REPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

University Senate Committee: Academic Staff Personnel Committee

Brief History of Issue - why the issue is being considered:

The Administrator Review Committee’s previous process for conducting reviews consisted of developing a Qualtrics Survey aligned with the position description of administrator being reviewed. All members of the campus community were invited to complete the survey. Survey information was collected anonymously. While survey results provided a perspective on campus community perception, the surveys have not been used as part of the administrator’s performance review, nor included in their personnel files. This process has resulted in the following repercussions.

1. Frustration and marginalization of the campus community not being heard because the feedback has not been used. Increased distrust of administration by campus community.
2. Frustration and marginalization of the Administrator Review Committee because of the significant amount of time and good will put into conducting the surveys and writing reports that were not used.
3. Frustration expressed by administrators being reviewed that the process occurred without acknowledgement or adequate follow-up from supervisors.
4. Confidentiality breaches by members of the Administrator Review Committee who shared survey documents and results with members of the campus community without permission or knowledge of the administrator being reviewed increasing distrust of campus community by the administrators being reviewed.
5. Overall dysfunctional and harmful process that provides the campus community an illusion of having a voice in administrator performance review where there is none.

Members of the ARC have met with the Chancellor to ask for guidance regarding how to improve the administrator review process to make it more meaningful for both the campus community, but in particular for the administrators being reviewed.

The Administrator Review Committee proposes the implementation of process for review of administrators that promotes continuous improvement of performance supported by targeted professional development. An administrator’s supervisor has foremost responsibility in assuring that annual performance reviews are completed and utilized by the administrator in guiding their work. The campus community will have three points to provide feedback pertaining to administrator performance:

1. Ongoing and direct contact with the Director of Human Resources.
2. Potential to participate as a member of a 360-degree review committee review team.
3. Provide input and feedback via a viable and inclusive means to be determined by the Administrative Review Committee at the time the 360-degree review is conducted.

Points Discussed by Committee:

1. Previous efforts by the Administrator Review Committee (ARC) to solicit input from the campus community have proved inadequate and of little value to upper level administrators or their supervisors.
2. Attempting to develop an appropriate means to gather feedback and input from the campus community, solicit and interpret the feedback, requires significant commitment of time and personnel evaluation expertise from members of the ARC. Members of the ARC often have limitations on both points.
3. The ARC, in alignment with the Chancellor, desires an assessment process that promotes improvement in the leadership effectiveness of our upper level administrators as well as unit directors. There are approaches and processes available commercially that are tested for reliability and validity in supporting continuous improvement in leadership effectiveness. And, many of these tools allow for diverse and inclusive input into an administrator’s performance and effectiveness.

4. The ARC recognizes the need for the campus community to have a viable forum to express concerns and commendations to both the administrator and their supervisor without fear of retaliation.

5. The ARC attempted to streamline the section with proposed changes. Procedure for Reviewing Department Chairs and Director of Libraries was moved from 2) to 3) better align with the university flow chart. No changes in process made.

Pros of Recommendation:

1. This proposal moves campus review of upper level administrators from only soliciting information with from members of the campus community who may or may not have accurate understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the administrator being evaluated and with a perception that the solicited information influences merit, to also include a model of continuous leadership improvement which incorporates a research-supported means of collecting feedback to develop and implement a professional development plan upon which the administrator’s supervisor bases annual performance reviews.

2. This proposal clarifies and streamlines options for the campus community to provide feedback to administrators. The proposal streamlines identification of leadership strengths and weaknesses for upper-level administrators, deans and unit directors to provide valid and reliable information for the personalized and focused leadership development of campus leaders.

3. This proposal expands the professional development model of 360-degree review to include unit directors and deans in addition to upper-level administrators on the current schedule which will hopefully build a more intentional culture of developing administrator leadership at UW-Eau Claire.

Cons of Recommendation:

This proposal presents a challenge for the campus community to shift from the current “review” system which is neither effective nor being utilized in administrator reviews or merit, to a system that will provide valid and substantive information for continuous leadership improvements aligned with the annual performance review process.

Technology/Human Resource Impact:

The Director of Human Resources will take lead responsibility in facilitating the 360-degree reviews. The Chancellor has committed to supporting the financial investments needed to support the 360-degree reviews.

Committee Recommendation:

Amend the FASRP as shown
MOTION FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The University Senate Committee: Academic Staff Personnel Committee

by a vote of _5___ for to _0___ against on __April 21, 2015______________ (Date)

Recommends that changes be made to the Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures, Part III, Article Four: University Governance Committees and Councils, Section A, 5) University-Wide Administrator Review Committee as follows:

5. University-Wide Administrator Review Committee (ARC)
   a. Membership: The committee shall include nine members serving three-year terms. One faculty member shall be elected by and from each of the Colleges; one member shall be elected by and from the Instructional Academic Staff; two members shall be elected by and from the Administrative and Professional Academic Staff; and two classified/university staff members shall be elected by the Classified/University Staff Council. Three members will be elected each year in the spring elections.
      Each year the review committee shall elect its own Chair. (US 4/13)
   b. Function: The committee shall conduct reviews of the Chancellor, Provost, Vice and Assistant Chancellors, Special Assistants to the Chancellor, Assistant or Associate Vice Chancellors and Administrative Officers according to the procedures outlined in Part III, Article Five, Section D, 1., b., be facilitated by the Director of Human Resources and have as its purpose to ensure university faculty and staff input to upper level administrator performance:
      i. Determine the means for soliciting input and communicating the campus community’s feedback to the administrator being reviewed and their supervisor.
      ii. Assist the Director of Human Resources in identifying the professional development tool to be used and the review teams for conducting the 360 degree reviews for all upper level administrators as directed by University Governance.
      iii. Representatives of the ARC shall be included as members of the upper level administrator review teams.
      iv. Document the implementation of the 360-degree review process and report to university governance on its effectiveness in service to the campus community.
      v. Upper level administrators shall include the Chancellor; direct-reports to the Chancellor; Vice-Chancellors and Provost; Assistant/Associate Vice-Chancellors; and Academic Deans. (4/15)

And that changes be made to the Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures, Part III, Article Five: Personnel Policies and Procedures; Section D – Joint Personnel Policies and Procedures;1., b. Review of Administrator Performance on page 106 as follows:

b. Review of Administrator Performance
   University Senate action provides as follows:

   The review of administrator performance by faculty like the review of faculty performance by peers is an integral part of the ongoing process of planning, development, and improvement in the University. Current performance is assessed with the view to making recommendations for
improvement and setting goals for the future. Performance is reviewed using as criteria the description of the administrative position, the mission and goals of the University, and qualities which are considered to be desirable for administrators. The faculty is an important source of information and judgment in the overall evaluation of academic administrators.

The primary responsibility for the evaluation of an administrator’s performance rests with the administrator’s immediate supervisor. This evaluation is both formal and informal. Formally, it involves an annual review that includes at a minimum a conference with the administrator whose performance is being evaluated and a report for the administrator’s personnel file. At the conference, the supervisor and administrator review and evaluate accomplishments and problems. They discuss and agree upon short-term goals for the coming year and long-term goals.

For this evaluation, the supervisor uses, in addition to his or her own direct observation of the administrator’s performance, any information that may have been received from others who work with or observe the administrator being evaluated and any information that may have been solicited from those in a position to observe the administrator.

The supervisor’s report summarizes the activities and the accomplishments of the administrator and evaluates them in light of the plans and goals previously agreed to.

Informally, evaluation by the supervisor of an administrator’s performance is a continual, almost daily, process. Informal evaluation is based on direct contact between the supervisor and administrator, direct observation by the supervisor, and on comments and suggestions from others as appropriate. Members of the faculty have the opportunity to participate in the informal evaluation of an administrator’s performance through comments and suggestions made to the administrator or supervisor.

In the years in which it is conducted, the faculty and academic staff review of an academic administrator’s performance as described below will be an important and key part of the overall formal evaluation. The final report of the review committee will be incorporated into and attached to the supervisor’s report.

- The review of administrator performance is an integral part of the ongoing process of planning, development, and improvement in the University.
- The primary responsibility for the annual evaluation of an administrator’s performance rests with the administrator’s immediate supervisor.
- The supervisor’s report summarizes the activities and the accomplishments of the administrator and evaluates them in light of the plans and goals previously agreed to.

Members of the faculty/staff of University of Wisconsin- Eau Claire have an ongoing opportunity to participate in the informal evaluation of any administrator’s performance through comments and suggestions made to the administrator, their supervisor, or through the Department of Human Resources. The Director of Human Resources provides an ongoing, viable, professional, and confidential avenue for all university faculty and staff to communicate any and all concerns, suggestions, and commendations pertaining to university personnel.

Of importance to optimal functionality of the university is the continuous professional development of its leaders in addition to assessing performance. In order to create a culture of continuous improvement of campus leadership, a 360 degree review and professional development process will be incorporated into the review of administrator performance. A 360 degree review process provides all administrators a congruent method of assessment and professional development. The comprehensive review will be implemented according to the schedule outlined in sections 1) and 2).

The 360 degree review is a process that:

- Gathers feedback and insights from representatives of direct reports, peers, supervisors and other stakeholders.
• Utilizes feedback-gathering tools and questions that have typically been researched and vetted across a wide range of professionals and have reliability and validity data available.
• Identifies areas for improvement, provides a safe harbor for open and honest feedback, and assists the administrator in developing a plan of focused professional development with specific goals and objectives.
• All results of the 360 degree review belong to the individual being reviewed and are expected to be used for creating a professional development plan. Working with a representative from Human Resources, each reviewee is expected to develop a professional development plan in response to the results of the review.
• It is expected that an administrator’s progress in implementing the professional development will be taken into consideration at the time of annual performance reviews.

The University-Wide Administrator Review Committee shall be facilitated by the Director of Human Resources. (US 4/15)

1) Procedure for University Faculty and University Academic Staff Review of Academic Administrators:
   - Chancellor
   - Provost
   - Vice and Assistant Chancellors
   - Special Assistants to the Chancellor
   - Assistant and Associate Vice Chancellors
   - Deans, Associate Deans and Assistant Deans
   - Administrative Officers

   Each administrator is reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter.
   It is expected that interim appointments will normally not last more than two years. If a successful search has not been completed within two years of a position being filled with an interim administrator, the supervisor to whom the administrator is responsible shall formally consult with the University Senate Executive Committee, and shall continue to consult with the committee annually until a successful search is completed. When the University Senate Executive Committee is consulted, a representative from the Classified/University Staff Council shall be invited to the meeting. When an interim administrator serves for more than two years, the administrator will be reviewed according to the above schedule. (US 4/06, 4/13)

   The University-Wide Administrator Review Committee shall review the Chancellor, Provost, Vice and Assistant Chancellors, Special Assistants to the Chancellor, Assistant or Associate Vice Chancellors and Administrative Officers. The review committee will be facilitated by the Director of Human Resources. (When the supervisor of the Director of Human Resources is the one being reviewed, the review committee will be facilitated by the Secretary to the Faculty and Academic Staff within the University Senate Office.) (US 3/05, 4/09)

   The committee to review Deans, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans will include three members elected by the University Faculty of the College. All members will serve three-year terms. One member of the committee will be elected each year during the spring election. Each year the review committee elects its own Chair. (US 3/05)

   The committee will receive a written statement from the administrator being reviewed which describes how his or her performance meets the requirements of the position, successful accomplishments, and planned improvements and activities for the subsequent five-year period. The committee will also receive a description of the administrator’s position, statements describing the University’s mission and goals, and other information as needed to place the administrator’s performance and position in an institutional context. The committee may interview the administrator being reviewed.
The committee will survey the faculty, academic staff, and classified/university staff and may, in response to the results of the survey, conduct interviews with representatives of the faculty, academic staff, and classified/university staff. Any such survey shall include a summary evaluative question granting faculty and academic staff an opportunity to express confidence in the administrator’s performance. All information obtained from the surveys and interviews will be held in confidence by the committee. (US 4/09)

The committee will write a review report. The administrator being reviewed will receive a copy of the report and will meet with the committee to discuss it. Following the discussion, the report will be revised, as appropriate, by the committee. Copies of the revised report will be forwarded to the administrator being reviewed and to his or her immediate supervisor, and data from the surveys shall become available to the administrator.

A copy of the review report will be filed in the administrator’s personnel file and will be available to committees conducting subsequent reviews. Immediately after the report is written the surveys and other information gathered by the committee will be destroyed, except for the numerical results or statements which are incorporated directly into the final report.

The review report will be part of the information used by the immediate supervisor in making personnel recommendations concerning the administrator and in improving the administration of the University. (US 3/05)

1) Procedure and Timeline for University Faculty and University Academic Staff Review of University Upper Level Administrators

Upper level administrators shall include the Chancellor; direct-reports to the Chancellor; Vice-Chancellors and Provost; Assistant/Associate Vice-Chancellors; and Academic Deans. (US 4/15)

Upper level administrators are to receive the 360 degree feedback and performance review within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter.

It is expected that interim appointments will normally not last more than two years. If a successful search has not been completed within two years of a position being filled with an interim administrator, the supervisor of that position shall formally consult with the University Senate Executive Committee, and shall continue to consult with the committee annually until a successful search is completed. When the University Senate Executive Committee is consulted, a representative from the Classified/University Staff Council shall be invited to the meeting. When an interim administrator serves for more than two years, the administrator will be reviewed according to the above schedule. (US 4/06, 4/13, 4/15)

The Director of Human Resources or their appointee and representative member(s) of the Administrator Review Committee will work with the individual to be reviewed and their supervisor to suggest members for the review team. The 360 review team will include a mix of the reviewee’s nominees, the reviewee’s supervisor, representative members from the Administrative Review Committee, and faculty/staff appointed by the Administrator Review Committee. Nominations will be solicited from the campus community. The report generated by the 360 degree review is the property of the administrator being reviewed and to be used solely for the purpose of creating a professional development plan. The 360 degree review is not intended to replace the annual performance review conducted by the administrator’s supervisor.

While it is the responsibility of an administrator’s supervisor to evaluate performance on an ongoing basis, members of the campus community shall have an opportunity to provide input into an upper level administrator’s performance at the time of the 360 degree review.

It is the responsibility of the Administrative Review Committee to determine a viable and inclusive means for soliciting input from the campus community at large and communicating the campus community’s feedback to the administrator being reviewed and their supervisor. (US 4/15)
2) Procedure for Reviewing Department Chairs and Director of Libraries

Department Chairs are to be reviewed by the Dean within three years of the initial appointment and concurrently with their normally scheduled faculty post-tenure review thereafter. The review of administrator performance is to be initiated by the Dean who will receive a written statement from the Chair which describes how his or her performance meets the requirements of the position, successful accomplishments, and planned improvements and activities for the subsequent five-year period. The Dean will survey all faculty and academic staff in the department and may, in response to the results of the survey, conduct interviews with the faculty and academic staff. Any such survey will include a summary evaluative question granting faculty and academic staff an opportunity to express their confidence in the Chair’s performance as an administrator. Any faculty or academic staff member of the department may request and shall be granted a meeting with the Dean to discuss the Chair’s performance as an administrator. The Dean shall write an evaluation which will include the results of a summary evaluative question. Summary data from the survey will be available to the Chair. Raw data and verbatim comments shall not be distributed, nor included in any report. Immediately after the evaluation is written, the surveys and other information gathered during the review will be destroyed, except for numerical results incorporated directly into the final report. Throughout the review process, the Dean will make every reasonable attempt to protect the confidentiality of the faculty and academic staff who participated in the review. Copies of the written evaluation will be given to the Chair and filed in the Dean’s office and in the personnel file of the Chair.

The written evaluation will be part of the information used by the Dean in making personnel recommendations concerning the Chair, and in improving the administration of the College or Division. *(US 4/05)*

The procedures for reviewing the Director of Libraries are the same as those for review of a Department Chair except that the Library serves as the department and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to whom the director reports, holds the responsibilities described for the Dean.

3) Procedure for Reviewing Vice/Assistant Chancellors

Vice/Assistant Chancellors are to be reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter.

It is expected that interim appointments will normally not last more than two years. If a successful search has not been completed within two years of a position being filled with an interim administrator, the supervisor to whom the administrator is responsible shall formally consult with the Senate Executive Committee, and shall continue to consult with the committee annually until a successful search is completed. When an interim administrator serves for more than two years, the administrator will be reviewed according to the above schedule. *(US 4/06)*

The review is to be initiated by the Chancellor who will receive a written statement from the Vice/Assistant Chancellor which describes how his or her performance meets the requirements of the position, successful accomplishments, and planned improvements and activities for the subsequent five-year period. The Chancellor will survey all academic staff and faculty in the division (and classified/university staff, clients, or other faculty and academic staff where appropriate) and may, in response to the results of the survey, conduct interviews with the survey respondents. Any such survey will include a summary evaluative question granting respondents an opportunity to express their confidence in the Vice/Assistant Chancellor’s performance. The Chancellor will write a report which will include the results of a summary evaluative question and will distribute it to the Vice/Assistant Chancellor along with an invitation to submit responses or reactions to the report. Following receipt of the response, the report will be revised as appropriate. Data from the survey shall be available to the
Vice/Assistant Chancellor. Immediately after the report is written, the surveys and other information gathered during the review will be destroyed, except for numerical results or statements which are incorporated directly into the final report. Copies of the final review report will be given to the Vice/Assistant Chancellor and will be filed in the Chancellor’s Office and in the personnel file of the Vice/Assistant Chancellor. The review report will be part of the information used by the Chancellor in making personnel recommendations concerning the Vice/Assistant Chancellor and in improving the administration of the Division.

42) Procedure and Timeline for Reviewing University Unit Directors

Unit Directors are to be reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter.

It is expected that interim appointments will normally not last more than two years. If a successful search has not been completed within two years of a position being filled with an interim administrator, the supervisor of that position shall formally consult with the University Senate Executive Committee, and shall continue to consult with the committee annually until a successful search is completed. When an interim administrator serves for more than two years, the administrator will be reviewed according to the above schedule. (US 4/06)

Unit Directors will be included in the 360 degree review process. The Director of Human Resources or their appointee will be responsible for facilitating the 360 degree reviews for unit directors. The 360 review teams will include a representation of academic staff and faculty in the unit (and classified/university staff, clients, or other faculty and academic staff where appropriate), the supervisor and others identified as able to provide viable feedback to the Unit Director in improving their leadership capacity at UW-Eau Claire. The report generated by the 360 degree review is the property of the Unit Director being reviewed and to be used solely for the purpose of creating a professional development plan. The 360 degree review is not intended to replace the annual performance review conducted by the Unit Director’s supervisor. (US 4/15)

The review is to be initiated by the Provost/Vice, Vice, or Associate Vice Chancellor (hereafter, Administrator) who will receive a written statement from the Unit Director which describes how his or her performance meets the requirements of the position, successful accomplishments, and planned improvements and activities for the subsequent five year period. The Administrator will survey all academic staff and faculty in the unit (and classified/university staff, clients, or other faculty and academic staff where appropriate) and may, in response to the results of the survey, conduct interviews with the survey respondents. Any such survey will include a summary evaluative question granting respondents an opportunity to express their confidence in the Unit Director’s performance. The Administrator will write a report for submission to the Chancellor which will include the results of a summary evaluative question and will distribute it to the Unit Director along with an invitation to submit responses or reactions to the report. Following receipt of the response, the report will be revised as appropriate and submitted to the Chancellor. Data from the survey shall be available to the Unit Director. Immediately after the report is written, the surveys and other information gathered during the review will be destroyed, except for numerical results or statements which are incorporated directly into the final report. Copies of the final review report will be given to the Unit Director and will be filed in the Administrator’s Office and in the personnel file of the Unit Director. The Chancellor will provide written notification to the academic staff and faculty in the unit that the review has been completed. The review report will be part of the information used by the Administrator in making personnel recommendations concerning the Director and in improving the administration of the unit.
Administrator Review

*The immediate supervisors of the administrators are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Director</td>
<td>Provost/Vice, Vice, Assistant/Associate Vice, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Dean of College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Dean of College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Dean of College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Provost/Vice or Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Provost/Vice or Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chancellor</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>President of the UW System (US 5/94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23) Procedure for Reviewing Department Chairs and Director of Libraries

Department Chairs are to be reviewed by the Dean within three years of the initial appointment and concurrently with their normally scheduled faculty post-tenure review thereafter. The review of administrator performance is to be initiated by the Dean who will receive a written statement from the Chair which describes how his or her performance meets the requirements of the position, successful accomplishments, and planned improvements and activities for the subsequent five-year period. The Dean will survey all faculty and academic staff in the department and may, in response to the results of the survey, conduct interviews with the faculty and academic staff. Any such survey will include a summary evaluative question granting faculty and academic staff an opportunity to express their confidence in the Chair’s performance as an administrator. Any faculty or academic staff member of the department may request and shall be granted a meeting with the Dean to discuss the Chair’s performance as an administrator. The Dean shall write an evaluation which will include the results of a summary evaluative question. Summary data from the survey will be available to the Chair. Raw data and verbatim comments shall not be distributed, nor included in any report. Immediately after the evaluation is written, the surveys and other information gathered during the review will be destroyed, except for numerical results incorporated directly into the final report. Throughout the review process, the Dean will make every reasonable attempt to protect the confidentiality of the faculty and academic staff who participated in the review. Copies of the written evaluation will be given to the Chair and filed in the Dean’s office and in the personnel file of the Chair.

The written evaluation will be part of the information used by the Dean in making personnel recommendations concerning the Chair, and in improving the administration of the College or Division. (US 4/05)

The procedures for reviewing the Director of Libraries are the same as those for review of a Department Chair except that the Library serves as the department and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to whom the director reports, holds the responsibilities described for the Dean. (US 4/15)
Implementation Date: July 2015 publication of the Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures

Signed: Katie Wilson
Chair, University Senate Academic Staff Personnel Committee