REPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

University Senate Committee: University Senate Executive Committee

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

Changes to the Administrator Review Procedures in the FASRP were approved by the University Senate in April 2016. Chancellor Schmidt held that motion for further consideration because of concerns that he had with some of the proposed changes. Consultation among the Chancellor, Director of Human Resources, and chairs of the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Academic Staff Personnel Committee identified those areas of concern. Because the Chancellor found the University Senate recommendation unacceptable in part the following modification was developed. After consultation with the Senate Executive Committee the following modification to the original proposal was accepted and is now being presented to the University Senate for action.

Points Discussed by Committee:

- The modification takes action on policy changes approved by the University Senate in April 2016 which were held by the Chancellor for further consideration
- The modification enables reviews of administrators to resume; the review process can take place early in the academic year to provide timely feedback to those administrators being reviewed
- The modification could reduce some of the responsibilities of the Administrator Review Committee for conducting/evaluating performance reviews

Pros of Recommendation:

- It streamlines the policy by removing the external professional development tool from the review process, thereby reducing HR workload
- The modification gives the responsibility for conducting performance reviews to HR professionals
- The modification allows for professional development but does not require it
- The modification preserves university-wide feedback about administrator performance

Cons of Recommendation:

- An online survey for campus faculty and staff allows inclusion of irrelevant/inappropriate comments under the guise of performance evaluation

Technology/Human Resource Impact:

- The Director of Human Resources will take lead responsibility in facilitating the reviews. The Chancellor has committed to supporting the financial investments needed to support the reviews.
- Changes would need to be made to the FASRP.

Committee Recommendation:

Amend the FASRP as shown
MOTION FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The University Senate Committees:

University Senate Executive Committee by a vote of _13_ for to _0_ against on May 2, 2017

*** Please Note: The text of the original motion approved on April 26, 2016 is provided below. Modifications to the original motion are indicated by double strikeouts and the inclusion of the text in red

That changes be made to the Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures, Part III, Article Four: University Governance Committees and Councils, Section B, 11) University-Wide Administrator Review Modification Committee (page 37) as follows:

11. University-Wide Administrator Review Committee
   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 university staff members shall be elected by the University Staff Council. Two members shall be elected by and from the University Staff Council. The Director of Human Resources will facilitate the committee as an ex-officio, non-voting member. Three members will be elected each year in the spring elections. Each year the review committee shall elect its own Chair. (US 4/13, 5/17)
   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., 1). The committee shall 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. The committee will:
      i. Provide opportunity (e.g. online survey) for campus faculty and staff to provide feedback on the performance of the upper level administrators in fulfilling the mission, vision, and strategic plan of the university. Feedback will be distributed to the employee, their supervisor, and the Director of Human Resources. (US 5/17)
      ii. Assist the Director of Human Resources in identifying the external professional development review tool to be used and the review teams for conducting the reviews for all upper level administrators.
      iii. Select 3-5 representatives of the ABC to serve on the upper level administrator external professional development review teams.
      iv. Document the implementation of the external professional development review process and report to university governance on its effectiveness in service to the campus community. (US 4/16)
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 (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 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. (US 5/17)

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.

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 concerns, suggestions, and commendations pertaining to university personnel. (US 5/17)
Of importance to optimal functionality of the university is the continuous professional development of its leaders in addition to assessing performance. To support a culture of continuous improvement of campus leaders, administrators will be reviewed using the process outlined in this section. The comprehensive review is a two-part process that will be implemented according to the schedule outlined in Personal Policies and Procedures: 1. h. Review of Administrator Performance. One part is the solicitation and dissemination of feedback about the upper-level administrators’ performance from campus faculty and staff. The second part is the external professional development review, which 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.

Results of the external professional development 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 reviewer is expected to develop a professional development plan in response to the results of the review. The external professional development review is not intended to replace the annual performance review conducted by the administrator’s supervisor but progress towards the professional development plan shall be incorporated into their annual performance review. The external professional development review shall be considered an integral component of the annual performance evaluation conducted by the administrator’s supervisor and progress towards the professional development plan shall be included in the annual performance evaluation. (US 4/16)

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 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 university staff and may, in response to the results of the survey, conduct interviews with representatives of the faculty, academic staff, and 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, University Academic Staff, and University Staff Review of University Upper Level Administrators

Upper level administrators to be reviewed by the ARC shall include:

- Chancellor
- All direct reports to the Chancellor
- Assistant and Associate Vice Chancellors
- Dean of Students
- Academic Deans

Upper level administrators shall be reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter. The University Senate will be informed by the reviewee’s supervisor that a review has been completed, along with any conclusions that can be shared, by the end of the semester in which the review is completed. In the case that the review is completed during the summer, the University Senate will be informed before the second meeting of the Senate in the Fall Semester. In all cases, the University Senate will, in turn, inform the larger campus community the results of such reviews.

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 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, 5/17)

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 external professional development review team. The 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.
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 ARC review.

It is the responsibility of the Administrator Review Committee to provide opportunity (e.g. online survey) for faculty and staff to provide feedback on the performance of the upper level administrators in fulfilling the mission, vision, and strategic plan of the university. The feedback will be distributed to the employee, their supervisor, and the Director of Human Resources. (US 5/17)

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.

2) Procedure and Timeline for Review of Unit Directors and Academic Deans

Unit Directors and Academic Deans 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 the University Senate Executive Committee is consulted, a representative from the 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, 5/17)

While it is the responsibility of a director’s supervisor to evaluate performance on an ongoing basis, members of the campus community shall have an opportunity to provide input into a director’s performance.

It is the responsibility of the director’s supervisor to provide opportunity (e.g. online survey) for faculty and staff to provide feedback on the director’s performance in fulfilling the mission, vision, and strategic plan of the unit and the university. The feedback will be distributed to the employee, their supervisor, and the Director of Human Resources. (US 5/17)
The Director of Human Resources or their appointee will work with the individual to be reviewed and their supervisor to suggest members for the external professional development review team. This review team will include a mix of the reviewee’s nominees and the reviewee’s supervisor. (US 4/16)

4) 3) 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.
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