas City community,

WHEREAS the UMKC Board of Trustees at a meeting held on April 11, 2005, enthusiastically endorsed the proposed study sponsored by Foundation.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate welcomes a comprehensive study of this university’s association and connections with the Kansas City community, encourages continuing analysis
of the faculty by internal or external evaluators, and appreciates the Foundation’s support in funding this Blue Ribbon Task Force and

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate has the following reservations with respect to the composition of the Blue Ribbon Task Force, the scope of its charge, and the timing of its study:

1) From the Senate’s research into the composition of the Blue Ribbon Task Force, we find it troubling that most members are directly connected with former Chancellor Martha Gilliland,

2) The Senate has also discovered that many Blue Ribbon Task Force members are on record of supporting the diminishment of faculty governance and favor an American university that is ultimately corporatized,

3) The Senate questions whether the budgeted sum of $50,000 allocated to compensate six distinguished members is sufficient for this task force to create a meaningful document and the Senate wonders who will be responsible for writing this report,

4) The Senate finds it impractical for this Blue Ribbon Task Force to do their site visit at a time when faculty are off contract and away from the university, and believe that the faculty the task force should want to talk with most will be away for the summer doing research in the field and writing to meet publishing deadlines,

5) The Senate believes that should the UMKC Trustees and the Foundation truly wish to provide a report with recommendations to support our future chancellor, then this research should take place after the installation of our new chancellor and operate in partnership with the new leader of UMKC,

6) Finally, the Senate believes that operating an external task force at this specific time has a high probability of being ultimately disruptive of our search for a new Chancellor and will only destabilize the pool of exceptionally qualified candidates,

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED by the Senate that the faculty of UMKC support this Blue Ribbon Task Force only if their investigation begins no earlier than the fall of 2005, the Task Force is reconstituted, broadened and balanced, and the study is conducted in conjunction with a newly appointed chancellor.

Program Evaluation Committee (see Senate website handouts)

Task of PEC has a number of functions assigned: COPE functions, continuous improvement of programs as well as forward-looking, self-evaluation processes. PEC will not have evaluations for accredited units separate from the established accreditation cycles. Major units for which a COPE-like process is being developed are specifically the College, Education and Biological Sciences.

PEC was originally established with rolling 3 year terms and a hand-picked membership. The resolution proposed accepts the current composition of PEC and establishes the process to maintain committee membership.

Currently, Kathleen Schweitzberger was on PEC as a Senator and not as a representation for Libraries. Should a unit that does not grant degrees have representation on PEC? Following discussion, it is recommended that the Assistant Director for Collection Development of Libraries be accepted as a non-voting member of PEC.

The Resolution below was passed unanimously.

Resolution

1. The faculty membership of the UMKC Program Evaluation Committee will consist of one (1) Senator, elected by the Faculty Senate to represent the campus faculty at-large, one (1) elected representative from each UMKC school with regular faculty, headed by a dean, and of four (4) elected representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences (one from each division and one at-large).

2. For each Committee seat with an expiring term of appointment, the faculty of the unit represented, through their faculty Senators and/or the chair of the faculty governance body of the unit, will be
requested by the Chair of the Senate to elect during the preceding Winter/Spring Semester from among the faculty of the unit one (1) nominee.

3. The request is made that faculty elected to the Committee have experience with and/or interest in program evaluation.

4. Each nominee is forwarded by the Senate to the Provost for appointment to a three (3) year term.

5. The Provost has the right, once, to refuse the proposed nominee and to ask for reconsideration by the faculty of the nominee elected.

Ballots were distributed to elect by secret ballot a new Senate representative for PEC from among the two nominees, Jakob Waterborg and Gary Ebersole. Gary was elected 13 to 8.

Short reports

- Senator Hood reported for Cosco on its interviews to understand the administrative size and functions in the Provost’s office.
- The Latin Honors policy has raised some questions, e.g. in Law and A&S, from interactions between units and the Registrar’s office. Units will honor stated commitments for honors based on published criteria but if stated ranges are exceeded this year, cut-off levels will be adjusted to reach, over years, the stated honors ranges. A discussion in Senate may be needed next year.
- Stephen Dilks presented an overview of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching (FaCET), its origin, and its current processes, participation, surveys and initiatives.
- Ed Gogol asked for continued attention to broadening of electronic journal subscriptions, especially for Life Sciences, and asked for help in making choices and raising funds.


Excused: C. Jones, K. Loncar.