

Report of the Taskforce on Faculty Roles and Rewards

Submitted to Provost Steve Ballard on

March 31, 2004

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-------|
| I. Introduction/Preamble..... | 1 |
| II. Executive Summary..... | 4 |
| III. Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations..... | 9 |
| A. Policies..... | 9 |
| B. Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure Review..... | 12 |
| IV. Investing in Tenure Track Faculty..... | 17 |
| A. Present Faculty Investment System..... | 17 |
| B. Recommendations for the Faculty Investment System..... | 19 |
| V. Investing in Non-Tenure Track Faculty..... | 22 |
| A. Present Practices for Investing in Non-Tenure Track Faculty..... | 22 |
| B. Recommendations for Investing in Non-Tenure Track Faculty..... | 23 |
| VI. Implementation..... | 26 |
| A. Communications of this Report..... | 26 |
| B. Accountabilities..... | 26 |
| VII. Appendices..... | 29 |
| A. Glossary..... | A1 |
| B. Current System Promotion and Tenure Guidelines..... | B1-4 |
| C. Current Campus Promotion and Tenure Guidelines..... | C1-9 |
| D. Current System-Based Investments..... | D1-2 |
| E. Current Campus Investments..... | E1-2 |
| F. Focus Group Report..... | F1-27 |

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.

Members of the taskforce are as follows:

Gary Baker, Facilitator
Jeff Thomas⁺, Provost's office
Ellen Suni, Law *
Karen Vorst^{@, *}, **Gayle Levy**^{\$}, and **YC (Jerry) Jean**[#], College of Arts and Science
John Killip^{@, *} and **Philip Feil**^{@, *}, School of Dentistry
Patricia Marken^{@, *}, School of Pharmacy
William Osborne[^], SCE
Dianne Smith^{\$}, School of Education
Nancy Mills[^], School of Nursing
Sullivan Read^{*}, School of Biological Sciences
Laura Gayle Green^{*}, Library
Randy Pembroke[^], Conservatory
Linda Gill Taylor⁺, Center for the City

*Faculty Senate

^ Dean

#Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee

+ Campus Administration

\$General Faculty member

@PRIDE member

(Designations are as of the time the taskforce was convened.)

In preparing this report, the taskforce reviewed many documents including, but not limited to:

- Chancellors Memorandum #77
- Chancellors Memorandum #35
- Collected Rules and Regulations: Faculty Bylaws and Tenure Regulations
- Documents relating to existing reward structures at UMKC
- Penn State and Portland State Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
- PRIDE Committee reports:
 - Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
 - UMKC Faculty Survey on a First Class Reward, Recognition and Development System.
- National Academy for Academic Leadership - The Faculty Reward System
(www.thenationalacademy.org/Resources/facreward.html)

The taskforce also collected its own information through a series of focus groups conducted by an independent body and meetings with the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee.

This report represents the best efforts of a diverse group of individuals to propose changes to the current faculty roles and rewards structure. The taskforce recognizes that this report discusses issues that are at the heart of academic life, including faculty governance, equity, and academic freedom, hence they did not take this work lightly. The taskforce looks forward to open dialogue

and debate about the content of this report and the outcome of a stronger and more coherent faculty roles and rewards structure.

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.

III. Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations

A. POLICIES

Introduction

As a leading teaching and research public institution of higher education, the University of Missouri-Kansas City seeks faculty members who are creative, world-class scholars, inspired teachers and engaged members of the community dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge, its transmission to others and the improvement of society. These high standards guide the recruitment, promotion and tenure of faculty at UMKC.

While both tenure-track and specialized faculty make significant contributions to the university, tenured faculty play a unique role. The granting of tenure reflects a significant investment in the future of the institution. Because of the virtual lifetime commitment involved in tenure, it is imperative those joining the ranks of tenured faculty are capable of serving, and are likely to serve both the short-term and long-term needs of their individual school and the university.

Institutions change over time, yet we expect the university will have a consistent mission in scholarship, teaching and service. Thus, those who become tenured faculty must have the capacity to contribute in each of these areas. While not all faculty will contribute equally in all areas at all times, it is essential to the long-term health and stability of the university that its tenured faculty make sustained contributions in each of these core areas.

The tenuring process is a determination that an individual not only has made, but will continue to make a significant contribution as a faculty member to the advancement of knowledge and the betterment of society, through scholarship, teaching and service. Demonstration of the candidate's capacity and commitment are the key to the promotion and tenure process.

The policies of the University of Missouri-Kansas City are consistent with the general philosophy of the University of Missouri and the general guidelines set forth in the "Policy and Procedure for Promotion and Tenure." However, recognizing that we are one of four campuses under the umbrella of the UM System, UM regulations take priority over UMKC rules when disagreement arises.

The Essential Requisites for Quality Faculty

Teaching

Teaching undergraduate, graduate and professional students is an essential and respected activity at UMKC. Teaching includes not only classroom, studio, laboratory and clinical instruction, but many other activities that contribute to the academic and professional advancement of students,

including academic advising, mentoring, creative redesign of courses (both live and distance), and preparation and updating of quality teaching materials.

Effective teaching is more than simply presenting quality lectures and facilitating class discussion; it involves motivating and engaging students, facilitating their commitment to lifelong, self-reflective learning. Effective teachers arouse students' curiosity and stimulate them to engage in creative work. Excellent teaching requires incorporating developments in the field as well as relevant pedagogical innovations. Effective teachers are committed to excellence, teach at a rigorous and challenging level, provide appropriate feedback, are accessible, serve as mentors and advisors to their students, and engage with students in ways that facilitate their learning and development as responsible individuals and citizens.

Good teaching requires careful planning, successful implementation and constant self-assessment and reflection. Teaching portfolios that manifest these activities and show demonstrated excellence can serve as effective means for measuring teaching effectiveness and should be encouraged. Schools and colleges should identify the elements of effective teaching within their disciplines consistent with these standards and should develop methods of self-evaluation, student evaluation and peer evaluation that critically assess teaching performance. These standards and means for measurement of effective teaching must be included in the school's promotion and tenure standards.

Scholarship

Productivity in research and other scholarly activity is a distinguishing characteristic of the faculty of the University, setting it apart from other public institutions of higher learning. Scholarship not only generates new knowledge but also results in teaching that is up-to-date and intellectually stimulating. All tenured and tenure track faculty members are expected to be engaged in scholarly or creative activities appropriate to their disciplines.

The essence of membership on a faculty is sustained, significant contribution to the creation, development and dissemination of knowledge. "The term *scholar* implies superior intellectual, aesthetic or creative attainment. A scholar engages at the highest levels of life-long learning and inquiry."¹ To be promoted to an associate professorship, the candidate should have completed work of sufficient quality to have gained recognition by her/his peers and standing in her/his profession. A candidate being considered for promotion to associate professor should also be considered for tenure. To be considered for a professorship, a person should have achieved national distinction with the rank of world-class qualifications in the areas of research and scholarly activity.

While the actual work of a scholar is often an individual endeavor, making scholarship accessible to others is key. Essential to the work of a scholar is dissemination: the sharing of results with others, be they scholars who build on and develop the research or creative work of

¹ Portland State University, "Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases," 1996; p. 5.

others, practitioners who utilize the results to better perform their functions, or legislators and policy-makers who use the work to advance the public welfare.

Traditional publication in refereed journals is one way in which dissemination will occur. However, it is not the only acceptable means and schools and colleges should be encouraged to reward dissemination in many forms and to varied audiences. The one unwavering requirement in rewarding scholarship is that it be of high quality, demonstrating mastery of important concepts in the field, depth, breadth, rigor, significance, curiosity, creativity, intellectual integrity and clarity of communication. Although publication in traditional formats and forums can certainly provide evidence of quality scholarship, dissemination in alternative formats and forums, to the extent it reflects similar quality, should be equally recognized.

The degree to which particular forms of scholarship will be rewarded appropriately will vary depending on the needs and traditions of particular schools, colleges and disciplines; however, in general, because of our commitment to quality teaching and effective learning, high quality scholarship related to pedagogy and teaching, as well as interdisciplinary scholarship, should be recognized at some level. Moreover, because of our unique role as an urban land-grant institution, and consistent with the unique needs of particular schools and colleges, quality scholarship, regardless of its form, that can be shown to contribute to the betterment of the community in which we live should receive consideration in promotion and tenure decisions.

For the university to carry out significant research and creativity activity in certain areas, it is necessary to obtain external funding for equipment, graduate student support and other project expenses as may occur. Academic units working in these areas have grant writing and the obtaining of external funds as an important element of their unit P&T policies on scholarship. This UMKC policy sets no specific guidelines for the securing of external funding to support research or creative activities, but encourages units to set appropriate guidelines based upon best practices in their field.

Although schools and colleges may provide quantitative guidelines, the key to determining whether a candidate for promotion and tenure has made the required showing in the area of scholarship is largely qualitative. The assessment to be made is whether the candidate has demonstrated an ability to do significant, high quality scholarly work and has shown a commitment to do so. Because of the crucial role scholarship plays in the life of the university, no candidate may be awarded promotion and tenure unless a finding has been made that the candidate has both the ability and the commitment to engage in high quality scholarship. For promotion to associate professor the candidate must be recognized in her or his field and promotion to full professor demands the candidate achieve national recognition. While the candidate will normally have to demonstrate that his or her scholarly endeavors have been disseminated to appropriate audiences, whether it requires a certain number of publications in traditional, peer-reviewed journals or grant monies awarded will depend on the requirements of the school or college.

Service

Service encompasses two independent components. Because of the unique role of faculty in governance, each faculty member seeking promotion and tenure should demonstrate a willingness and ability to play an important role in institutional governance at some level. Whether at the department, school, campus or university level, each faculty member should demonstrate active engagement in institutional life.

Additionally, the university exists in part to serve the needs of the community and society, not only in training its future generations, but also in helping to solve the problems confronting it. Candidates for promotion and tenure should demonstrate achievement in this area and a commitment to continued contribution.

As scholars and teachers, faculty are able to make unique contributions to the betterment of society and have an obligation “to make their expertise useful to the community outside the University . . . in community based activities . . . which are tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge.”² Whether proposing solutions to the intractable problems of the day, supervising students in providing services to under-served communities, providing service to one’s discipline or contributing to the artistic and cultural life of the community, faculty have an obligation to advance the betterment of society. This obligation is manifested by recognizing and rewarding community engagement as an element of service. To be fully rewarded as service, activities should be related to the scholarship, teaching or professional expertise of the faculty member and have relevance to their community.

Integration of teaching, scholarship and service

Too often the three pillars of faculty contribution have been viewed in isolation. While faculty may obtain promotion and tenure through a package that independently demonstrates excellence in all three areas, many faculty members may find the impact of their contribution is increased through integrated efforts involving teaching, scholarship and service. These efforts to integrate teaching, scholarship, and service should be encouraged. A candidate will not be granted promotion and tenure based on a dossier that presents evidence only of high quality teaching and service. However, where such activities are manifested in the dissemination of quality scholarship, promotion and tenure may well be appropriate.

B. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW

Review of faculty for promotion in academic rank or continuous appointment (tenure) is a four-part process. Step 1 is the declaration of the candidate for consideration for Promotion and Tenure and the data gathering to support their candidacy. Step 2 is the review of the candidate within their school or college by the unit Promotion and Tenure Committee, the faculty member's Department Chairperson or Division Head, and the Dean. Step 3 consists of review by the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee and by the Provost. Step 4 consists of review of

² Portland State University, “Policies and Procedures...” p. 10.

the file and a final decision by the Chancellor. All applications will be subjected to the full review process, through review by the Chancellor, regardless of whether they have received a positive or negative recommendation by any party at any earlier step. The only exception will be if the candidate withdraws the application prior to a final decision by the Chancellor.

Step 1. Declaration and Data Gathering

A. Declaration of Application for Promotion and/or Tenure: Consideration of a faculty member for promotion in academic rank or tenure shall be initiated by a faculty member submitting an application to the Dean of the candidate's primary academic unit. Candidates undergoing mandatory review will be so informed by the Provost's office through their Dean. The Dean, or his/her designate, will inform the candidate of the necessary materials, statements, or documentation that must be submitted by the candidate. The Dean will also coordinate the collection of all documentation concerning the application and distribute it to the unit Promotion and Tenure Committee and individuals involved in the review process.

B. External Evaluation: All candidates for promotion and tenure shall have their portfolio subjected to external peer evaluation. External peer evaluators are highly respected and recognized individuals from nationally and internationally known institutions. All external evaluators must hold academic appointments at the rank/tenure being considered for the candidate, or have equivalent credentials. External peer evaluators cannot be employed by the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Each unit must file a written process with the Provost's office to select external evaluators in a fair and objective manner. Proposed evaluators must be submitted for approval to the Provost before May 16th of each year.

Upon approval of the evaluators by the Provost, it shall be the responsibility of the Dean to obtain a letter from these evaluators and provide them with materials to ensure a complete and fair assessment. A sufficient number of evaluators should be contacted to ensure that a **minimum** of three external evaluations be obtained.

Step 2. Review within a Faculty member's School or College.

A. First Review. First review of the application will be by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the candidate's unit (department, division, school). If the candidate holds a joint appointment between two academic units (departments, schools, etc.), the primary academic unit shall be responsible for making decisions and preparing recommendations regarding promotion and tenure after inviting input and recommendations from the other units involved. Candidates at the rank of assistant professor who are under mandatory consideration for continuous appointment shall also be considered for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Candidates who are not recommended for promotion to associate professor should not be recommended for continuous appointment.

B. Composition of Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee. In each unit the Promotion and Tenure committee is a standing committee appointed, elected, or otherwise designated in accordance with the established departmental, school, or college procedures as long as these procedures are in compliance with the Curators' rules and regulations. The charge of the unit Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be to provide a rigorous peer assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and to assess the candidate's potential for continued, sustained and significant contributions in these areas. Voting committee members may include both tenured professors and tenured associate professors, but will not include anyone who has an independent opportunity to review the candidate. The procedures shall ensure that no members with a conflict of interest or of lower rank than that being sought by the candidate shall vote on the candidate. A document describing the unit procedures for selection of members of the Promotion and Tenure committee will be on file in the Provost's office.

C. Charge of Unit Promotion and Tenure Committee. During its deliberations, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will review materials and statements submitted by the candidate, the letters of evaluation solicited by the Dean from external scholars, the candidate's teaching evaluations, and such other materials as are permitted and/or required by the unit

Following its deliberations, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward its recommendation, including a statement of justification and other supporting documentation, to the candidate. The candidate shall be afforded 14 calendar days in which to provide a written response to the recommendation including any supplemental documentation that will be forwarded along with the candidate's file to the Dean.

The recommendation of the committee to the Dean must include mention of the vote for or against advancement of the candidate. Any dissenting committee member may submit a minority report, which will be forwarded to the Dean along with the recommendation of the majority.

D. Supervisor's Evaluation. The unit Promotion and Tenure guidelines must provide for an independent evaluation and recommendation regarding the candidate's application for promotion and tenure by someone in a supervisory position for the candidate. This supervisor may be a Chair, a Division Head, or a Dean.

E. Dean's Evaluation. Upon receipt of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendations and, where applicable, the Department Chair or Division Head's, the Dean shall make an evaluation and recommendation to the Provost and Chancellor regarding the candidate's promotion and/or tenure application. As part of her/his deliberations, the Dean should solicit whatever additional information deemed appropriate for making an independent evaluation and recommendation. The critical questions that should be addressed at this level are as follows:

1. Is the candidate qualified to be promoted or to be placed on continuous appointment?

2. Is it in the best interest of the University of Missouri to promote the candidate or place him/her on continuous appointment?

After reaching a decision, the Dean will inform the candidate of his/her recommendation. The candidate shall be afforded 14 calendar days in which to provide a written response to the recommendation including any supplemental documentation that will be forwarded along with the candidate's file to the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Step 3. Review by the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Provost.

A. Composition and Charge of Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee. Upon receipt of the Dean's recommendation and the dossier, the Provost will forward these materials to the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee for their evaluation and recommendation of the candidate's application. The Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee is a standing committee established to assist the Provost and Chancellor in the review of recommendations for change of status. The members of the Committee will be appointed by the Chancellor in consultation with the Faculty Senate. The Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Provost and Chancellor and will review all applications for promotion and continuous appointment of faculty, regardless of whether they received a positive or negative recommendation at an earlier stage.

The Committee will advise the Provost and Chancellor on the qualifications of the individuals recommended based on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service. In making its recommendation, the Committee will also answer the two critical questions in Step 2, section E which have been addressed by all the others who have made reviews at the department and school/college levels.

Following its deliberations, the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward its recommendation, including a statement of justification, to the Provost. The recommendation of the committee must include the vote for or against advancement of the candidate.

B. Provost's Recommendation. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost will make a recommendation to the Chancellor. Before forwarding the decision to the Chancellor, the Provost will inform the candidate of her/his recommendation. The candidate shall be afforded 14 calendar days in which to provide a written response to the recommendation including any supplemental documentation to be forwarded along with the candidate's file to the Chancellor.

Step 4. Review by the Chancellor.

A. Chancellor's Decision. After receipt of the Provost's recommendation, the Chancellor will conduct a thorough review of the candidate's file, including all recommendations, and will make the final decision regarding the candidate's promotion and/or tenure application.

B. Other Recommendations are Advisory. Only the Chancellor may make a decision regarding promotion and tenure. Previous deliberations only result in a recommendation to the next higher level. Consequentially, after receipt of the Provost's recommendation, criteria statements or other statements made at the department, school or college level relate only to recommendations at the level at which the statement originates. Mere satisfaction of minimum criteria at the college, school or department level is not sufficient to ensure promotion or continuous appointment.

IV. Investing in Tenure-Track Faculty

Although promotion and tenure is a prominent part of the faculty investment system, it is not the only way faculty members are rewarded for their performance. Other rewards and investments include merit raises; access to resources for travel, research and professional development; and recognition of achievement through awards or public recognition. Because there is no current document that systematically addresses rewards and investment, the following will describe the present reward system at UMKC and its weaknesses, and make a number of recommendations for improvement.

A. PRESENT FACULTY INVESTMENT SYSTEM

General Description

The way in which UMKC invests in faculty presently is substantially decentralized, and in many cases is fragmented and opaque. Merit raises, one of the most important non-P&T rewards, typify the present system. Merit raises are generally recommended by Division/Department Chairs and/or Deans within parameters set by the system and the campus (e.g. “2% raise pool”). While in some cases there are specific standards, in other cases there are no standards or the standards are not articulated or communicated. Even where there are standards, “market adjustments” to salary are generally treated as an exception, subject to negotiation between the faculty member and the dean. Specific standards, when they exist, are generally developed at the unit or departmental level. Technically the Chancellor gives raises, but she/he typically follows the recommendations of the academic units.

Investing in faculty, in the form of resources for travel, research and professional development is somewhat more centralized, but the system for administering those kinds of rewards in some cases is still fragmented and opaque. An example of a centralized investment program from this category is the Faculty Travel Grant program. Travel grants are available through UMKC’s Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Support. Travel grants are provided on a competitive basis, to match funds faculty need to present their work at professional conferences. Information about travel grants is available on UMKC’s website and faculty members can submit applications electronically. While this portion of the travel grant process is relatively transparent, how grants are awarded is not as clear. Moreover, the process and standards for obtaining travel support for the academic unit’s share of the expenses varies from unit to unit and in some cases the standards are not apparent.

Faculty Research Grants are also available centrally on a competitive basis, as are research grants in higher amounts from the University of Missouri Research Board. These grants are rewards for outstanding research in the sense that prior success is one factor considered in evaluating grant applications. However, other factors independent of prior success—significance of the research, the level of competition for awards, and the availability of extramural funding—also affect the availability of grant support. Individual academic units also provide support for research, but their processes and standards vary.

Outside of this support for research, generally resources for other professional development are not available centrally. Of particular concern to the taskforce is the lack of centralized support for development of the faculty's teaching skills. Academic units provide some support for development, but usually on an ad hoc basis. One form of support for professional development is the availability of a paid leave of absence. Leaves of absence must be approved centrally (by the Provost), but they must also have the support of the academic unit (through the Chair and/or the Dean) that bears the economic consequence of any paid leave of absence. There are minimal centralized standards for the granting of leaves. Some academic units have standards for leaves, but in many cases the request for a leave is considered without reference to generalized standards or without reference to achievement to be rewarded by the granting of a leave. A light teaching load is another form of support for research or professional development decided at the unit or departmental level with little central review.

Another category of rewards is the recognition of faculty achievement through awards. The University of Missouri, UMKC, and UMKC's academic units offer a variety of awards for teaching, research and service. Some of these awards are handled centrally at the campus or system level, others are administered by academic units. The standards and processes for the awards vary, as does the availability of information about the awards. Less formal public recognition for research, presentations and receiving grants is available in the campus newsletter, which requires someone (typically the person seeking recognition) report the achievement.

Weaknesses

Most faculty members identify the most significant weakness of the faculty investment system as the lack of available resources. In particular, many faculty members feel frustrated by the limited amount of resources available for merit-based raises. In addition, the lack of resources has led to salary compression. As one faculty member of 26 years put it, "the average salary increase over 26 years has been approximately 1 ½ %, which is why the starting salary for my job exceeds my salary today" (Focus Group Report). Because of the lack of resources, giving merit raises to some faculty can dilute the remaining pool for cost-of-living raises for other faculty and employees, which further discourages meaningful merit-based raises.

A second weakness is the perceived arbitrariness of decisions concerning rewards. It is unclear whether rewards are given in an arbitrary or unfair way, or whether it is merely understood thus. This perception is due in part to the perceived or real absence of clear standards in evaluating merit, and in part to the perceived or real unfair application of the standards. The decentralized decision-making about rewards may contribute to these perceptions.

A third weakness, which may be related to the perceived arbitrariness, is poor communication about the faculty investment system. Some faculty members are unaware of standards being applied, or are unaware of the rewards available. The decentralization and fragmentation of the faculty investment system contributes to the communication problem.

A final weakness identified through the focus-group process was the lack of creativity in the rewards structure. "Creative" investment did not mean the kinds of rewards often cited as

examples of innovative employee benefits, such as child-care resources, elder-care resources, and free parking (Focus Group Report). Instead, faculty requested rewards such as greater flexibility in responsibilities to accommodate their scholarly and academic activities, greater public recognition of achievements and exemplary performance, and extended contracts for proficient specialized faculty.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FACULTY INVESTMENT SYSTEM

1. Budget Planning for Merit-Based Raises: Merit-Based Raises and Market-Adjustment Raises

Faculty should be paid comparable salaries for comparable performance as are paid at comparable institutions. Competitive salaries were identified by more than 83% of faculty surveyed as “absolutely essential” to a first-class incentive system (Focus Group Report). Providing competitive salaries and meaningful merit-based raises requires specific planning in the budgetary process. Long-term budget plans should include appropriate amounts, in light of circumstances and budget priorities, set aside for merit raises or necessary market adjustments. These amounts could come from increased revenue or from some kind of cost savings, depending on the circumstances of the program or academic unit. The taskforce recommends there be periodic reviews of salaries with respect to market norms and merit, both at the campus and unit levels, and that we no longer allow the giving of merit-based raises to be subject to the decisions made by others (such as the State Legislature).

2. Standards and Transparency for Merit-Based Raises

Merit-based raises should be given via clear and fully communicated standards. Although a certain amount of confidentiality may be appropriate for personnel matters, decisions to award merit-based raises should be as transparent as possible. Merit raises should relate to the assessment of progress and merit during the annual review process; percentages, where awarded, should correlate with the relative determination of merit across the unit. While the present decentralized and fragmented rewards system may have contributed to perceptions of arbitrariness in the awarding of merit-based raises, the taskforce does not recommend greater centralization of decision-making about faculty rewards. Department/Division Chairs and Deans are in the best position to evaluate faculty performance, and they should continue to play a major role in giving rewards. However, standards to be used in deciding who receives rewards need to be developed at each level where decisions are made, and those standards should be communicated to all faculty members eligible for the rewards. In addition, those making decisions about awards should be accountable for those decisions, and shall provide timely and meaningful annual feedback to faculty about their absolute and relative performance.

3. Communication and Information Clearinghouse for Rewards

Although the taskforce supports continued decentralization of decision-making, it also recommends *information* about rewards be made available through one or more central locations

to better communicate that information to the faculty. The taskforce recommends that all faculty rewards and investments, and the standards used in giving those rewards and investments, be collected and available in one easily accessible location, preferably somewhere on UMKC's website.

The taskforce also recommends a communication plan be developed to ensure faculty rewards and decision-making about faculty rewards is appropriately communicated to faculty. Such a communication plan should include a way to inform faculty about merit-based raises before and after the fact. As part of this communication plan, the taskforce recommends a mechanism be developed to publicly recognize outstanding faculty accomplishments in a way that does not rely solely upon self-reporting by faculty members. One possible mechanism that should be explored is the use of the Faculty Activity Report (or any new accomplishment-reporting system) to identify outstanding accomplishments for recognition. Another is a nomination system relying on peers and colleagues.

4. Development of New Rewards and Investments

The taskforce recommends additional rewards be developed reflecting the needs and interests of the faculty, and that put limited resources to better use. Although there are many possibilities, the taskforce recommends the following rewards in particular:

A. *Scheduling Flexibility*. The taskforce recommends academic units develop plans that would reward faculty with greater flexibility in scheduling to permit research and professional development. Such plans should have measures for accomplishment and clear standards for the awarding of scheduling flexibility. Although different kinds of flexibility may be appropriate depending on the needs of the academic unit, examples include having a light teaching load, having a preferred teaching schedule, or a reduction or temporary relief from service obligations.

B. *One-time Financial Rewards*. The taskforce also recommends plans be developed for merit-based financial rewards that would not increase a person's salary. Such rewards would provide greater flexibility in the rewards system and in the budget. A rate-funded pool could be used to reward different faculty members from year to year, and could be used to provide incentives for new initiatives or for exceptional work that may not justify a raise. The recently approved deferred-compensation mechanism may be one vehicle for providing such rewards, and the taskforce recommends it be used for this purpose.

C. *Rotating Endowed Faculty Fellows Program*. This Fellows Program would fund salary supplements on a competitive basis. The supplement would continue for a set period of time (one, two, or three-year periods).

D. *Faculty Salary Enhancement from Research Grants*. Faculty should be awarded salary enhancement out of the research grants they earn.

E. Summer-Research Grants.

5. Alignment of Rewards with Campus and Academic Unit Priorities

The taskforce recommends that the standards for giving rewards and the application of those standards in practice should align with campus and academic unit priorities. Exemplary work that advances campus and academic unit goals should be rewarded based on its overall contribution rather than its characterization as a certain kind of work. Individual academic units or departments may, consistent with their priorities, put different emphasis on teaching, scholarship or service, but the taskforce recommends exemplary work in teaching, scholarship and service all should be rewarded and recognized.

As a workplace of choice and in our attempts to set new standards in higher education, the taskforce maintains each faculty member deserves a comprehensive package of benefits, which includes maternity leave, child care, elder care, and parking.

V. Investing in Non-Tenure Track Faculty

To create a workplace of choice, it is essential that all employees receive appropriate investments, rewards, and recognition regardless of their status. Such behavior will demonstrate that UMKC values and invests in all employees who make significant contributions to its mission and who manifest its core values. While non-tenure track faculty have responsibilities differing from tenure-track faculty, their contributions allow flexibility and specialization that advance UMKC's mission. For example, non-tenure track faculty may temporarily cover teaching responsibilities of tenure-track faculty, which thus enables tenure-track faculty to engage in major research or community service projects. Similarly, non-tenure track faculty may provide additional expertise or capacity for major funded research. These contributions should be rewarded, along with contributions made by others, in a way commensurate with the levels of achievement and the extent of the contribution to UMKC's mission. Although the granting of continuous appointment ("tenure") is a major reward for tenure-track faculty and is not available for non-tenure track faculty, other rewards and investments should be made available to non-tenure track faculty. This section addresses those rewards and investments. After a brief description of present practices, this section will make recommendations to improve the rewards and ways we can invest in non-tenure track faculty.

A. PRESENT PRACTICES FOR INVESTING IN NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

The relationship between non-tenure track faculty and UMKC is less standardized than the relationship for tenure-track faculty. There are various titles used for non-tenure track faculty, which are sometimes negotiated individually and in other cases are given pursuant to an academic unit's policy. The non-tenure track faculty who are given "visiting" titles cannot, under the Collected Rules and Regulations, work more than seven consecutive years for the university. Faculty who work part-time (typically defined as less than 75% FTE) usually are given the title of Adjunct Professor.

Compensation for non-tenure track faculty varies significantly by department, discipline, and job responsibility. In some units or departments, compensation is negotiated for each individual, in other disciplines it is set as a matter of policy, and in some programs adjuncts teach without compensation. Opportunities for merit-based raises also vary by department, discipline and job responsibility, although non-tenure track faculty members generally have less opportunity for merit-based raises than tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty generally are supervised by other tenure-track faculty or administrators, but annual reviews of specialized faculty are less common and may not be as thorough as reviews of tenure-track faculty.

Promotion policies for non-tenure track faculty also vary significantly by department, discipline, and job responsibility. Some, but not all units have adopted promotion guidelines for non-tenure track faculty. 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.

Non-tenure track faculty are entitled to university benefits typical of those available to employees of UMKC, but are not eligible for many of the rewards available to tenure-track faculty. For example, non-tenure track faculty are not entitled to apply for Faculty Travel Grants, though they can now apply for Faculty Research Grants and UMRB grants (with support from an academic unit). Non-tenure track faculty members are also technically eligible for research and development leaves after six consecutive years of service. While eligibility for grants and leaves is an important step, as a practical matter non-tenure track faculty are rarely given grants or leaves. In addition, non-tenure track faculty members are not eligible for most of the recognition awards available to tenure-track faculty. While non-tenure track faculty are eligible for public recognition in UMKC publications, their accomplishments often go unreported.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INVESTING IN NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

To create a workplace of choice, UMKC's investment system should recognize the vital contributions made by non-tenure track faculty, create incentives for them to excel, and reward significant accomplishments. In addition, to the extent possible within the guidelines of the Collected Rules and Regulations, the investment system for non-tenure track faculty should be integrated with the system for tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure track faculty should be eligible for the same or similar awards as those available for tenure-track faculty for similar conduct. The taskforce also makes the following specific recommendations:

1. Designation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty as “Specialized” Faculty

The taskforce finds the term “non-regular” faculty potentially carries negative connotations, and therefore recommends different terminology. The term “specialized faculty” recognizes these faculty members are different than tenure-track faculty because they have specialized in one or two of the areas of academic responsibility (teaching, research, and/or service). The use of this term does not substantively change the status of non-tenure track faculty under the Collected Rules, but instead would simply apply the term “specialized faculty” as an alternative but equivalent of the term “non-regular” faculty in the Collected Rules.

2. Use of Titles Appropriate To Specialization and Skill Level

The taskforce recommends specialized faculty be given titles allowing for recognition of each individual's particular skill level. This should include faculty ranks recognizing progression through one's career from the equivalent of Assistant Professor to Associate and Full Professor. In some cases, as with those who specialize in teaching, additional appropriate titles should be developed to allow proper recognition of the contributions of specialized faculty. In addition to the titles of Adjunct Professor and Instructor, the taskforce recommends the use of Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor. Faculty with this title would be primarily responsible for non-clinical teaching and would have less or no responsibility for scholarship. In addition, the taskforce recommends the use of Senior Lecturer and Distinguished Adjunct to provide greater recognition for more experienced specialized

faculty who play specialized roles. Each unit will be responsible for submitting to the Provost a list of criteria for obtaining any title they wish to use.

3. Promotions, Merit Raises, and Longer-Term Contracts for Specialized Faculty

a) Full-Time Specialized Faculty

Although specialized faculty members are not eligible for continuous appointment (“tenure”), the taskforce recommends specialized faculty be eligible for promotions, merit raises, and longer-term contracts. The taskforce recommends full-time specialized faculty should have titles allowing for promotion (e.g. from assistant to associate teaching, research or clinical professor), and should have a process available for promotion through those titles. Full-time specialized faculty should also be eligible for merit raises and longer-term contracts based on performance. When combined with timely and meaningful annual reviews, the availability of promotions, merit raises, and longer-term contracts would create incentives for them to excel.

To facilitate promotion of full-time specialized faculty, academic units that make consistent and regular use of them should develop procedures for their promotion modeled on, though perhaps not identical to, the procedures for promotion of tenure-track faculty. The standards applicable to the promotion process should be clear and in writing, and the process should allow for some level of peer review as defined by the local unit.

b) Part-Time Specialized Faculty

Promotions, merit raises, and longer-term contracts should also be available for part-time faculty. Those who have performed well as part-time faculty should be rewarded with higher pay, advancement, and longer-term contracts, as appropriate.

4. Investing in Full-Time Specialized Faculty

Full-time specialized faculty should be eligible for benefits available to tenure-track faculty for similar work. For example, specialized faculty should be eligible to compete with tenure-track faculty for Faculty Travel Grants and Faculty Research Grants. Specialized faculty also should be eligible for professional development benefits provided by the academic units and provided by the Campus in areas of the specialized faculty members’ contribution and expertise.

5. Investing in Part-Time Specialized Faculty

Even if budgetary constraints and market conditions make it difficult to increase compensation for part-time faculty, UMKC should give part-time faculty additional benefits. Part-time faculty should be surveyed to identify their needs and priorities, and the budgetary implications of benefits would need to be considered. Units should decide which benefits will be offered to their part-time specialized faculty and should submit this list of new benefits to the Provost.

6. Awards and Recognition for Specialized Faculty

All specialized faculty should be eligible for awards and other forms of public recognition for accomplishments. The taskforce recommends campus-wide awards be developed for various types of specialized faculty, including part-time faculty, and that some of those awards be recognized at the Campus level. The taskforce also recommends accomplishments of specialized faculty be gathered and publicized on campus and in the Kansas City community

7. Service Opportunities for Specialized Faculty

Specialized faculty also should be eligible for greater involvement in university service, such as service on committees, to the extent possible and appropriate to their contribution, expertise, and desire.

VI. Implementation

Faculty investments, as outlined in this document, represent a system of parts linked together to form a whole. Its success depends on each part carrying out its accountabilities completely and with integrity. Two broad accountabilities must be adopted to ensure success: one requires each faculty member, regardless of his/her place in the hierarchy, become intimately familiar with the contents of this document. Toward this end, a series of opportunities are outlined immediately below that will serve to help all constituents become familiar with the implementation process the taskforce suggests be followed. The second broad accountability requires all faculty members, especially administrators, apply the guidelines completely and with integrity. The section entitled “Accountabilities” outlines how this might occur. The entire academic community can benefit from the possibilities that may result from implementation of these guidelines only if the spirit and soul of the document are respected and embraced. Under those circumstances the University of Missouri-Kansas City will truly become a workplace of choice.

A. COMMUNICATION OF THIS REPORT

Immediately upon completion of this report, the taskforce will send it to the Provost. After he reads and makes any necessary changes, we suggest he distribute copies to the Faculty Senate and all faculty members of the University. Their responses should then be addressed to the Provost.

B. ACCOUNTABILITIES

1. Office of the Provost

- a) Ensure each unit’s P&T document is consistent with campus guidelines and work with Units to bring their documents into compliance.
- b) Maintain an up-to-date library of all unit documents and updates.
- c) Submit to campus P&T committee verification that unit and departmental guidelines applicable to those faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure are consistent with campus guidelines.
- d) On a regular basis, but not less than every two years, the Provost shall assess the experience of successful candidates for promotion and/or tenure and recommend improvements to the process. To accomplish this, the Provost shall appoint an ad hoc committee composed of members of the Senate and campus P&T committee to meet with faculty members who were awarded promotion and/or tenure over the previous two years to identify which processes helped and which hindered the journey. This information should be included in the annual workshops for newly hired faculty.
- e) Each newly hired faculty member should receive written communication from the Provost’s office referring him/her to the website detailing campus P&T guidelines.

2. Deans:

- a) Verify to the Provost that promotion and tenure documents produced at their unit are consistent with the campus guidelines.
- b) Annually submit to the Provost any changes to any unit document and if there are none, indicate such.

3. Local P&T Committees:

- a) Faculty in each department or unit shall review its promotion and tenure guidelines to determine whether any changes are appropriate
- b) Verify to its dean that current documents are consistent with the campus guidelines.
- c) Annually review progress for all probationary faculty members relative to each individual's contract, goals, and dossier and provide appropriate feedback regarding the individual's strengths and weaknesses as they relate to the P&T guidelines under which that person falls.

4. Immediate Supervisors (e.g. department Chairs or Deans):

- a) Prepare, with input from their faculty, local (department, unit, school) P&T guidelines consistent with campus documents.
- b) Annually review local guidelines to ensure consistency and verify to the unit Dean that they are consistent and if they are not, make appropriate revisions and submit those to the Dean.
- c) Ensure P&T guidelines for each probationary faculty member are appropriate (i.e. consistent with campus guidelines; appropriate for the faculty member's discipline and employment agreement).
- d) On a regular basis, but not less than annually, monitor and assess faculty members' progress towards tenure and/or promotion and provide formal feedback to the individual with the goal of providing constructive assistance.
- e) Provide an annual assessment of probationary faculty members' progress towards tenure to the unit's P&T committee.
- f) Tenure-track and full-time specialized faculty will be reviewed by their supervisors annually as outlined below in Rules and Regulations 310.015 (in Appendix B).

5. Individual Faculty Members:

- a) Provide yearly documentation of their research, teaching, and service activities (Faculty Activity Report) in order to facilitate the department Chair or Dean's yearly review.

- b) Be familiar with local P&T guidelines so as to assist in the review of their performance and/or progress towards promotion and tenure.

6. Candidates for Faculty Employment:

- a) Serving as an unbiased third party, search committees shall have the initial responsibility for conveying campus, unit, and local guidelines for promotion and tenure to prospective faculty. At each unit, the Dean's office shall be responsible for ensuring the candidate receives the latest local and campus P&T document.

VII. Appendices

Appendix A

Glossary

Evaluation: the process by which the information acquired by the appropriate instruments is analyzed to determine the quality of performance as measured against the criteria set by the department. Instruments of evaluation include letters from peers at outside institutions, student evaluations, student interviews, class observations by colleagues, letters from mentees, etc.

Faculty Investment System: A wide array of resources and recognitions that the University awards to or makes available to faculty in order to reward excellence or develop the skills that support success.

Merit-based raise: An increase in salary in response to a faculty member's performance. Faculty members are considered for merit-based raises annually, unless budget restrictions preclude raises.

Market-adjustment: A salary increase given to bring compensation in line with that paid by other sectors who hire individuals with similar credentials. Market-adjustments are awarded on a case-by-case basis.

Scholarship: all the forms that research can take (development of theories, models, explanations and examples of why and how things and ideas work, experiments and research to support new or expanded hypotheses, the creation of art, the application of new ideas and practices, etc.) and the **communication** (publication via the norms and practices of the particular scholarly field—this can include print publication; public performance, lectures, or presentations; electronic or digital publication) of this research to the greater community (which can include interest groups, the university, the city, the nation, the world).

Specialized Faculty: Faculty who have responsibilities in one or two, but not all three of the traditional academic responsibilities (teaching, scholarship, service). These faculty members may be eligible for promotion, but not tenure. Each unit is responsible for submitting to the Provost a list of titles used in their Department, School or College along with the criteria used to obtain these titles. This title is used in place of the term “nonregular”.

Teaching Portfolio: A selection of materials representing a faculty members approach to student education and their performance as a teacher. A portfolio is a personal document that can include items such as one's own materials (e.g. teaching responsibilities, placement of course in a program of study, syllabi, reflective statements, revisions and innovations), materials from others (e.g. peer review, student evaluations, alumni statements), or products from student learning (e.g. pre- and post-exam scores, record of student accomplishments, student publications)

Appendix B

Current System Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

310.015 PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

A. Non-Regular and Untenured, Regular Faculty. The performance of all non-regular and untenured regular faculty is to be reviewed annually by the appropriate unit supervisor (e.g., department chair, dean, director, etc.) The review should cover the performance for the past year and plans for the coming year. Written evaluations are expected and must be provided to non-regular faculty members where there are concerns about substantial shortcomings in performance. Annual evaluations of untenured faculty members during the probationary period must follow the faculty bylaws governing tenure for each campus (300.010 Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-Columbia; 300.020 Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-Kansas City; 300.030 Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-Rolla; and 300.040 Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-St. Louis.)

B. Tenured Faculty Members. Tenured faculty have proven their ability to contribute significantly in their discipline and to work independently and productively in their field. In this document we affirm and strongly defend the importance of tenure at the University of Missouri. By fostering creativity and protecting academic freedom, tenure safeguards faculty from unfair dismissal based on arbitrary or discriminatory practices, thus encouraging the constant search for truth that is the hallmark of the University. Under this policy or any other university policy, academic tenure should be revoked only with just cause, and may only be done in accordance with the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University, section 310.020.C.1. However, tenure does not protect faculty from the consequences of not performing satisfactorily their duties to the University. It is in the best interest of the faculty as a whole to ensure that each faculty member contributes fully to the institution throughout that individual's career.

1. Performance Review of Tenured Faculty Not Holding Full-Time Administrative Positions

a. The tenured faculty of each department or unit will develop and publish minimum standards for overall satisfactory performance.

b. Every tenured faculty member, including those with part-time administrative positions, will submit a signed annual report describing her/his activities in research, teaching and service. The annual report will be reviewed by the chair (In this document the term chair will be used to mean the appropriate unit director (e.g., chair, unit administrator, area coordinator, etc.) or evaluation committee of the unit following normal unit practices. Chairs will be reviewed annually by the dean according to the standards described in B.1.a. Using the standards described in B.1.a, the activities of the faculty member will be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory in research, teaching and service, and an overall evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory will be provided. The faculty member will receive this information in a written evaluation. If the overall evaluation is unsatisfactory, there must be a face-to-face discussion of the evaluation between the faculty member and the chair. The faculty member will sign the written evaluation to acknowledge its receipt and may provide a written response to the evaluation. A copy of this

signed evaluation will be provided to the faculty member by the chair within a month after the faculty member has signed the evaluation.

c. At five-year intervals a tenured faculty member will resubmit the annual reports and evaluation statements for the past five years, with a concise summary statement of research, teaching, and service activities for the five-year period, and a current curriculum vita to the chair or evaluation committee of the unit. The first five-year review will be done five years after the tenure decision or the last formal review of the faculty member for promotion to associate professor/full professor. Faculty hired with tenure will be reviewed five years after they are hired.

d. Based on the five-year report, the chair will evaluate the faculty member's performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The five-year evaluation process will be complete with a satisfactory evaluation. If the evaluation is unsatisfactory, then the five-year report will be sent to the appropriate established committee of the department/unit, typically the one that reviews faculty for tenure and promotion. The departmental committee of faculty peers will perform its own full review of the performance of the faculty member over the five-year period and provide an independent assessment of the performance of the faculty member. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the departmental committee judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.

e. In the event that both the chair and the departmental committee determine the performance of a faculty member to be unsatisfactory for the five-year period, the report will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. The dean will review the report and provide an assessment of the performance of the faculty member. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the dean judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.

f. At every level of review, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of any written report that is part of these proceedings and will have the right of appeal of any evaluations, decisions, or recommendations to the next level of the process.

2. Formulation of Development Plan and Assessment of Progress

a. If a two-thirds majority of the members of the committee of the department/unit and the dean consider the performance of the faculty member to be unsatisfactory, a plan for professional development will be written. This plan will be developed by the faculty member, the department/unit committee or a designated subcommittee, a mutually agreed upon mediator from outside the department, and the chair of the department/unit. This development plan will have clear and attainable objectives for the faculty member and may include a reallocation of the faculty member's effort and a commitment of institutional resources to the plan. This plan will be signed by the faculty member, the chair or unit administrator, the mediator, and the dean. The development phase will begin when the necessary resources as described in the development plan are provided.

b. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory five-year evaluation by the chair, the departmental committee, and the dean may not appeal the process of developing a professional plan. If the faculty member is not satisfied with the plan that has been developed,

he/she may appeal to the next administrative level for help in the formulation of an acceptable development plan.

c. A faculty member with a plan for professional development will submit an annual progress report to the chair for three successive years after the plan has been initiated. The chair will review the report and provide a written annual evaluation on the progress of the faculty member toward the objectives stated in the development plan. If the chair finds satisfactory progress for any two of the three years, then the process will cease and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle.

d. If the chair does not find satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the development plan, the chair will provide the annual reports and evaluations to the department/unit committee and the mediator. If the department/unit committee that includes the mediator finds satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the development plan, the process ceases and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle.

e. If both the chair and the department/unit committee that includes the mediator do not find satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the development plan, the chair will provide annual reports and evaluations to the dean. If the dean finds satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the development plan, the process ceases and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle.

f. If the chair, the department/unit committee that includes the mediator, and the dean do not find satisfactory progress in two of the three years, then the five-year evaluations plus the three years of progress reports and evaluations by the chair on the development plan will be forwarded to the campus committee on Tenure and Promotion and to the Provost or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Each will review the reports and will recommend separately to the Chancellor that: 1) an additional two-year development plan be written and implemented in consultation with the faculty member and the originating departmental committee, or 2) the faculty member be considered for dismissal of cause proceedings (see section 3.)

g. Any faculty member may request participation in a formal development plan (as described in 2a) after two or more consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations. In addition, chairs will strongly encourage faculty who have had three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations to participate in a development plan.

3. Dismissal for Cause

a. If it is deemed by the Chancellor that the performance of the faculty member during the periods covered in section 2 constitutes sufficient grounds for termination for cause, dismissal for cause may be initiated and if initiated will proceed in accordance with the procedures for dismissal for cause described in section 310.060.

b. This procedure for review and development of faculty performance does not substitute for the dismissal for cause procedures stated in section 310.060.

c. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 310.015 B.2.f above, this procedure does not impose additional requirements upon the University prior to initiating dismissal for cause procedures as stated in section 310.060.

C. Full-Time Tenured Administrators

In the event that a full-time administrator leaves her/his administrative position to become a full-time active tenured faculty member of a department, the normal annual departmental review process would be used to establish any discrepancy between the current abilities of the administrator and expectations concerning performance based on minimum departmental standards. If there is a discrepancy between current ability and departmental standards, a development plan funded by the administration should be considered for the administrator prior to her/his returning to the department.

Appendix C

Current Campus Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

Chancellor's Memorandum #35

May, 1977

(Revised May 19, 1997, July 7, 2000)

Policies and Procedures for Promotion and/or Continuous Appointment at the University of Missouri - Kansas City

I. Initiation of Recommendations

A. A recommendation to consider a faculty member for promotion in academic rank or continuous appointment (tenure) shall be initiated by the department chairperson or the appropriate department or school promotion and tenure committee. In units having departments, the first review of a recommendation shall be by the department promotion and tenure committee. In schools without departments, the respective promotion and tenure committee shall transmit its recommendations to the Dean of the School. If the candidate holds a joint appointment between two academic units (departments, schools, etc.), the primary academic unit shall be responsible for making decisions and preparing recommendations regarding promotion and tenure after receiving the recommendation of other units involved. Candidates at the rank of assistant professor who are under mandatory consideration for continuous appointment shall also be considered for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Candidates who are not recommended for promotion to associate professor should not be recommended for continuous appointment. All recommendations shall be forwarded with supportive documentation including teaching evaluations, evidence of research, scholarly activity and service.

B. The promotion and tenure committees may be appointed, elected, or otherwise designated in accordance with the established departmental or school procedures as long as the procedures are in compliance with the Curators' rules and regulations. If other than tenured professors are included on the committee, only those committee members who are tenured may pass on a candidate seeking tenure.

C. Prior to the deliberations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, all tenured members of that department or school holding the same or higher rank as that of the candidate (or, in larger departments or schools, all tenured members of the particular academic field holding the same rank or higher rank as that of the candidate) shall be given the opportunity to provide written and signed comments to the Promotion and Tenure Committee regarding the candidate being considered.

D. All candidates for promotion and tenure shall have their portfolios subjected to external peer evaluations. Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure, and each academic department or

division must submit to their Dean or Director a list of external scholars who might be called upon to review and evaluate the candidate's portfolio. These lists should include the names of well-respected and recognized individuals from nationally and internationally known institutions. All external reviewers must hold academic appointments at the university level and must have achieved the rank/tenure that is being considered for the candidate. These proposed evaluators must be submitted for approval to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs before May 16th of each year.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee should solicit whatever additional information its members deem appropriate, from within and outside the University, to evaluate the candidate under consideration in the areas of teaching, research and public service. They must provide time for candidates to appeal a negative decision prior to submitting their recommendations to the Dean/Director.

II. Review by the School or College Dean

A. Upon receipt of the recommendations from the Promotion and Tenure Committee or the department chairpersons, the Dean shall review all such recommendations. The Dean may consult with members of the faculty individually or in a group and may confer with others.

B. It shall be the responsibility of the Deans and Directors to: 1) initiate the external review by selecting, from the list approved by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, a minimum of three experts; 2) devise an appropriate letter seeking appraisals and evaluations of the candidate's competencies relative to the evaluator's institution as well as UMKC; 3) supply the relevant criteria for evaluation at UMKC in the areas of the University's concerns --- research, teaching, service; 4) ensure that all materials submitted by external evaluators are available for the initial level of formal review within the unit, and for all subsequent review; and 5) provide a period for candidates to appeal a negative decision of the Dean prior to submitting recommendations to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The critical questions that should be addressed at this level are as follows:

1. Is the candidate qualified to be promoted or to be placed on continuous appointment?
2. Is it in the best interest of the University of Missouri to promote the candidate or place him or her on continuous appointment?
3. Is the recommended action the best possible action that can be taken for the University?
The Dean should solicit whatever additional information is deemed appropriate for making an independent evaluation and recommendation.

The Dean shall then forward all positive recommendations to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, including a written statement of evaluation and recommendation for each candidate. The Dean shall allow ten to fourteen calendar days for candidates to appeal any negative decision of the Dean. If the Dean's decision remains negative following the appeal, the candidate will be informed of the Dean's second negative decision and the process will stop at that step.

III. Review by the Chancellor

A. A campus-wide Promotion and Tenure committee has been established to assist the Chancellor in the review of recommendations for change of status. The members of the Committee are appointed by the Chancellor in consultation with the Faculty Senate. The Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor and will review all recommendations for promotion and continuous appointment of faculty. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs also chairs the Committee and forwards its recommendations to the Provost. The Provost will conduct a thorough review of the candidate files and forward her/his recommendations to the Chancellor with the recommendations made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Negative decisions by the Dean should not be forwarded to the Vice Provost; the candidate must be given an opportunity to rebut the decision or supplement the dossier with current information relative to the decision. They must also be informed of the appeal process to the Chancellor. Only positive recommendations from the Dean will be sent for the Committee to review. The Committee will advise the Chancellor on the following matters:

1. The adequacy of the criteria used at the departmental, school, and college level;
2. The qualifications of the individuals recommended based on the candidate's teaching, research, and service.

In making a final recommendation to the Chancellor, the Committee will also answer the three critical questions in II-B which have been addressed by all others who have made reviews at the department and school/college levels.

IV. Evaluation and Notification Process

A. It is to be clearly understood by all persons involved in the promotion and continuous appointment process that recommendations by committees, chairpersons, and Deans are only recommendations and a final decision can be made only by the Chancellor. Criteria statements or other statements made at the department, school or college level relate only to recommendations at the level at which the statement originates. Mere satisfaction of minimum criteria at the college, school or department level is not sufficient to ensure promotion or continuous appointment.

B. Negative recommendations for continuous appointment should be made at the earliest possible time by the first level of review. Negative recommendations at the divisional or departmental and Dean's level will provide the strongest possible evidence for retaining positions within the unit making the decision.

In all cases, final decisions by the Chancellor will be based upon the best interests and needs of the campus.

To ensure fair and timely review of all actions, committees and chairpersons shall communicate their recommendations to candidates under consideration and give the candidates a reasonable time to submit written rebuttal to the recommendation so that both recommendation and rebuttal may be forwarded to the Dean's level of review.

THE CHANCELLOR'S POLICIES CONCERNING PROMOTION AND TENURE

The University of Missouri-Kansas City seeks faculty members who are creative, world-class scholars and inspired teachers, and who are dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and its transmission to others. These high standards are to be observed in the recruitment, promotion and tenure of faculty members. In making recommendations to the Chancellor with respect to promotion and tenure, the Committee will be concerned with the candidate's demonstrated ability to fulfill these responsibilities.

Outstanding intellectual qualities as reflected in teaching and scholarship are the primary criteria for recommendation for promotion and tenure. Additional criteria include professionally-oriented public service contributions and services to a faculty member's department, school, college, and the University. Because the faculty has a special role in the decisions of the University, service to the University and its numerous units is expected of every faculty member; but such service shall not substitute for teaching and scholarship in matters of promotion and tenure.

The essential factors in consideration of candidates for promotion and tenure will be documented merit in the traditional areas of teaching, research and service and the degree to which contributions are comprehensively substantiated and represent sustained efforts.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should demonstrate sustained merit and contributions over an extended period of time. Only in rare and exceptional instances will consideration be given to recommendations for early promotion and/or tenure.

The policies of the University of Missouri-Kansas City are consistent with the general philosophy of the University of Missouri and the general guidelines set forth in the "Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure," Executive Order No. 6A September 1992.

Teaching

By teaching, the Chancellor means to include, besides classroom and laboratory instruction, activities that require professional knowledge and that directly contribute to the academic advancement of students, for example: academic advising, supervision of junior staff, creative redesign of courses, liaison with teachers outside the University, off-campus teaching, and preparation of teaching materials, including textbooks.

Teaching activities of all faculty members shall be evaluated each year (Chancellor's Memorandum #77). Evaluation of teaching is difficult, but evaluation based on systematically gathered data into broad categories of "excellent," "good," "average," and "poor," is possible. Among the most useful kinds of evaluative evidence are testimony of chairpersons and deans, especially when based on student interviews covering several semesters, comments of colleagues who are well acquainted with the teaching performance of the candidate, achievement of students, and the quality of teaching materials prepared by the faculty member. A significant element in the evaluation of teaching is the overall judgment of students, and each unit, department, school, and college is responsible for obtaining such information on all faculty, particularly those recommended for promotion. Questionnaires developed at the college or school level in cooperation with the faculty committees on promotion and tenure may be used for

this purpose, or a similar procedure can be followed which is designed to reflect comprehensive student judgment concerning teaching qualities. Faculty members whose records consistently reflect poor teaching normally will not be recommended for promotion.

In unusual circumstances tenure may be recommended for demonstrated excellence in teaching, even in the absence of significant published research. The qualifications for teaching and scholarship are closely related. The faculty member who does not keep current with developing knowledge in her/his field or who is not constantly searching for new insights does not have a future as a classroom teacher at UMKC. Graduate as well as undergraduate instruction is a responsibility of the faculty of this campus; a continuing interest in, and a capacity for, creative scholarship by a faculty member is essential to effective instruction for undergraduate as well as graduate students. A faculty member who lacks the qualifications to teach advanced students ordinarily will not be recommended for promotion.

Scholarship

Scholarship gives evidence of the capacity of individuals to remain abreast of developments in their disciplines; placing a high value upon it is a way of ensuring that the campus will fulfill one of its essential responsibilities, that of advancing knowledge. Obviously certain distinctions have to be made in judging scholarship. Quantity can be a consideration, but quality must be the primary one. In those branches of learning where new hypotheses are being tested experimentally, there may be expectations different from those in areas requiring synthesis and interpretation, or the development of concepts, methods, or propositions.

Productivity in research is an important factor in judging scholarship. It is expected that candidates for promotion and tenure demonstrate sustained contributions to their discipline through research activities. Documentation of research activities should include some evidence that the research had a reasonable or recognized impact upon the field.

Unlike the assessment of teaching, an accurate judgment of scholarly achievement generally may best be made by the academic community at large. To be considered for promotion to an associate professorship, the candidate should have completed work of sufficient quality to have gained recognition by her/his peers and standing in her/his profession. A candidate being considered for promotion to associate professor will also be considered for tenure. A person to be considered for a professorship should be a scholar who has achieved national distinction, with the rank of world-class qualifications in the areas of research and scholarly activity.

Evidence of favorable judgment by colleagues includes publication in journals where expert evaluation is required for acceptance, favorable reviews of books, appointments or awards that require evaluation of professional competence, election to office in learned societies, and receipt of fellowship.

Although faculty committees on promotion and tenure have the first responsibility for evaluating the quality of the work of a candidate for tenure or promotion, it is within the scope of the department chairperson's, Dean's, Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' and Chancellor's responsibilities to gather confirming evidence of scholarly competence by seeking the comments of other scholars both internal and external to the University.

Service

The University community provides many opportunities for service contributions. These opportunities may exist with professional organizations (local, state, regional, national, the University, campus, school or college, and home department, as well as the urban community at large). Service contributions shall be judged from a qualitative standpoint as opposed to quantitative. While service is important to providing balance in the academic experience, such contributions alone do not constitute grounds for promotion and/or tenure. Service shall be considered a factor in the promotion and tenure review process, but service in the absence of teaching and scholarship will not suffice for promotion or continuous appointment.

Chancellor's Memorandum #77

December 1, 1989

(Revised 12/15/93, 1/19/95/, 5/29/98, 7/7/00)

Procedures for Review of Regular Faculty on Tenure-Track or Tenured Appointments

The University of Missouri Board of Curators stipulate that the performance of tenure-track faculty on probationary status must be reviewed each year during their probationary period. UM Executive Guideline No. 27 (2-2-93) requires a similar annual review process for faculty who have attained tenure status. Each academic unit is to establish written procedures based on this document which must be approved by the Chancellor through the Office of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The maximum probationary period for faculty on an initial regular term appointment (not including credit for previous years' service) is:

| | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Instructor | Seven Years |
| Assistant Professor | Seven Years |
| Associate Professor | Five Years |
| Professor | Four Years |

The probationary period enables new faculty to establish a pattern of sustained performance for evaluation by the appropriate chair/unit review committee and Dean or Director. Professional growth as evidenced by teaching, scholarly activity, and service is the primary factor in granting tenure as detailed in the guidelines set forth in **Chancellor's Memorandum #35**. These same guidelines will be used to annually review faculty who have attained tenure status.

I. Annual Review of Regular Faculty on Probationary Status

Decisions to grant faculty tenure dictate a careful annual review during the probationary period. This process cannot wait until the year of mandatory tenure review. Yearly progress must be monitored and, if deemed appropriate, non-renewal of a contract should be the recommendation. Annual review of regular faculty is only one part of a complete faculty development process. The total process also must include procedures that assist the faculty member's maximum

professional growth and greatest possible contribution to the University and his or her academic unit.

Each academic unit's annual evaluation review procedure for regular faculty must meet the following criteria:

1. The Academic unit will form its own Review Committee and review process in accordance with established bylaws and procedures. (If appropriate, this can be an existing promotion and tenure committee.) All committee members will be tenured full professors. If a unit does not have enough tenured full professors to serve, then tenured associate professors can be appointed.
2. The academic unit must develop its procedure with faculty input. The plan must incorporate the guidelines set forth in Chancellor's Memorandum #35 and be approved by the Chancellor, through the Office of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
3. Evaluations are part of the professional development of faculty and should include established procedure for assisting faculty in their professional development.
4. The annual review process must include a written performance evaluation of teaching, scholarly activity, and service to the academic unit and University.
 - 4a. Faculty will receive written performance evaluation from their immediate supervisor and have opportunity to provide written dissent. Both the written evaluation and rebuttal become a part of the faculty member's official record and a copy will be forwarded to the Chancellor through the Vice Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
 - 4b. Performance objectives will be coordinated, by July 15 each year, between faculty member and immediate supervisor. Objectives for the coming year will be provided to the faculty member by the immediate supervisor, and must include components to assist faculty in their professional development.
 - 4c. Performance objectives must recognize individual differences; however, reasonable expectations must be established for each of the three areas.
 - 4d. Performance evaluations also are to measure faculty contributions that achieve common goals of the academic unit and the University.
 - 4e. The evaluation design should identify unsatisfactory, satisfactory and outstanding performance.

II. Annual Review of Tenured Regular Faculty

Each unit will implement procedures, stipulated in Section I above, to annually review performance of tenured regular faculty.

In cases where the performance of a faculty member is deemed unsatisfactory by the dean/director or immediate supervisor, a faculty committee of the academic unit will conduct a review. This review is solely for the purpose of determining whether the faculty committee concurs with the evaluation of the dean/director/supervisor. The finding of the faculty committee shall in no way compel nor preclude further action against a faculty member pursuant to other existing procedures involving other faculty committees, including, but not limited to, the campus Faculty Committee on Tenure described in Section 310.060 of the Collected Rules and Regulations. If there is a finding of unsatisfactory performance by the faculty committee, the dean will schedule, before April 15 (each year), a meeting with the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to review the evaluation and recommendation(s). During this meeting, the dean will present specific documented examples of the performance deemed to be unsatisfactory. A decision then will be made on what action may be taken to address the situation. In cases where the Vice Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs deems the evidence is insufficient, no further action will be taken.

If decided that an evaluation plan for the ensuing year is needed, the Vice Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will arrange, within thirty calendar days, a meeting between the faculty member, the immediate supervisor, and the academic dean/director. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the proposed performance plan for the following academic year. The Vice Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will provide, within fourteen calendar days, the faculty member with a written plan of expected performance. The plan will include components for the faculty member's professional development. The academic dean/director or immediate supervisor will be expected to conduct a mid-year and year-end progress evaluation. This evaluation will be shared with the faculty member and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. All performance evaluations shall be in writing. The faculty member may submit a written response within two weeks following her/his receipt of the written evaluations.

The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will report to the Chancellor on all faculty evaluations. The Chancellor's review recommendations will be forwarded to the President by July 1 (each year).

Appendix D

Current System-Based Investments:

340.020 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

A. **GENERAL POLICY** -- Leaves of absence are granted to members of the staff of the University for institutional purposes. Leaves of absence provide opportunity for the reflection, research, and professional development essential in a scholarly community. The several classes of leaves of absence are described in the following sections.

1. Upon expiration of a leave of absence, the employee shall be eligible for reinstatement to his former position or to one of similar requirements and compensation.
2. Should a position not be available at the time of return to work, the leave of absence may be extended until such time as a position for which the employee is qualified becomes available.
3. Failure to return to work upon expiration of the leave of absence or when a position becomes available shall result in termination of the employee's services.
4. Leave of absence shall be granted only to staff members who have bonafide intention of returning to the University at the termination of the leave.

SABBATICAL LEAVE

Revised Bd. Min. 10-9-81; Amended Bd. Min. 7-22-83 and 10-30-87.

340.070 SABBATICAL LEAVE

A. **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES** -- All regular faculty are eligible for sabbatical leave after six or more years of service in the University of Missouri. In special circumstances, nonregular faculty may be considered eligible for sabbatical leave.

B. CONDITIONS FOR GRANTING LEAVE

1. Sabbatical leave may be taken for a period of time up to a full year.
2. Faculty on sabbatical leave will receive one-half their regular salary.
3. Faculty members granted sabbatical leaves must state their intention to return to the University for a least one year on conclusion of the leave and at that time must file a report, as specified by their chancellors, on accomplishments during the leave period.

RESEARCH LEAVE

Revised Bd. Min. 10-9-81; Amended Bd. Min. 7-22-83 and 10-30-87.

340.080 RESEARCH LEAVE

A. **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES** -- Regular faculty with established scholarly, artistic or research records are eligible for research leave. In special circumstances, nonregular faculty may be considered eligible for research leave.

B. CONDITIONS FOR GRANTING LEAVE

1. Research leave may be taken for a period of time up to a full year.
2. If a faculty member receives external fellowship or grant support for a research leave, the University will supplement such support to provide full regular salary; if such external support is not received, the University will provide full regular salary. Additional travel and expense funds may be provided as deemed appropriate.
3. Faculty members granted research leaves must state their intention to return to the University for at least one year on conclusion of the leave and at that time must file a report, as specified by their chancellors, on accomplishments during the leave period.

DEVELOPMENT LEAVE

Revised Bd. Min. 10-9-81; Amended Bd. Min. 7-22-83 and 10-30-87.

340.090 DEVELOPMENT LEAVE

A. **ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES** -- All regular faculty are eligible for leave to pursue personal, professional, instructional, or administrative development. Nonregular academic staff may also be considered for development leave.

1. The concept of development need should not be restricted to teaching faculty. Administrators and other nonacademic staff may also be eligible for development leave.

B. CONDITIONS FOR GRANTING LEAVE

1. Development leave may be taken for a period of time up to a full year.
2. If a faculty member receives external fellowship or grant support for a development leave, the University may supplement such support to provide full regular salary; if such external support is not received, the University may provide full regular salary. Additional travel and expense funds may be provided as deemed appropriate.
3. Faculty members granted development leaves must state their intention to return to the University for at least one year on conclusion of the leave and at that time must file a report, as specified by their chancellors, on accomplishments during the leave period.

Appendix E

Current Campus Investments

Chancellor's Memorandum #100 (Leaves)

April 1, 2001

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-KANSAS CITY DEVELOPMENT LEAVE POLICY

This Development Leave policy represents a merger of existing Sabbatical Leave, Research Leave, and Development Leave procedures under a single, common heading of Development Leave.

A. A Development Leave is intended for the mutual benefit of the University and the faculty or staff member granted a leave. The purpose of this leave is to free faculty members from their normal University duties to pursue their scholarly interests full-time and maintain their professional standing so that they may return to the University with renewed vigor, perspectives, and insights. In accordance with the mission of the academic unit or University, a Development Leave may also be used to expand or acquire new qualifications or skills; or to contribute to academic unit plans to improve or refocus instructional, research or service activities.

B. Each request for leave must include a detailed plan describing the purpose, objective, and any scholarly/research activities for the leave. Requesting a leave, including the detailed plan, does not imply automatic approval. The dean/director must include a description of arrangements to cover the faculty member's instructional responsibilities, supervision of his or her dissertation students and advisees, and other duties for which s/he is responsible. These should be submitted to the first level of review four (4) months before the anticipated start date. The plan should indicate how the goals and objectives of the leave will advance the interests and eventual contributions of the faculty member to his/her role in the School, College, or University. All requests must have the approval of the department chair, dean/director, and Provost. They must be submitted to the Provost no later than three (3) months prior to the anticipated start date. Final approval must be received from the Board of Curators.

C. The granting of a leave must depend on the unit's capacity to maintain necessary teaching schedules and advising responsibilities either by reallocation of work among other faculty members or, in some cases with justification, through temporary replacements. It should not create undue hardships for other faculty members and should not limit course offerings. The leave must also support and contribute to the mission and plans of the academic unit. Approval by the dean/director will be taken that all conditions will be met.

1. **Eligible Employees:** All regular and non-regular faculty are eligible to apply for Development Leave after six or more years of full-time service at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Administrative and support staff may also be considered for Development Leave.

2. **Length of Leave:** May be taken for a period of time up to a full year.

3. **Compensation:** If a faculty member receives external fellowship or grant support for a Development Leave, the University may supplement such support to provide full regular salary;

if such external support is not received, the University may provide full regular salary. Additional travel and expense funds may be provided as deemed appropriate and if funds are available.

D. Faculty members and other staff who are granted Development Leave must state their intentions to return for at least one year, and sign the Request for Leave of Absence Form. This form indicates that if they do not return to the University after the leave, they must reimburse the University for the amount of salary and benefits received from the University while on leave. Within forty-five (45) days following the conclusion of the leave, personnel must file a report to the Provost with a copy to the dean/director on objectives completed during the leave period. The report should include an assessment and evaluation of the leave accomplishments in relation to the leave plan. A copy must be kept in applicable unit files.

Leave application forms can be obtained from the dean/director's office. If you have any questions about Development Leave, contact the Office of the Vice Provost at (816) 235-1323.

Appendix F
Focus Group Report

Report to the Faculty Roles
and Rewards Taskforce

**2003 Faculty Roles &
Rewards Focus Groups**

May 2003

Report Prepared by
Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership
Bloch School of Business & Public Administration
University of Missouri - Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri 64110-2499

Jill S. Cook, Program Coordinator
Mark Culver, Program Coordinator

(816) 235-2305
(800) 474-1170
Fax (816) 235-1169

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Methodology & Process | 4 |
| Section I: Overall Focus Group Summary | 5 |
| Section II: Individual Focus Group Summaries | |
| Faculty Senate Focus Group | 7 |
| Regular Faculty Focus Group | 11 |
| Promotion and Tenure Process Focus Group..... | 15 |
| Part Time Faculty Focus Group | 18 |
| Faculty Candidates for Promotion and Tenure Focus Group..... | 20 |
| Non-tenure Track Faculty Focus Group..... | 22 |
| Section III: Conclusion | 24 |
| Appendix | 25 |
| Taskforce Members | 26 |
| Focus Group Questions | 27 |

Introduction

The University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC), the only university in western Missouri offering graduate and professional study at the highest academic level, provides instruction, research and community service. UMKC manifests its vision of comprising “a community of learners making the world a better place,” through its mission covering the following areas: 1) leading in life and health sciences, 2) deepening and expanding strength in the visual and performing arts, 3) developing an urban workforce through collaboration in urban issues and education, and 4) creating a vibrant learning and campus experience. In full alignment with its vision, UMKC is a strong partner with the Kansas City community, active in the region's economic and cultural development.

The vision and mission allow the UMKC community to live its values set forth by *UMKC 2006: Our Emerging Future*. One of these specific values encompasses discovery and innovation by promoting the following: creativity, critical thinking and interdisciplinary cooperation; scholarship in all its forms; research and sharing of knowledge; recognizing and rewarding excellence. In an effort to realize this reality the Faculty Roles and Rewards Taskforce – comprised of seventeen faculty members representing a variety of disciplines - was established to explore UMKC’s faculty roles and rewards and to inform the provost’s policy development on this particular issue.

To inform their recommendations, the Faculty Roles and Rewards Taskforce sought faculty feedback on and perceptions of UMKC’s reward structure through focus groups under the following categories: faculty who sought tenure or promotion in 2001 or 2002, regular faculty, part-time faculty, Faculty Senate members, non-tenure track faculty and clinical faculty. In an effort to obtain candid, honest observations the taskforce engaged The Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership, an education, research and outreach center of the Henry W. Bloch School of Business and Public Administration at the University of Missouri - Kansas City, to conduct these focus groups.

The Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership is pleased to have the opportunity to present this Faculty Roles and Rewards Report to the taskforce. This report provides information about the focus group process, and summary and information of responses from the focus groups. Section I of the report presents the findings of the overall focus group responses, Section II presents findings from the individual focus groups and Section III provides the summary conclusion of the overall process.

It is our hope that the information presented in this Faculty Roles and Rewards Report will inform the taskforce’s recommendations for strengthening the faculty roles and rewards structure at UMKC. And while this report offers summaries that have been developed by the project consultants, *taskforce members are encouraged to take the time to personally review and reflect on the information presented in the report and develop their own conclusions regarding the most appropriate opportunities for the future development of the faculty roles and rewards at UMKC.*

Methodology and Process

The UMKC Faculty Roles and Rewards focus groups were conducted in four phases. The *initial* phase involved identifying the actual focus group questions. Taskforce representatives developed the final set of thirteen questions with assistance from the Midwest Center. These questions are included in the appendix of this report.

The *second* phase comprised of faculty classification for the purpose of developing homogeneous focus groups and faculty invitations to participate. The final classification system included the following categories: faculty who sought tenure or promotion in 2001 or 2002, regular faculty, part-time faculty, Faculty Senate members, non-tenure track faculty and clinical faculty. The taskforce then provided a pool of faculty under each category to the Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership. The Midwest Center randomly selected an agreed-upon number of faculty from each category to participate in their respective focus groups. Invitations were extended via email and campus mail. The table below outlines this process along with the number of responses.

| <i>Focus Group</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Number in Pool of Candidates to be randomly selected</i> | <i>Number of Randomly Selected Invited</i> | <i>Number Signed up</i> | <i>Number Showed Up</i> | <i>Note</i> |
|--|-------------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Faculty Senate | 4/22 | 27 | 27 | 6 | 4 | All Faculty Senate members were invited except taskforce members. |
| Sought Tenure or Promotion in 2001 or 2002 | 4/30 | 43 | 15 | 4 | 0 | All no shows. Reoffered on May 13 th . |
| Sought Tenure or Promotion in 2001 or 2002 | 5/13 | 43 | 25 | 2 | 1 | Expanded randomly selected invitations. |
| Regular Faculty | 5/12 | 467 | 27 | 4 | 3 | |
| Promotion & Tenure Process | 5/12 | 20 | 20 | 4 | 3 | |
| Part-time Faculty | 5/12 | 154 | 25 | 5 | 4 | |
| Faculty Not on Tenure Track | 5/14 | 57 | 25 | 3 | 2 | |
| Clinical Faculty | 5/15 | 121 | 27 | 2 | 0 | Session held at the Medical School. |

During the *third* phase the Midwest Center conducted the focus groups. Each session was located at the 4747 Troost Building in Conference Room 213 except for the Clinical Faculty Focus Group, which was scheduled to occur at the UMKC Medical School on Hospital Hill (there were no actual participants). MCNL audio recorded each session to ensure accuracy in reporting. These tapes will remain in the custody of MCNL until completion of this process. They will then be destroyed.

Compilation of this report to the taskforce is the *final* phase of this process. The Midwest Center presents this report to the Faculty Roles and Rewards Taskforce in order to provide each member an opportunity to reflect on the significance and implications of this information for development of recommendations to the Provost.

Section I: Overall Focus Group Summary

As shown in the preceding table participation in this round of focus groups was disappointingly low, with an average attendance rate of 11.5 percent. *For this reason, it is important that task force members recognize this document for what it is – a springboard for dialogue on opportunities for policy development rather than a comprehensive picture reflective of the entire faculty.* It is also important to explore possible factors contributing to such a low rate of participation among UMKC faculty. Overall, participants in the focus groups viewed the fact that the university has a reward structure and conducts annual reviews as strengths.

Three themes common to the majority, if not all of the groups emerged as critical issues to address in strengthening UMKC's faculty roles and rewards structures. First, UMKC faculty members perceive the university reward structure to be weak. The merit-based system of rewards appears not to reward based on merit, but rather on subjective judgment or other factors. Merit-based salary increases are simply seen as small cost of living raises awarded to everybody rather than significant increases awarded to those exhibiting exemplary performance. And although UMKC attracts high quality faculty with competitive starting salaries, subsequent, significant salary increases cannot be maintained. The resulting salary compression serves to frustrate or demoralize faculty who work hard to distinguish themselves through their years of service at UMKC. As one participant – a 26-year UMKC faculty member – indicated, “the average salary increase over 26 years has been approximately 1 ½ %, which is why the starting salary for my job exceeds my salary today.”

Regarding UMKC's tenure process, faculty expressed concern that the standards and timelines are unclear and constantly changing. They would like to see consistency of standards and timelines adopted as well as some sort of mechanism to help guide those seeking tenure through the process of filing paperwork. Another area of concern was the lack of communication with the applicant to update him or her on the status of the application. In essence, if the university is hiring an individual in a tenure-track faculty position, UMKC must expect that individual to obtain tenure and support him or her in achieving this goal. And once a professor is tenured, systematic post-tenure reviews should be conducted.

One final area of weakness repeated among the different groups involved the lack of creativity in UMKC's reward structure. For instance, offering extended contracts to loyal, proficient part-time or non-tenure track faculty would be considered a type of reward. Full-time faculty expressed their desire to be able to readjust their schedules to accommodate specific activities such as decreasing their teaching loads to allow more time to conduct major research. One final repeated creative reward involved UMKC recognizing publicly – both within and outside the physical borders of the campus – exemplary performance.

Another theme emerging as a critical issue involved the areas of scholarship – research, teaching and service. The majority of participating faculty members perceived the current emphasis on research to be appropriate and did not want to diminish this component. They also felt that departments should determine standards for quality research in their fields and educate promotion and tenure committee members from other schools to inform their decision-making when considering a candidate for promotion or tenure. While satisfied with an emphasis on research, participants also recognized teaching as underemphasized within the current reward structure. Professors spend a great deal of time mentoring students and fellow faculty (especially during the tenure process), but there is no incentive within the current reward structure to encourage these activities. Finally faculty members felt some sort of mechanism for rewarding service – both to the

campus community and to the Kansas City community – should be established but that tenure is not the appropriate reward for service alone.

The third and final theme to emerge as a critical issue is that of communication. There is a perceived need for clarity around definitions of terms used in the reward structure such as “merit,” “faculty,” “scholarship,” “performance,” and “titles.” As was stated before, UMKC could do a better job communicating with faculty members seeking tenure regarding paperwork, deadlines and status of the application. Strengthening interdepartmental communication was also mentioned. Specifically educating each other about discipline-specific standards for the scholarship areas and best practices will only strengthen the interdisciplinary nature of the university. Finally, university administration needs to communicate better and more clearly with faculty. There is a perceived rhetoric versus reality in that the administration speaks to valuing faculty input but continues to make decisions affecting the faculty before seeking faculty input.

Section II: Individual Focus Group Summaries

Faculty Senate Focus Group

Tuesday, April 22, 2003, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

The faculty senate had a 14.8 percent response rate with four of the 27 invited participating. The emerging themes of this session involved the amount of emphasis on the three areas of scholarship – research, teaching and service – and the merit-based reward system. Overall participants agreed with a strong emphasis on research within the reward structure and the promotion and tenure process as UMKC is a research institution, but they also recognized the need for flexibility for departments and schools to determine the level of emphasis for each area of scholarship within the reward structure as appropriate to their disciplines. And although participants identified merit-based raises as a strength of UMKC's reward structure, they questioned the university's definition of "merit" as it appears to be more of an annual cost of living salary increase when it takes place.

1. *In what ways does UMKC reward faculty for their performance?*
 - Increased salary
 - Decreased teaching load to free time to do research
 - After 6 years, consideration for tenure
 - Promotion from associate to full professor
 - Peer recognition – elected by peers to represent in university governing mechanisms, consider you thoughtful and value your input
 - Personal recognition – characteristics the individual has that contribute 'significantly' to the aim(s) of the school; this then leads to the individual being able to present an idea and have other people take it more seriously than they would otherwise (an expectation/reputation has been established for the individual)
 - Annual awards – alumni association, individual teaching unit awards every 3 years, invitation to trustee dinner
 - Awarded opportunities to do more of what we do well
2. *What do you see as the strengths of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*
 - The unit-specific perspective – shields people who put in the effort from university-wide bureaucratic processes
 - The merit-based system of recognition (promotions and raises) in that it motivates you and allows you to control the outcome of your career path
 - The high salaries – attract quality faculty in the areas of teaching and nationally competitive research
3. *What do you see as the weaknesses of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*
 - Mentors, those who help tenure candidates navigate the system, are not awarded – their valuable contribution to the unit is not recognized
 - The merit-based system of recognition becomes more of a cost of living system during lean years, thus reducing motivation for high performance
 - "Merit" is defined differently – anything below a certain percentage raise is really cost of living; anything above and beyond that becomes merit-based recognition
 - Maintaining the high salaries that attract such great faculty create problems for the Missouri system to keep up with over time

- UMKC does not clearly guide faculty through the tenure process – the tenure handbook is often too little, too late, or procedures are not clearly defined
 - Individual discipline expectations are not always in line with university expectations for tenure consideration – in some cases, faculty contractual obligations are contrary to those of the campus P & T committee
 - Awards are dependent on recommendations by specific people, making them more personality-based than performance-based – if you do not get along with that person you are most likely passed over for recognition
 - Inequitable staff / faculty raises – staff raises should keep pace with faculty raises
 - Faculty do not often see or know the staff that make their work possible – staff are underpaid resulting in high rate of turnover among staff
 - SHARE program – bonus should be spread
4. *What additional rewards could UMKC offer you for your contributions in teaching, research and service?*
- Salary – give raises based on merit so that they are perceived as a real reward, not a customary, annual two percent raise
 - Reward performance by giving faculty control over teaching load – they can teach more only if they want more, or they can scale back teaching to free time to do research
 - Make criteria for rewards discipline-appropriate – i.e. community service as a criteria should apply when appropriate to your line of work and research
 - Respect – utilize faculty expertise to solve UMKC issues rather than bringing in external expertise
 - Make UMKC a satisfactory work environment – when the economy is bad focus on nonmonetary rewards such as time off to pursue training opportunities, seminars, collegial opportunities, research projects, sabbaticals – try to accommodate nonfiduciary interests
 - Make awards (Jefferson, Curator) worth the effort to be considered for nomination
 - Research-based awards – promote faculty research to media and acknowledge faculty expertise
 - Establish a better infrastructure by which the communications department is aware of faculty expertise and research in all departments
 - Make UMKC a place where staff want to stay to reduce turnover and time spent retraining and re-educating new employees
 - Stop assuming the faculty are not doing anything by forcing them to account everything in numerous reports – start assuming productivity
 - Provide help for faculty – design a department web site; the support staff should be working to help faculty, not central administration; faculty mentoring
 - Free parking is NOT an award
5. *What faculty roles or activities, if any, do not get sufficient emphasis in UMKC's reward structure?*
- Time spent with students outside the classroom
 - Class preparation time
 - Time spent on prospective students – faculty help to attract students by giving prospective students personal attention and this pays off by helping to motivate

- students in their academic pursuits, thus enhancing university recruitment and retention efforts
- Service to campus community such as committee work – although rewarding this might make faculty suspicious, it might serve to attract faculty to these positions; many are not engaged because nothing ever comes of it, and they want to produce outcomes
6. *What faculty roles or activities, if any, are over-emphasized in UMKC's reward structure?*
- UMKC emphases match my expectations (of what a faculty member should be doing or receive for their efforts)
 - Recommendations – most recommendations do not serve as a neutral filter, and colleagues do not always realize the amount of time and work put in
 - Some say research is over-emphasized (this factors in where research determines tenure) – traditional research gets more emphasis, but different academic units differ on what is quality research (perception-based); what is the quality commensurate with tenure performance?
7. *In what ways does the present reward structure encourage faculty to undertake activities that will help UMKC achieve our Goals for 2006?*
- Our academic unit goals are commensurate with those of our field
 - If you bring in research funding, you pay for your raise
 - Community involvement – how do you define community?
 - The current structure encourages teaching and research – this makes UMKC strong
 - Drop the references to 2006
 - No way with current and projected funding
 - Faculty resent this reference, it's demeaning - the administration is candid about funding projections and their implications with faculty senate but unrealistically optimistic with the faculty
 - Reward structure and many of the 2006 goals are not linked
 - Anything positive that happens gets lumped under 2006 - garbage rhetoric that rarely translates into action—or reflects reality. We are not doing good things solely because of 2006.
 - These goals represent what we should be doing anyway, and the reward structure already rewards these appropriate functions
 - Link to 2006 gives no direction
 - Don't capitalize on these goals – instead focus on the mission of UMKC
 - Extra efforts toward stated 2006 goals should be rewarded – UMKC faculty conducting research that brings in big money should receive financial rewards
8. *What changes, if any, are needed in the present reward structure to support achieving our Goals for 2006?*
- Drop references to 2006 – talk about the mission and vision
 - Merit raises
 - Clearer definitions of the following terms: teaching, research, service, merit raise
 - Develop campus standards around these terms – what is good, quality research in different disciplines? Benchmark for each
 - Flexibility – reward nontraditional teaching or research without diluting expectations; allow departments to set priorities across teaching, research and community service goals

- Funding
9. *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure?*
 - It stays on this campus – no longer system-wide
 10. *How could UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure be improved?*
 - Expedite the process
 - Sometimes left in limbo – provide status updates throughout the process
 - Provide mentoring for forms and paperwork or simplify them
 - Establish a process and stick with it – in the past the calendar has changed leaving candidates inadequate preparation time
 - Provide a “go-to” person for everybody – somebody who knows the system and is willing to help shepherd others through
 - Respect those going through the process – expedite and respect set deadlines
 - We need an administrative process that confirms that hiring contracts comply with promotion and tenure standards
 11. *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's annual review process?*
 - The fact that we do one
 12. *How could UMKC's annual review process be improved?*
 - Develop a process that serves faculty, the system and the schools
 - Standardize the process allowing for appropriate academic unit-specific criteria – allow for judgment on merit-based rewards
 - These should be used to determine you are where you should be – design and implement based on this
 - This data is not currently usable for the system or the provost to judge how academic units are performing
 - Current system makes you feel you haven't done anything – give room to expand on accomplishments
 - Reward those who complete it
 13. *Is there anything else you would like to add?*
 - The changing expectations for tenure were not addressed here – there should be quality academic performance in the accepted areas
 - Great teachers should be rewarded / recognized
 - Chancellor's Memorandum #35 I D (dealing with external peer evaluations) – this needs to be changed as it rules out scholars at non-academic institutions who are experts in their field

Regular Faculty Focus Group

Tuesday, May 12, 2003, 10:15 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

This group of faculty participated at a rate of 11.1 percent with three of the 27 invited attending the focus group. The major theme emerging from this session was the lack of clarity and consistency around “performance” as it relates to UMKC’s reward structure. Specifically, placing priority on community service over research and teaching changes the nature of UMKC and is inappropriate. Another area of concern and frustration involved the perception that any accomplishments before employment at UMKC are simply ignored and invalidated resulting in frustration for professors with distinguished and rich career experiences joining UMKC faculty. *Frederic Lee of the Economic Department wanted to be identified as a participant in this focus group.*

Q1 – *In what ways does UMKC reward faculty for their performance?*

- Financial
- Promotion and tenure
- Politicking gets rewarded
- Academic performance does not—either in terms of promotion or resources
- VERIP
- Community oriented mission statement rather than rewarding publication or research in the 2006 goals
- “Performance” must be defined. Is it research/publication, teaching, or service (both within and without the university)?
- Protests the ‘dumbing’ down of the professoriate—to place priority on community outreach is to change the nature of the university’. Changes made violate rules of MU system as well as AAUP.
- UMKC only rewards work done in Kansas City for promotion/tenure. This is unreasonable if the majority of your work has been done outside the city—but it’s part of the city’s culture.
- Need a cure for “PMS”—Pre-Martha Syndrome. The idea that anything that predates Martha cannot be good.

Q2 – *What do you see as the strengths of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*

- Community marketing brings people together—led to a joint appointment that allowed individual to interact with people he would not have otherwise—a positive experience.
- Many intangible benefits in both teaching and research that allow you to address problems you wouldn’t otherwise be able to

Q3 – *What do you see as the weaknesses of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*

- How resources are allocated to a department—this is a form of favoritism—not necessarily granted to those who actually do the work
- Resources allocated/rewards granted to departments rather than interdisciplinary programs
- Structural impediments to rewarding interdisciplinary work
- Administration does not see consequences of their reward structure—what does tenuring an individual do to a specific department? If that individual is tenured on the basis of public service rather than research, what does that mean? Where is the value structure that rewards research and scholarship?

- Younger faculty—who are our future and actually doing the work—are not rewarded in a way that makes them want to stay here (an example of this is minimal salary increases for someone here 3 years that is eclipsed by new faculty being hired at even higher salaries)
- Many of the Hospital Hill faculty are disillusioned about their situation.
 - Their appointments are not tenure track
 - Must be “substantive inducement” (may be financial or other) to encourage participation of HH faculty. Right now there is still a divide between HH and UMKC.
 - A university-wide graduate program. Right now HH faculty feel alienated, with no say in what goes on at UMKC.
 - Administration must endorse HH programs
- Definition of “faculty” is a problem
 - Adjunct faculty teach many undergrad courses. They are exploited—the ‘working poor’ with no benefits. Some admin staff have become ‘addicted’ to using adjunct people because of the savings to UMKC. They carry a tremendous load and should be recognized for their efforts.

Q4 –What additional rewards could UMKC offer you for your contributions in teaching, research and service?

- Provide resources for my collective
- Individual rewards are not important
- Salary equity within the department
- More overt recognition for someone who doesn’t have to do what they’re doing—i.e., recognition in the UMKC monthly magazine
- More respect from the students—recognition of the teacher’s efforts
- No expectations that UMKC will do anything to support research
 - UMKC could remove more barriers to grants/other procedures for funding research
 - Recognize that UMKC is one unit (including HH) and not to treat some as ‘foreigners’
- Endowed chairs are always brought in from outside
- Some system-wide rewards are awarded on a completely political basis—this acts as a disincentive to faculty who deserve these rewards and do not receive them.

Q5 – *What faculty roles or activities, if any, do not get sufficient emphasis in UMKC’s reward structure?*

- Real scholarship: publications, conference engagement, mentoring students. The ability to conduct research and teach simultaneously.
- Roles of non-tenured, non-exempt faculty (including med school faculty): recognizing their contribution to the mission of UMKC, the image, and the endowment.
- Faculty salaries should approximate the ‘huge’ administrative salaries—students do not come to a university because of its chancellor. We have adopted the wrong business model for the university.

Q6 – *What faculty roles or activities, if any, are over-emphasized in UMKC’s reward structure?*

- ‘Life doesn’t start when you arrive at UMKC’. Many of us have distinguished histories, but what we’ve done since arriving at UMKC is over-emphasized.
- Community engagement – emphasis should be on research and teaching.

- Taking on any administrative responsibilities. Rewarding these people while there is a hiring freeze in a department that needs new faculty.
- Accountability, whether admin or faculty. i.e., if you pay someone twice as much they better be delivering twice as much.

Q7 – In what ways does the present reward structure encourage faculty to undertake activities that will help UMKC achieve our Goals for 2006?

- None indicated

Q8 – What changes, if any, are needed in the present reward structure to support achieving our Goals for 2006?

- Support faculty research
- Encourage cross-campus collaboration: start by educating each other
- Commit real resources to interdisciplinary programs
- Encourage those who provide real scholarship—there is no structure to provide rewards for those who want to build strength in their department.
- The future is interdisciplinary. Give this the importance (resources) it deserves—it will keep us competitive and strong.
- Think creatively across boundaries
- Administrative message is that rewards will come to those who show increased enrollments.
 - Using the undergrad program as a cash cow allows faculty less time to address graduate program
- 'Raise the bar' for graduates. Encourage a greater breadth of knowledge for all students. A greater diversity of teaching is necessary.
- Carefully think through the consequences of policy decisions.

Q9 – What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure?

- It is seen as important that you contribute to different arenas—scholarship, community service, and teaching.
- That it exists—that the chancellor cannot simply appoint someone to full professor without going through a formal process.

Q10 – How could UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure be improved?

- Chancellor should be more specific in why she turns someone down for promotion
- HH faculty should be eligible for tenure
- Make them equitable for everyone
- Recognize accomplishments pre-UMKC – i.e. a tenured professor at another institution coming to UMKC shouldn't have to re-earn tenure
- Deans should exercise post-tenure review uniformly—salaries should reflect productivity (or a lack thereof)
- Expectations must be very clear from the beginning
- Uneven application of standards
- Raise the bar

Q11 – What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's annual review process?

- None indicated

Q12 – *How could UMKC’s annual review process be improved?*

- There should be clear expectations set out at the beginning and during the annual review.
- They should be open to everyone
- Straighten out the lack of clarity in faculty definitions
- A compendium publication as an annual report to see what’s going on across the board—eliminate isolation
- Use the results to allocate resources: accountability
- Needs to be in the hands of the faculty if faculty are being reviewed: the administrators should not be able to come in and use new criteria

Q13 – *Is there anything else you would like to add?*

- What faculty do accomplish in spite of the impediments is incredible
- Better respect/recognition between faculty with different professional degrees. Degree should not equal how you’re perceived but rather what your contribution should be.

Promotion and Tenure Process Focus Group

Tuesday, May 12, 2003, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

With three participants from a pool of twenty, promotion and tenure process faculty had a participation rate of fifteen percent. Overall this group found the university's reward structure to be weak in that there is no systematic reward system, only research is rewarded, and many rewards depend too heavily on personal judgments of department chairs. In addition there was a lot of discussion around the issue of university service and community engagement and the participants' perceptions that these activities are not currently rewarded. *Please note: one participant from this group expressed concern that since the focus group facilitators are not faculty, they are not equipped to report on this issue.*

Q1 – *In what ways does UMKC reward faculty for their performance?*

- Promotion/tenure
- Merit raises
- Beginning attempt to increase visibility of faculty who excel
- Tremendous variation in reward system

Q2 – *What do you see as the strengths of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*

- None indicated

Q3 – *What do you see as the weaknesses of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*

- University service is not adequately rewarded
- Reward structure itself is weak
- Research/publication depends on the recommendations of dept. chairs—an individualistic person with a definite viewpoint will not be recommended
- A systematic reward system needs to be created—there is a lack of a visible process
- College of Arts & Sciences is working to codify what constitutes research and teaching. Once they do this the question is will they have the resources
- There is a great deal of inequity between ranks of faculty—'this is largely a function of salary compression. The average salary increase over 26 years has been approximately 1½%, which is why the starting salary for my job exceeds my salary today.'
- A great deal of lip service is paid to mission/values but there is no real change in reward structure. UMKC rewards research *only*.
- Community engagement is not rewarded because it is not traditionally academic. There is no reward for translating theory into practice.
 - This is a divisional problem, not a university problem. There are dramatic differences between the schools in how one gets tenured and promoted, but the individual has never seen anyone get promoted solely on the strength of their community engagement/teaching excellence.
 - The only exception to this is the medical faculty, who have an unusual, flexible structure (and no tenure). It is an interesting model that might do well to be adapted to the rest of the school.

Q4 – *What additional rewards could UMKC offer you for your contributions in teaching, research and service?*

- Better handling of indirect money—'I shouldn't have to buy my own paper towels for the lab'
- Merit raises or other financial rewards

Q5 – What faculty roles or activities, if any, do not get sufficient emphasis in UMKC’s reward structure?

- There is an emerging change of the lexicon relating to teaching/research/service. They are treated not just as areas of excellence but rather as areas of scholarship. Your particular area of scholarship will be rewarded.
- Mentoring (faculty and student)
- Professional community involvement
- Contact with students (advising, etc.)
- Community engagement
- Department chairs are weakly rewarded. Their reward structure is integrated into the overall faculty reward structure and needs to be separate.
- Part time faculty—getting the ‘shortest end of the shortest stick’ and yet they comprise the largest percentage of the faculty at UMKC

Q6 – What faculty roles or activities, if any, are over-emphasized in UMKC’s reward structure?

- University service—it is expected but not in reward structure. The only ‘reward’ if you’re excelling is to relieve your teaching/service load—so that indicates that these things are a punishment? It is an ironic message to send.
- Extramural research funding—the ‘holy grail of academia’
- Administrative roles (above the chair) are given enormous financial rewards

Q7 – In what ways does the present reward structure encourage faculty to undertake activities that will help UMKC achieve our Goals for 2006?

- The reward system is not great but it exists. It is the only structure available to reward/punish those who are or are not working toward Goals.

Q8 – What changes, if any, are needed in the present reward structure to support achieving our Goals for 2006?

- Professionalism is a motivator but there is nothing in the reward structure that promotes this
- The structure is fine but there should be more rewards within it. The rewards are not incredibly motivating.
- Community engagement is not built into the structure.
- Making the rewards applicable to areas other than research.

Q9 – What do you see as the strengths in UMKC’s process and standards for promotion and tenure?

- Flexibility—no ‘one size fits all’ approach, units establish standards

Q10 – How could UMKC’s process and standards for promotion and tenure be improved?

- Flexibility—no university-wide standards
- Wider umbrella—more formal recognition of alternative forms of scholarship
- Change reliance on external reviewers—ask them different questions. Specifically the question “Would this candidate be promoted at your institution?” is an unreliable indicator.
- Dean carries disproportionate weight in the process—often great candidates are lost simply because the dean does not like the person.

- Shorten the process—14 months is unnecessary (in addition to the six years from hire date)

Q11 – *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's annual review process?*

- Dependable
- The fact that there is an annual process
- Focus differs from pre-tenure review to post-tenure review

Q12 – *How could UMKC's annual review process be improved?*

- P & T committee should NOT do annual reviews. It complicates the process. Your immediate superior should write annual reviews.
- To put everything in the hands of one person, the chair, is wrong.
- Using the calendar year vs. academic year drives people crazy.
- Get rid of faculty activity reports

Q13 – *Is there anything else you would like to add?*

- Hopefully this is not a waste of time

Part Time Faculty Focus Group

Monday, May 12, 2003, 3:15 – 5:15 p.m.

This session was attended by four of the 25 invited, resulting in a participation rate of sixteen percent. Participants expressed the fact that there is no reward structure currently in place for part time faculty, and creation of a reward structure is the logical first step to take. Further, they emphasized the need to distinguish between the types of part time faculty in order to develop appropriate reward structures for this group (i.e., “full time” part time faculty vs. part time instructors supplementing their careers or teaching after retirement). One final concern involved the sense that part time faculty are not valued as integral contributors to the success of the university and are, therefore, underrepresented in important policy-making bodies.

1. *In what ways does UMKC reward faculty for their performance?*
 - The answer to this question is largely determined by *why* you are part-time faculty
 - My part time teaching position for me is a reward – helps me stay connected to the university
 - No rewards for us – but this may differ by department
 - JCCC pays part time faculty more than UMKC pays
2. *What do you see as the strengths of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*
 -
3. *What do you see as the weaknesses of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*
 - Lack of communication between UMKC and part time faculty. There is not much listening going on at either end.
 - Part time faculty has no representation with UMKC on focus groups, task forces, etc.
 - We're not paid anywhere near what is livable, and we teach more than full time faculty
 - No benefits
 - Not very creative: there are many things UMKC could do to reward part time faculty that would not cost UMKC a penny.
 - No academic freedom issues because we can be fired 'at the drop of a hat'
4. *What additional rewards could UMKC offer you for your contributions in teaching, research and service?*
 - Create permanent part time faculty positions – if you've been teaching at least 2 years provide healthcare benefits and office space with computer access
 - Give immediate family free tuition
 - Free use of the health center
 - Eligibility for teaching awards
 - Departmental connection with fellow faculty
 - Faculty ID cards (to allow such things as library privileges, etc.)
 - Permanent parking permits that are valid all the time and carry over for more than one semester without being renewed
5. *What faculty roles or activities, if any, do not get sufficient emphasis in UMKC's reward structure?*
 - Service

- Being allowed to have a voice in committees and task forces—being allowed to vote on issues important to PT faculty
 - Allowing PT faculty time and recognition for research/publishing
6. *What faculty roles or activities, if any, are over-emphasized in UMKC's reward structure?*
- We have no reward structure except we get to stay if we do our job well
7. *In what ways does the present reward structure encourage faculty to undertake activities that will help UMKC achieve our Goals for 2006?*
- Nothing—these questions imply that there *is* a reward structure in place
8. *What changes, if any, are needed in the present reward structure to support achieving our Goals for 2006?*
- Create a reward structure
 - There are different categories of part time faculty – those who need salary and benefits and those who teach part time to supplement income from another job
 - Structure rewards appropriate to these categories
 - Access to training on evenings or weekends
 - Reward loyalty to university
 - None of the goals pertain to part time faculty – we aren't even on the university's radar
9. *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure?*
- N / A
10. *How could UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure be improved?*
- N / A
11. *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's annual review process?*
- N / A
12. *How could UMKC's annual review process be improved?*
- N / A
13. *Is there anything else you would like to add?*
- I hope the university administration takes this focus group process seriously and listens and responds to these issues
 - There is no salary consistency
 - Stop pitting part time faculty against full time faculty
 - I am putting together a living but working twice as much as a full time faculty member

Faculty Candidates for Promotion and Tenure Focus Group

Tuesday, May 13, 2003, 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.

One of the 25 invited attended, resulting in a four percent participation rate. This individual highlighted the perception that rewards are not really merit-based under the current system and that as a research institution, the research component should not be diminished under the university's reward structure.

1. *In what ways does UMKC reward faculty for their performance?*
 - Trustee research award
 - Continued employment
 - Tenure
 - Teaching awards
 - Pay raises – not very significant these days
 - Travel money for conferences
 - Money for equipment
 - School-specific funding through cash generated by specific research
2. *What do you see as the strengths of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*
 - Flexibility to negotiate teaching relief for research purposes
3. *What do you see as the weaknesses of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*
 - Rewards not really merit-based
 - Awarding of tenure accompanies a pitiful increase in salary
4. *What additional rewards could UMKC offer you for your contributions in teaching, research and service?*
 - Salary increases – reduction of salary compression
 - Partial teaching release for research
 - Initial research funding – like UMRB
5. *What faculty roles or activities, if any, do not get sufficient emphasis in UMKC's reward structure?*
 - Teaching
6. *What faculty roles or activities, if any, are over-emphasized in UMKC's reward structure?*
 - None
7. *In what ways does the present reward structure encourage faculty to undertake activities that will help UMKC achieve our Goals for 2006?*
 - See responses to question 1
8. *What changes, if any, are needed in the present reward structure to support achieving our Goals for 2006?*
 - Provide money for equipment and research
9. *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure?*
 - Appropriate standards – this is a research institution; therefore the research component should not be diminished relative to teaching

- Allowance for variation in standards among the different schools

10. *How could UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure be improved?*

- Actively communicate with faculty coming up for tenure about timelines and paperwork: make it an obligation for administration
- Structured guidelines
- Don't limit external reviewer requirement to only those in academic institutions – include those working with research institutions such as Stowers
- Teaching should be taken into account more than it is

11. *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's annual review process?*

-

12. *How could UMKC's annual review process be improved?*

- Reviews conducted before completion of academic year
- Reviewer should walk reviewee through the tenure process the year the application is due

13. *Is there anything else you would like to add?*

- Some people are wanting to change the standards for tenure and to provide a mechanism to gain tenure for reasons I don't understand – community service should not take the place of research
- Schools already have latitude in dealing with individual faculty roles and rewards – it is inappropriate to try to change university standards that already provide for this latitude
- Rewards should be more merit-based – it is frustrating to receive equal rewards with those who aren't pulling their weight

Non-tenure Track Faculty Focus Group

Wednesday, May 14, 2003, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Non-tenure track faculty had a participation rate of eight percent, with two of the 25 invited attending this session. Again, the issue of the amount of emphasis on the areas of scholarship – research, teaching and service – was addressed. These faculty members, who have little to no time to conduct research due to heavy teaching loads, largely perceive the reward structure as underemphasizing the scholarship of teaching.

1. *In what ways does UMKC reward faculty for their performance?*
 - Department chair grants raises
 - Granted service opportunities on campus such as committee work or member of faculty senate

2. *What do you see as the strengths of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*
 - Medical school is supportive of non-tenure track faculty
 - Provide junior faculty with opportunities to be active at UMKC
 - Direct contact with the dean

3. *What do you see as the weaknesses of the way UMKC rewards faculty?*
 - We have heavy teaching loads so there's no room for research, which is what most people are rewarded for
 - We have no promotion guidelines for our non-tenure track faculty but are currently working on changing this
 - Promotion tends to link to the dollar amount your research brings in; since we have hardly any time for research and our research doesn't necessarily generate high dollars, promotion would be difficult using current criteria

4. *What additional rewards could UMKC offer you for your contributions in teaching, research and service?*
 - Promotion opportunities
 - Salary increases
 - Lighten teaching load to allow us room to conduct important research
 - Grant me a different title – my official university title is “adjunct,” but I’m a full time faculty member. The title doesn’t reflect my contribution at all and people from outside (and some within) the UM system misunderstand it.
 - Equipment for teaching (we did get some new equipment this last year but don't know if this will happen again)
 - No graduate program means no graduate teaching assistants (we did get some this past year, but there's no formal system to ensure we will get this help ever again)
 - We only get yearly contracts – we would like a three to five year contract for employment. Multi year contracts are being done now to attract new people; should we lose out because we were here first?

5. *What faculty roles or activities, if any, do not get sufficient emphasis in UMKC's reward structure?*
 - Teaching
 - Scholarship in teaching

- Time spent in course and curriculum development
6. *What faculty roles or activities, if any, are over-emphasized in UMKC's reward structure?*
 - Clinical faculty receive credit for their time with students, but we don't
 - Historical performance – faculty who at one time brought in a big grant and have been rewarded with large salaries and tenure but who now do very little continue to receive the large salaries and privileges of tenure
 7. *In what ways does the present reward structure encourage faculty to undertake activities that will help UMKC achieve our Goals for 2006?*
 - My plate is full with teaching – I don't have time to focus on any additional activities
 8. *What changes, if any, are needed in the present reward structure to support achieving our Goals for 2006?*
 - Reward people for extra efforts
 - Reward service that contributes to the goals
 9. *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure?*
 - We don't currently have promotion guidelines and are non-tenure track faculty
 - In developing our promotion guidelines one of our strengths will be to detach good, quality research from the expensive, big money research and reward based on originality, innovation and sustained efforts
 10. *How could UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure be improved?*
 - Development of promotion guidelines for us – currently working on this, but there wasn't any when we came
 - Reward loyalty to the university – those who choose to stay versus those who go elsewhere where the promotion system is faster
 11. *What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's annual review process?*
 - The fact that it is done
 - We have the opportunity to comment on what we want to do in the next three to five years – informal management by objectives
 - The individual who conducts the review is absolutely the right person to do so
 - Constructive process
 12. *How could UMKC's annual review process be improved?*
 - Midterm promotion reviews – am I on track according to the promotion guidelines?
 - Mentoring by established and knowledgeable faculty: how else do you know if you're doing what you need to be?
 13. *Is there anything else you would like to add?*
 -

Section III: Conclusion

These focus groups were not conducted to determine a final prognosis on the state of faculty roles and rewards at UMKC. Rather, they were designed to obtain valuable faculty input to inform recommendations and policy regarding faculty roles and rewards. Although the rate of participation was extremely low (a factor in and of itself to be explored), these focus groups did result in thoughtful and insightful feedback on UMKC's reward structure. These faculty members are invested in UMKC's mission and vision and care deeply about the future of the university. Each task force member must now review the information presented here and form his or her own conclusions regarding opportunities and priorities in university faculty roles and rewards policy development. Continued success of UMKC depends not only on thoughtful and engaged faculty, but also on a university that values its faculty and rewards them appropriately.

Appendix

Taskforce Members

Phillip Feil, *Dentistry*

Laura Gayle Green, *Libraries*

Jerry Jean, *Arts & Sciences*

John Killip, *Dentistry*

Gayle Levy, *Arts & Sciences*

Patricia Marken, *Pharmacy*

Nancy Mills, *Nursing*

William Osborne, *SCE*

Randall Pembroke, *Conservatory*

Sully Read, *Biological Sciences*

Dianne Smith, *Education*

Ellen Suni, *Law*

Linda Gill Taylor, *Center for the City*

Jeff Thomas, *Law/Academic Affairs*

Karen Vorst, *Arts & Sciences*

Focus Group Questions

- (1) In what ways does UMKC reward faculty for their performance?
- (2) What do you see as the strengths of the way UMKC rewards faculty?
- (3) What do you see as the weaknesses of the way UMKC rewards faculty?
- (4) What additional rewards could UMKC offer you for your contributions in teaching, research and service?
- (5) What faculty roles or activities, if any, do not get sufficient emphasis in UMKC's reward structure?
- (6) What faculty roles or activities, if any, are over-emphasized in UMKC's reward structure?
- (7) In what ways does the present reward structure encourage faculty to undertake activities that will help UMKC achieve our Goals for 2006?
- (8) What changes, if any, are needed in the present reward structure to support achieving our Goals for 2006?
- (9) What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure?
- (10) How could UMKC's process and standards for promotion and tenure be improved?
- (11) What do you see as the strengths in UMKC's annual review process?
- (12) How could UMKC's annual review process be improved?
- (13) Is there anything else you would like to add?