

3-1-2013

## Membership minutes 03/01/2013

Membership Committee

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Membership Committee, "Membership minutes 03/01/2013" (2013). *Membership Committee*. 19.  
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/member/19>

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 Membership 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).

Membership Committee  
March 1, 2013

Present: Matt Zaske, Judy Kuechle, Zak Forde, Troy Goodough

Guest: Jacqueline Johnson

Zak thanked Chancellor Johnson for taking the time to meet with the committee to see how she views the Membership Committee's role in the administrative review process. Zak had several questions to consider for this meeting:

- How should we interpret the charge of tracking the review schedules of those reporting directly to the Chancellor that the writers of the Constitution may not have had directly in mind (as it was largely written before the 2009 reorganization that added several direct reporting lines under the Chancellor's purview, including those who may not have officially proscribed review schedules on the same par as Vice Chancellors, etc.)?
- How might the Membership Committee engage with those about to be reviewed in such a way that fulfills our constitutionally mandated charge "to advise the chancellor on review committee memberships" of administrators that report to her, especially when the specific language of that constitutional charge does not exactly reflect how reviews are conducted?
- What is the desired goal to be achieved from the Membership Committee's involvement in the administrative review process?

Chancellor Johnson said she initiates the reviews for those who report to her. Sandy Olson-Loy is currently in the process; Maddy Maxeiner is next (the University Foundation initiates); and then Lowell Rasmussen. The Office of Human Resources coordinates with an outside firm to conduct a 360 review. Matt asked if there we have any input when an outside vendor is used. Chancellor Johnson said she was asked to consider who should be reviewing her making sure there was representation from all constituents. She also said the University already requires annual performance reviews and this is more in keeping with the best practice and standards. She asked the committee to consider where does the review information go? Should the Membership committee simply be kept informed? Is there some opportunity for people on campus to know the review has taken place? Perhaps some kind of narrative that could be available to the Membership Committee or smaller group? Matt said he thinks the committee just needs to know that the review is happening and for whom. Zak agreed that it is important to know what is happening; however, he wondered if we should create an avenue where concerns from the campus community could be addressed.

Chancellor Johnson wondered if we should articulate some of things that are not specifically mentioned in the Constitution. For example, the practice (not policy) is that senior administrators will be reviewed on a three or five year term and then establish a calendar of the reviews. We could expect there would be some kind of report that the review has been

conducted with the assumption that the person's performance was appropriate; and that the results have been shared with the reviewer. She added that the University has other avenues for disgruntled employees to make their voices heard.

Troy wanted the committee to think about larger question of how and when subordinates are given the opportunity to provide feedback. He believes we need to create a civil culture on campus and that people don't actually hear that they are doing something well. Matt said the role of this committee could be to serve as a sounding board to help address that. Troy would like to see a more standardized practice for reviews and pointed out that what works for senior management might not work for other folks on campus. Zak added that the Membership Committee could provide a best practice document with guidelines for the process and articulate a range of time. Troy suggested have the chair of the Membership Committee meet with the chairs of the Consultative Committee to begin the conversation to identify best practices. Perhaps Human Resources should be giving the committee information about reviews.