

Doc. T93-080  
Passed by the BoT  
8/11/93

# **UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES ON THE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS**

## **I. Purposes of Review Process for President and Chancellors.**

In addition to informal discussions between members of the Board of Trustees and the President, and between the President and campus Chancellors, a more formal, structured review and evaluation of the President and Chancellors approximately every five years serves several purposes. Such a process provides the Board of Trustees with an assessment of how effectively these administrators are guiding the University in such areas as academic, financial, and student affairs; personnel management; and community relations. The review process goes further, however, and is intended to support and strengthen the performance of the President and Chancellors. Specifically, the review process provides an opportunity for the President and Chancellors to review institutional and campus goals and priorities; a framework for assessing individual, campus, and University progress in relation to these goals and priorities; and an opportunity to assist the President and Chancellors by suggesting areas for attention that could enhance the quality of their leadership.

The formal evaluation and review of the President and the Chancellors shall, at a minimum, address the following broad areas: administrative and academic leadership and management; institutional and campus goals and priorities; sensitivity to the needs of the University and the campuses; and internal and external relationships. More detailed criteria are set forth below.

## **II. Review and Evaluation of the President.**

The Board of Trustees shall conduct a review and evaluation of the President of the University twenty-four to thirty-six months following initial appointment and every five years thereafter or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Board. The Chair shall appoint a Presidential Review Committee, consisting of either (1) one member of each of the standing committees of the Board, which members may seek the assistance of outside consultants, or (2) outside consultants experienced in the review and evaluation of the heads of universities. In reviewing and evaluating the President, the Committee shall gather information from, at a minimum, the campus Chancellors, duly-constituted campus-wide governance bodies on each of the campuses, and chairpersons of Trustee committees. The President may submit a self-assessment or statement of stewardship if he so chooses. The Committee shall prepare a written report on the results of the review and shall meet with the President to discuss the report prior to submitting it to the Board of Trustees. The President shall, if he or she chooses, submit a response which shall be attached to the report. The final report shall be prepared in two copies, one for the

Secretary of the Board and one for the President. No other copies will be prepared or distributed.

The criteria used in the evaluation should be similar to those which are employed in choosing a President, including the following:

- a. How successful has the President been in creating a sense of unity, civility and purpose, as well as momentum and growth within the University?
- b. How would you estimate the quality of the President's appointments both within his office and in those areas of University-wide leadership where his judgment counts?
- c. How effective has the President been in working with the Trustees: i.e., in providing them with information and guidance as well as in carrying out their overall policies?
- d. How successful has the President been in obtaining adequate budgetary support for the University, first from the Executive Branch and the Legislature and, second, from other sources such as the Federal government, the Alumni and private donors?
- e. How successful has the President been in shaping long-range planning and in implementing the various states of an overall plan?
- f. How successful has the President been in promoting the goals of affirmative action within the University?
- g. How effective has the President been in overseeing and working with the Chancellors of each of the campuses?
- h. How successful has the President been in obtaining and maintaining the academic quality of the University in its teaching, research and services?
- i. How effective has the President been in communicating and working with the Executive Branch, the General Court, the Secretary of Education and the Higher Education Coordinating Council?
- j. How effective has the President been in making sound and sometimes difficult decisions?

### **III. Review and Evaluation of Chancellors.**

The President shall provide for a review and evaluation of each campus Chancellor twenty-four to thirty-six months following initial appointment and every five years thereafter, or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Board of Trustees or the President. The President may conduct the review or may make arrangements for one or more outside consultants to assist in the review and evaluation of the Chancellors. Consultants shall individually or as a team be experienced in various aspects of higher education administration and conversant with skills and techniques for gathering information from appropriate persons and groups.

The President and consultant, if appropriate, shall meet with the Chancellor at the beginning of the review process to discuss the procedures to be followed. In conducting the review, the President or consultant shall solicit information from, at a minimum, the

Vice Chancellors of the campus, duly constituted campus-wide governance bodies, faculty and students. The Chancellor may submit a self- assessment of his/her performance if he or she so chooses. If a consultant is used, the consultant shall prepare a written report to the President containing his or her findings, recommendations and evaluation. The President shall prepare a written report of the results of the review and shall meet with the Chancellor to discuss the report prior to reporting to the Board of Trustees. The final report, which shall have as an attachment any written response that the Chancellor wishes to make, shall be prepared in three copies, one for the Chancellor, one for the President, and one for the Secretary of the Board. No other copies will be prepared or distributed.

The criteria used in the review and evaluation of Chancellors are similar to those used in initially selecting a Chancellor. The criteria are also in many ways similar to those used in the review and evaluation of the President, although the focus shifts to the activities and conditions of the campus. More specifically, in addition to the broad guidelines set out in Section I above, those conducting the review shall address such issues as the following:

- a. How successful has the Chancellor been in creating a sense of unity, civility, and purpose, as well as momentum and growth on the campus?
- b. How effective has the Chancellor been in choosing and working with his/her Provost, Vice Chancellors, and Deans/Directors? Has the Chancellor assisted the administration in maintaining good relations and encouraging good morale among University employees? Has the Chancellor promoted the goals of Affirmative Action on the campus?
- c. How effective has the Chancellor been in establishing good relations with the faculty, staff and students on the campus?
- d. How effective has the Chancellor been in supporting, maintaining and enhancing the quality of the academic mission of the campus.
- e. Has the Chancellor successfully maintained and enhanced relations with alumni and with external funding agencies, such as foundations and federal agencies? Has he/she assisted the campus and the University in maintaining good relations with the state legislature, the Governor, state agencies, and other institutions?
- f. How effective has the Chancellor been in projecting an attractive image of his/her institution to the people of the Commonwealth?
- g. Has the Chancellor assisted the campus in developing well articulated and detailed planning documents and policies? Has he/she provided mechanisms for implementing and revising policies and plans? Has he/she successfully explained plans and policies to concerned constituencies off the campus?
- h. Has the Chancellor effectively supervised the overall allocation of campus resources such as budget, personnel and physical plant?
- i. How well has the Chancellor worked with the President and the Board of Trustees?

#### **IV. Review and Evaluation of Vice Presidents.**

The President shall conduct a review and evaluation of each Vice President at least every five years, or as he deems appropriate, or as directed by the Board of Trustees.

In the reviews, the President shall seek the appraisals of the Chancellors, appropriate Vice Chancellors of the campuses, members of appropriate Trustee committees and the other Vice Presidents. The Vice President may submit a self-assessment if he or she chooses, and this document and/or a response to the final report shall be attached to the report if the Vice President so chooses. The President shall prepare a written report of the results of the review and shall discuss the report with the Vice President. The Vice President shall have an opportunity to respond to the President's report. The final report shall be prepared in three copies, one for the Vice President, one for the Secretary of the Board, and one for the President. No other copies will be prepared or distributed.

Vice Presidents shall be evaluated on their performance in performing their assigned duties, including providing leadership in University- wide policy development and coordination, and working with the campuses in developing, coordinating, and implementing Trustee policies.

## **V. The Evaluation of Vice Chancellors, Provosts and Deans/Directors.**

Each campus Chancellor shall conduct a review and evaluation of the Vice Chancellors, Provost and academic Deans/Directors on the campus at least every five years, or more frequently if he or she deems it appropriate, or as directed by the President or the Board of Trustees.

In reviewing the Vice Chancellors and Provost, the Chancellor shall solicit information from, at a minimum, the Deans/Directors who report directly to the Vice Chancellor or Provost, duly-constituted campus- wide governance bodies, the other Vice Chancellors and the appropriate Vice President. The Vice Chancellor or Provost may submit a self-assessment of his or her performance if he or she so chooses. The Chancellor shall prepare a written report of the results of the review and shall meet with the Vice Chancellor or Provost to discuss the report prior to submitting it to the President. Distribution of copies shall be restricted to the person reviewed, the Chancellor, and the President. The Vice Chancellor or Provost shall be given the opportunity to submit a written response to the Chancellor's report, which response shall be attached to the report.

The Chancellor may, at his or her discretion, delegate the authority for evaluating the academic Deans/Directors to the Provost or Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. In reviewing and evaluating the Deans/Directors, the Chancellor/Provost shall seek the appraisals of, at a minimum, the other Deans/Directors; the Department Chairs, Center Heads and/or Program Directors in the appropriate college or other academic unit; duly-constituted collegiate governance bodies and/or a collegiate Committee jointly appointed by governance and the Chancellor/Provost for this purpose. The Chancellor/Provost shall prepare a written report of the results of the review and shall meet with the Dean/Director to discuss their report. The Dean/Director shall be given the opportunity to submit a written response to the Chancellor's report. Copies of the reports shall be provided to the

Dean/Director, the person preparing the report (if other than the Chancellor), the Chancellor, and the President.

Criteria to be used in the review and evaluation will include the effectiveness of the Vice Chancellor, Provost or Dean/Director in fulfilling the responsibilities of his or her office, including, the following categories as they relate to his/her area of responsibility - Leadership, Policy Development, Management and Administration, Personnel, and Affirmative Action/Diversity.

In reviewing the Provosts and Deans, the process should focus particularly on their contributions to shaping the intellectual life of the campus, most specifically through decisions affecting the quality of the faculty, the promotion of academic values and standards, and the adaptation of the campus to changing needs.

At the commencement of a given review, any review committee established by the appropriate governance body shall, in consultation with the person responsible for the evaluation, delineate the above criteria in further detail, as specifically appropriate to the area of responsibility of the administrator to be review and evaluated.