

Report to Provost *Faculty Roles and Rewards Taskforce*

I. Introduction/Preamble

“Faculty roles and rewards” is a broad term that describes what we do as faculty and how we are rewarded for our efforts. Promotion and tenure guidelines generally dictate the roles of regular faculty, while non-regular faculty members are guided by promotion guidelines and/or contracts. Unit missions also impact specific faculty responsibilities. A first-class institution defines faculty roles in the context of its mission and values and is sensitive to differences across the disciplines and between individuals (National Academy). The faculty assessment system, the underpinning of a reward structure, must be rigorous and maintain high standards while recognizing all individuals who contribute to the university mission in a fair and equitable manner. Such a system sets guiding principles at the campus level, while allowing for flexibility at the unit level.

UMKC does not exist in a vacuum, but is part of a greater community of institutions of learning. Since the early 1990s, a national dialogue on the role of faculty and universities in society has been ongoing on campuses and within relevant organizations such as the Carnegie Foundation, the American Association for Higher Education and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. As UMKC reevaluates its roles and rewards system we must take into account the national dialogue in order to draw from the experiences of others while breaking new ground as we seek to redefine standards in higher education.

At UMKC, faculty roles and rewards are not organized in a cohesive and coherent system. Data suggests that some parts of the system are effective, while others are poorly described or poorly communicated to the faculty at large (PRIDE survey, Focus Group Report, workplace survey). The quality of an academic institution rests on its ability to recruit and retain outstanding faculty, who in turn create a vital environment for scholarship and learning. In order for UMKC to realize its full potential, it must have a well-articulated roles and rewards system that reflects our local climate, while considering the external environment in which we function.

With this background statement, on October 23, 2002, the Provost charged a campus-wide taskforce to examine current faculty roles and rewards practices and to develop recommendations for a system on this campus. The taskforce was asked what was needed to achieve an outstanding roles and rewards system at UMKC and whether we needed to change Promotion and Tenure policies and procedures in order to improve the system and better support the campus mission and values. The taskforce consisted of a mix of faculty and academic administrators across the campus and included membership from the general faculty, Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, Faculty Senate original PRIDE members, and the Council of Deans. The taskforce represented a broad range of views and opinions about roles and rewards. The group did not always achieve consensus, but after several months of discussion and debate, they did reach a reasonable compromise as reflected in this report. Because of the nature of compromise, not all taskforce members fully support each and every recommendation found in this report.

II. Executive Summary

This Executive Summary highlights the differences between the present roles and rewards system and the system recommended by this Report. There are three main sections: Promotion and Tenure Recommendations, Faculty Investment Recommendations (non-promotion and tenure) and Implementation.

PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS

This Report essentially follows the organization of Chancellor's memorandum 35, the present policy document for Promotion and Tenure. It starts with general premises, and then addresses teaching, scholarship and service. The last section considers promotion and tenure procedures. The Report recommends changes from the present policies in the following ways:

- **Tenure premises:**
 - Under the present policies, scholarship is the most important criterion for promotion and tenure. Under the recommendations of the report, tenure should be granted to those who can make **sustained contributions** in **all three** areas of teaching, scholarship and service.
 - Under the present policies, tenure is often considered a reward for past performance. Under the recommendations, tenure would be based on the contributions in the past, **and commitment and capacity for future contributions** to teaching, scholarship and service.

- **Teaching**
 - Although current policies consider teaching as one of the criteria for promotion and tenure, the recommendations emphasize the importance of **teaching** by identifying it as **an essential and respected activity**.
 - Present policies rely predominantly on student evaluations for evidence of good teaching. The recommendations go beyond student evaluations by encouraging the use of **teaching portfolios**, which would provide more detailed information about a faculty member's teaching.
 - Present policies do not define effective teaching or provide any criteria for evaluation of teaching (other than student evaluations). The recommendations would require that academic units **identify elements** of effective teaching in their disciplines and "develop methods of self-evaluation, student evaluation and peer evaluation that **critically assess** teaching performance." These elements and evaluation methods would become part of the promotion and tenure evaluation.
 - The recommendations would require that standards for teaching and methods of assessment **be included in promotion and tenure guidelines**.

- **Scholarship**

- Consistent with present policies, the recommendations provide that **scholarship should be a defining characteristic** of the institution and all tenured and tenure-track faculty should be engaged in it.
- Under present policies, little connection is found between teaching and scholarship. The recommendations suggest that **good scholarship supports and improves teaching**.
- Present policies imply that scholarship is disseminated through publication, preferably through peer-reviewed journals. The recommendations put greater emphasis on dissemination by requiring that scholarship be **disseminated**. The recommendations recognize that peer-reviewed journals are a primary method of dissemination, but also recognize other methods of dissemination.
- Present policies do not address the type of scholarship that should be given weight, relying instead on the discipline and/or the academic units. The recommendations do not specify the weight to be given to different forms of scholarship, but they would require that “high quality **scholarship related to pedagogy** and teaching, as well as **interdisciplinary scholarship**, should be recognized at some level.”
- Present policies do not address the scholarship of engagement. The recommendations would require that scholarship which contributes “to the **betterment of the community** . . . should receive consideration in promotion and tenure decisions.”

- **Service**

- Present policies treat service as a unified activity; the recommendations suggest that service has two components: **university service and community service**.
- Although present policies require service as part of the promotion and tenure process, they do not consider community engagement. The recommendations would require that **community engagement be recognized and rewarded** as an element of service.

- **Integration of Teaching, Scholarship and Service**

- Present policies do not address or consider integration of teaching, scholarship and service. The recommendations would **encourage integration of teaching, scholarship and service**.
- The recommendations suggest that integration can increase the **impact** of teaching, scholarship and service.

- **Changes in Procedures for Promotion and Tenure**

- Present guidelines are unclear about whether associate professors can vote on candidates seeking promotion to full professor. The recommendations make it

clear that **committee members cannot vote unless they have the rank being sought.**

- Present guidelines are unclear about the extent to which candidates should be informed of recommendations through the promotion and tenure process. The recommendations would **inform candidates of recommendations at each stage** and would give candidates **the opportunity to respond to the recommendations as the file goes forward.**
- Although present policies establish a procedure for a Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, they do not specify the procedures for the committee's input. The recommendations of this report would require that the **Campus Committee provide a statement of justification** for its votes on candidate applications.
- Under the present guidelines a Dean's negative decision on a candidacy can stop the review process. The recommendations of this report would require that **all files proceed through full review** regardless of whether the Dean's recommendation is positive or negative.

FACULTY INVESTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Report uses the phrase "faculty investment" instead of "faculty rewards." This represents a change in the way we think about benefits to faculty. The taskforce believes the term "investment" is a more accurate description of the objective of the rewards, to develop the skills that support success, and helps to recognize the positive impact that these benefits have on the satisfaction and productivity of faculty. This section of the Report has two subsections, one for tenure-track faculty and one for non-tenure track faculty. Each of these sections starts with a brief summary of the present practices, and then enumerates a number of specific recommendations. This executive summary will follow that same order.

Investment in Tenure-Track Faculty

- **Present Practices for Investing in Tenure-Track Faculty**

The present faculty investment system at UMKC is substantially decentralized, fragmented and opaque, and suffers from a lack of resources. The academic units have predominant influence over merit raises and development leaves, but the standards for these decisions are often unclear or are not clearly communicated. Although some faculty investments receive centralized support, support for development of faculty teaching is insufficient. Most investments are fairly traditional; a more creative use of resources would improve the quality and impact of investments.

- **Recommendations for Investing in Tenure Track Faculty**

- *Budget Planning for Merit-Based Raises: Merit-Based Raises and Market-Adjustment Raises*
- *Standards and Transparency for Merit-Based Raises*
- *Communication and Information Clearinghouse for Rewards*

- *Development of New Rewards*
 - Scheduling Flexibility
 - One-time Financial Rewards
 - Rotating Endowed Faculty Fellows Program
 - Faculty Salary Enhancement from Research Grants
 - Summer Research Grants
- *Alignment of Rewards with Campus and Academic Unit Priorities*

Investing in Non-Tenure Track Faculty

To create a workplace of choice, all employees should receive appropriate investment and recognition regardless of whether they are eligible for tenure or not. The contributions of non-tenure track faculty need to be recognized, along with contributions made by others, in a way that is commensurate with the levels of achievement and the extent of contribution to UMKC's mission.

- **Present Practice for Investing in Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

Under the present system, the relationship between non-tenure track faculty and UMKC is less standardized than the relationship for tenure track faculty. Various titles are used for non-tenure track faculty, which are sometimes negotiated individually and in other cases are given pursuant to an academic unit's policy. Compensation for non-tenure track faculty, opportunities for merit-based raises and promotion policies vary significantly by department, discipline and job responsibility. Promotion policies for non-tenure track faculty also vary significantly by department, discipline and job responsibility. Generally, though there are some exceptions, promotion applications of non-tenure track faculty are not reviewed by a campus committee or approved by the office of Academic Affairs.

- **Recommendations**

- *Designation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty as "Specialized" Faculty Rather than "Non-Regular" Faculty*
- *Use of Titles Appropriate To Specialization and Skill Level*
 - Tracks for Specialized Faculty: Teaching, Research, Clinical, Service, Adjunct
 - Levels Within Each Track (typically Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor)
- *Promotions, Merit Raises, and Longer-Term Contracts for Specialized Faculty*
- *Investing in Full-Time Specialized Faculty: specialized faculty should be eligible for benefits available to tenure-track faculty for similar work*
- *Investing in Part-Time Specialized Faculty: compensation and additional benefits*
- *Awards and Recognition Specifically for Specialized Faculty*
- *Greater Involvement for Specialized Faculty in University Service*

IMPLEMENTATION

The final section of this Report outlines a plan and accountabilities for implementation. It recommends that the Provost distribute this Report to the Faculty Senate and to all faculty members, who should be given an opportunity to comment on the Report and its recommendations. The Report also recommends that the Provost's office oversee the implementation of the recommendations, and that Deans, promotion & tenure committees, Chairs/Division heads, and search committees to be accountable as appropriate to their areas of responsibility.