Minutes
Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs
December 8, 2006

Members present: Keene, Boone, Adcock, Gorr, Lytton, Campbell, Oaks, Niles, Hyer, and Woodard

Guest: Tony Gambill, Director, Leadership and Employee Development

Keene called the meeting to order with three agenda items:

1) Performance Management Project Update,
2) Diversity Accomplishments for A/P Faculty Evaluations, and
3) 360° Performance Evaluation Presentation.

Keene welcomed Michele Adcock, Extension Agent (Montgomery County), to the commission.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROJECT UPDATE

Commission members were divided into four workgroups to collect data on AP Faculty Performance Evaluations. Woodard, Oaks, and Campbell presented their findings from the General Administrative units:

- The majority of the areas surveyed had some sort of process in place.
- The most common approach linked evaluations to the department’s strategic operating plans.
- The general concept is that feedback occurs on a routine, day-to-day basis.
- The formats used are not consistent across the board.
- Assistance in improving the process is welcomed (best practices).
- A complex and forms driven process is not ideal.
- Directors are not in favor of a process similar to the one used for classified staff.
- Process heavily concentrated in July; not a good time; cycle should be earlier, maybe May-June instead of July-August; concerns with fiscal year closeout, BOV meetings.

Gorr concluded that evaluations are “spotty” in Extension and that there is a lack of uniformity. In Spring 2005, a document was circulated that listed guidelines for evaluating all faculty. There is uncertainty as to whether it is currently being utilized. According to Gorr, the document was management oriented, succinct, and relevant to all areas. However, regardless of whether the employee received an exceptional, acceptable, or not acceptable evaluation, everyone received a salary increase.

Boone reported that there is no separate, or formal evaluation process for A/P faculty in engineering; the process is the same as the instructional faculty. Directors meet annually to conduct face-to-face evaluations. The Dean is in favor of establishing a process. Employees are allowed to set their own goals and expectations; there is a verbal exchange with the supervisor; and the appraisal is somewhat tied to compensation.

Hyer is still in the process of connecting with the directors who report to the provost. She explained that Karen Sanders has established a thorough process that is linked to the strategic plan. An annual meeting, facilitated by the director, is held to negotiate goals and to discuss progress. Hyer expressed her concerns with the possibility of creating a standard form as it may not address every department’s needs.

Niles alerted the commission to the difference between AP Faculty with tenure and those without – he has both reporting to the dean’s office. He concurred that there should be an assessment system; but commented that the creation of a “one-size fits all” approach would not be conducive. He advised the
commission to offer a variety of options with fundamental operating principles or tools for directors to choose.

Seventy-five percent of the Student Affairs units employ an evaluation system that focuses on departmental/division initiatives and individual goals and achievement. Cynthia Bonner is working on formal process that links evaluations to merit increase. Keene reported that staff members are unclear as to how compensation information is being conveyed to assistant and associate vice presidents. Her findings also included:

- Almost every unit has a face-to-face meeting
- There is on-going feedback within the departments
- Lack of consistency across departments in terms of forms used
- Directors support a flexible framework; a timeline would be useful – there is a gap between pay raise letters and when evaluation occurs

Keene solicited suggestions on how to move forward with the data collected. Lytton cautioned the group not to generate more forms due to the complexity of departments. Niles encouraged the creation of a results-oriented process. This discussion led into Tony Gambill’s presentation on the 360˚ Performance Evaluation.

**PRESENTATION ON 360˚ PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

Gambill described 360˚ Performance Evaluation as a simple, non bureaucratic process. It allows creativity, keeps track of progress, and focuses on the future. This tool measures perceptions of respondents; it also assesses impact and not the manager’s intentions.

The 360˚ can be used for either developmental or performance-related purposes. This method is different from traditional evaluations where feedback is from a single source. 360˚ involves a team (four-way mirror): self, peers, direct reports, and managers. When using the evaluation for developmental purposes, the employee chooses her/his own respondents. The information collected is confidential and not shared with the supervisor, unless the participant chooses to do so. The participant’s goals can be shared with the supervisor. The 360˚ results may also be used in the context of Annual Performance Evaluations or Mandatory Performance Improvement.

The use of peer review may be subjective, intimidating or viewed as a weapon, however, it allows managers to know the climate of the office.

Gambill shared information on the Direct Report Review which can be a less expensive, time-friendly, un-mandated evaluation method. Additionally, it does not require the use of an outside consultant. This process offers insight into how direct reports and peers view a manager. It provides an opportunity for direct reports to share their opinions. Employees currently complain that they never get a chance to evaluate their managers.

Woodard addressed concerns with confidentiality. Supervisors have a right to view all documents and employees may have concerns with the disclosure of information if they are asked to respond to a survey. She suggested that the group explore this issue further. Woodard also expressed concern about using such evaluations for performance reviews when we have not yet offered managers the opportunity to develop their leadership skills through appropriate training.

Keene asked commission members to forward all sample forms and information collected (mail code 0277) to her prior to the January 19th meeting. Keene will assign commission members a peer institution to contact for more information about their evaluation processes.

**DIVERSITY ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR A/P FACULTY EVALUATIONS**

Hyer presented a document prepared by a subcommittee of the Commission on Equal Opportunity and Diversity. It provides a framework for reporting Diversity Accomplishments. The categories were
developed based on faculty reporting in promotion and tenure dossiers, where this requirement has been in place for two years, and from annual activity reports in the College of Agriculture, which is using an electronic reporting system.

Please forward feedback no later than early January.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There is a vacancy for an A/P faculty representative on the Commission on Research. Recommendations are needed to fill this position.

Recorder: Tracey Cameron, Office of the Provost