

To: SSSP Board of Directors

From: Stephani Williams, Chair. Annual Review Committee of the Executive Officer

Date: July 1, 2023

EO Annual Review 2023 - Report to the Board

Summary of the evaluation –

The committee met with Dr. Windsor on June 12. The meeting provided an opportunity for the committee to hear from Dr. Windsor about their accomplishments, their perception of the functioning of the Society, issues facing the Society, and areas that they would like to spend more time on in the coming months.

Highlights

Accomplishments:

In the first five months in the position, Dr. Windsor has built effective relationships with each member of the Administrative Office, with the Executive Officers of the ABS and SWS, and has engaged in personal outreach with many members of the Society to build rapport and garner feedback about issues facing the Society. Building interpersonal relationships is a clear strength and one that stems from both genuine interest in the needs and perspective of others, as well as on a belief that the SSSP will be stronger with the development of more meaningful collaborations.

Concern:

Dr. Windsor expressed a desire to have more frequent feedback, particularly from the Board. It may benefit the Society, and the success of future EO's (and all SSSP staff) to have informal check-ins frequently in the first months prior to formal review. Informal check-ins will provide an opportunity to clarify the relationship between the EO and the Board (for example, if the Board would like the EO to be more/less vocal) and provide guidance to future EO's earlier in their onboarding. Similarly, Dr. Windsor pointed out that similar check-ins with new SSSP staff can help to set clear expectations, build rapport, improve working relationships and outcomes.

Given that this evaluation occurred prior to their being in the position for 6-month, it would be beneficial to further clarify aspects of the role (see below) and complete a 1-year annual review (because of the timing of our virtual meetings, this "annual" review is occurring at 5+ months). Informal check-ins will provide an opportunity to clarify the relationship between the EO and the Board (for example, if the Board would like the EO to be more/less vocal).

Clarity of expectations is a concern. There are many areas in which clarity could be improved, including in terms of time on/off (workload flexibility on a weekly basis, as it relates to "vacation time"), and in terms of what the review process and the goals of the review process are (for

example, should materials be provided by EO in advance, like a faculty annual review?). As we considered these questions, it may be that POPSC should be involved or be the primary location for the annual review process.

It is recommended that another review occur at 1-year, as the EO will have a full cycle of experience and greater insights into issues of time, other obstacles to maximizing success, as well as future goals.

Takeaways:

First and foremost, is that the committee is left with a sense of confidence and optimism. While the Society is facing significant issues (i.e., financial constraints, membership recruitment/retention), we strongly believe that Dr. Windsor has a clear understanding of these pressing issues, has begun communicating with committees/individual to increase their knowledge and their capacity to help resolve these issues, and will be capable of working with the Board and other SSSP committees and members to envision solutions to these pressing problems.

Dr. Windsor has many good ideas about the future of the society, how we might maximize our resources and relationships (GA position, relationships with other organizations, getting fundraising training (could include grant/foundation funding).

Perhaps our biggest takeaway is that at this stage (5+ months in the position), time is an issue.

- 10-hours allows for the day-to-day activities to be accomplished, but this leaves little time for the kind of broad and bold future visioning that we might want/expect from an Executive Officer. Elroi did note that until they have completed their first full year, it is difficult to determine how much additional time would maximize their success in the position.
- As noted in the previous section, a there is related issue/concern about clarifying time on/time off. There is currently no clearly stated expectation about vacation, weekend response times, how hours should be distributed, etc. This creates an unclear expectation and a lack of effective boundaries as to what is an appropriate or expected length of time to respond to Society business. Clarifying these time and workload responsibilities now will provide improved assessment, should the Board determine that a one-year review will be conducted.

Action Item:

Based on the committee's meeting with Dr. Windsor, it is recommended that earlier and more frequent meetings with Board representatives (could be in the form of the Annual Review Committee) would be useful for EO's during their first 1-2 years in the position.

Action 1: We propose that the Board formalize the annual review process to include clearer goals and expectations.

Action 2: We propose that the Board formalize regularized opportunities for feedback for future Executive Officers (suggested as 30, 60, 90, 180 days, before the 1-year evaluation).

Action 3: We propose that this current review be considered the 180-day evaluation, and that a second annual review occur at the end of the first year.

Action 4: Currently the policy states that the evaluation should occur within a 2-week period, June 30-July 15. Given that most faculty are off contract at their home institutions, and often juggling multiple demands on their time (including trying to fit in much needed down time), mandating a specific two-week period seems unnecessarily prohibitive. We propose that the policy be revised to provide a completed by date (i.e., July 15), that will fall before Board meetings, whether they be virtual or at the annual meeting.

Recommendation: Provide more flexibility in the timeframe for the annual review to be conducted. Given that this is during the summer break and that there is tremendous variation in the dates and times of availability for a group of 4 people, more flexibility should be built into the process. There doesn't seem to be any need to narrow it to a 2-week window. A completed by date that would be satisfactory whether the Board meeting was occurring virtual before the meeting or at the meeting would be more helpful.

The current policy states: "The review should be conducted between June 30-July 15".