Date: November 10, 1977
From: Office of the Provost

Subject: Revision of Procedures for Evaluation of Presidents

In the absence of the Acting Chancellor, I'm pleased to inform you that the Trustees have approved a revised set of guidelines for evaluations of campus Presidents.

The revisions incorporate the following changes:

a. The time frame has been changed to reduce the impact of the hiatus that may be caused when a President chooses not to stand for reaffirmation or the Board chooses not to reaffirm the services of a President. The review process will begin in September of the fifth year of service (it now begins in January of the fourth year) and ends with action taken by the Board in June of the fifth year (now accomplished in the previous October).

b. The statement of stewardship will be made available to the entire college community at the same time it is sent to the ad hoc evaluation committee.

c. The role of the central staff representative is changed from that of "convener" to advisor, to be available to the committee chairman and expected to check on the progress of the evaluation.

d. The Chancellor will arrange to meet with the ad hoc evaluation committee, as well as with the President, prior to making his recommendations for reaffirmation to the Trustees.

A copy of the revised guidelines and a timetable for the review process are enclosed.

The evaluations of the Presidents whose cycles for review fall in 1978-79 will be conducted under the new guidelines. Beginning in September 1978, evaluations will commence at Alfred, Delhi, Environmental Science and Forestry, and Plattsburgh. They will be coordinated for the Chancellor's Office by Murray Block, and any questions concerning the new procedures may be sent directly to him.
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CHANCELLOR AND PRESIDENTS

October 26, 1977

The Trustees of State University of New York have acted to strengthen the role of the President by the designation of appointment periods coupled with continuing status in academic rank and provision for study leaves. These offer each President a more flexible approach to his or her duties, while emphasizing accountability in the leadership role.

Responsibility for the evaluation of the President's performance is clearly vested in the Trustees (Article IX, Policies of the Board of Trustees, 1976) and must be carried out by the Chancellor, as the Board's chief administrative officer. The Trustees intend that the following revised guidelines for a presidential review process will provide the Chancellor and Trustees with an effective mechanism for a comprehensive and fair evaluation; that they will involve constituent groups, as necessary; and, most importantly, that they will be of assistance to the President in defining and strengthening his or her leadership role. While proposing that these guidelines normally will be applied, the Trustees explicitly reserve the right to modify them in particular instances.
A. Principles

The presidential review process is distinct from the initial search process for a President. In the latter, the various constituents of the campus join to search for, and the College Council recommends to the Trustees, the best possible candidate or candidates for the position. The search is extensive, and the screening process may be both lengthy and complex. The Chancellor, through his representative, offers guidance and assistance. The major work of the screening process remains a campus undertaking and is coordinated by the College Council.

The presidential review process differs from the preceding in that the broad search element is not a factor, for the President being evaluated is known to all concerned. He or she has already served under the direction of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor as the chief administrative officer of the campus. The review is a Trustee function and process initiated by the Chancellor in behalf of the Trustees. Since the President also has interacted during the period of service with various constituent groups on campus, it is both appropriate and desirable that, in conducting the review, the Chancellor and Trustees consult with the College Council and, at appropriate times and by means determined by the Trustees, with representative spokesmen of the faculty, the administrative staff, and the students.
Care should be taken to insure input to the process by alumni, non-teaching professionals, classified employees, and local community groups.

In Article IX of the Policies of the Board of Trustees, 1976, the Trustees have defined the responsibilities of the chief administrative officer of the campus. These provide the criteria against which the President's effectiveness will be reviewed.

The principle of confidentiality will be observed throughout the review process. This will apply to written documents other than the statement of stewardship of the President, and to discussions among all those who participate.

With these principles to guide the review, the following process is established.

B. Procedural Steps

1. In September of the fifth year of the President's period of service, the Chancellor will request the President to indicate if he or she wishes to be considered for reaffirmation.

2. If the President's response is affirmative, the Chancellor will ask the President to prepare, and submit by October 15,
a statement of stewardship as chief administrative officer. At the same time, the Chancellor will designate a central staff member to serve as liaison with the President and the campus during the review. If the President's response is not affirmative, the Chancellor and the President will discuss alternatives, including assuming or resuming full-time faculty status.

3. Upon receipt of the President's statement of stewardship, the Chancellor will invite the Chairman of the College Council, the elected chairman of the college faculty senate or assembly, the elected chairman of the professional employees assembly (where such separate assembly exists), the elected chairman of the college student body, and a member of the administrative staff of the college, selected by the President, to constitute themselves as an ad hoc evaluation committee to prepare a written appraisal of the presidential performance. Each committee member will be acting as a representative of a particular constituency and each shall submit a separate report from his or her constituency. The President's statement of stewardship will be made available to the ad hoc evaluation committee for its review. It will also be made available to the college community, at the same time. The reports of the evaluation committee will be made available to the President for his or her reaction, but will otherwise be kept confidential. The ad hoc evaluation committee may choose and the President may request an interview with the committee as a part of its deliberations.
4. The College Council will assemble and review the reports made by the *ad hoc* committee and will transmit them to the Chancellor with any appropriate comments. Such comments will be made available to the President for his or her reaction.

5. The Chancellor will then review the several appraisals and will arrange to discuss them with the President and with the *ad hoc* evaluation committee.

6. The Chancellor will then recommend appropriate action to the Board of Trustees.

7. The Board of Trustees will invite the President to meet with the Board at its May meeting. At its June meeting, the Board will act on a formal resolution approving reaffirmation of an additional period of service.

8. Each President reappointed under this process will submit a report within one year on progress made in relation to items discussed during the May interview with the Board of Trustees.

C. **The Role of the *ad hoc* Evaluation Committee**

The *ad hoc* evaluation committee will perform a consultative role in the presidential review process. It will be assisted by the Chancellor's representative, named specifically
by the Chancellor for this purpose. The Chancellor's representative will serve as convenor of the committee, and shall be available to the chairman of the committee for advice. The Chancellor's representative will be expected to monitor the progress of the procedures on campus.

Since campuses vary in size and scope and even in complexity of constituent groups, the committee and the Chancellor's representative will propose a procedure to be followed at that campus to ensure appropriate input of constituent evaluative judgments in the review process, and include provision for chairing meetings of the committee. This procedure will be reviewed by the Chancellor and must be accepted by him before being put into operation.

The procedure will not allow for the creation of a committee of constituents beyond the ad hoc committee, nor will it imply or accept as valid need for a voting mechanism. It should, however, ensure that the viewpoints of various constituents, coordinated by the committee, are reviewed by the College Council, brought to the Chancellor and through him to the Trustees. All parties to the process will observe the proprieties appropriate to a dignified and professional administrative procedure.

D. The Nature of the Evaluations

Through the ad hoc evaluation committee, the campus constituents should provide the Chancellor with evaluations that are substantive and illustrative. Based on the previously
identified criteria (p. 3), the responses should cover, among other aspects, evaluations of the President's performance in respect to:

1. Academic leadership and management;
2. Administrative leadership and management;
3. The institutional tone set by the President;
4. Internal relationships;
5. External relationships; and
6. Sensitivity to the needs of campus and to the concerns of faculty, students, and staff.

In addition, the responses should address particular points which the President may have raised in the statement of stewardship.

E. Time Frame for the Evaluations

Appointment dates will be brought to the nearest July 1. When a five-year appointment period is due to end on July 1 of a particular year, the review process will begin the preceding September with the Chancellor's inquiry as to the President's desire about standing for reaffirmation. The entire process normally will be expected to culminate in action of the June meeting of the Trustees.

F. Guidelines for the Review of the Chancellor

A parallel procedure will be followed by the Board of
Trustees in reviewing and considering the Chancellor for reaffirmation. The review will be conducted by the Chairman of the Board, assisted by such other members of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

Following receipt of the Chancellor's statement of stewardship, the Chairman will invite a representative of the Council of Presidents, the President of the University Faculty Senate, the President of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, the President of the University Student Assembly, the President of the Association of Council Members and College Trustees, the President of the Association of Boards and Councils of Two-Year Colleges, the President of the Confederation of Alumni Associations and a member of the central administrative staff designated by the Chancellor, to constitute themselves as an ad hoc evaluation committee to prepare a written appraisal of the Chancellor's performance. This evaluation committee will be convened by the Secretary of the University.

Other procedural steps, including the criteria for, and the timing of, the review will be developed by the Trustees in general conformity with those of the presidential review process.

Revised October 26, 1977
The following timetable is to accompany the Guidelines for the Review Process for the Chancellor and Presidents, dated October 26, 1977, and the section references given in parentheses below are to be found in that set of guidelines. This timetable goes into effect in September of the fifth year of the President's period of service.

1. **September** (first week)
   Chancellor requests the President to indicate if he or she wishes to be considered for reaffirmation (Sect. B1, page 3).

2. **September** (third week)
   President responds in writing to the above request.

3. **October 15**
   a) If response to above is affirmative, the President submits a statement of stewardship to the Chancellor (Sect. B2, page 3).
   b) If response is not affirmative, Chancellor and President discuss alternatives (Sect. B2, page 3).
   c) Chancellor designates staff liaison to ad hoc committee (Sect. B2, page 3).
   d) Chancellor writes to Chairman of College Council, elected chairman of college faculty senate or assembly, elected chairman of the professional employees assembly (where such separate assembly exists), elected chairman of college student body, and the member of the administration selected by the President to present the charge to the ad hoc committee (Sect. B3, page 4).

4. **November**
   a) Chancellor's representative convenes the ad hoc committee early in the month (Sect. C, page 5).
   b) Before end of the month, the ad hoc committee recommends its procedures to the Chancellor (Sect. C, page 5).
5. **December** (first week)
   
   Acceptance by the Chancellor of ad hoc committee's procedure (Sect. C, page 5).

6. **February** (last week)
   
   Ad hoc committee completes review and reports to the College Council.

7. **March**
   
   College Council assembles and reviews reports.

8. **April 1**
   
   College Council submits reports to Chancellor (Sect. B4, page 5).

9. **April-May**
   
   Chancellor meets with President and ad hoc committee to discuss the appraisal (Sect. B5, page 5).

10. **May** (Board Meeting)
    
    a) Chancellor recommends action to the Board of Trustees (Sect. B6, page 5).

    b) Trustees invite President to its May meeting (Sect. B7, page 5).

11. **June** (Board Meeting)
    
    Trustees take action on Chancellor's recommendation. (Sect. B7, page 5).
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