Review of Administrators
by Richard P. Dowdy, Associate Professor of Human Nutrition, Foods and Food Systems Management

"Assessment" — the term of the day. In the academic community, there is assessment (read "review" or "evaluation" of performance, etc.) all around us. Students assess courses, faculty and programs; faculty assess students, curriculum and peers; department chairs evaluate faculty; deans, sometimes with faculty input, evaluate department chairs; etc.

Most assessment focuses on courses, curricula, programs and students. Yet, we must not lose sight of the fact that administrative decisions also affect the quality of education that students receive. Because of the important role that administrative decisions have on academic programs and program quality, Faculty Council (in the Summer of 1986) established a Task Force to consider procedures by which periodic performance reviews of administrators might be conducted. That Task Force presented its report to Faculty Council in April 1987 and the Council adopted the report on May 7, 1987. Subsequently, the report was sent to Provost DeFleur, with copies to interim Chancellor Stucky, Chancellor designate Monroe and President Magrath.


The ultimate goal of any assessment/performance review in the academic environment should be to improve the overall quality and operation of the institution. Faculty (aided by staff and graduate students) provide the teaching, research and scholarship. Yet, administrative decisions can markedly affect faculty performance and program resources. Consequently, Faculty Council deemed it appropriate for faculty to have a more substantive role in the review of academicians serving in the administrative role.

There should be a systematic plan for periodic review of administrators at all administrative levels (department chair through university president). To be most effective, this review should be a cooperative effort, a partnership, involving faculty and administration.

Faculty have certain expectations of the various administrators and the administrator(s) should be responsible to the faculty for the effective utilization of the University’s resources to accomplish its multiple missions. In like manner, the next “upline” administrator for any administrative office may have particular expectations for that office and needs to be assured of accountability for those expectations. Additionally, faculty may not be fully aware of all the constituencies an administrator serves, whereas the upline administrator will be more aware of these demands.

With these thoughts in mind, the Report on the Review of Administrators recommends a partnership between faculty and administration to accomplish meaningful reviews of administrative performance. The chairs of the respective four UM campuses’ faculty governance bodies would work in partnership with the Board of Curators to review the Office (to include Associates and Assistants) of President. The Faculty Council would work in partnership with the President to review the Office of Chancellor, and with the Chancellor to review the Office of Provost. The Graduate Faculty Senate, with the Provost, would be responsible for the review of the Office of the Graduate Dean and Vice Provost for Research. Each elected divisional faculty governance body would work in partnership with the Provost and Dean to review the Offices of Divisional Dean/Director and Department Chair, respectively.

It is recommended that the reviews be conducted no less often than every five years (three years for department chairs) with a formative review to be conducted by the end of the third year following initial appointment. Provisions are made for sharing the results of the review with the person being reviewed and for sharing an appropriate summary of the review with the faculty.

The Task Force and Faculty Council believe that systematic, periodic assessment of administrative performance is equally important to other assessments (faculty, students, curricula, programs, etc.) in providing quality education at the University of Missouri-Columbia. We believe the implementation of the Task Force Report that Faculty Council adopted will be a positive step in making this campus an even greater University.

(Members of the Task Force were: Sam Brown, Psychology; Richard Dowdy, Human Nutrition, Foods and Food Systems)
Minutes from Oct. 1 Meeting

Attendance

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. in 5110 Memorial Union by Professor Bauman, Chair. Professors Baldwin, Crown, Fritzell, James, Noteboom and Wylle were absent. Vice Provost Gerald Broder, Professors David West and David Leuthold were visitors.

Introduction

Professor Bauman, Chair, introduced the new secretary for the Faculty Council, Ms. Sandy Corey, effective immediately.

Professor Bauman, on behalf of the Council, presented a gift to Virginia Pochman on the occasion of her retirement. Virginia served as secretary to the Council from 1976 to 1987. Past Chairs, Professors David West and David Leuthold, were present for the presentation.

Minutes

The minutes of Sept. 17 Faculty Council meeting were approved as distributed.

Announcements

Professor Bauman, Chair, made the following announcements:

In response to the “Agenda for Administration” a letter was received from President Magrath. The first responses were generally positive. The Executive Committee will be meeting with the Provost and Chancellor soon to work on the Agenda.

Chancellor Monroe will address the faculty, students and staff Oct. 19 at 3:30 p.m. in the Memorial Union Auditorium.

The Campus budget hearing is November 5, 11:00-2:00 p.m. EEO reports and Budget information are available and/or are being circulated to Council members. Copies of the Fiscal Year 1989 Request are available in Room 125 Chemistry.

Action

Task Force on General Education Requirements: Professor Hahn, Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee, recommended that a Task Force on General Education Requirements be formed to begin work soon. The motion read as follows:

Charge: The Task Force should design the architecture of general education requirements of the University, outline the environment in which they will be taught (e.g., use of laboratories, discussion groups, etc.), devise procedures for departmental submission of courses to the core, and develop procedures for selecting courses to be part of the general education requirements.

Task Force Make-up: The Task Force will have membership recommended by each divisional policy committee. Their recommendation must be a faculty member of that division who, in the opinion of each policy committee, will be best able to represent the thinking of the divisional faculty on the topic of general education requirements. One representative of each division will be selected for the Task Force. The Chairman of Faculty Council and the Vice Provost for Instruction will devise an executive structure of the Task Force which will be formally appointed by the Chancellor.

Professor Hahn graphically displayed the array of courses currently constituting general education requirements as one reason for the formation of such a task force. The recommendation regarding task force membership was discussed. There were questions as to the merits of equal distribution among all divisions or weighted in favor of the College of Arts and Science. There are 15 divisions. Arts and Science would be teaching most of the courses. A second issue was raised regarding the submission of the report. Since the curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty, it was suggested that it was more appropriate for the Task Force to report back to the Council.

Professor Brown moved (Twaddle) to insert that the Task Force report go to the Faculty Council and then be submitted to the Chancellor.

Vice Provost Gerald Broder requested clarification as to distribution of membership. Professor Kimber moved (Anderson) that the Task Force membership be amended to “at least” one from each division. It was suggested that the proposed amendment was too open-ended. If the size is to be kept manageable, the addition of 2 or 3 Arts and Science faculty would have little impact. Professor Gardner pointed out that while Arts and Science would be teaching many of the courses, the other divisions would be impacted by the changes. Vice Provost Broder inquired about the possibility of student and administrative members of the committee. It was pointed out that such persons could be appointed by the Chancellor. The motion failed (8 ayes, 13 nays).

Professor Brown made the observation that the Task Force be reminded to make recommendations and conduct deliberations with cognizance of resources available for implementation. The main motion, as amended, passed.

Discussion

The Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee placed before the Council for discussion, and later action, a proposal for a Standing Committee on Curriculum:

This standing committee of either the Council or the University will oversee the addition and deletion of courses to the Catalog, approve undergraduate degree programs that are new or revised, study the overlap of courses, recommend standards and oversee the adherence to course numbering standards.
The discussion raised questions as to the interface, especially in regard to 200 level courses, with the Graduate Senate, and the need to avoid duplication of effort and possible conflict. This would also set up a dual process with divisional curriculum committees. Professor Stewart raised the question of the possibility of integrating the two review systems and suggested that there is a need to look at structure and to have a firm recommendation as to the type of committee, e.g., Council or campus. Professor Dix queried whether or not this oversight function might fall under the purview of the Vice Provost for instruction. Professor Kimber concurred but iterated the faculty responsibility for curricular development.

Professor Marshall expressed his hope that this work be done primarily at the divisional level. There was a request for clarification of the rationale for such a committee by the Task Force on Basic Competencies from whence it arose.

A second discussion item, the 1989-90 Academic Calendar, was presented by the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee. Professor Hahn identified the problem as related to the change in calendar requirements for elementary and secondary schools. If we accommodate the late start for the summer, we create a conflict at the end of the schedule for those teaching in the summer session. Professor Good was asked to present data and comments. He indicated that the public school calendars would be available in about two weeks and a better estimate of the problem would be gained. The Council concurred that further discussion be postponed.

Reports

Intercampus Faculty Council meeting of Sept. 22: Professor Kimber presented a report on the discussions. Copies of the latest Staff Benefits Bulletin were sent to Council members. The distribution of the 0.9 percent salary increase was discussed. President Magrath indicated that the timetable for faculty salaries was open-ended.

Professor Kimber inferred from this and the data presented that salaries are not of a high priority. The Tenure Regulations were discussed; they will probably include two categories of sexual harassment, grave and repeated. Professor Stewart noted that the Weldon Springs Awards would have the same procedures this year. The next Intercampus Faculty Council meeting is Oct. 22; the agenda will include admission standards, general education requirements and salaries.

Communications Committee:
Professor Patterson indicated that problems experienced with the Faculty Forum should be rectified by the next issue.

Fiscal Affairs Committee:
Professor Dix indicated that the Committee is taking steps to be more proactive than reactive.

Special Projects Committee:
Professor Good reported that the Committee is looking into computer systems on campus and fringe benefits.

Student Affairs Committee:
Professor Markie reported on a meeting with Vice Provost Chinn regarding assessment and stated that Dr. Chinn will be at the next Council meeting. Professor Markie also reported that the Chancellor is moving ahead on the Minority Affairs Task Force.

Special Report on Assessment:
Professor David Leuthold, Coordinator of Campus Assessment, reviewed the history. The plan was sent to all Council members through the mail. The principal goal is to impact on quality of instructional programs on campus. Discussion centered on concerns for student motivation for meaningful participation and on the assessment of proficiency for the major field. Professor Leuthold emphasized the need to develop meaningful procedures and the requirement to report something for all departments by June. Professor Brown expressed misgivings, including the lack of specifics regarding the use of outcomes. Further questions were raised about requiring students to participate and the meaning of this in regard to graduation. Professor Dowdy expressed the faculty's concern that we have already identified goals and outcomes and are assessing them. Fiscal issues were raised; it was noted that the program was not fully funded and that the faculty cannot absorb the cost from research and teaching time.

Professor Good noted that the idea of assessment is perceived by many to be poorly conceived and that the notion that evaluation hasn't been going on is felt to be erroneous and outrageous. MSA Vice President Ferris requested to make comments and expressed the concern of the students about the haste with which this is being done. MSA is concerned that requiring the students to participate will affect the outcome. Professor Leuthold encouraged the faculty to view this as an opportunity.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Taylor, Recorder

Editor's Corner

by Joye Patterson

Is There a Brain Drain?

The perception exists across campus that we have lost many of our “best and brightest” to other institutions where salaries are more attractive and opportunities for research, in both time and funding, are more compelling.

We can all cite colleagues who have departed for these reasons in the recent period. But there seems to be little data to document the situation and thus determine whether the number departing is greater than the
normal rate one would expect of a mobile faculty at a major university. So - your help is requested. Please send to the Faculty Forum editor (Joyce Patterson, 115 Walter Williams Hall) the names of faculty in your department who have departed for other institutions, the year they left (or plan to leave) from 1982 through the current year, and the university where they accepted an appointment. (Names will not be used in the compilation of course, but we want to be sure we are not including duplications.)

Perhaps the perception is flawed. Perhaps a few instances have led many to think the numbers are larger than they actually are. But let's run a check and see. By Oct. 23, please.

We Hear You

Some of you have sent notes about issues of interest to you or have called Council members to express concerns. Be assured that those expressions do reach the Executive Committee of the Council. Some then go forward to the full Council. If you don't see your item reported in the Minutes, know that it was discussed and that Council thanks you for bringing it to our attention. The agenda is always full and not all items seem of such urgency that immediate action is in order. But all receive attention and help Council to reflect faculty interests and concerns. Please do keep those cards and letters coming.

Staff: We Misspoke

We understand that some staff were upset by a recent article in the Faculty Forum that said - right up front - that "The faculty are the University."

Well, yes. But in the Forum we were talking to each other with much understood but left unsaid. We didn't mean to imply the exclusion of others. All who labor in the campus vineyard are essential to the institution. Faculty, we say, but certainly staff, too. We (faculty) - and the University generally - simply couldn't do without them. They have our full support and appreciation.

In fact, the Council had passed at an earlier meeting (Sept. 17) a resolution that said just that: "The Faculty Council voices support for our dedicated staff. We are united with them in a joint effort to deliver a high-quality University education for the State of Missouri."

We regret the confusion.

—Dr. Patterson is professor of journalism and chair of Faculty Council's Communications Committee

Highlights from Oct. 15 Meeting

Professor Jay Dix reviewed briefly initial comments of the Provost and Chancellor regarding the "Faculty Agenda for Administration," which was forwarded to them earlier this month. The Agenda asks for the campus administration to develop a plan for bringing salaries to mean levels equal to or greater than that of the Big Eight/Big Ten by the academic year 1989-90. No formal response has been received.

Council approved the academic calendar for 1989-90.

Vice Provost Jeff Chinn visited Council to discuss the assessment program and answer questions about procedures. Assessment reports on 1988 graduating seniors must be forwarded to the Governor's office in June. He encouraged divisions to be innovative in finding ways to assess their students that can also contribute to continued program improvement.
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