



Guidelines for Stewardship Review of UC Chancellors¹

The Academic Senate will participate in the UC president's periodic review of the campuses by providing the president with a faculty appraisal of the chancellor's leadership. This review will occur between the fourth and fifth anniversaries of the chancellor's appointment² and approximately every five years thereafter. Earlier reviews may be undertaken at the president's discretion. No review will occur if the chancellor has informed the president of the intent to step down within 12 months of the chancellor's anniversary date.

Phase 1: Initiating the Review Process

The Academic Senate recommends that the chancellor submit a report describing major accomplishments, the current state of the campus, and aspirations for the campus. This report will be made available to all Academic Senate members on the campus.

The Academic Council chair will appoint five members of the Academic Senate to form a Chancellor Review Committee (CRC) tasked with preparing a report to the president. Three committee members will be from the divisional Senate of the campus whose chancellor is under review, nominated by the divisional Committee on Committees and appointed by the Council chair. The remaining two members, one of whom will serve as the CRC chair, must be Senate members from two other campuses. These two faculty will be chosen by the Council chair from a list of nominations provided by the University Committee on Committees. The chancellor under review will be invited to submit to the president a list of individuals whose impartiality they believe to be in doubt. The president will inform the Council chair of any such concerns. The CRC membership will be known only to the president, Council chair and vice chair (see Phase 3), and systemwide Academic Senate staff coordinating the review process, unless the Senate division requests the CRC to conduct interviews (see Phase 2).

The CRC will assess the chancellor's leadership based on evidence including:

1. Letters solicited from all Academic Senate members on the campus where the chancellor is under review.
2. Letters specifically solicited from campus Senate members who have been active in divisional affairs, including current and past Senate division chairs, and who are recommended by the campus Committee on Committees, Executive Council, or by some other mechanism as determined at the campus level.
3. A letter/statement from the current division chair reflecting opinions of all division chairs who served during the period under review.
4. Optional: Confidential interviews with members of the divisional Senate identified by the division.

¹ The Academic Council endorsed a revised version of these guidelines on June 7, 2000, and subsequently endorsed further amended versions on April 30, 2009; July 8, 2009; July 27, 2011; and May 22, 2024.

² Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 200-17 defines the date of appointment as "the first day on which the payment begins for appointments."

Phase 1 Action Items

Chancellor: Prepares report on major accomplishments, current state of the campus, and future aspirations for the campus.

Academic Senate Division:

1. Nominates Senate faculty for the CRC: The divisional Committee on Committees recommends to the Council chair a panel of division members willing to serve, from which the Council chair will select three to appoint to the CRC.
2. Identifies select Senate members for comment: The division identifies Senate members active in divisional affairs during the chancellor's review term to provide feedback in the form of a group report or individual letters. These groups or individuals may be chosen through recommendations from the Committee on Committees, Executive Council, or in whatever manner the division deems appropriate, and should not overlap with the panel of CRC nominees.

Systemwide Academic Senate:

1. Nominates Senate faculty for the CRC: The University Committee on Committees recommends to the Council chair a panel of Senate members willing to serve who are from campus divisions other than the one under review. The Council chair will select two to appoint to the CRC, one of whom will be asked to serve as CRC chair.
2. Confirms CRC members: The Council chair finalizes the five-member Chancellor Review Committee and sends appointment letters detailing the service responsibilities and timeline.

Phase 2: Soliciting Comments for the Review

The president and the Senate division chair will, by letter and as early in the process as possible, request an appraisal of the chancellor by Academic Senate members on the campus, and include the attached Criteria to Guide Chancellor Review Committees. The request will assure respondents of the confidentiality of their letters, but also explain that the chancellor may request copies of letters upon which the review is based. If the chancellor requests copies, the letters will be redacted to remove identifying information such as the sender's email address, letterhead, and signature block, but the text of the letters will not be revised to remove identifying information therein.

All groups identified by the campus, as described in Phase 1, shall meet to discuss the chancellor's academic leadership, with each group preparing a summary report for the CRC.

The campus executive committee may suggest the CRC conduct interviews on the campus to gather additional information on the chancellor's effectiveness. These interviews might be with knowledgeable faculty such as the division chairs who served during the review period, and other faculty as identified by a selection process determined by the Senate division. Since conducting campus interviews would require that the CRC members be identified, nominees for the review committee should be informed of this when asked to serve.

Phase 2 Action Items

Academic Senate Division:

1. Solicits comment from division members: The division chair sends a letter by email to all division members inviting comment on the chancellor's stewardship of the campus during the review period. A letter from the president provided by the systemwide Senate making this same request accompanies the division chair's transmittal.
2. Compiles comments from select Senate members: The division gathers summary reports or individual letters from identified Senate members active in divisional affairs during the chancellor's review term.
3. Prepares division chairs' comments: The current and former division chairs who served during the chancellor's review term prepare a letter/statement reflecting their views on the chancellor's stewardship, delivered under the current division chair's signature.
4. Decides on CRC interviews: The division determines if the CRC should conduct face-to-face interviews with faculty from the division to provide additional information on the chancellor's effectiveness.

Phase 3: Preparing the Report from the Chancellor Review Committee (CRC)

The CRC will prepare a confidential report for the president based on the solicited materials and interviews, if conducted, with the groups noted above. The committee will receive copies of all materials, including those identifying the active Senate members from whom letters were requested, and information about the campus's academic structure and faculty distribution within that structure. At the Council chair's discretion, basic information about the campus that is available to the public (e.g., from the campus website) may be included. The purpose of the CRC report is to facilitate discussions between the president and the chancellor, highlighting strengths, areas for improvement, and any areas needing further examination. The report will not serve as an up-or-down judgment on the chancellor's service. The final report, submitted by the CRC chair, will include a cover letter signed by all CRC members.

Phase 3 Action Items

Systemwide Academic Senate: Compiles review materials and delivers to the CRC. Arranges for the CRC's meetings to discuss all the information received.

Chancellor Review Committee: Meets in person by default (or virtually) for 1-2 days and continues work as needed to draft and finalize their report. The CRC chair delivers a final report to the Council chair.

Phase 4: Discussing the Review Outcomes

The Academic Council chair and vice chair are to ensure that the review process adheres to the Senate guidelines and the CRC report reflects the evidence before it. If either the Council chair or vice chair is from the same campus as the chancellor under review, they will recuse themselves except for submitting a letter to their Senate division or participating in interviews, as described in Phase 1. If the Council chair must recuse himself or herself, the Council vice chair will serve in place of the chair in all processes noted below.

The Council chair and vice chair will receive a copy of the CRC report and all the received letters, along with information about whether the CRC conducted interviews. They will review the report and certify to the president its consistency with the letters and whether interviews provided additional insights.

After reviewing these materials, the president will meet confidentially with the CRC chair and the Council chair to review the report. The president will then meet privately with the Senate division chair to discuss their assessment of the chancellor's performance, with the division chair having access to the CRC report beforehand.

Following these consultations, the president will meet privately with the chancellor, who will receive a copy of the CRC report for review. Finally, the Council chair will meet privately with the chancellor.

Upon completion of these meetings, the Council chair will inform the Senate division chair that the review has been completed. All documents will be confidentially filed with the systemwide Academic Senate office until the next review of the same chancellor, after which time they will be deleted.

Phase 4 Action Items

Systemwide Academic Senate: The Academic Council chair and vice chair certify the CRC report and send it to president. Following the three meetings involving the president (see below), the Council chair informs the Senate division chair that the review has been completed.

President:

1. Meets with the CRC chair and Academic Council chair.
2. Meets with the Senate division chair.
3. Meets with the chancellor to discuss the review outcomes.



Criteria to Guide Chancellor Review Committees

The following criteria provide a general framework for assessing a chancellor's performance across four main categories. While not exhaustive or limiting, they are intended to guide the stewardship review.

Leadership Ability

- Creativity and originality of intellectual, academic, and administrative ideas
- Clarity in formulating and articulating institutional goals and academic standards
- Resourcefulness in gaining support and acceptance of innovative plans to develop the campus to levels of still higher academic excellence
- Ability to motivate and to inspire confidence, trust, and respect among faculty, students, staff, and the community

Decision-Making Ability

- Originality and creativeness of own ideas
- Openness and receptivity to new ideas from diverse constituencies
- Ability to search campus and its environment for innovative opportunities to initiate necessary improvements
- Skill by which essential data are gathered and evaluated to make relevant, high-quality decisions
- Ability to mobilize and allocate resources in conformance with academic and administrative plans
- Effectiveness in designing and scheduling short-term and long-term plans

Administrative & Managerial Skills

- Ability to translate goals and plans into operational programs that produce desired outcomes
- Ability to recruit, select, and retain effective administrators
- Ability to supervise effectively and to inspire managerial staff
- Ability to evaluate performance of administrators and constructively develop their potential and provide for their training
- Fairness and justice in administration
- Openness of communication; ability to seek and receive a wide variety of information to understand the campus and its environment
- Diagnostic ability in problem-solving; ability to analyze important, unexpected problems and take appropriate corrective action
- Flexibility and adaptability in changing environments while pursuing fundamental institutional goals

Representational Ability

- National and international recognition as academic leader and ability to stand as symbolic head of the campus
- Knowledge of campus in all its components
- Sensitivity to and awareness of campus and community attitudes and needs
- Ability in developing network of internal and external contacts to serve as information nerve center for the campus
- Ability to represent the campus effectively in major negotiations
- Ability to generate support among external constituencies