

## **Process for the Evaluation of Chancellors**

**October 26, 2018**

This process has been formulated through a series of iterations from the Rutgers University Senate and the president of the University, and applies to the chancellors of Rutgers University–New Brunswick, Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences, Rutgers University–Newark, and Rutgers University–Camden.

1. Each chancellor shall normally be evaluated by their faculty, staff, and students every five years, but under extraordinary circumstances the University Senate, following substantive input to the Executive Committee from unit faculty or students, may request that the president consider conducting an out-of-cycle evaluation at any time. An out-of-cycle evaluation may only be requested once between any two consecutive five-year evaluations.
2. The initial evaluation for newly appointed chancellors should not be earlier than the fifth year of service.
3. The president will write to the unit faculty and the chancellor to initiate the process. This communication will emphasize that this evaluation of the chancellor is not a personnel evaluation, in the sense that it is not to be used as the basis for a personnel action (e.g., reappointment or non-reappointment). Rather, it is an opportunity to look, on a five-year timetable, at where we are in the chancellor’s vision for the unit, to provide a balanced and constructive view of the individual’s chancellorship, and to make observations about where improvements could be made, noting things that work well and suggesting ways that some things might work better.
4. The University Senate will be informed by the president in case of major delays or irregularities. Ideally, the evaluation will be completed in a single semester.
5. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA) will initiate the process of organizing an ad hoc Chancellor Evaluation Committee (“CEC”), the majority of which must be faculty members,<sup>1</sup> to oversee the accumulation of feedback for the chancellor’s evaluation. The committee, to be selected by the president, will be constituted in the following manner:
  - a. The Executive Committee of the University Senate will provide a slate of four faculty nominations from the chancellor’s academic units, from which one individual will be selected.
  - b. The unit Faculty Council (or other appropriately representative unit faculty body) will provide a slate of four faculty nominations from the chancellor’s academic units, from which one individual will be selected.

---

<sup>1</sup> Full-time faculty members with three or more years of service at Rutgers, who (with the exception of RBHS) are tenured, and who do not hold administrative appointments other than department chairs, graduate directors, or undergraduate directors.

- c. The deans of the chancellor's academic units will provide a slate of 10 faculty nominations, from which five individuals will be selected. The relevant Provost(s) will oversee this nomination process to ensure that the resulting nominees are representative of the chancellor's academic units.
  - d. Up to two members of the University administration may be appointed to the CEC.
6. Once fully appointed by the president, the CEC will have an initial meeting with the SVPAA, where they receive their charge and elect a CEC chair.
7. The CEC, in consultation with the SVPAA, will decide on whether to include in its membership representatives from among the staff, students, alumni, or other constituencies (from inside or outside the unit, or even the University) with whom the chancellor may have had substantial contact. In so doing, the CEC must ensure that the majority of its members are faculty members. The CEC will also decide on the manner of choosing such members. In the case of student membership, the student representative(s) should be chosen from among the officers of an appropriate student governing association. The full CEC should not exceed 12 members.
8. The president will ask the chancellor to submit to the CEC, within a reasonable timeframe, a statement detailing responsibilities and accomplishments that will include objective measures as well as the chancellor's vision and strategic plan for the academic units. A formal job description, if it exists, will also be forwarded to the CEC by the chancellor. The chancellor's statement may be made available to those providing feedback.
9. The CEC will then meet and formulate a plan for the review with advisory input from the chancellor, the SVPAA and the president. In so doing, the committee shall enjoy significant latitude, but will need to ensure that meaningful faculty (including PTLs and non-tenure-track faculty), student, and staff input is received during the evaluation process, and that the process provides for anonymity of respondents. Furthermore, in addition to any unit-specific questions or criteria, the CEC will include in the review process evaluations of the chancellor in the following areas:
  - Quality of relationship with, and care for, students
  - Quality of collegial relationship between the chancellor and the faculty
  - Performance of strategic and financial management of the unit's resources
  - Fundraising
  - Overall performance
10. Several surveys should be formulated by the CEC. Provision should be made for narrative comments as well as a series of multiple-choice evaluations. The multiple-choice evaluations will include the performance areas listed above plus any specific additions from the chancellor's faculty.
  - a. The CEC should direct different surveys to several groups: faculty in general, administrative and non-administrative staff, department chairs, deans, fund raising professionals, students, etc. Sample surveys are maintained by the Center for

Teaching Advancement and Assessment Research (“CTAAR”) and will be made available to the CEC for consideration. The addition of unit-specific questions should be considered by the CEC. The committee should make every effort to avoid bias in the formulation of the questions. The structure and content of the chancellor evaluation surveys will be reviewed and approved by the president in advance of distribution.

Analysis of the data will be programmed so that means and other statistics will be standard outputs, along with anonymous listing of the narrative comments. This summary of respondents’ input is all that will be made available to those having access to survey results. The system must provide privacy assurances for the faculty, staff, students, and other respondents. Use of an electronic survey is recommended, and non-electronic copies of the survey instruments will be provided to faculty, students, or staff who do not wish to participate in the electronic version. The CEC will need to determine how to protect the confidentiality of those respondents and how to ensure that their views are included in the overall evaluation. Response rates for the survey by type of respondent (tenured and tenure-track faculty, other faculty, student, administrative and non-administrative staff, other) should be reported along with the survey results.

The CEC may wish to collect additional data, such as:

- Respondent’s familiarity with chancellor’s performance in position
- Quality of faculty and program development
- Fairness and ethics
- Leadership
- Communication
- Functional competence
- Commitment to diversity
- Interpersonal skills

b. The surveys will be administered by CTAAR, which will also tabulate the numerical results and provide a transcript of the written comments. Nevertheless, evaluating the data and formulating the report is the task of the CEC and should not be delegated to the staff of CTAAR. Committee members analyzing the survey data should consider the response rates and distribution of responses when interpreting survey results.

c. The CEC or a subset of the committee will write a summary of the written comments (if any) and will correlate them with the numerical results.

11. A thorough evaluation process should be carried out by the CEC. In addition to the information provided by surveys, the CEC may consider other methods of soliciting input. These could include, but are not limited to, discussions summarized in narrative form (similar to departmental narratives used in faculty personnel decisions), letters and communications from individuals commenting on the chancellor’s performance, and results of interviews or focus group discussions, as long as anonymity of the individuals

responding can be preserved if desired by those respondents. CECs are encouraged to use qualitative as well as quantitative data in the evaluation process. The SVPAA may provide some secretarial support to the CEC, if needed.

12. The CEC will generate a confidential report of the information gathered through the evaluation process. The report of the CEC will be sent to the chancellor, along with a request for a written response to the CEC. Following receipt of the chancellor's reply, the CEC will consider modifications of the original evaluation report, particularly in cases where the chancellor has pointed out to the committee errors of fact or interpretation. The CEC will append the response of the chancellor to its final report, and the CEC chair should directly distribute one copy each to the president, the SVPAA, the chancellor, and the chair of the University Senate. The results will be confidential and those with access to the results will respect that confidentiality.
13. The CEC also will prepare a non-confidential summary of the findings of the evaluation, which will serve as feedback to the unit faculty, and at the CEC's discretion, to others who participated in the review. It may include contents from the chancellor's response to the evaluation report, and should include some quantitative summary information from the surveys. The chancellor will have an opportunity to review and comment on the non-confidential summary in advance and the SVPAA will both review and approve the summary before it is distributed.
14. The president will meet with the chancellor to discuss the evaluation and any changes in unit policy, strategic direction, or mode of operation stemming from the findings and recommendations of the review. They will also discuss the most appropriate way of informing the unit of any outcomes resulting from the evaluation.