Faculty Senate Agenda
Tuesday, 18 March 2008
Plaza Room, Administrative Center, 3-5pm

1. Welcome – Ebersole

2. Information Items
   a. All-faculty meeting planned for 4/7/2008 from 11am-1pm in Pierson Auditorium, University Center.
      i. Call for agenda items
      ii. If the bylaws vote goes through today, it will be brought to the All-Faculty Meeting to vote
   b. Considering recent discussions of academic dishonesty, we as a Senate need to being thinking about a campus-wide Honors Contract for all students. Upcoming discussion regarding academic dishonesty at IFC meeting. A call for volunteers to serve on a committee may be forthcoming.
   c. Call for nominations for Faculty Senate officers; can e-mail nominations to fsaic@umkc.edu.

3. Provost Gail Hackett
   a. Distributed Information Management Update from Mary Lou Hines-Fitts regarding Vista
   b. Mary Breslin from the Higher Learning Commission (?) visited campus recently regarding the NCA accreditation and the self-study process. Brief, but informative visit. Overall, she was pleased with the progress to date. Public (campus) preparation will be necessary before the site visit.
      i. A senator asked for more information about what may be required of faculty. Provost Hackett said there may be more opportunities, for example, each school/unit will need to have an assessment plan. Faculty will need to be involved in developing such plans.

4. Bylaws discussion and vote– Stein for Administrative Issues Committee and Ebersole
   a. A senator brought up a concern from his unit that the language was not consistently gender neutral.
   b. Another senator asked about holding the all-faculty meeting at Hospital Hill. Another noted last year’s all-faculty meeting was held at Hospital Hill. Chair
Ebersole noted that we do try to shift meetings between the Volker and Hospital Hill campuses.
c. A senator noted his faculty noted the wide range of powers given to faculty in this document, especially regarding promotion and tenure.
  i. Ebersole noted his is an umbrella document and Chancellor’s Memorandum #35 outlines the specifics. Ebersole also noted Senators are representing their faculty and are voting on principle not necessarily their personal views.
  ii. Sully Read, School of Biological Sciences was recognized; he prefers option 2 because he sees regular faculty as being held accountable to all three areas of teaching, research and service and are qualified to vote on policies and recommendations in those three areas.
d. Another senator asked if there would be a scenario in which Faculty Senate would not support a school’s proposed voting faculty.
  i. One person responded if the Medical School wanted all 600 of their affiliated faculty to be voting faculty, that would most likely be voted down.
  ii. Another faculty asked if there needs to be a statement that will help ensure checks and balances.
  iii. Someone asked about the role of NTT faculty in the health profession schools and how many are there.
    1. Dental—NTT are clinical faculty engaged in teaching, have criteria for service and research in different proportions. NTT clinical faculty are about half of the total faculty.
    2. Nursing—7 tenure-track/tenure faculty, 3 of which are in administration and not eligible for Senate service. NTT clinical faculty in order to be promoted, must meet criteria in teaching, research and service.
    3. Pharmacy
    4. Medicine – 98% of faculty are NTT/clinical faculty. Want their faculty to have a voice; in order to be promoted, must meet criteria in teaching, research and service.
  iv. Question about if a faculty member could serve on Senate and not be a part of the unit’s voting faculty. Doesn’t seem to be the case.
  v. Sully Read recommended staying with the two year term for the Senate officers.
  vi. Suggested revision regarding bylaws revision votes was accepted. (rephrase – this is the Saul Honigberg amendment)
vii. Lou Potts moved, Foxworth seconded to vote on the proposal.
viii. Discussion ensued as to put forward all three options of defined voting faculty to the all faculty meeting with a Sense of the Senate resolution or as a Senate to put forward one version for all faculty to vote on.
   1. Senators voted as to which version of defined voting faculty should be presented in the proposed by-laws. Version 1 receive 1 vote; version 2 received no votes; version 3 received 22 votes. 
   
**Motion passed to include version 3 in by-laws recommendations.**
ix. **Unanimous** vote to accept recommended changes to bylaws and present for a vote at the all-faculty meeting.

5. Faculty Senate Budget Committee Report – Luppino

6. Swinney Recreation Center renovation – Tyler, Saunders (4:30pm)
   a. Swinney was in need of infrastructure updates. Saunders negotiated a deal with athletics to have their locker rooms renovated as well (pricing?).
   b. Timing of project was changed.
   c. Have been disseminating information to patrons.
   d. Have had a small committee working on this project that included a student, faculty member and a community person.
   e. Annual surveys are conducted of what Swinney patrons want.
   f. Bulk of renovation is about 22 year old and 68 year old plumbing and HVAC systems.
   g. A senator asked if usage is down. Saunders said that many customers have adjusted their schedules to avoid high peak times.
   h. Project is ahead of schedule; projected to take six months.
   i. Another senator asked if the fee increase changed numbers of members. Saunders responded that as student enrollment increased, community members have decreased.
   j. Another senator noted that summer would have been a better time for the renovations, however, athletics needs the renovation to be completed during the summer so they will not lose use of their locker rooms.
   k. Renovation cost is $1.9 million.
   l. A faculty member said that he thinks more involvement of Swinney patrons (such as faculty and members) in discussion would diffuse some of the anger about the renovation construction. Saunders says that yes, this could have been done better.
m. Ebersole asked Saunders why he didn’t use the Facilities Planning Committee, which has broader representation. Saunders was unaware that this kind of project (a departmental project) or scale of the project would be appropriate to bring to that committee.
   i. Mardikes noted that the Facilities Planning Committee has not well defined what needs to be brought to the committee.

n. Saunders said that they looked at different scenarios to avoid customer disruption. However, went with current scenario to try to get project completed as soon as possible.

o. Another senator asked if customers can bring forward complaints and get a refund or something else. Saunders said that they have worked with some individuals on a case by case basis to suspend their membership and go elsewhere.

p. A faculty observer noted that he and other SRC users feel disenfranchised; their rates doubled and then have limited facilities and feel disenfranchised by the whole decision-making process.

q. Saunders noted that they are continuing to look at creative solutions to the situation.

r. Another faculty member asked if there will be a separate locker room for faculty and staff. Saunders responded that there is no plan for that. Faculty acknowledged this is a big issue; faculty see the need for a separate changing area for faculty and staff. Faculty noted if the planning committee included more representative faculty and staff, that issue could have been avoided.

s. Another faculty member noted that she is hearing the same issue in her school.

t. Tyler noted that SRC is a student facility and is trying to serve many constituencies in a relatively small space.

u. A senator asked if a hierarchy had to be made of the groups, what would it look like? Tyler responded students, athletics, then faculty and staff.

v. Tyler acknowledged that this facility is inadequate. (ask Hali for details on her question)

w. Saunders noted that Hospital Hill needs a recreational facility for students, faculty and staff as well. Should athletics develop their own facility, then that would free up space in SRC to develop more facilities.

x. A faculty member observed that no notification went out to members via e-mail or campus mail. Much of the frustration and anger about the situation could have been avoided if people were involved in discussion and if information was disseminated.
y. A senator asked if there is any opportunity to modify the plans. Tyler and Saunders responded that the plans are final

7. Athletics Logo Redesign – Dickson (4:50pm) – now moved to 1 April meeting

Meeting adjourned at 4:52pm.


Excused: Holsinger, Luppino, Rice, Butner
Absent: Crossland, Durig, Yang, Marken

Guests: Derek Simons, U-News; Jakob Waterborg; Sully Read.