

**VII-5.01 – POLICY ON THE MULTI-YEAR REVIEW OF USM PRESIDENTS**

(Approved by the Board of Regents, April 16, 2004; Amended on June 19, 2015; Amended on October 9, 2015; Amended on April 21, 2017; Amended on June 19, 2020.)

**I. PURPOSE OF REVIEWS**

**A. Initial Multi-Year Reviews**

Nationally, the average tenure for a university president is five (5) to six (6) years following their initial appointments. It is appropriate, therefore, for the Chancellor and Board of Regents to conduct an in-depth review of Presidents and the impact of their leadership after three (3) years of service, with the option of extending to five (5) years of service with Board approval. Such review will enable the Board and the Chancellor to assess presidential performances over a more extended period of time than is possible with annual performance reviews. The multi-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.

B. It is also important to occasionally conduct in-depth reviews of Presidents who serve extended periods of time in order to ensure 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 three (3)-year intervals following the initial multi-year review. When possible and practical, these reviews should be coordinated with the cycle of Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) and/or other accrediting body reviews.

**II. AREAS FOR REVIEW/ASSESSMENT**

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

**A. Institutional leadership:**

1. Establishing a vision and mission for the Institution;
2. Developing a strategic plan and direction; and
3. Aligning the vision, mission, and planning with resource allocation;

**B. Progress toward academic excellence as measured by student and faculty quality and accomplishments;**

**C. Soundness of fiscal management;**

## **USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents**

---

- D. Success in non-state resource development, including external grants and contracts, and private gifts;
- E. For those campuses with a major research mission, success of the research enterprise and its impact on economic development;
- F. Strength of external relations efforts (including public relations, marketing efforts, and government and private sector relations);
- G. 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;
- H. Commitment to serving the public good through well articulated state and community outreach and engagement efforts;
- I. Quality of student services, including the student experience (if appropriate);
- J. Commitment to shared governance;
- K. Ability to contribute as a constructive and collaborative member of the University System of Maryland (USM) leadership; and
- L. Attention to the development of a high quality administrative and managerial infrastructure and an attractive, well maintained physical plant.

### **III. REVIEW COMMITTEE**

- A. The Chancellor shall appoint an external review team and charge it with evaluating the President's overall performance in the areas mentioned above.
  - 1. The team will be knowledgeable and experienced leaders or consultants, such as individuals that have experience with institutions with missions similar to that of the President under review.
  - 2. The President may suggest suitable members for the committee and will be asked to review the proposed team; however, the final selection will be made by the Chancellor.
- B. Review Schedule

The deliberations and recommendations of the team 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.

## **USM Bylaws, Policies and Procedures of the Board of Regents**

---

2. The self-assessment is shared with the team members several weeks in advance of their site visit.
3. Before conducting a site visit, the team 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. In advance or at the beginning of the site visit, the team meets with the Chancellor to receive its formal charge and then meets with USM Administrative Office Vice Chancellors.
5. The team visits the campus and meets with the Institution's Provost, Vice Presidents, Academic Deans, 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.
6. The team will also solicit written input from the Institution's community. Anonymous comments will not be accepted.
7. The team has an exit interview with the Chancellor.
8. The team prepares and submits its formal report to the Chancellor within two (2) weeks of the exit interview.
9. The Chancellor shares the report with the President, who is invited to respond in writing within ten days of receiving the report.
10. The Chancellor makes the review team report and the President's response available to the Committee on Governance & Compensation, discusses the report with the Committee and then the entire Board of Regents. The report remains confidential and becomes part of the President's personnel file.
11. The Chancellor meets with the President to discuss the review team's reports, the Board's reaction to it, and the steps that need to be taken in a response to the report.