

## **Policy 5.05 Chancellor and Presidents, Review and Assessment**

### **1 Scope and Purpose**

The Board of Trustees fulfills one of its most important responsibilities in appointing a Chancellor or a President, and that responsibility implies an equally important one: to review and assess their performance in office. Within the City University, the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the Presidents and the University Faculty Senate have all expressed the view that a policy of executive evaluation is desirable. The following guidelines have been prepared to facilitate the careful exercise of the Board's responsibility for evaluation and to assist the Chancellor and the Presidents to become more effective as chief executive officers. The evaluations also serve other functions. They provide a mechanism for publicly demonstrating the University's concern about the quality of its constituent colleges, and its desire for accountability of its chief administrative officers. The evaluations also allow the University a formal opportunity to clarify its own sense of mission and to communicate that mission more effectively to the colleges and to the community-at-large.

### **2 Principles**

In developing the specific criteria and procedures to be used in the evaluation of executive administrators, the following general principles have been taken into account.

The evaluation should, for the most part, take place in an institutional context, that is, based on an understanding of the institution's background, resources, priorities, and significant problems. It is for this reason that the evaluation of the Presidents should be scheduled no more than five years after the date of initial appointment and no more than every five years thereafter. The evaluation of the Chancellor should be scheduled five years after the date of initial appointment and every five years thereafter. In any case, the evaluations should be preceded by a self-assessment of the Chancellor's or the Presidents' services as chief administrative officers.

Although in general the periodic evaluation of the Presidents will be scheduled with a frequency of no more than every five years, it is expected and understood that circumstances may occasion the Board, on the recommendation of the Chancellor, to conduct an ad hoc evaluation of a President's executive performance. In such cases the same general procedures will be followed as that specified for the periodic evaluations.

Similarly, the Board, as the occasion may warrant, may schedule an ad hoc review of the Chancellor.

Evaluation of either the Presidents or the Chancellor may include an assessment by administrative and educational peers to assure an appreciation of achievements in meeting policy and management requirements.

In order to maintain a constructive and candid atmosphere, the basic principle of confidentiality must be observed.

### **3 The Presidents**

The Chancellor, as the University's chief executive officer, and the Board, as the University's policy-making body, have the responsibility to review the performance and effectiveness of the Presidents. These evaluations should normally be carried out through systematic, periodic, and well-defined procedures.

Each President, in consultation with the Chancellor, at the beginning of his or her term of office and at no more than five-year intervals thereafter, should establish his or her own performance goals and objectives. These should be consistent with the policies and regulations of the Board (particularly section 11.4 of the Bylaws) and with the educational mission of the institution. When the Board, the Chancellor and the President agree on the performance goals and the institutional mission, the necessary foundation for a sound and professional evaluation has been established. The Chancellor and the President should review the statement at the end of the second year, and bring it up-to-date.

The President to be evaluated should prepare a statement of his/her stewardship in office for submission to the Chancellor. This statement will note both the progress and the problems in fulfilling the stated objectives, as well as the President's proposed performance goals and objectives for the period until the President's next evaluation.

The report should cover the period since the President's last evaluation or date of hire, whichever is most recent, and may add any special factors or circumstances important to insure a more valid and objective review and assessment of performance in office.

### **4 Criteria**

The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees charge each President with "the affirmative responsibility of conserving and enhancing the educational standards and general academic excellence of the college under his/her jurisdiction. . . ." and with wide discretionary powers in acting as the "executive agent of the Chancellor" at his or her respective campus. The following major areas should be included in the evaluation.

#### 4.1 Academic Leadership

The President must understand and be committed to the educational needs of his/her college, and have the ability to articulate and to meet these needs at all levels. The essential criteria of affirmative educational leadership are how well the President is able to recruit, to develop, and to maintain a qualified and distinguished faculty, to advance programs and curricula of high quality, to effectively and creatively use instructional resources to support these programs, and to support the principles of academic freedom. Academic leadership also includes the encouragement of research, scholarship, and creative activity, and each President is expected to demonstrate that encouragement by providing appropriate resources for its conduct.

#### 4.2 Administrative Leadership

The quality of a college depends to a great extent upon how well the President meets his or her administrative responsibilities. Measures of a President's effectiveness include how well he or she is able to maintain an effective administrative team, to develop sound and

responsive management practices, to develop and carry out an effective affirmative action program, to designate the appropriate use of fiscal resources, to coordinate the advancement of campus construction programs, where relevant, and to maintain ongoing programs of planning, evaluation and review.

#### 4.3 The President's Relationship with the College Community

As the educational leader, the President is responsible for defining and communicating his or her sense of the college's mission and its priorities to the college community. The President's effectiveness on this dimension can be gauged, in large measure, by his or her relationship with various internal constituencies, the faculty-at-large, elected faculty representatives (such as chairpersons, University Faculty Senators, members of College Council), the student body, and the staff.

#### 4.4 The President's Role Outside the College

The President bears a major responsibility for interpreting and communicating the mission of the college and its policies to a variety of constituencies external to his own institution. These groups include the Board of Trustees whose members serve as trustees for the University and its constituent colleges, the Chancellor's office, governmental agencies, and the communities served by the college and professional associations concerned with higher learning.

### **5 The Annual Evaluation**

Each year, along with his or her campus's Performance Management Process ("PMP") report, each President will submit a letter detailing his or her campus's noteworthy events and achievements during the past year; ongoing challenges and strategies for meeting them, as informed by PMP data; and his or her campus's particular role in the collaborative, integrated university. These materials, and additional campus-specific data, will be assessed by the PMP Review Committee. The Chancellor will then review all this information with the President in the President's annual evaluation meeting with the Chancellor, and the content of the meeting will be summarized in the annual evaluation letter from the Chancellor to the President.

### **6 Additional Campus Input**

Every three to five years, with the interval chosen at the discretion of the Chancellor, input from campus individuals will be sought concerning a President's performance. Information will be collected anonymously by the Office of the Chancellor from standing or ad hoc campus committees for evaluation of administrators, leaders of faculty and student governance bodies, University Faculty Senate delegations, faculty chairs of college committees and departments, and other faculty, staff and students. After a summary has been prepared, the President will have the opportunity to read, review and comment upon it prior to its submission to the Chancellor. The Chancellor will consider the summary and any response along with the annual evaluation information for that President for that year.

### **7 Constitution of the Evaluation Committee**

At his or her discretion, the Chancellor of the University may appoint a select evaluation team composed of the following three members:

- a) At least one president from outside the University chosen by the Chancellor in consultation with the President.
- b) Two distinguished educators chosen by the Chancellor in consultation with the President from within the professional or academic community.

Should a select evaluation team be appointed, the Chancellor will also appoint a person from his/her staff to serve as a non-voting coordinating officer among the committee, the President, and the Chancellor's office during the evaluation process.

The select evaluation team will be chaired by a person appointed by the Chancellor from among the three members of the team. The chairman will have the responsibility for writing the final summary report.

In general, it will be the responsibility of the select evaluation team to develop the procedures for conducting the evaluation and to structure its evaluation around the principles and criteria outlined above.

It is particularly important that the select evaluation team get a broadly representative view of the President's performance by obtaining input from the various constituencies within the institution. To this end the team will be expected to make use of existing resources within the institution such as standing or ad hoc committees for evaluation of administrators, leaders of faculty and student governance bodies, University Faculty Senate delegations, faculty chairs of college committees and departments, and other faculty, staff and students, as well as making use of the data and survey results ordinarily collected as part of a presidential evaluation.

When the final report has been prepared, the President will have the opportunity to read, review and comment upon the report prior to its submission to the Chancellor.

The Chancellor will review the written report of the evaluation team and submit it with the response received from the President, along with his/her own recommendations, to the Board of Trustees.

## **8 The Chancellor**

The Chancellor serves an indefinite period at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees, which has both the authority and responsibility for evaluating his performance in office. In order for the Board to carry out its obligation to review its chief executive officer, it should have a systematic, periodic and well-defined procedure on which to rely for data and information in support of this review.

The evaluation of the Chancellor should be scheduled approximately five years after the beginning of his or her appointment and every five years thereafter.

The Chancellor, in consultation with the Board, should establish his or her own performance goals and objectives at the beginning of his or her term of office and every five years thereafter. These should be consistent with the policies of the Board and consistent with the educational mission of the University (particularly section 11.2 of the Bylaws). The Chancellor's evaluation will, in part, be based upon the extent to which he or she meets the agreed upon performance goals. The Board and Chancellor will review these goals at the end of the second year, to bring it up-to-date.

The Chancellor will prepare a self-assessment, to be submitted to the evaluation committee approximately one month prior to the first meeting of the evaluation team. The self-assessment will include a review of his or her tenure in office, the performance goals he or she has established, and the progress and problems he or she has had in fulfilling these stated objectives.

## **9 Criteria**

Under the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor is charged with providing educational leadership for the City University. With so broad a mandate, and in an institution as large and dynamic as the City University, the Office of the Chancellor has become an extraordinarily complex and sensitive one.

The criteria enumerated below are meant to serve as a guide for suggesting areas likely to indicate his or her effectiveness as an educational leader.

### **9.1 Academic Leadership**

As the chief source of educational opportunity for the citizens of New York City, the City University must provide the full spectrum of educational activity within a complex urban environment. For this reason, it is critical that the Chancellor have a broad and deep understanding of contemporary higher education and a commitment to the City University's policies of open access and quality education. The essential criterion of affirmative educational leadership is the ability of the Chancellor to support the recruitment and promotion of a distinguished faculty, to advance programs of high quality and to support the effective and creative use of instructional resources.

### **9.2 The Chancellor's Relationship with the Board of Trustees**

The principal group to which the Chancellor is responsible is the Board of Trustees, whose members are the trustees of the University and representatives of the public-at-large. Of prime importance in this relationship is the Chancellor's ability to develop policy alternatives for the Board in educational and fiscal matters that are the Board's responsibility, and to adequately inform the Board of the state of the institution.

### **9.3 The Chancellor's Role in the University**

As the educational leader of the University, whose philosophy must be consonant with its mission, the Chancellor bears the major responsibility for communicating this sense of mission and its priorities to the University community. A measure of his or her effectiveness is evidenced by how he or she is viewed by University-wide constituencies such as the Council of Presidents, the University Faculty Senate, and the University Student Senate, among others.

### **9.4 The Chancellor's Role Outside the University**

As with his or her internal constituencies, the Chancellor bears an equal responsibility to interpret the University to a variety of external constituencies. These include educational organizations, governmental agencies and elected officials, civic groups and associations and the community-at-large.

## 9.5      Administrative Leadership

The quality of the University depends, to a great extent, upon how well the Chancellor meets his or her administrative responsibilities. A critical measure of the Chancellor's effectiveness includes his or her ability to maintain an effective administrative team, to develop sound and responsive management practices, to develop and carry out an effective affirmative action program, to designate the appropriate use of fiscal resources, and to maintain ongoing programs of planning, evaluation and review.

## 9.6      Institutional Quality

The Chancellor must exercise his or her responsibilities to preserve and advance institutional quality. He or she must assure the maintenance of the quality of the faculty throughout the University, insure the quality of the curricula from the associate degree through the doctoral levels, advance the integrity and equity of academic personnel practices in regard to recruitment, appointment, promotion and tenure, and be sensitive to the issues of academic freedom.

# **10**      **Constitution of the Evaluation Committee**

The Board of Trustees will appoint a select evaluation committee composed of the following three members:

- a)            One peer at the Chancellor's level to be chosen in consultation with the Chancellor, from urban, multi-campus universities;
- b)            Two distinguished, nationally known educators, to be selected by the Board in consultation with the Chancellor from among the learned and professional societies.

The Secretary of the Board shall serve as a non-voting staff member who will act as liaison officer between the committee and the Board.

The select evaluation committee will be chaired by a person appointed by the Board from among the three members of the team. The chairman will have responsibility for writing the final summary report.

It will be the responsibility of the select evaluation committee to develop the procedures for conducting the evaluation and to structure its evaluation around the principles and criteria outlined above. It is important that the committee get a broadly representative view of the Chancellor's performance from the perspective of various constituencies within the University. To that end the Committee will be expected to make use of such resources as the Vice-Chancellors and other top University administrators, the Council of Presidents, the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate, and the Executive Committee of the University Student Senate.

When the final report has been prepared, the Chancellor will have the opportunity to read, review, and comment upon it prior to its formal submission to the Board.

## **11 Conclusion**

The intent of these guidelines is to reaffirm the University's responsibilities for providing the finest possible education to all citizens of New York City. While these guidelines reflect the best experience and practice currently operative in institutions in higher education, they were developed to meet the special needs of the City University. On condition that all parties in the evaluation process proceed in a dignified, confidential and professional manner, the guidelines will insure a valid and objective review of performance in office. The implementation of the guidelines will have the additional advantage of reaffirming the responsibility of the Board of Trustees to fulfill its public trust by a periodic review and assessment of the performance and achievements of its highest academic office-holders.

(Board of Trustees Minutes,2007,11-26,5,E. Amended: Chancellor's University Report,2015,10-01,Errata)