

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF CHANCELLORS¹

The Academic Senate will participate in the President's periodic review of the campuses by providing the President with a faculty review of the Chancellor's leadership. This review will occur between the fourth and fifth anniversaries of appointment² of a new Chancellor and at approximately five-year intervals thereafter. Earlier reviews may be undertaken by the President at his or her discretion. No review will be conducted if the Chancellor has informed the President of the intent to step down within 12 months of the Chancellor's anniversary date.

The Academic Senate recommends that the Chancellor submit a report describing his or her major accomplishments, the state of the campus, and his/her aspirations for the campus. This report will be made available to all members of the Academic Senate on the campus.

The President and the campus Senate Divisional Chair will, by letter, request an evaluation of the Chancellor from Academic Senate members on the campus. The request will include the attached "Criteria to Guide Chancellor Review Committees" as a guide to matters that respondents might address. The request also will advise respondents that letters are confidential but that the Chancellor being reviewed is entitled to request redacted copies of the text of letters upon which the review is based. If the Chancellor requests copies, the letters will be redacted to remove identifying information such as the letterhead and signature block, but the text of the letters will not be revised to remove identifying information within the text.

The Chair of the Academic Council will appoint five members of the Academic Senate to constitute an *ad hoc* evaluation committee to prepare a report to the President. Three members of the *ad hoc* committee will be members of the Divisional Senate of the campus under review. These three members shall be appointed from a list of nominees submitted to the Chair of the Academic Council by the Divisional Committee on Committees of the campus under review. The remaining two members, one of whom will serve as the chair of the *ad hoc* committee, must be members of the Divisional Senates of two other campuses. These two *ad hoc* committee members will be selected from a list of names solicited by the Council Chair from the University Committee on Committees. The Chancellor under review will be invited to submit, or to designate the Executive Vice Chancellor (or equivalent) to submit, to the President a list of individuals whose impartiality the Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor believes to be in doubt. The President will advise the Chair of the Academic Council if any individuals proposed for appointment to the *ad hoc* committee are questioned by the Chancellor. Membership of the *ad hoc* evaluation committee will be known only to the President and Chair of the Academic Council, unless the divisional Senate requests the *ad hoc* committee to conduct interviews.

The *ad hoc* evaluation committee will assess the Chancellor's leadership based on evidence which includes the following:

¹ This revised version was endorsed by the Academic Council on June 7, 2000, and amended and endorsed on April 30, 2009, July 8, 2009, and July 27, 2011.

² APM 200-17 defines the date of appointment as "the first day on which the payment begins for appointments."

1. Letters solicited from all members of the Academic Senate on the campus under review.
2. Letters specifically solicited from members of the Academic Senate on the campus under review who have been active in the affairs of the Divisional Senate, including the current and past divisional chairs, and who are recommended for this purpose by the campus Committee on Committees, executive council, or by some other mechanism as determined at the campus level;
3. If requested by the Division, confidential interviews of members of the Divisional Senate identified by the Division.
4. A letter from the current Divisional Chair reflecting opinions of all Divisional Chairs who have served during the period under review.

The letters to Academic Senate faculty will be sent as early in the process as possible. A month or two before the first meeting of the *ad hoc* evaluation committee, the Divisional Chair will send an email reminder to all Senate faculty.

In addition to the letters described above, the group identified by the campus, as described in number 2 above, shall meet in person for a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the Chancellor's academic leadership. The group shall prepare its own summary report of this discussion. The report shall be included in the materials provided to the *ad hoc* evaluation committee.

The campus executive committee should consider asking the *ad hoc* committee to conduct interviews on the campus to gather additional information regarding the Chancellor's effectiveness, including interviews with a group of knowledgeable faculty such as the Divisional Chairs who served during the review period, and other faculty as identified by a selection process determined by the Divisional Senate. Since conducting campus interviews would require that the members of the *ad hoc* committee be identified, candidates for the committee should be informed of this when asked to serve.

The *ad hoc* evaluation committee will prepare a confidential report to the President based on the letters and reports from Senate members and interviews, if any, with the groups noted above. The committee will receive copies of all solicitation materials, including material that identifies the active Senate members from whom letters were requested, and information about the campus' academic structure and faculty distribution within that structure. At the Academic Council Chair's discretion, basic information about the campus that is available to the public (e.g., from the campus website) may be included. The purpose of the *ad hoc* evaluation committee's report is to prepare the President for discussions with the Chancellor concerning specific areas where performance is strong and areas in which performance could be improved. The report also may identify areas the committee believes should be examined but for which the committee lacked sufficient information. The *ad hoc* committee is not expected to render a

comprehensive up-or-down judgment on the Chancellor's service, and its report will not be used in that manner.

The *ad hoc* committee also will submit a transmittal letter signed by each of the members.

A copy of the report and all the received letters will be provided to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council, who will also be informed whether the review committee conducted interviews. The Chair and Vice Chair will review the report and certify to the President whether, in their judgment, the report is consistent with the contents of the letters and whether the review committee also conducted interviews that may have provided information not contained in the documentary record. The role of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council is to ensure that the review process is undertaken in accord with policy and that the *ad hoc* committee report reflects the evidence before it. If the Chair or Vice Chair of the Council is on the faculty of the campus whose Chancellor is subject to review, they will recuse themselves from participation in all aspects of the review with the exception of being interviewed or submitting a letter to their campus *ad hoc* committee. If the Academic Council Chair must recuse him or herself, then the Academic Council Vice Chair will serve in place of the Chair in all processes noted below.

The report of the *ad hoc* committee, the committee's transmittal letter, the letters from campus faculty, and the certifying letter from the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council will be provided to the President. Following review of these materials, the President will meet privately and in confidence with the chair of the *ad hoc* committee and the Chair of the Academic Council for a review of the report.

The President will then invite the Chair of the Division of the Academic Senate involved in the review to confer privately and in confidence regarding the division Chair's assessment of the Chancellor's performance. The Chair of the Division will have an opportunity to review the *ad hoc* committee report prior to this meeting.

Upon completion of these consultations, the President will meet privately with the Chancellor who will have an opportunity to review a copy of the *ad hoc* committee report. Subsequently, the Chair of the Academic Council will meet privately with the Chancellor.

After the Chancellor has met with the President and the Chair of the Academic Council, the President shall report to the Chair of the Division that the review has been completed. Immediately thereafter all copies of the report and all supporting letters will be destroyed.

CRITERIA TO GUIDE CHANCELLOR REVIEW COMMITTEES

The following criteria to guide the gathering of data about a chancellor's performance are organized under four somewhat overlapping heads. The listing is not definitive and is not intended to be limiting. On the other hand, there may be cases where it is not possible to gather data relevant to all criteria given time available or where some criteria may be deemed inappropriate for the review at hand.

Leadership Ability

- creativity and originality of intellectual, academic and administrative ideas
- clarity with which institutional goals and academic standards are formulated and articulated
- resourcefulness in gaining support and acceptance of innovative plans to develop the campus to levels of still higher academic excellence
- ability to motivate faculty, students, staff and the community and to inspire confidence, trust and respect

Decision-making Ability

- originality and creativeness of own ideas
- openness and receptivity to new ideas from diverse constituencies
- ability to search campus and its environment for innovative opportunities to initiate necessary improvements
- skill by which essential data are gathered and evaluated to make relevant, high-quality decisions
- ability to mobilize and allocate resources in conformance with academic and administrative plans
- effectiveness in designing and scheduling short-term and long-term plans

Administrative and Managerial Skills

- ability to translate goals and plans into operational programs which produce desired outcomes
- ability to recruit, select and retain effective administrators
- ability to supervise effectively and to inspire managerial staff
- ability to evaluate performance of administrators and constructively develop their potential and provide for their training
- fairness and justice in administration
- openness of communication; ability to seek and receive a wide variety of information to understand the campus and its environment
- diagnostic ability in problem-solving; ability to analyze important, unexpected problems and take appropriate corrective action
- flexibility and adaptability in changing environments while pursuing fundamental institutional goals

Representational Ability

- national and international recognition as academic leader and ability to stand as symbolic head of the campus
- knowledge of campus in all its components
- sensitivity to and awareness of campus and community attitudes and needs
- ability in developing network of internal and external contacts to serve as information nerve center for the campus
- ability to represent the campus effectively in major negotiations
- ability to generate support among external constituencies