

Report

The Voice of the U.M.K.C. Faculty

Jan. 16, 2001

Administrator Evaluation Procedure considered by IFC & discussed by the Senate

The IFC is considering a document that would recommend that the faculty develop a formal review process for campus administrators, including the Chancellor, the Provost and academic deans. Other directors (e.g. of the library, and of campus computing) should be considered for review. The IFC suggests some basic guidelines:

- 1-Reviews should normally be every three years.
- 2-They should be administered by a faculty body and designed to ensure wide participation of relevant faculty. Staff and students should join the process when appropriate.
- 3-Procedures should be designed in cooperation with the administrators being reviewed, and should be a development tool as well as an evaluation method.
- 4-Campuses should consider having administrators provide a document to the Faculty before each review to explain the administrator's goals, accomplishments, problems, decisions, and reasons for their decisions or actions.
- 5-The results of the review should be shared with the administrator being reviewed and his or her supervisor. Suggestions for improvement should also be supplied.

Chancellors are encouraged to use the results of the Faculty evaluations as meaningful input in their reviews of administrators, and the President is asked to use the results of the Faculty evaluations in his evaluations of the Chancellors.

Senate discussion centered on whether Vice-Chancellors should be evaluated by faculty. What about the President and Vice Presidents? The problem is to identify a group that would know enough about the performance of specific officers. Should faculty simply self-identify, not voting if they are not sufficiently familiar with the administrator's work? Should specific groups be identified? The Senate did not reach any conclusion, and the IFC is still considering the issue. Contact your Senator, or IFC representatives Ed Mills, Max Skidmore or Jakob Waterborg for more information or to share your ideas.

Note: Two items in this meeting involved personnel or Honorary Degrees and were confidential. There was a high degree of consensus on both issues, though, and they will be reported on in the future. In the meantime, confidential items make the job of writing this Report much easier.

One important policy change announced at the meeting is that Acting Provost Bill Eddy invited the Senate to send its Chair to the Academic Council, which includes the Deans and Directors. Though this is not a policy making body, the change allows for coordination and input. The new policy, which had been requested by the Senate, is a return to a procedure implemented by Chancellor Russell and suspended during the somewhat autocratic regime of Interim Chancellor Lamb and Provost Smelstor.

Chancellor pushes Blueprint process, wants plans implemented.

The Chancellor, in talking with the senate, noted that it is at this point in a planning process that most projects fail and degenerate into buzzwords and paper plans. She would like to see the Blueprint plans developed and implemented. It is in order to achieve this goal that she developed the idea of the extended 150-person cabinet that she wrote faculty about. Their purpose

is to take on leadership responsibilities and engage the rest of the campus. The group will meet with the Chancellor on an all-day retreat in March.

There was some discussion of the role of the Senate in this whole process.

Gilliland said that she didn't have a specific role for the Senate in mind, but suggested that we send her proposals.

One Senator suggested that the Senate, as the only elected body of the whole faculty, could play an important coordinating role as various plans are proposed.

Another suggested that we look at alternative plans that were used at Auburn University. The Chancellor and several Senators suggested a retreat to examine governance issues. No decisions were reached and the Senate will return to this issue at its next meeting.

One issue concerning the new tenure standards was raised. Administrators change, and if a non-tenured faculty member relied on the new standards they would need guarantees that they would still be in force when they came up for tenure. The Chancellor agreed, and said that if the new standards were right they would need to be embedded in the institutional process so that they would last beyond any changes in administration.

President Pacheco expects tight budget for coming year; Web copyright policy discussed

He expects the state to raise the University's budget about 2%, but with reallocation a 3% average salary increase should be possible. Pacheco does not want to touch mission enhancement money. The tight budget means no new capital projects will be started at this point, though that should not affect the already planned Pharmacy/Nursing building.

Copyright policy for web courses is the same as normal policy. If you develop a web course as part of your normal load it is yours, but if there are extensive extra university funds, or if you are hired for a special project, the course belongs to the University.

Odds & Ends

The IFC is considering policies for endowed professorships.... Evaluation packets for deans and administrators have been prepared and are now being sent out.... The Senate Report of Dec. 5, 2000 was officially approved. This Report has not yet been approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,
Faculty Secretary

Help Wanted:

The Academic Issues Committee is charged with examining the roles of the various campus curriculum committees, reviewing faculty salaries across the various units and examining salaries to see if any groups have been systematically discriminated against. The issues are obviously important and the committee needs volunteers. You do not have to be a member of the Senate to volunteer.

If you are willing to help please contact Prof. Leah Gensheimer (Psychology) at 1065 or gensheimerl@umkc.edu.