

Univ. Senate, May 14, 1987

SOCIAL CONCERNS Faculty/academic professionals: Barbara Knudson (chr.), Michael Baizerman, John Beatty, Warren Gore, John LaBree, 2 to be named.

SUMMER SESSIONS Faculty/academic professionals: John Malmberg (chr.), Ed Coen, Arnold Henjum (UMM), Allen Johnson, Walter Johnson, Judith Lambrecht, Richard Skaggs.

Approved

INFORMATION:

COMMITTEES Faculty academic professionals: Patricia Swan (chr.), Wilbert Ahern (UMM), Sheila Corcoran, Robert Johnson (UMC), John Leppi (UMD), Thomas Scott, George Shapiro, Roberta Simmons, Roger Stuewer.

CONSULTATIVE Faculty: Ellen Berscheid, Mark Brenner, Shirley Clark, Richard Goldstein, Lynnette Mullins (UMC), Ronald Phillips, Kathleen Price, W. Phillips Shively, 1 to be elected from UMM. Students: Sonia Arreaza (Graduate School); David Dahlgren, Steve Kohlmeyer, Bruce Vandal, and Valentine Zweber (Liberal Arts). Student representatives from the coordinate campuses are to be elected.

Accepted

II. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Information

In the April 16 election to fill the 4 Twin Cities campus vacancies on the Senate Committee on Committees, Patricia Swan was elected for a 1-year term (1987-88), Roberta Simmons was elected for a 2-year term (1987-89), and Thomas Scott and George Shapiro were elected for 3-year terms (1987-90). In addition, Wilbert Ahern (UMM) and John Leppi (UMD) have been elected to 3-year terms (1987-90).

Accepted

III. CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS, SELECTION AND REVIEW

Action (15 minutes)

MOTION:

That the University Senate approve the following proposed guidelines for the selection and review of persons to hold middle management positions at the University of Minnesota. Middle management is defined here as all 93xx appointments except the President, Provosts, Chancellors, Deans, Chairs, Heads, and Directors (with faculty rank). Included are Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Provosts, Associate and Assistant Chancellors, Associate and Assistant Deans, University Librarian, Directors (University-wide), etc.

I. Automatic Termination with Change in Command

All officers in this class will, at the commencement of the appointment of a new person to whom they are responsible, be given a trial term appointment of up to six months, or for as long as is required for notice under the terms of their contracts, whichever is longer. At the end of the period their appointment will be terminated; however, the responsible official may at that time choose instead to continue their appointment without a new search. All University, state, and federal equal opportunity policies, and policies protecting academic freedom, apply to the decision not to reappoint officials under this procedure.

II. Search Procedures

Section VI of the April 17, 1980, Senate resolution on search committee guidelines should be supplemented with the following:

The responsible (hiring) officer, or the officer's agent, should meet directly with the search committee at certain key junctures of the search, including but not limited to (a) the selection of a set of candidates to be interviewed and (b) a discussion of all interviewed candidates at the conclusion of the interviews. Individuals to be interviewed will be jointly selected by the search committee and the responsible official. At the close of the interviews, and after further direct consultation with the responsible official, the search committee will consider whether any of the interviewed candidates are unacceptable. The responsible official, who will have been informed on the committee's views of the relative merits of the candidates from the direct consultation, may appoint any interviewed candidate who has been judged acceptable by the committee.

III. Acting Appointments

Appointments should be made in an acting capacity only under urgent and exceptional circumstances, with a strong burden of proof on the responsible official that such an appointment was necessary. Except in cases of death or incapacitation, individuals should leave their positions with sufficient notice that a timely search for a successor is possible. When new positions are created, demonstrable urgency must be shown if ordinary search procedures are to be postponed, and an official appointed in an acting capacity.

IV. Performance Review of Administrators

The performance of all administrators in this class will be evaluated annually by their responsible officer. Timely public notice of the review, and an invitation to comment on the review, should be offered to colleagues, to others with whom the administrator interacts or for whom the administrator performs a service, to other administrators at both higher and lower levels, and to faculty and students where appropriate.

V. Implementation in College Constitutions

We urge that the above model be implemented in college constitutions.

VI. Editorial amendments to "Search Committee Guidelines," approved by the University Senate, April 17, 1980.

- Section I, sentence one: Search committees are expected to seek out and identify the best qualified nominees available for administrative positions, irrespective of sex, religion, race, national origin, age, or any other criteria violating ~~affirmative action~~ equal opportunity statutes.
- Section IV.E.: Personal responsibility of each member for affirmative action and ~~discretion~~ confidentiality.
- Section V.B., first sentence: The President (or the President's agent), or the chairperson, shall file notification of the availability of the position in...

VII. Review of Policies

After these policies have been in place for two years, the Senate Consultative Committee will review them and the manner in which they have been implemented.

COMMENT:

The above provisions are intended to make middle management officers more accountable, both to those whom they serve and to the officials under whom they work. It is intended to create a tighter system in which administrators have better control over those working under them for whose work they are responsible and can therefore be held more strictly accountable for the performance of their offices. Thus, when administrators are themselves reviewed for reappointment, they can properly be held responsible for the personnel and the general efficiency and effectiveness of their offices.

The provision in Article IV changes a previous (see Keller memorandum of June 22, 1983) permissive suggestion to a requirement that annual performance reviews be open to input from the administrator's colleagues and those whom the administrator serves. This is not intended to raise annual reviews to the formal status of the reappointment review, but seeks a regular infusion of constructive criticism into the administrators' performance reviews.

John

Article I is intended to insure a productive working relationship between middle management and those to whom they are responsible by requiring that their continuation in office after a change in command is a positive choice by the new official, rather than a normal expectation.

Article II involves the responsible official more directly than in the past in the selection of subordinate officials. Unlike faculty positions, where individuals are held accountable for their own actions, the middle management individuals dealt with by these provisions are accountable to a responsible officer, who will in turn be held responsible for their actions. Therefore, the responsible person should be able to play a more direct role in the selection of assistants for whose actions they will be held responsible.

By allowing the responsible official more direct involvement in searches, it is intended that Article II should eliminate any motivation for sham searches and evasive appointments on the part of hiring officials. Article III, which erects a strong burden of proof on the use of acting appointments, is intended for the same purpose.

ELLEN BERSCHIED
Chair

Approved

IV. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

INFORMATION:

The Senate Committee on Committees and Educational Policy Committee endorses the proposal to establish a Twin Cities Assembly Committee on Undergraduate Education and encourages each coordinate campus to establish mechanisms to discuss undergraduate education issues, if it has not already done so. (Refer to Item IV on the Assembly agenda.)

C. ARTHUR WILLIAMS, Chr.
Committee on Committees
W. ANDREW COLLINS, CHR.
Educational Policy Committee

Accepted

V. SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Action (5 minutes)

A. BUSINESS AND RULES COMMITTEE

MOTION:

To amend Article IV.1.A of the Senate bylaws as follows: "Membership: The Business and Rules Committee shall be composed of 4 faculty/academic professional members, 2 students, and ex officio nonvoting membership of the clerk and parliamentarian of the University Senate. The members shall be appointed by the ~~Senate Consultative Committee~~ Committee on Committees with the approval of the Senate."

B. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

MOTION:

To amend Article IV.1.B. of the Senate bylaws as follows: "The Committee on Committees...Duties and Responsibilities (fifth item)—to forward annually to the president an al-

phabetical list of candidates for each of the committees of the Senate whose members are to be appointed by the president (~~except the All-University Honors Committee~~). The list shall contain more candidates than there are positions to fill for each committee."

C. ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS COMMITTEE

MOTION:

To amend Article IV.2. of the Senate rules as follows: "All-University Honors...Membership...Faculty/academic professional and student members shall be nominated by the ~~Senate Consultative Committee~~ Committee on Committees and approved by the president..."

COMMENT:

The Committee on Committees appoints (subject to Senate approval) the faculty academic professional and student membership of most committees of the Senate. The Consultative Committee appoints (subject to Senate approval) the faculty/academic professional and student members of the committees on Business and Rules, Finance, Planning, and (subject to the President's approval) All-University Honors.

Unremitting and increasing demands upon the Senate Consultative Committee lead us to recommend that responsibilities for membership appointments for the Business and Rules and All-University Honors Committees be shifted to the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees is particularly well prepared to carry out these responsibilities. Because the roles, functions, and compositions of the committees on Finance and on Planning have a special congruence with the Senate Consultative Committee, we do not propose to change the responsibilities for membership appointments for these bodies at this time. The Senate Consultative Committee will continue to appoint, or to advise the President and Vice Presidents about membership on, such ad hoc committees and task forces as are important to special Senate actions or extraordinary administrative activities.

ELLEN BERSCHIED, Chr.
Senate Consultative Committee
C. ARTHUR WILLIAMS, Chr.
Committee on Committees

The three motions were joined by the chair and were approved 145 to 0.

VI. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE MINORITY PROGRAMS, COMMITMENT TO FOCUS Action (5 minutes)

MOTION:


That the University Senate endorse the establishment and maintenance of programs to expand and coordinate recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty on the campuses of the University of Minnesota, as specified in the recommendations of the Special Committee on Minority Programs in Support of Commitment to Focus. Recruitment should be enhanced by establishing a comprehensive, coordinated program to contact and recruit minority students, setting goals for the successful recruitment and admission of high-potential minority high school seniors, developing indices of academic potential appropriate to the educational backgrounds and experiences of nontraditional minority students, expanding and supporting contacts with minority elementary and secondary school students throughout the state, and improving financial aid packages for minority students. Recruitment of minority graduate students should be enhanced by placing the Office of Equal Opportunity in Graduate Studies in the office of an associate dean of the Graduate School, who



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
213 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-2033

June 22, 1983

TO: Provosts, Deans, Directors and Department Heads
FROM: Kenneth H. Keller, Vice President 
SUBJECT: Guidelines for the Performance Review of Administrators

Based on the recommendations of the Academic Professional and Administrative Advisory Committee, I have approved the enclosed set of guidelines for the Performance Review of Administrators. They are effective as of July 1, 1983.

The guidelines are intended to assure in the least burdensome way that administrators are reviewed fairly, regularly, and in a manner consistent with legal requirements. I would very much appreciate it if you would read them carefully. I think you will find them to be sensible and useful in systematizing this very important evaluation process.

:jhh

Enclosure

cc: C. Peter Magrath, President
University Vice Presidents
Mr. Stephen S. Dunham, General Counsel

GUIDELINES FOR THE PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS

Introduction

These guidelines have been prepared for use by individuals and committees having responsibility for the performance review of administrators. The guidelines should be used for persons in the academic administrative category (93XX series) who hold positions for which other formal or regularized evaluation procedures have not been established. The guidelines do not supersede any existing documents or regulations that have been approved by the Board of Regents.

Background Preparation

Preparation for performance review of an administrator should begin at the time of the search to fill the position. A complete job description should be available to and reviewed by the candidate chosen, and the initial appointment should be made with understandings reached on the basis of a non-abbreviated job description. Care should be taken that any description of the duties of the position be in conformity with other documents on file, such as collegiate or departmental constitutions.

At the time of hiring, the appointing official should put in writing a statement for the administrator's permanent personnel file that outlines the following:

- (a) any further clarification or amplification of the expectations for performance of the person in the position;
- (b) the exact term of office;
- (c) the nature and timing of annual and reappointment reviews:
 - (1) individual responsible for performance reviews;
 - (2) probable sources of evaluation for performance reviews;
 - (3) materials required for performance reviews;
 - (4) how recommendations and conclusions would be used.

The Annual Review

Administrators should be reviewed annually by the official to whom they report. Annual reviews can be relatively informal, but should be based on the job description and on other written expectations that have been previously determined and agreed upon. Conclusions or recommendations resulting from the review should be discussed in private meetings with the person being reviewed and become part of the individual's personnel file kept by the reviewing administrator.

The annual review should be carried out by the individual who appointed the administrator or to whom the administrator reports. The reviewing individual should seek whatever evaluations are necessary to complete a fair and thorough review. Such evaluations might be sought from colleagues, from others with whom the administrator interacts or for whom the administrator performs a service, from other administrators at both higher and lower levels, and from faculty and students when appropriate. The individual being reviewed may submit information for the file to supplement or refute the evaluation of the reviewing administrator.

The Reappointment Review

The reappointment review should be scheduled to provide the necessary information for a timely decision on reappointment or non-reappointment (see Robinett memorandum of March 14, 1983, on notification dates for non-reappointment of academic staff). In contrast to the more informal annual review, the reappointment review should be more formal and extensive.

While all-inclusive guidelines are difficult, it is suggested that the appointing official select another knowledgeable individual or a committee to conduct the reappointment review. If a committee is selected, it is further suggested that at least one member be from outside the administrator's department. Composition of the review committee should be discussed with the administrator being reviewed, but the final decision rests with the appointing official.

The review committee (or individual) should receive a clear charge, a job description, written statement of other expectations, and copies of prior annual reviews. The reappointment review process itself should adhere to the "Procedural Guidelines for Collection and Use of the Information in a Performance Review of an Administrator for Purposes of Possible Reappointment" (attached).

The nature of the review process should be carefully tailored to the specific administrative post. The review committee should gather appropriate performance data and evaluations. The sources of such evaluations might be similar to those discussed in the previous section, "The Annual Review." Evaluations might be particularly helpful if the review committee requests responses to specific questions relating to the administrator's performance.

On the basis of the performance data gathered, the review committee should prepare a report of its findings. The report should clearly assess the strengths and weaknesses of the administrator, but usually should not include a specific recommendation as to reappointment or non-reappointment. The report should be submitted to the appointing official, who would make a decision regarding reappointment or non-reappointment.

Procedural Guidelines for Collection and Use of Information in a Performance Review of an Administrator for Purposes of Possible Reappointment

These procedural guidelines have been prepared to make the performance review of administrators more uniform across the University and to assure that appropriate procedures are used so that matters of confidentiality and privacy are dealt with properly.

Review Committee Meetings

The review committee may hold closed meetings to the extent that it would be dealing with personnel information classified as private under state law.

Written Materials

Written materials assembled by the committee in the course of its deliberation should be handled in two ways:

- (1) An official committee file should be established and contain review committee minutes, letters of evaluation, and any other materials providing information on the person being reviewed. This file will be open for inspection by the person being reviewed who may submit information for the file to supplement or refute materials contained in the official committee file. At the end of the work of the committee, this file will be turned over to the official who requested the review. This file must be kept for seven years to comply with the state and federal regulations and with the Consent Decree.
- (2) Files of personal working notes may be maintained by any member of the review committee. Such notes will record an individual committee member's observations, thoughts, etc. rather than official activity of the committee. Except for the possibility of subpoena, personal working notes are not subject to access by the person under review, nor may they be the basis for official statements of the committee. Personal working notes may be destroyed when they are no longer of use to their owner.

Methods of Evaluation

The review committee may wish to collect information by requesting letters of evaluation, responses to specific questions, or by use of a survey or evaluation instrument. Additionally, the review committee may wish to provide opportunity for evaluators to speak directly with the committee, either in lieu of or in addition to providing a written evaluation. Notes of such conversations would be made by the committee and included in the official committee file (and persons giving oral evaluations should be so informed in advance).

Attribution of Evaluations

Persons from whom evaluations are solicited should be informed that in conformance with the state's data practices law, all evaluations will be accessible to the person being reviewed. Furthermore, individuals making oral statements should be informed that the evaluation and notes of the conversation will be available to the individual being reviewed. However, a permissible exception to this rule would be survey instruments sent to the immediate subordinates of the person being reviewed, in which case a summary of the unsigned responses would become a part of the official committee file and available for inspection and comment by the person being reviewed.

:lme