

October 16, 2001

### **INSIDE: PROPOSED REVISION OF TENURE REGULATIONS**

See p. 2 for full story. Gilliland disputes  
Star article statement on tenure. p.3

### **NOT TO WORRY...**

The UMKC mailroom is alert to the  
Anthrax scare, though there have been no  
indicators of trouble and they do not  
expect any. One change is that FedEx  
envelopes without a personal address will  
now be returned. Previously the mailroom  
would open them and try to determine  
who the intended recipients were.

The SBS and other units sometimes get  
biological and chemical samples. The  
mailroom is aware of this and will follow  
reasonable procedures.

### **ELECTION RESULTS**

Kathleen Schweitzerger was elected as  
Chair of the Faculty Senate in one of the  
most hotly contested campaigns in Senate  
history. :-)

## **Evaluation of university administration discussed**

The faculty has evaluated deans, but there has never been a  
faculty evaluation of the UMKC or MU central administration.  
There are some vexing issues, like picking an appropriate group to  
do the evaluation. Most faculty are familiar with the performance  
of their dean, but people might not be as aware of university level  
administrators. One possibility is self-selection -- the assumption  
that faculty would only fill out evaluation forms if they were  
familiar with the performance of the person being evaluated. But,  
there is the danger that people would rely on hearsay evidence.  
Another method is to designate appropriate faculty to participate  
in an evaluation, but that raises questions of criteria.

The Chancellor was at the first part of the Senate meeting, and we  
asked whether she would support an evaluation of the upper  
administration. Gilliland thought it would be useful if well done.  
She believed in a "360 benchmarked evaluation"<sup>1</sup> and thought it  
was an important part of staff development. She hoped the  
evaluations would be viewed that way rather than as punitive.

There was a discussion of whether an outside firm should be used  
to develop and administer the evaluations or whether the  
university should use its own resources, since we already had  
evaluation instruments and had faculty that specialized in the

development of surveys. The Chancellor preferred "procedures and instruments that were the benchmark in the industry." Gilliland thought those were most available outside the university in commercial firms that had experience in executive evaluation, but said she was open to discussion on the issue.

---

<sup>1</sup> A "360" evaluation uses input from people in an organization who are below the person being evaluated, who are their peers, and who are above them -- e.g. it is a circle. A "benchmarked" evaluation is conducted by a standardized process.

## PROPOSED TENURE REVISIONS

The PRIDE BluePrint project had a revision of campus promotion and tenure regulations as one of its goals. Profs. John Killip (Dental School, Chair), Patricia Marken (Pharmacy Senator), Karen Vorst (College Senator) and Phil Feil (Dental School) presented a draft that had been worked on by about 11 faculty members. They said it reflected concerns expressed in focus groups held at the beginning of the BluePrint process. The document is still in early draft form. A preliminary copy of the draft was sent to the Senate and deans for feedback. Senators can provide faculty members with the preliminary draft document, and a revised version will soon be on the Web.

The PRIDE group said the proposed procedures were not a threat to faculty control of the tenure process. The proposed document was intended to allow broader criteria for tenure if units wanted it. It defined several different types of scholarship:

- \* Scholarship of Teaching and Learning<sup>2</sup>
- \* Scholarship of Discovery<sup>3</sup>
- \* Scholarship of Integration<sup>4</sup>
- \* Scholarship of Community Engagement<sup>5</sup>

The draft also emphasizes excellence in teaching,<sup>6</sup> “scholarly teaching”<sup>7</sup> and “citizenship.”<sup>8</sup> It didn’t talk about procedure. That part is still under development and will be addressed in a later document.

Senators raised questions about the relationship of the central administration and the units. If, for example, a unit wanted to emphasize the “scholarship of discovery” as a criterion for tenure, would it be overridden by the central administration? Would a faculty member turned down for tenure by the unit be able to appeal the decision based on the broader criteria outlined in the proposed draft document, or would they be able to sue the university? Senators also raised questions about how this policy related to the post-tenure review procedure, and to UM tenure rules. Some Senators thought the proposed criteria were too broad and vague.

The committee was not clear about the relationship between the central administration and the units. At times they said the central administration would allow broader criteria than it now does if units wanted it, and at other times they implied the units would need to bring their tenure policies in line with those of the University. They said they intended to address all these issues. This was only part of a review of the faculty

<sup>2</sup>Innovative pedagogy, publication of exceptional instructional materials, grants for teaching, software development.

<sup>3</sup>Much the same as traditional ideas of research. Includes publications, presentations, software development, performance, grants, citations, etc.

<sup>4</sup>Scholarship that involves the connections between disciplines

<sup>5</sup>Enriching the artistic and cultural life of the community, consultation, Congressional testimony, intervention programs, community service, etc.

<sup>6</sup>It tries to spell out some of the components, and moves beyond only using student evaluations. Includes mentoring and advising, participation in Honors Programs, teaching awards, peer reviews, etc.

<sup>7</sup>Development of new courses, creative approaches to teaching, development of innovative pedagogical methods.

<sup>8</sup>University and professional service.

rewards system. Mostly they argued that this was just the beginning of a discussion of the criteria for tenure, not a document to be imposed on the faculty. Perhaps it could serve as a guide for the hiring of new faculty, and we could look at a broader range of candidates. [Note: Relevant to this discussion is the story ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~Kansas~~ ~~City~~ ~~Star~~ on Gilliland's effort to revamp the campus, and her response to the article. Lynn Franey wrote: "Another goal is 'aligning the architecture' -- changing campus ... rules to support transformation. For example, Gilliland wants promotion and tenure decisions to rest partly on how a professor contributes to the transformation effort." p. 22, Oct. 2001. The Chancellor wrote the Senate that "the statement implying that I favored P and T criteria based on contribution to the transformation effort is blatantly false. I have no idea how Lynn Franey would have received that impression. It was probably in a discussion about faculty reward systems and their relationship to our vision of academic excellence, campus without borders, etc." ]

The committee emphasized that the new tenure criteria had to be acceptable to faculty. They couldn't be imposed, and they were not trying to create that type of policy. They were trying to broaden the criteria for tenure so that innovative teaching and community service projects could be recognized. Some Senators thought they had overused Boyer jargon in the report.<sup>9</sup> The committee said it had been influenced by his ideas. Faculty comments are welcome, and faculty members are also welcome to work on the project. PRIDE will bring a revised version of the document to the Senate at the December 4th meeting.

## ODDS & ENDS

The Senate will appoint a committee, with one member from each unit, to look at issues of intellectual property. It will make recommendations to the Senate about the proposed policy and about procedures for reviewing it (Open faculty forum, Senate discussion, etc.).... The campus is working on the creation of an undergraduate committee to review proposed General Education changes.... There might be a further state withholding in January, but the President does not think so.... The Research Board has reduced assets (because of withholding) and will give preference to assistant professors. Others can still apply.

Respectfully submitted,

Harris Mirkin, Faculty Secretary

<sup>9</sup>From the Senate Report of March 7, 2000: "Three of the faculty members who had attended the AAHE conference gave a report on it. Briefly, the conference focused on broadening the concept of research so that it included teaching (as long as you wrote about what you did) and the application of knowledge within the community. Much of the theory of the conference came from Ernest A. Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. A press release from the conference discussed the UC San Diego's effort to initiate a "dialog between UCSD faculty and the... community, with the aim of better integrating the university's research and teaching expertise with community needs and interests." At UCSD the effort would include "the development of a community based research agenda, academic seminars and community roundtables, neighborhood dialogues and consensus building." There was no discussion of how the program would function at UMKC, but apparently incoming Chancellor Gilliland (who was at the conference) is interested in the program."