

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well  
**University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well**

---

Consultative Committee

Campus Governance

---

1-31-2018

## Consultative minutes 01/31/2018

Consultative Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult>

---

### Recommended Citation

Consultative Committee, "Consultative minutes 01/31/2018" (2018). *Consultative Committee*. 163.  
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/consult/163>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consultative Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

## Consultative Committee Minutes

1/31/18

Present: Mike, Nancy, Michelle, Roger, Sarah, Noah, Tiernan, Jeri, Angie, Ann, Elsie

Guest: Sarah Mattson

- I. **Approval of minutes.** Tabled.
- II. **Sarah Mattson and discussion of procedures and policies concerning the review of upper administrators.**

Sarah Mattson discussed the current review policy for administration. There was some general feedback on the 360 review from committee/members of campus: in the past there has been lack of mechanisms for feedback, it feels like the review is done by UMTC, it's a small group that completes it, people on campus are looking for a different type of review that includes public perception and opportunity for feedback.

Additionally, the committee discussed the 360 Review process for the chancellor/upper administration and how it is initiated by the president's office. The question posed: how can we give more feedback? One idea proposed was to have CC as one of the 20 raters who collects feedback. Another idea stated to have a job description of sorts for raters that required them to collect feedback from a variety of stakeholders. Members of the committee recognize that while the campus community wants input, the review needs to be representative and fair.

The following questions were raised throughout the discussion:

- Could raters let certain committees know the review is happening?
- Where can reviews come from? Discipline leaders? Division chairs? Direct reports from units? From faculty/staff/students?
- What did past reviews look like? Locally they included committee, questionnaires, etc.
- Do division chair reviews happen? These are done regularly through the Dean's office.

CC discussed with Sarah M. possible ways for implementation of review:

- Membership committee should be visited for advice on who is part of review
- Notification should be sent to other committees or campus committee that a review is happening
- Reviews should be shared with campus (following principles for how feedback goes out).

Sarah discussed upcoming administration reviews: Sandy OL and Brian H.

The theme throughout this discussion of the administrator review policy the desire for broader feedback, especially due to our governance structure. Currently, the perception on campus is that the 360 reviews are done by and for the administrators and that there is very little to no room for the UMM community to comment.

After discussion of reviews, the committee also discussed the following with Sarah M.:

- How do we help HR to strive towards transparency and consistency? How do we adapt to more frequent job transitions (people now change jobs more frequently)? Are there strategic staffing plans being considered?
- In terms of positions that have searches and those that do not, is there advice for unit leaders to decide whether a search needed. What goes into that consideration? Long-term position or high-transition? Size of unit? Impact of unit?
- Campus sees cases where promotions are announced versus others who have to go through nationwide searches. Can we be clear about how the process is applied in different situations?
- There needs to be a culture of transparency and the reasons for promoting someone internally rather than doing a national search needs to be communicated for benefit of employees impacted. For example an email or communication sent to explain the process that was followed and who was hired. Could something like this be added to a list? Is the final duty as hirer or chair is to announce the position and what happened?
- What is our standard communication on campus? How do we get messages back and forth?

Summary:

- Reviews will be initiated by HR. Schedule for review in place by summer. Hoping for pattern (ex. always fall or spring).
  - More opportunities for input
  - Notification to campus community/key committees that reviews of administer(s) are taking place
- Summary of tasks will be added to end of search to do list.
- Will also mention to VC group the concern about communicating how positions are filled and the sense of how they happened (ex. Local Search, Promotional, etc.).

Note taker: Angela Stangl