



BOARD OF REGENTS

SUMMARY OF ITEM FOR ACTION, INFORMATION OR DISCUSSION

TOPIC: Revisions to Policies VII-5.00 and VII-5-01

COMMITTEE: Committee on Organization and Compensation

DATE OF COMMITTEE MEETING: May 27, 2015

SUMMARY: Policy VII-5.00 addresses the process for the annual evaluation of USM presidents and the Chancellor. The attached revision updates the language in the policy and deletes a section that calls for a regular comprehensive strategic reassessment of the leadership and resources of the System. The USM conducts numerous comprehensive assessments and reports those regularly to the board. Those assessments include a review of accountability plans, reviews of Managing for Results (MFR), dashboard indicators, and effectiveness and efficiency activities. The USM also provides periodic reports on the strategic plan. This particular policy was developed in 1990 at the beginning of the formation of what was then the combined University of Maryland System. The intent may likely have been to assess how the two boards were working together to combine resources and utilize strengths of both board administrations.

Policy VII-5.01 addresses the 5-year review process for USM presidents. An initial 5-year review is extremely valuable since it is a way to assess a president's impact on an institution after 5 years, which is a reasonable time to expect any significant changes from a previous administration. The Board has not conducted subsequent 5-year reviews but should have the option to request one if either the Board or the Chancellor feel one is called for.

ALTERNATIVE(S): The Board can decide to explore such a reassessment as initially envisioned by the first Board of Regents in Policy VII-5.00. The Board can choose to develop other time frames for more comprehensive presidential reviews, in addition to the annual review and 5-year review, in Policy VII-5.01.

FISCAL IMPACT: Costs associated with a reassessment for Policy VII-5.00; costs associated with 5-year reviews.

CHANCELLOR'S RECOMMENDATION: Chancellor recommends revised policy.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

DATE: May 27, 2015

BOARD ACTION:

DATE:

SUBMITTED BY: Katie Ryan, Chancellor's Office, 301-445-1903

VII-5.01 - Board of Regents Policy on the Five-Year
Review of
USM Presidents
(Approved by the Board of Regents, April 16, 2004)

Definition and Purpose

The normal expectation is that presidents will serve for periods of at least five to six years following their initial appointments. It is appropriate, therefore, to conduct an in-depth review of presidents and the impact of their leadership after a period of roughly five years of service. This will enable the Board and the Chancellor to assess presidential performances over a more extended period of time than is possible with the ongoing annual performance reviews. The five-year review is expected to highlight major accomplishments, offer constructive suggestions as to areas where improvement in performance could occur, and provide guidance about the continuation of a president's service.

It is also important to occasionally conduct in-depth reviews of presidents who serve extended periods of time in order to insure that their leadership continues to move their institutions forward with vitality and vigor. At the request of the Chancellor and/or the Board of Regents, a President shall be scheduled for an in-depth review at no less than 5-year intervals following the initial 5-year review. Thus, the five-year review cycle should be an ongoing expectation for every president. When possible and practical, these reviews should be coordinated with the cycle of Middle States and/or other accrediting body reviews.

Areas for review/assessment

Presidential performance will be assessed in a number of areas including:

1. Institutional leadership
 - establishing a vision and mission for the institution
 - developing a strategic plan and direction
 - aligning the vision, mission, and planning with resource allocation;
2. Progress toward academic excellence as measured by student and faculty quality and accomplishments;
3. Soundness of fiscal management;
4. Success in non-state resource development,

- including external grants and contracts, and private gifts;
5. For those campuses with a major research mission, success of the research enterprise and its impact on economic development;
 6. Strength of external relations efforts (including public relations, marketing efforts, and government and private sector relations);
 7. Ability to develop strategic partnerships with other System institutions, higher education institutions outside the System, federal laboratories, state and local agencies, and the private sector;
 8. Commitment to serving the public good through well articulated state and community outreach and engagement efforts;
 9. Quality of student services (if appropriate);
 10. Commitment to shared governance;
 11. Ability to contribute as a constructive and collaborative member of the USM leadership; and
 12. Attention to the development of a high quality administrative and managerial infrastructure and an attractive, well maintained physical plant.

Process

The Chancellor shall appoint a review committee and charge it with evaluating the President's overall performance in the areas mentioned above. The committee will consist of no more than five members, who will be knowledgeable and experienced leaders, such as presidents of institutions with missions similar to that of the president under review. The President may suggest suitable members for the committee and will be asked to review the proposed committee; however, the final selection will be made by the Chancellor.

The deliberations and recommendations of the committee are strictly confidential and will proceed according to the following schedule:

1. A president under review completes a self-assessment, which includes the major accomplishments and the challenges faced during the period under review.
2. The self-assessment is shared with the committee members several weeks in advance of their site visit.
3. Before making a site visit, the committee members review the self-assessment and other key institutional documents, such as Middle States review documents, recent accreditation reports, strategic plans, as well

as representative information shared with alumni, donors, and other external groups.

4. At the beginning of the site visit, the committee meets with the Chancellor to receive its formal charge and then with the Vice Chancellors. The Committee visits the campus and meets with the institution's vice presidents, and the officers of constituent groups such as faculty, staff and student governance bodies, alumni, and affiliated foundation boards (this will differ from institution to institution). These meetings are expected to be strictly confidential and will take place in a conference room setting. The campus visit should be completed in a concentrated time frame of no more than three days.
5. The committee has an exit interview with the Chancellor.
6. The Committee prepares and submits its formal report within two weeks of the exit interview.
7. The Chancellor shares the report with the President, who is invited to respond in writing.
8. The Chancellor makes the review committee report and the President's response available to the Committee on Organization & Compensation, discusses the report with the Committee and then with the entire Board of Regents. The report remains confidential and becomes part of the president's personnel file.
9. The Chancellor meets with the President to discuss the review committee's reports, the Board's reaction to it, and the steps that need to be taken in response to the report.