Memorandum to Presidents

Date: April 11, 1986

From: Office of the Chancellor

Subject: Revised Guidelines for the Evaluation of Campus Presidents

To: Presidents, State-operated Campuses

At the February 19, 1986, meeting of the State University Board of Trustees, revisions to the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Campus Presidents were approved. Attached is a copy of the Guidelines, as revised.

The changes include the following new items:

-- specification for a three-week advance notice of the Chancellor's visit with the campus Council, and that the period of notice be coincident with the campus in session;

-- requirement that the Council meet in executive session;

-- provision for the Chancellor's invitation of a faculty observer;

-- provision for the Chancellor's invitation of a professional employee representative;

-- authorization for attendance of an alumni representative, if there is one who normally attends Council meetings;

-- provision for the Chancellor, or designee, to meet separately with representatives from one or more constituencies when there are special circumstances.
The changes, with the exception of the requirement for executive session, generally follow recommendations from the University Faculty Senate which were transmitted to the Chancellor in September 1985.

Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.
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Guidelines for the Evaluation of Campus Presidents

Purposes of Presidential Evaluation

The basic purpose of Presidential evaluations is to strengthen the role of the President and to offer to each President a more flexible approach to his or her duties, while emphasizing accountability in the leadership role. The Presidents are responsible primarily to the Chancellor and the Trustees. Therefore, a continuing review process, as provided for in Article IX, Title A, Section 1, of the Policies of the Trustees (as amended September 24, 1980), requires the full involvement of the Chancellor so that the President is made aware of how colleagues perceive his or her service. The process provides for constituent input, as required by the Chancellor, and at his option may include an on-site evaluation by an outside peer group. The process is flexible to account for variations among campuses in size, scope, and problems, and to account for differences among Presidents as to length of service and experiential levels.

Procedures for a Presidential Evaluation

1. At appropriate intervals, the Chancellor will hold a special extended meeting with each State-operated campus President as part of the ongoing evaluation process. The meeting should provide an opportunity for the President to discuss campus problems and SUNY-wide problems that affect his or her campus, as well as to give the Chancellor an opportunity to express his views about the service of that President. The Chancellor, in preparing for these periodic evaluation meetings, will depend upon ongoing communications with campus Councils, and with faculty, students, and other campus constituent groups, as required.

2. The Chancellor, or his designated representative, will meet at appropriate intervals with the Council on each State-operated campus to assess the health of that campus, to review SUNY-wide concerns, and to review the stewardship of the President. The following general guidelines shall be applicable:

   a) Plans for such a meeting shall be announced at least three weeks in advance, and those three weeks should be coincident with the College in session;

   b) Since the meeting is one at which the performance of an individual is to be discussed, the Council would be expected to move into an executive session;
c) The faculty observer who normally attends meetings of the campus Council shall be invited to the meeting by the Chancellor;

d) On campuses where there is a separate governance body for professional employees, the presiding officer of that body shall be invited by the Chancellor to attend the meeting. Where such body does not exist, a representative can be selected through local governance procedures;

e) If there is an alumni representative who normally attends Council meetings as an observer, that person should be present at such a meeting;

f) Presence of the representatives from alumni, faculty, and professional employees at the Council meeting is preferable. If there are unusual circumstances in which there are concerns about the ability to raise sensitive matters within the full Council session of the discussion, it may be possible for the Chancellor, or designee, to meet separately with one or more of the above representatives. Only the duly-selected representative from each constituency shall attend such a separate session, which shall be arranged in advance of the Chancellor's visit.

3. Whenever possible, the monthly meeting of the Board of Trustees should set aside a block of time for one or more Presidents to make presentations on campus activities, highlighting both accomplishments and problems. A rotational plan should be developed to give all Presidents such opportunities to appear periodically before the Board of Trustees.

4. In the judgment of the Chancellor, he will determine the timing of the above process for each campus, as well as the method of his personal involvement. This informal ongoing process would not preclude the involvement of an outside peer evaluation group, for example, if the Chancellor deemed that necessary.

5. The Chancellor will report periodically to the Trustees on the service of campus Presidents. Such reports may or may not coincide with his meetings with the President, the Council, or campus constituent groups. Such reports will be made by the Chancellor to the Trustees in complete confidence. The President will be informed by the Chancellor of the nature of the report, since its purpose would be to emphasize the strong points to be continued and to pinpoint problem areas that need attention. Subsequent to his confidential report to the Trustees and the ensuing interaction with the President, the Chancellor, either directly or through his designee, will share the major points of the evaluation with the Councils.

February 19, 1986