Faculty Senate Minutes  
Tuesday March 17, 2009  
Rm 217B Dental School, 3-5pm


Visitors: Derek Simons

Excused: Stanley, Holsinger, Lou Potts (until April), Krause, Marken, Humrichauser, Gutheil, Fieldman, Stancel, Luppino, Stancel, Holsinger

Absent: Williams, Whitt, Gardner, Davies, Knopp, Gonzalez

Welcome-3.05 pm. Call to order by the Chair, Gary Ebersole.

Information items:
Chair Ebersole requested additional agenda items and added that Sue Sykes Berry would incorporate discussion of electronic voting with the discussion of Dean-evaluation questions. Senator Honigberg remarked that he had not received a revised draft of the last minutes to which he had suggested some changes. The Secretary said this was completed and his were the only corrections requested by the Senate. It was agreed to hold the minutes from the 3rd March 2009 meeting for Senator Honigberg and others to review. Acceptance of the proposed agenda was approved unanimously (Foxworth, Honigberg)

Provost: Gail Hackett
Provost Hackett gave a brief update on the strategic planning developments and the rationale for timing of the release, accompanied by some good natured humor. At this stage, she said there were daily rewritings of sections of the plan, and a draft was expected later this week. The plan, though, would be held until the 30th before release to provide for careful vetting and avoidance of possible “missteps”. The provost was asked how many people were involved and she indicated in the 100’s, perhaps in the range of 100-150 overall. One Senator commented that there had been a short time-line for this plan to be developed, to which the Provost replied that there had been numerous previous white papers and reports available at UMKC already, implying that much of the plan was already developed but that it needed to be updated and implemented. The Provost outlined the steps in the development of a strategic plan, which included members of the community and students, and added that she would attempt to have action steps from all areas of the current plan.

Benefits:
Chair Ebersole asked if there was sentiment to send a resolution or Sense of the Senate to President Forsee regarding the Benefits issue. Senator Price suggested tabling this in the interim so that President Forsee would have the opportunity to take the initiative on faculty governance procedures, but said he had redrafted a resolution with less
adversarial language in response to requests by others in the Senate. There was also the sentiment that several senators were excused today and that this discussion involved them. Chair Ebersole agreed and said he would be asking the IFC to keep in close touch with events surrounding the benefits issue which affects us all. There was brief discussion of the need to revisit the campus-wide membership of the UM System Benefits Committee to review how it is populated. Senator Wang asked about the time period for which President Forsee has the power to invoke changes if the financial situation became critical. He asked if this time was for a year, as stated by the draft resolution, and if not whether the resolution could be modified to propose another duration acceptable to the President. Chair Ebersole said that given the uncertain economic situation, a year was perhaps a little short, but he would revisit this with President Forsee.

Dean evaluation and electronic voting: Sue Sykes-Berry  
Senator Sykes-Berry reported that the Administrative Affairs Committee had set up a test site and tried the electronic voting method to show how it is restricted and available only to those who are eligible to vote. The process makes the voter unidentifiable and the person in charge of the voting is only aware of the total number of votes for each candidate, but not who voted for them. Senator Sykes Berry said she would write up the procedure. Questions asked were regarding the campus-wide nature, confidentiality, and whether there may be some individuals who could not vote because they did not have access to Blackboard. There is still a site available if a voter did not want to use Blackboard; there will also still be a paper ballot available for those who request to vote this way. Senator Ziskin felt paper ballots provided for more easily identification of the voter. Chair Ebersole said other UM campuses have gone to electronic voting, but we have not done so yet.

There was also a discussion of the questions pertaining to the Dean evaluations and the time when this would occur; whether it should be annual and how it should relate to the Provost’s evaluation of Deans. It was felt necessary to give a Dean sufficient time to perform, but not too long while performing sub-optimally before this could be recognized. Some Senators felt that an annual review was too soon, while others felt it was not since the review consisted of only 15 questions. The Provost said she would request a broader evaluation of Deans and would prefer it to alternate with the evaluation by faculty. Some questions would be in common and some would be open-ended, but there should not be too many. There were questions about the results and would they be available. The Provost said there would be some kind of summary. Another Senator asked if the Chancellor would be evaluated, and it appeared as though the CRR’s provided for that to occur but that this had not been done yet.

There was a motion to approve the AIC document regarding evaluations (Ziskin/Taylor), which passed unanimously and which was followed by further discussion of the questions for evaluations of Deans. There was one new question (#6) regarding promotion of diversity and Senator Marken’s suggestions were considered in her absence and question #4 was reworded. Senator Taylor raised the potential of the structure of the question as it pertains to the various units such as the Bloch School. Chair Ebersole suggested rewording of #8, which addressed a Dean’s ability to problem solve and to rate their
Approved

transparency as applied to their operating principals, especially the budget. Senator Hopkins proposed the #6 be converted into 2 questions and Senator Ziskin suggested taking out #13 on vision/leadership which she considered were different issues. Senator Honigberg felt this was the only question that was directed to the Dean’s vision or plan and, thus, it should be retained. Senator Ziskin also asked how the questionnaire addressed hiring practices and there were others who asked about space utilization, allocation and maintenance of this. Chair Ebersole suggested the questionnaire be applied to see how it worked. Once we have preliminary approval, the Senate can update the questionnaire as it sees fit. If the document proved inadequate, we could modify it accordingly. This was moved by Ziskin and seconded by Yang; all were in favor.

Core Learning Objectives: Michael Strait
Michael provided an overview and multiple documents regarding essential learning outcomes expected of an educated individual. One of these was Core Learning Objectives from UM–Columbia, which contained goals and objectives; a second from the Board of General Education in Chicago; and yet another from the Missouri Board of Education, regarding goals and competencies. A document regarding Assessment of General Education from the University of Pittsburgh was also available. Senators were interested in how the documents were to be used and were informed that this would be for planning and review. John George provided a very comprehensive critique.

Staff Council: Bob Shubert
Bob provided 2 motions he had been asked to bring to the Senate to consider. The first concerned the new holiday policy, which some thought was a “staff friendly” gesture and others thought it was President Forsee’s idea. There was general discussion about what this meant, but some felt that perhaps staff felt they had lost something as a result of the policy. Chair Ebersole said we would keep this on the agenda for future discussion.

Facilities Advisory Committee: Saul Honigberg
Senator Honigberg reported that there was a mixed reception to the suggestion that FAC get involved in space utilization, since traditionally this had not occurred with respect to under-utilized space. It appears that space is only discussed when it is between units involved. Senators and Chair Ebersole felt there had not been a study to check into under-utilized space. Senator Honigberg requested e-mails with suggestions concerning this issue. Honigberg also reported that on the issue of appointing a faculty co-chair for the FAC, the consensus of the FAC was that it was up to the Senate to make this recommendation. Ebersole advised the committee to stay active and suggested that the Senate discuss the issue of a faculty co-chair for the FAC at a later date.

The meeting was adjourned at 5.05pm