Recommendation of the University Committee to revise UWM Faculty Document No. 2137.

RATIONALE:

Several problems have become evident with the implementation of the present policy. First, there is confusion as to the sequence of the process. Most notable is amount and type of involvement that the administrator being evaluated has in the process. Second, it is unclear as to when faculty are informed on the status of the assessment process and in particular how the appointing officer informs the faculty and University Committee that the review process has been completed.

Therefore the University Committee offers the following proposed changes.
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POLICY FOR FACULTY EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

PURPOSES

The procedures shall: are designed to serve the following purposes:

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

2. to provide an avenue facilitating communication between faculty and administrators by opening 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 the 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, participates 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* will 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 10th, 15th...years). The associate deans will normally be evaluated at the same time as their dean. However, the first evaluation of associate deans must take place no later than five years from the date of appointment to the position. Thereafter, evaluation of associate deans shall occur at the same time as their deans.

4. Prior to step 5, a committee of faculty (known as Administrator Evaluation Review Committee or AERC) from the college/school or division will be designated to receive and review the SSEA’s preliminary evaluation report. In the case of the deans and associate deans, it will be a group, such as department chairs, faculty representative of the college, school, or division administered by the administrator. The group will be recommended by the dean and/or associate dean and must be approved by the SSEA. In the case of the Chancellor and Provost/Vice Chancellor, the Administrator Evaluation Review Committee will be the University Committee.

5. 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 6) 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, 10th, 15th...years). Sample questionnaires are available for review in the University Committee office.

6. 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 preliminary evaluation report of the results of the submitted evaluations. The summary evaluation report will include the number and percentage of faculty reporting. The summary report will be distributed first to the administrator(s) being evaluated and the immediate appointing officer. Those evaluated will have 15 working days within which to review and respond to the committee’s report. The SSEA shall have 10 working days to examine any response received. The final summary report will then be distributed to the designated preexisting faculty group. In the case of the Chancellor and Provost/Vice Chancellor, this will be the University Committee. In the case of the deans and associate deans, it will be a group such as the chairs of 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.

7. The SSEA’s preliminary assessment report will be distributed to the administrator being assessed. The administrator will have 15 working days within which to review and respond to the committee’s preliminary assessment report. The SSEA shall have 10 working days to examine any response received from the administrator being evaluated and to make any additions or corrections to their preliminary assessment report.

8. The SSEA will forward their final assessment report to the Secretary of the University.

8. The SSEA will forward their final evaluation report to the Secretary of the University. The SSEA will also meet with the appointing officer to deliver and discuss their final report evaluation report.

9. The Secretary of the University shall distribute the SSEA’s final evaluation report to the University Committee, the administrator being assessed, the Administrator Evaluation Review Committee, the appointing officer, and to all chairs of departments within the all faculty members of the evaluated administrator’s college/school or unit. Faculty from the college/school or unit are encouraged to contact either their department chair or member of the Administrator Evaluation Review Committee in order to review the SSEA’s final evaluation report.

10. The evaluated administrator shall have an open session meeting or series of open session meetings with the Administrator Evaluation Review Committee (AERC) to discuss the results of the SSEA’s final assessment report. The purpose of this meeting(s) is for the administrator and members of the AERC to discuss the findings of the SSEA’s final evaluation report.

11. Upon completion of step 10, the appropriate appointing officer shall meet with the Administrator Evaluation Review Committee (AERC) to discuss the AERC’s reaction to the SSEA’s final assessment report.
12. Upon completion of step 11, the appropriate appointing officer shall meet with the administrator to discuss the SSEA’s final assessment report as well as the Administrator Evaluation Review Committee (AERC) reactions to the report. The review of SSEA’s final assessment report as well as the Administrator Evaluation Review Committee (AERC) reactions to the report shall be part of the confidential performance evaluation of the administrator by the appointing officer. The SSEA’s final assessment report shall be kept on file for five years and then destroyed.

13. The appointing officer shall inform the University Committee and the faculty of the school/college/unit whose administrator was reviewed of the date the confidential performance evaluation review (including discussion of the SSEA’s final assessment report) was conducted.
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