

**The  
U.M.K.C.  
Faculty  
Senate**

# Report

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

---

December 7, 1999

ADMINISTRATION ARGUES IT IS IN INTEREST OF FACULTY:

## POST-TENURE REVIEW

Academic Vice President Steve Lehmkuhle came from Central Administration to argue for an examination of post-tenure review procedures. In the last few years state universities in 37 states, including California, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Washington and Wisconsin have adopted some form of post-tenure review. It is popular with state legislators and Boards of Governance. Though there has been no strong push for these procedures in Missouri, President Pacheco and others in the administration feel that there is interest. Vice President Lehmkuhle said he thought that if the University does not act on its own it will be forced to respond to pressure in the future.

The proposal is to establish a faculty committee to examine policies for post-tenure review in the UM system and in the nation. It would be composed of 3 faculty members from each campus. UMSL had an election to select the members, UMR is using their IFC representatives and UMC has not yet responded. In any case the members of the committee will be selected by faculty or faculty organizations, not by the administration.

### **Bulletins:**

Barbara Glesner Fines was elected as Senate Vice Chair.

-----

Chair Ed Mills sent a letter to Martha Gilliland congratulating her on her appointment as Chancellor. She thanked him and said that she would like to meet with the Senate before she offici

When the committee finished, its Report would come back to the campuses for discussion and review before it is submitted to the administration. The President would appoint the chair of the committee, and Central Administration would staff it. July 1 was set as a tentative deadline, but the Senate thought that deadline was unrealistic.

Lehmkuhle argued that faculty needed to reframe its conception of a post-tenure review process. Some Senators thought that the concept had a negative tone, but the Vice President said there were many possible variables in policies.

- They did not have to be punitive. He hoped that any policy that was developed would be mostly remedial and developmental.
- They do not need to be onerous, involving constant reports and reviews. Rather reviews could be triggered by a variety of events. For example it might be triggered if a tenured faculty member went five years without a pay increase while others were getting raises.
- The policy could be far more faculty oriented than current UM post-tenure review policies, which involve decisions by chairs and deans and do not have a peer review component.
- Lehmkuhle said that it was important to separate issues of performance from issues of academic freedom. The review process was not supposed to jeopardize the latter.

There apparently is not a pressing problem necessitating a post-tenure policy, except for the Administration's assumption that a policy will be mandated if the University does not develop one. The UM system has review policies in place, and if incompetent people are kept it is probably because of poor implementation of existing policies rather than a result of poor policies. At a minimum it might be politic to rename current policies, and call them a post-tenure review procedure.

Approximately 40 people in the system have not received a pay raise in the last 5 years. That might be because their performances were inadequate. It might also be because a dean or a chair was retaliating against the faculty member. Would a post-tenure review policy handle that kind of issue? Possibly. If the problem was with the faculty member there might also be suggestions for a leave to allow them to catch up with changes in the field. Or a faculty member's position might be redefined as more of a teaching position, or they might be encouraged -- and given time -- to develop a different type of course.

The review process might have a triggering mechanism, or there might be reviews every [x] years, though the latter type of review was often onerous and time consuming, and was sometimes seen as undermining tenure. On the other hand we currently have yearly reviews of performance, and a longer time period might be desirable. Some Senators suggested that account be taken of other reviews (like those of Doctoral Faculty

members) so that we weren't spending all of our time reviewing each other. Lehmkuhle seemed to think that was a good idea.

Some Senators suggested that there needed to be more review of administrators in addition to reviews of faculty. Others thought a review system should have some method of rewarding people who are performing above the accepted standards. Why focus only on the people that were in trouble? There was a question about how well the various post-tenure review policies had worked in other states, but Lehmkuhle said that none of them had been in place long enough to evaluate them.

Lehmkuhle seemed solid, and the discussion seemed to quiet Senate fears of an attempt to undermine the tenure system. On the other hand, some Senators expressed doubt that Pacheco and the Central Administration were really primarily interested in a post-tenure review policy because it would benefit the faculty. The Senate agreed to discuss the issue further at their December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## Registration

Professor Lanny Solomon (B&PA) came before the Senate to discuss the problems with late registration. Students wait until the last minute before they register for classes, and this creates problems in scheduling. Sometimes new sections of a course need to be opened up in a hurry and there isn't adequate time for the faculty to prepare.

It was suggested that one problem might be that the telephone registration system tells students how many people have registered for classes. That allows students to easily assess the risks of being closed out of a class and delay registration. It also sometimes discourages students from registering in classes that they think might be dropped because of low enrollment, and that becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Professor Solomon requested that the Senate support a policy in which students were only told whether a class was open or closed, without being told the exact enrollment figures. Professors would still be able to find out how many students were enrolled in their class. Most Senators supported the idea, though some thought it would make little difference, since students knew which classes were likely to close. One Senator suggested that a controlled experiment might be useful, so that we would know if the policy of withholding information made any difference.

Senators discussed other barriers to early registration. Some graduate students might want to wait until they heard from another school before registering. Other students couldn't register until they got their student loans, and these payments came late. Some newly admitted students needed to take placement tests before being assigned to classes.

Even if there would always be some late registration, Senators thought it could be reduced. Most seemed to think that a differential fee policy, in which reductions in fees were given for early registration, would be useful. Right now fees are paid later if students register later, so there is subtle encouragement to delay registration. Another possibility, suggested by Solomon, was to place the name of students who register early in a lottery, in which they could win a \$50 bookstore certificate.

## **Odds & Ends**

There was a discussion of the process for granting Honorary Degrees and for appointing faculty and administrators to Emeritus positions. The process for granting Emeritus degrees seemed cumbersome and is not followed. We asked the Academic Affairs Committee to review the policy and make recommendations. We also asked the committee to send out letters to faculty reminding them of the process for nominating people for Honorary degrees.... Senator Jakob Waterborg made a report on his discussion with Vice Chancellor French on Endowed Chairs. French said that these are supposed to be reviewed by the units to ensure that people who receive money really are benefiting the University. The Medical School, which currently has a large number of Endowed Chairs in hospitals, where they might not be using their positions to advance the teaching or research interests of the University, is currently conducting a review of these positions.... Senators who had participated in the Coordinating Board for Diversity meeting noted that it was difficult to recruit and retain a diverse student body if the faculty didn't also contain various minorities. Recruitment in this area is an issue.... The AAUP has met and is organizing a campus chapter.... The Senate Report of November 16<sup>th</sup> was approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin,  
Faculty Secretary