

A Proposed System of Faculty Feedback For effective University leadership

Whereas the University's experts in personnel administration agree that continuing the development of a system of faculty feedback for University leaders, initially limited to deans and department chairs, is consistent with principles of shared governance and is sound contemporary management, and

Whereas research demonstrates that superiors do not receive systematic and objective feedback when subordinates are unprotected, and

Whereas the proposal that follows helps leaders improve performance, reduces the bias in the unsystematic feedback that leaders currently receive, and provides more timely and less flawed feedback than our system of performance evaluation that occurs only once every five years, and

Whereas advocating for the faculty through overseeing a system of faculty feedback is an essential and appropriate role of the Faculty Senate when avenues for enhancing communication between the faculty and administration are rejected and limited, and

Whereas a system of faculty feedback will allow leaders to achieve a higher level of performance and responsiveness to faculty, thus allowing for a more productive and satisfied faculty,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate proposes the following system of faculty feedback for effective University leadership:

A Proposal for A System of Faculty Feedback for Effective University Leadership

Faculty Senate Sponsored Feedback System. We propose that the Faculty Senate oversee a system of faculty feedback.

Feedback System Administered by a University-wide Committee Accountable to the Faculty Senate. To reduce demands on Senate members, who are often already overburdened, we propose that a committee comprised of faculty outside the Senate administer the survey and disseminate the results. Accountable to the Senate, this committee would be funded by the Senate and would use Senate resources (e.g., Linda Knowles, Senate office supplies). This committee would operate much like the Senate's Legislative Agenda Committee or the Ad Hoc SPI committee.

Composition and Charge of a Faculty Leadership Review Committee. We recommend that the committee that administers the feedback survey be called the Faculty Leadership Review Committee. Such a name will reduce the sense that we are restricting our focus to only giving feedback to deans and chairs. We recommend that this committee normally be comprised of ten faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate. These ten shall include a liaison from the Faculty Senate. We further recommend that normally at least one of the ten members have expertise in survey research. The non-Senate members shall serve three-year terms with one third of the members completing a term every year (i.e., one-third of the committee shall turn over every year). This committee shall administer the feedback instruments, disseminate the results, recommend modifications to the instruments as needed, and nominate qualified faculty to serve as the Committee's new members.

To help ensure successful implementation of the new system of feedback and a successful transition of responsibility to the Faculty Leadership Review Committee, members of the Ad Hoc Committee will serve as initial members of the Faculty Leadership Review Committee. To create the cycle of one-third membership turnover each year, initial members of the Faculty Leadership Review Committee will serve terms of one, two, or three years.

Frequency of Feedback. To ensure that the feedback system accomplishes the desired results, we propose that feedback instruments be administered no less than once every two years. A more precise frequency of administering instruments would be determined through what is learned in the process of developing and administering the initial instruments.

Feedback on Leaders *and* on the College and Department as a whole. To enhance the amount of useful information for University leaders and to reduce the perception that the Senate is targeting leaders in an adversarial manner, we propose that leadership feedback be a part of an instrument providing feedback on the operation of colleges and departments as a whole.

Instruments Developed by the Ad Hoc Committee Experts. We propose that the experts serving on the Ad Hoc Committee develop the core, or base, feedback instruments. This includes experts in public sector performance evaluation, private sector performance evaluation, and psychometrics. To allow for differences in job responsibilities, leaders will be allowed to add questions to the core instruments. However, before any instruments are administered to

the faculty, the Faculty Senate shall approve them. Recommended changes in instruments occurring over time shall also be approved by the Faculty Senate.

Administered On-line. Because the Senate does not have the administrative network to administer a hard copy of a survey and because a mail-out survey would be costly, we recommend that the instruments be administered on-line.

Dissemination of Results. For feedback to have maximum effectiveness, we propose that:

1. Except for one's first round of feedback, feedback should be shared with the individual leaders *and* their immediate supervisor. That is, we recommend re-instituting the accountability that did not exist in the previously proposed system of private feedback. To allow leaders a forewarning of problems and the opportunity to address/correct problems without the stigmatizing judgments of their supervisors, feedback should not be shared with supervisors during one's first experience with the feedback system.

Feedback on individual leaders should *not* be shared with the general faculty. Faculty should be given access to the aggregate data on leaders (e.g., the aggregate statistics on deans and chairs).

Data from the research process used to develop the feedback instruments should be made accessible to the faculty.

Reconsideration of the Five-year Review. So that leaders do not experience excessive evaluation, the Faculty Senate shall evaluate whether the University should continue with the University-wide system of evaluating deans and chairs every five-years. This evaluation shall take place after leaders experience two complete cycles of the Senate's new feedback system. In the event that the Senate's system of feedback is effective and that the five-year review does not add to the quality of this feedback system, the Senate shall recommend discontinuing the five-year review of deans and chairs.

Adopted by the Senate March 19 2002