MOTION TO AMEND UWM FACULTY DOCUMENT NO. 2137 (POLICY FOR FACULTY EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS)

The UWM University Committee moves to amend UWM Faculty Document No. 2137, Policy for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators, per attached.

Rationale

At the April 2003 UWM Faculty Senate Meeting, a motion was passed to request an opinion of the State of Wisconsin Attorney General (AG) with regard to both the legality and liability of 1) pursuing our current policy and 2) using of questionnaires as part of our process. This motion was presented by the 2002/2003 SSEA (Senate Sub-Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators) Committee. In July 2003, the University Committee received a Memo from then Secretary of the University Ellen Murphy, in which she further investigated preparing and submitting AG opinions. She also clearly indicated that our request, reflected in the April 2003 motion, does not adequately comply with the AG’s operating procedures. She recommended, and the University Committee concurred, that we not pursue an AG’s opinion at this time.

This led the University Committee to recodify sections of the current policy (UWM Faculty Document No. 2137) in order to address the concerns raised by the SSEA in its review of then Chancellor Nancy Zimpher. The proposed amendment reflects these assumptions:

1. The faculty of UWM have primary purview over the evaluation process for administrators, as codified in UWM Fac Doc No. 2137.

2. In the case of the Chancellor’s evaluation, the involvement of either the UWS President and/or the UWS Board of Regents is not anticipated in the UWM review process; in fact, higher level involvement should be at the discretion of the SSEA Committee conducting the evaluation of the Chancellor, as this evaluation is internal to UWM.

3. The SSEA Committee conducting a review of the Chancellor has complete discretion in deciding whether or not to share summary findings with the UWS President.

4. If we follow codified procedures, the risk of legal liability is minimal; further, we would be provided full legal support should any litigation result for whatever reason.

Therefore, the University Committee recommends that the Senate approve the amendment (which also includes some minor editorial changes, such as names of academic units and awkward syntax).
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POLICY FOR FACULTY EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

PURPOSES

The procedures are designed to serve the following purposes:

1. to provide formative information to administrators for the purpose of self-evaluation and improvement of performance;

2. to facilitate communication between faculty and administration by providing a forum that stimulates the independent expression of views of faculty members on administrative performance;

3. to provide faculty input to the appropriate appointing officer concerning the performance of the Chancellor, the Provost/Vice Chancellor, the deans and associate deans;

4. to exercise faculty governance, and

5. to include administrators in a process of review analogous to what faculty experience.

PROCEDURES

1. The faculty, in cooperation with the office of the Secretary of the University and in consultation with the appropriate appointing officer, participate in periodic evaluation of the UWM Chancellor, Provost/Vice Chancellor, deans and associate deans.

2. A five-member Senate Subcommittee for the Evaluation of Administrators (SSEA) is elected annually with no more than two members from one school or college. Staggered three-year terms are recommended. The function of this committee will be the coordination/administration of the faculty evaluation of administrators.

3. The Chancellor, the Provost/Vice Chancellor, and the deans of UWM's decanal units* be evaluated by their constituent faculties (as defined by the SSEA) in their 5th year of service (from the date of appointment to the position), and every 5 years thereafter (i.e., the 5th, 10th, 15th...years). The associate deans will be evaluated at the same time as their dean.

4. The SSEA assumes responsibility for design and approval of an evaluation procedure. This procedure will be developed in consultation with the administrator, the appropriate appointing officer, and a member of the faculty group chosen (see Procedure 5) to receive the committee's summary report. The
procedure should include, minimally, a questionnaire in which faculty are asked to comment on and indicate their level of satisfaction with the administrator's performance. The questionnaire is to be distributed to all constituent faculty members and collected before the end of the first semester of the 5th year of administrative service. Sample questionnaires are available for review in the University Committee office.

5. Members of the SSEA, with the help of a designated member of the Secretary of the University's staff, will use the completed evaluation materials (i.e., questionnaires and any other data or information solicited from the faculty by the SSEA) to compile a summary report of the results of the submitted evaluations. The summary report will include the number and percentage of faculty responding. The summary report will be distributed to the administrator evaluated, the immediate appointing officer, and to a designated preexisting faculty group. At the meeting of the Faculty Senate following the SSEA’s submission of its report, the SSEA shall inform the Senate whether the report was accepted by the appointing authority. In the case of the Chancellor and Provost/Vice Chancellor this will be the University Committee. In the case of deans and associate deans, it will be a group such as the chairs or the academic budget planning committee of the decanal unit. The group will be recommended by the dean and approved by the SSEA. Evaluated administrators shall have a closed meeting or series of closed meetings to discuss the results of the evaluation with the specified group and the issues raised by them shall be thoroughly discussed. The SSEA summary report will be sent to the appropriate appointing officer as part of the entire performance review he/she will conduct of the administrator. Completed evaluation materials will be kept on file for one year and destroyed afterwards.

6. The SSEA summary report will be made available in the University Committee office to all members of the faculty in the unit of the administrator being evaluated. The summary report should be considered a confidential personnel document with faculty members in the unit of the administrator being evaluated included among those who have a legitimate need to see the summary report.

7. The faculty evaluation of administrators shall be coordinated with and be part of a periodic comprehensive review of the administrators by their appointing officer.
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