Faculty Senate Agenda
Tuesday, 22 August 2006
3:00 – 5:00 pm, Plaza Room

1. Opening of meeting, information items- Ebersole
   • Minutes of 9 May 2006 meeting.
   • Additions to or modifications of the Agenda
     Minutes approved (Honigberg), seconded (Krause). No additions.

2. Committee appointments and IFC election
   • Faculty Senate committees must elect new chairs
   • COSCO needs new/revised charge
   • ASAP, need to hold an election to fill IFC vacancy – nominations to be sent to Laura Gayle Green (greenlg@umkc.edu) by 8/28/06, 5pm.
   • Parking and Traffic committee faculty rep to finish S. Neau's term
   • Candidates put nominated and agreed to serve: Jane Carl (Conservatory), Kathy Loncar (Education), Jerry Place (SCE), Tom Stein (Conservatory).
     o Jerry Place elected
   • Campus Beautification committee needs faculty member – e.g. selecting class gifts. Need nominations.
   • Provost has asked Senate to submit a list of three faculty from current faculty who have been inspirational teachers to be recognized at Convocation.

3. Parking discussion—Cesari and Cone guests

   Senators asked Cesari and Cone a number of questions. Question represents Senator comments/questions and Response represents Cone and Cesari responses.

   Question: UMKC employees do not trust that correct tickets are issued, or that any correct information at all will be taken. The authorization form did not indicate how to confirm something has been deducted ahead of time. Distrust on clerical side. Hope the form is negotiable.

   Question: This senator has been concerned about parking for quite some time. Concerned about collection issues brought up by Provost—retroactive enforcement. Expressed concern that it was illegal. Thought issue had gone to bed; indications were that the issue had been dropped. Thinks it’s poor public policy. This senator crafted a letter opposing the policy that was signed by many faculty and staff, sent it to Provost, Chancellor and UM President. Has heard a response, indication that issues have been heard, concerned with contractual issues with the new form authorizing payroll deduction.

   Question: What is the composition of parking committee?
   Response: 3 faculty, 3 staff, 3 students. Chair is elected by committee. Committee makes recommendations to Vice-Chancellor, who recommends to Chancellor, depending on how big the issue is. Committee hears appeals.

   Question: UMKC employees come here, pay for parking, and we can’t find a place. What happens when we can’t find a spot? We get penalized. What happens with the airlines with
overbooking? The customer gets a free ticket. Parking is the biggest issue affecting faculty morale on this campus. Must make some changes along the line. Concern for law school—administrators park in the law school area, not across the street. These are serious issues that need to be addressed. Cannot have an autocratic regime that ignores faculty and staff concerns.

Question: Concern about renewal form. We’ve been repeatedly told by Parking Ops folks, if you get a ticket because you can’t find a spot and you park at a meter, you’re supposed to be able to send it in and get it waived. How can we trust anything will happen appropriately? This senator seconds having parking assigned to a building.

Question: What happens with the parking deduction? Is it immediately deducted?

Response: A 90 day process. If the recipient does not respond, does not appeal, they would get a letter within so many days. 30 days later, the recipient would get a reminder letter. There should be ample opportunity to correct problems. It will take some initiative on the part of the person receiving the letter.

Question: What about the penalty fee?
Response: Yes, there is a penalty fee—a late fee that is assessed.

Question: Were students questioned?
Response: Students do not receive payroll deduction. Student tickets are placed on student accounts.

Question: Which brings us back to the issue— is it good policy to treat faculty the same as students?
Response: We forgive three tickets a year for hangtags not displayed if it’s sent in. There are people who park in driveways and loading zones.

Question: How often does the appeals group meet?
Response: The appeals group meets once a month. The appeals group waives a lot of tickets a year. There are individuals that will get a number of tickets and don’t ask. Appeal board brings forth problems regarding parking.

Question: Doesn’t seem to be any parking control. No gated lots. Doesn’t see control going on—is a problem for this senator.
Response: The problem of gating lots is that it is expensive.
Question: What about my time? And parking is operating at a surplus. Find something else to do to fix the issue!

Question: There are some places that need gates. This senator and others were irked by comment last year from Parking Ops that parking permits are a hunting license. These issues drive people away, irritate students, faculty and staff.

Question: from an adjunct faculty member that paid $190 a year for a permit—this year the cost is $324. This adjunct faculty member makes $2,500 a semester. Clearly not teaching for the money.
Question: What about the requests for tiered parking? These stories demonstrate that it is bad for morale that it takes a year to investigate issues regarding tiered parking while lowest paid folks are still being paid lowest wages.

Question: Agree 100% with that. What about faculty and staff who cannot find parking spots and park in meters? Only parking at a meter out of necessity. Last fall sent a message to Provost and Vice-chancellor of Finance regarding this issue, no response, asked in January, no response. Asked again for it to be put on the table.

Response: On the surface, I can understand that. So what if faculty and staff start parking at the meters because it might be closer? Now students and visitors don’t have places to park.

Question: You have to trust faculty and staff. Secondly, if you had enforcement out there, it wouldn’t happen. Do you have electronic “hoojehjobbers” to keep track of tickets? After so many, then issue a ticket.

Question: Clearly there are issues regarding communication and customer service. What is possible?

Question: Why did Gates delete message from a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding parking concerns without reading it? Message was meant to inform and facilitate a civil discussion regarding concerns.

Question: Was the form approved by parking committee? Who drafted it?
Response: Parking office did; based on UM-Columbia’s form.

Question: Is payroll deduction a part of Columbia’s form?
Response: Is, and is in CRR.

Question: Who recommended/forced it?
Response: Anderson/Gates; the administration.

Response: Need payroll deduction to enforce parking violations.
Question: If people are going to sign form, do it prospectively only.

Response: Let me speak personally. Have worked for 19 years in parking, don’t feel that they’ve done anything slimy. Have tried to keep things fluid, not mired in the past.

Question: People perceive that fines were done retroactively.
Response: Don’t want people to not trust parking.

Question: Big sledgehammer to handle issue. No real discussion with Senate regarding automatic deduction.

Response: Parking ops folks are not foreseeing a great deal of difference in how things will be handled.

Question: If I return renewal form with statement: I do not agree with this. This policy is the same sort of autocratic sledgehammer that the computer screen notice foregoing privacy was. Administrative actions have taken place that will not be tolerated by faculty and staff.
Response: Does this question specifically have to do with the form?
Question: That form was the straw that broke the camel’s back. Added insult of when you try to
do your job, you get a ticket. And if you don’t pay it, it’ll be taken out of your paycheck.

Question: Administrators get a covered garage, don’t experience same issues. Issue will come
back to haunt those folks.

Question: What will happen to those who have refused to return form or who have crossed out the agreement?

Response: Cone did not know what would happen. Cesari said that if he was going to interpret
the form (from a contract perspective) that the permit would be revoked. This was not a final
decision.

Question: If you revoke parking permits based on people not signing the form, then you’ll probably see the university closed for a few days.

Response: Do you disagree that parking should have the ability to take the ticket (after the process) to take it out of your check? If you disagree with that, how do you get those who abuse the system to pay their fines? We’re just trying to get faculty and staff to live with the rules that everyone lives with.

Question: But you’re putting me in the place I must violate the rules!

Question: One of the difficulties we’re in is should we be put in a position to pay tickets that are incorrect? Suggests separate sticker for folks in different buildings.

Question: It’s not helpful to have permit to park in special lot if you don’t have a building – folks like School of Nursing staff are all over the place, are everywhere. What should be considered, when someone pays for a parking permit, that’s what they’re paying for is a permit, not a hunting license. When faculty and staff pay for a permit come here and do their job, you need to have adequate spaces for them to come to work, park, and then do their jobs. Consider revising the policies. Should not have to compete with students for spaces. Faculty are not the same as students, should not be treated the same. The parking issue has affected the community of learning at nursing school – no one comes down there because there’s no place to park. When they go out to do their job, there’s no place to park when you come back.

Response: Meter issue. Only 327 meters left on campus. Still a commuter campus. Doesn’t like having to ask someone to pay $87 a semester when taking a three hour class.

Question: In Engineering and in Computer Sci, faculty overwhelmingly against retroactively paying for tickets. If you had enforced the rules to begin with, you don’t change the rules mid-stream. Instead of handing you a blank check to take money out of my pay, simply ask folks to have the option to paying by payroll deduction to pay it.

Question: Someone from Hospital Hill paid for a permit, had to park at the meters. Has a legal case to ask university to refund her for the money she’s paid through the meters. Parking is a profit center, we are consumers of that business. We should have spaces available.

Response: If every lot was assigned, then the same percent overbooked for each lot. With current system, there may be more spots overbooked for different spots. Assigned spots are a different issue.
Question: how much money was collected on 30 June?
Response: can explore this and get back.

Question: For Dennis, for 5 years, faculty and staff have had a cap on salary increases. Administrators had no caps on salary increases, and they did increase. The administrators are making policy decisions that affect those who have lost ground on their income.

4. Chancellor’s report (if available)

Not available.

5. IFC report—Stancel
Non-tenure track faculty report (http://www.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/x060822b.pdf)
Technology Transfer document draft (http://www.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/x060822a.pdf)

Stancel summary of IFC meeting is at: http://www.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/x060822d.pdf
Stancel’s summary of IFC activities is at http://www.umkc.edu/fsenate/files/x060822c.pdf

Discussion regarding Non-Tenure Track Faculty report:

One senator asked who was pushing this action. Senate Chair Ebersole responded that many of those folks have been appointed with no guidelines about how they should be evaluated be promoted, etc. The recommendations give those folks a structure through which they can be promoted. IFC will look at the issue of non-regular faculty, large number of adjuncts, how to maintain quality with those large numbers of adjuncts.

Another senator commented that these folks cannot predict their future. Some people in those appointments went through the grievance process at UMKC. Quite a bit of discrepancy exists between how the various situations were handled because there were no guidelines. Yet another senator voiced concerns about creating a new category where none existed before. IFC representative Stancel responded that variability exists already among campuses and how deans use that variability to their advantage. Many employees are treated inequitably now. If one looks at the revised non-tenure track faculty document, top of page 3, definitions now include unranked faculty. Please read through it, somewhat different now.

6. Senate Budget Committee (FSBC) report – Luppino
Chancellor Bailey has requested a study of a new budgeting model for UMKC and the University Budget Committee has been working on developing this model at the Chancellor’s request. The Chancellor has been vocal about the need for improvement to the current system. The Chancellor has RCM (Resource centered management); Luppino does not try to describe system in detail. In a nutshell, in first instance, allocate to each school its income and its fair share of the state allocation and then schools pay for items such as overhead, support systems, etc. Complicated – the system is successful at some places. If the overall plan is truly successful, all constituents (including faculty) are familiar with issues, how items are budgeted.

The Budget Advisory Committee has been reconstituted as the smaller University Budget Committee (UBC): Bruce Bubacz, Chair; Curt Crespino, Betty Drees, Gary Ebersole, Larry
Gates, Laura Gayle Green, Lori Laster (staff to the committee), Tony Luppino, John Morrissey (staff to the committee too?), Paris Saunders, Lanny Solomon, Karen Vorst, Nancy Zielke.

As Faculty Senate broke in the spring, there was an open question that the small ad-hoc budget advisory committee be part of the larger group. UBC supplants the larger Budget Advisory Committee. This 10 person committee is now studying the RCM and big issues. Deans are liaisons to Dean’s Council, UBC faculty members are members of the FSBC and are there to keep faculty senate and faculty informed. If new model is implemented, will be in place for a while, most likely. FSBC is trying to keep pace with the UBC, which meets twice a month, so does the FSBC.

If faculty are interested in being members of the FSBC, let Tony know. Committee has been looking at draft Fund Balance Policy put forth by administration, FSBC has been responding to issues. FSBC has received answers to most questions. Will keep Senate informed. Lot of money involved – operating fund alone is over $33 million.

Regarding new budget model, RCM, FSBC has been looking at 6+ schools that have implemented or tried to implement RCM and provide information to UBC regarding RCM. Committees have been doing research with the intent to provide good information regarding RCM to the University Budget Committee.

Senators may have seen in the papers when the Board of Curators met in Kansas City, there was a follow up on President Floyd’s request for Administrative Streamlining (administrative cuts). Report was made available to Curators, and FSBC has questions about a few of the line items. FSBC decided to present more on this at the next Senate meeting. FSBC will send questions, comments regarding report to Senate and questions, concerns will be sent forward to Bailey, Bubacz and Gates.

Luppino noted that the committee can use help; RCM is complicated stuff. Question from a senator: do you think RCM is a done deal? Luppino responded that the Chancellor likes some elements, like disseminating information, and that deans and unit leaders will keep track of their own funds. Overhead charges are difficult to work out. No one good system exists that will take care of all needs and issues. Luppino thinks communication about how budgeting and allocation works is a good thing.

Another question from a senator: One of the interfaces that – as more and more responsibility for managing budget goes to each unit, there are going to be decisions regarding academic programs that are made on the basis of budget not academic quality. Can see some conflicts and don’t know how conflicts will be resolved.

Luppino: You have identified key issue. Subvention is one word used quite a bit – make sure committees making decisions have a lot of faculty representation. We’re on it, but it’s not easy.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05pm.

In attendance:

Ebersole, Driever, LG Green, Stancel, Honigberg, Crossland, Gardner, Hopkins, Krause, Potts, Mardikes, Knopp, Beard, Fieldman, Stein, McCunniff, Adler, Hood, Luppino, Sistrunk, P Johnson, Yang, Foxworth, J Rice, Igwe, Joy
Excused: Gogol, C Rice, M Euler

Guests: Fred Wickman, English Faculty; Emily Iorg, Editor, U News