Joint Meeting of University Senate Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Committees
April 7, 2015
2:00 p.m.
Little Niagara Room, Davies Center

Members Present:
Julie Aminpour, Catherine Berry, Janice Bogstad, Linda Carlson, Jeff Erger, Marc Goulet, Tom Hilton, Stephanie Jamelske, Marquell Johnson, Geoff Peterson, Jim Phillips, April Pierson, Lisa Schiller, Lori Snyder, Michael Wick, Katie Wilson

Guests:
David Miller, Barb Hanson, Laurel Kieffer

1. Katie Wilson brought the meeting to order and followed with a draft copy and background information on the proposed lactation support policy. Discussion followed.
   a. K Wilson reported that the classified staff council suggested better definition of break times.
   b. Suggestion that “main campus” buildings should be defined.
   c. For support/grievance, employees may go to HR; students would go to Associate Vice Chancellor.
   d. K Wilson will prepare policy revisions for presentation for a vote by this joint committee or by the Senate Executive Committee.

2. Laurel Kieffer, on behalf of the Administrator Review Committee, distributed a draft copy and background information on the need for the proposed revisions to the Administrator review process. The primary purpose of the revised policy would be to provide for ongoing professional development of the administrator. The administrator would be assessed by a 360 degree review process with feedback from a committee composed of selected members of the Administrator Review Committee, faculty, staff, and students. The Administrator Review Committee would also distribute a campus-wide survey, then submit a report on the findings of the survey to the 360 degree committee. The results of the 360 review would be the property of the administrator for purposes of professional development only.

Discussed focused on the role of the Administrator Review Committee, the role and size of the 360 degree team, identification of administrator titles who would follow the 360 review process, the need for a “now vs. then” chart to clarify the changes being proposed, pros and cons of survey anonymity, whether the review results/professional development plan should be placed in the administrator’s personnel file, effects of the PDP/review on merit pay, whether the PDP should be used as a basis for future reviews, and how to hold the administrator accountable to the PDP.

The meeting adjourned at 2:54 p.m.

- Submitted by Julie Aminpour