

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

March 17, 2017

Dear Colleagues,

Yesterday, the Senate received the attached memo from the Chancellor, along with supporting materials, regarding the five-year leadership development assessment of Provost and EVC Tom Peterson. The memo outlines the purpose of and schedule for the review.

In addition, and for your information rather than anything else, the Chancellor included both the policy regarding senior management assessments, and the policy for the review of Deans and Vice Provosts, also attached. The primary distinction is that the review of deans is based on [APM 240-80 \(b\)](#); the SMG assessment process is guided by [Regents Policy](#). The assessment of the Provost is not directly tied to reappointment in the way that of deans is. As you will see, the SMG review committee has a faculty co-chair, a former Chair of the Division. It also has a faculty representative from each school, chosen by CoC. The membership of that committee is confidential.

In the next week or so, you will receive a communication from the Review Committee inviting comments on the Provost's leadership. I urge you to respond to that request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Susan Amussen". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Susan Amussen, Chair
Merced Division of the Academic Senate

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
TEL: (209) 228-4417
FAX: (209) 228-4423

March 16, 2017

TO: UC MERCED DIVISION COUNCIL OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: 5 Year Senior Management Review — Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Tom Peterson

Dear Division Leadership,

I would like to inform the Academic Senate membership that the five-year leadership development assessment for Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Tom Peterson as required by Regents Policy 7702 (<http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/policies/7702.pdf>) has commenced. The purpose of this confidential assessment is to provide the Senior Management Group (SMG) member with performance feedback from a broader perspective than is usual with an annual performance evaluation. The SMG 5-year review differs from the 5-year review for Deans and Vice Provosts. The guidelines governing both processes are attached for your information.

The target date for completion of this SMG review is May 15, 2017. The proposed timeline is included below but is subject to change. I have asked that the review committee be led by two co-chairs, one past Senate Chair and one senior non-academic administrator. In a cautious attempt to remain as unbiased as possible as the ultimate reviewer of the report, I have also asked that the members serving on this confidential review committee remain anonymous to me.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please let me know.

TIMELINE FOR PROVOST PETERSON REVIEW:

Action	Initiated By	Due Date
Advise SMG member under assessment that the assessment is to be undertaken; request self-evaluation and list of suggested reviewers and constituencies (3 internal and 3 external letters)	Chancellor	Feb 6, 2017
Apprise Senate that assessment is initiated	Chancellor	Feb 6, 2017

Request from the Academic Senate suggested faculty for Review Committee (one member from each Divisional Executive Committee to serve on committee)	Chancellor	Feb 6, 2017
Request from the Staff Assembly suggested staff for Review Committee (one staff selected to serve on committee from slate of three)	Chancellor	Feb 6, 2017
Appoint and charge the review committee co-chairs and members	Chancellor	Feb 20, 2017
Convene the review committee	Co-Chairs	March 6, 2017
Solicit written input for the review committee	Chancellor	March 20, 2017
Prepare report for the Chancellor and/or P/EVC	Review Committee	April 20, 2017
Meet with review committee regarding the outcome of the assessment	Chancellor	May 1, 2017
Provide SMG Coordinator with a redacted copy of the report	Chancellor	May 15, 2017

Best,



Chancellor Dorothy Leland

- cc: Susan Amussen, Senate Chair
- cc: Kurt Schnier, Senate Vice Chair
- cc: Laura Martin, Executive Director
- cc: Luanna Putney, Associate Chancellor and Senior Advisor to the Chancellor
- cc: Leticia Aldama, SMG Coordinator

**University of California, Merced
Five-Year Senior Leadership Development Assessment
for Members of the Senior Management Group**

ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

As of April 2016, the Chancellor, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (P/EVC), Vice Chancellors, University Librarian, Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, and Campus Counsel are designated members of the UC Merced Senior Management Group (SMG). The Chancellor serves at the pleasure of the UC President, and other SMG members serve at the pleasure of the Chancellor and/or the P/EVC. In the spirit of maximum administrative effectiveness, understanding our weaknesses, and efficiently accomplishing our goals, a comprehensive leadership development assessment of each SMG administrator will be conducted (1) no later than the fifth year of service in the SMG position and (2) at five-year intervals thereafter, or earlier at the Chancellor's and P/EVC's discretion.

Five year assessments will be conducted under the general direction of the Chancellor or the P/EVC, acting on behalf of the Chancellor. The purpose of this assessment is to provide the SMG member with feedback from a broader perspective than is usual provided in an annual performance evaluation. This is a managerial, coaching, and development exercise, rather than an evaluation of achievement toward specific goals.

The five-year assessment does not replace the annual performance review.

Policy Reference: SMG Performance Management Review Process

(http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/employees/policies_employee_labor_relations/personnel_policies/smg_505_process_policy.pdf)

COMPOSITION OF CONFIDENTIAL REVIEW COMMITTEES

A confidential review committee will be appointed to assess the performance and accomplishments of the administrator and report its findings to the Chancellor and/or P/EVC. The recommended composition of the confidential review committee is as follows:

For all SMG members, the standard committee composition will be:

- one Dean and/or one Vice Provost
- one Vice Chancellor
- one staff representative
- two members of the faculty who are not current SMG members

Additions to this standard are as follows:

- For the P/EVC, one additional faculty member, bringing total faculty representation to three. The three faculty members will be from different divisions.
- For the Vice Chancellor, University Relations, a representative from the Foundation Trustees will be added.
- For the University Librarian, a campus librarian will be added.

Members of the confidential review committee must have had extensive and substantive interactions with the administrator in his or her areas of responsibility. Committee members will be appointed by the Chancellor and/or P/EVC in consultation with the Academic Senate and staff leadership. The Chancellor and/or P/EVC will designate one member to be committee chair. Although the committee is to be made up of a relatively small number of individuals, it will consult broadly in terms of seeking input from all constituents, including faculty, staff, and students as appropriate.

CHARGE TO REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. To review and evaluate the performance of the SMG administrator during the period of service since the last leadership development assessment, or since initial appointment if this is the first 5-year review, based on the defined Criteria for Evaluation (see below).
2. To consult broadly by seeking input from all constituents, including faculty, staff, students and others as appropriate.
3. To review input pertaining to the first charge from a representative group of persons knowledgeable about the quality and effectiveness of the SMG administrator's performance, and to assess and summarize the input in a balanced, thoughtful, and fair manner.
4. To provide the Chancellor and/or P/EVC with a confidential written report of the findings and conclusions of the committee.
5. To conduct all activities of the review committee in a timely and **completely confidential** manner. The written report and its contents will only be known to the candidate, review committee, Chancellor, P/EVC, the SMG Coordinator, and limited office staff. The membership of the review committee will only be known to the Chancellor, P/EVC, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, SMG Coordinator, and limited office staff.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The specific responsibilities of SMG administrators vary widely as a function of the type of unit they lead. However, SMG administrators share certain general responsibilities regardless of their specific functional areas. Based on these general responsibilities, the following evaluation criteria are expressly applicable to all members of the SMG. The development assessment will assess each SMG administrator's effectiveness in the following areas emphasizing internal and external leadership. The established criteria are consistent with the categories provided by UCOP for the annual review process.

Accountability and Governance

- Establishing a well-developed philosophy and direction for the unit, and articulating this philosophy both to the unit and to the campus community.
- Linking the work of the unit to the strategic goals and core academic missions of the university.
- Working with program area heads and/or department chairs to achieve the goals of the unit.

Collaboration and Communication

- Working constructively with and communicating with internal campus constituencies in a system of shared governance.
- Representing the campus with the Office of the President and with related senior officers systemwide.

People Leadership

- Recruiting, developing, and retaining high quality staff, administrators, faculty, and students (as appropriate).
- Managing the operation of a unit, e.g., personnel reviews, budget, etc.

Inspiring Innovation and Leading Change

- Stimulating creative ideas and adaptive approaches to challenges and opportunities.
- Serving as a collegial, collaborative, and contributing member of the campus senior leadership team.
- Contributing to the profession of which the administrator is a part.

Resource Management and Financial Budget

- Managing the resources of a unit – operational, financial, and human (e.g., personnel reviews, budget, facilities, etc.)
- Efficient stewardship of university resources
- Long range planning and development for the unit and campus.

Diversity

- Demonstrating an active and engaged commitment to diversity
- Ensuring equal opportunity in recruitment and retention processes.
- Achieving the objective of a diverse and inclusive community.

Client Service

- Representing the unit and the University at community, state, and national levels, including the major communities of interest to the unit.
- Building productive partnerships on behalf of the campus.

Health and Safety

- Ensuring a safe, healthy, and environmentally sound workplace.

Principles of Community

- Ensuring that the UCM [Principles of Community](#) are integrated into the operational strategy of the campus to foster the best possible learning and working environment.

PROCEDURES

1. The Chancellor and/or P/EVC will meet with the review committee at its first meeting to discuss the charge and process for the assessment. The Chancellor and/or P/EVC will oversee the assessment process with the Senior Management Group Coordinator or designated staff providing direction and support to the review committee.
2. The committee is to work under the direction of its chair.
3. All communication to and from the committee will be handled through the Office of the Chancellor, P/EVC, and/or SMG Coordinator to ensure confidentiality.
4. Each SMG administrator undergoing assessment will be asked prior to onset of the assessment to provide a statement of achievements and challenges over the current term of service, and a list of potential internal and external references. This statement will be made available to the review committee. Further information from the administrator may be solicited for the review committee by the Chancellor and/or P/EVC as they deem appropriate.
5. At the beginning of each assessment, confidential letters will be solicited from the internal and external references identified by the SMG administrator. The list will be supplemented by additional references identified by the review committee. These confidential letters will be provided to the review committee in their entirety.
6. The report of the committee, along with the evaluative letters that were solicited will be submitted to the Chancellor and/or P/EVC. The review committee will have an opportunity to meet with the Chancellor and/or P/EVC at any point in the process.
7. A redacted copy of the report will be provided to the SMG administrator under review. A written response to the report may be submitted by the SMG administrator.
8. The confidential report forms the basis of a discussion between the Chancellor and/or P/EVC and the administrator.
9. Responsibility for final action on the leadership development assessment rests solely with the Chancellor and/or P/EVC.

CONSTITUENCIES TO BE CONSULTED

Individuals from appropriate constituencies with direct experience in the SMG administrator's areas of responsibility will be consulted during the review process. The constituencies may include relevant Academic Senate Committees, faculty, deans, chairs, academic unit heads, staff (from all levels of the SMG members' respective division/unit), UCM students through the Graduate Student Association President and Associated Students President, other appropriate administrators within the UC system, and other pertinent groups including those external to the campus. All UCM Academic Senate

members will be invited to write letters commenting on the assessment of the P/EVC.

The review committee will develop a specific set of questions that will be provided to all reviewers consulted based on the Criteria for Evaluation. In addition to questions about the capacity in which the reviewer interacted with the SMG administrator and the extent and frequency of the interaction, reviewers will be asked to respond specifically to the Criteria for Evaluation, using specific illustrative examples whenever possible. In all cases, solicitation of letters must permit a reasonable time for response. The number of and responses to the solicitation for letters will be recorded; unsolicited letters will be noted and categorized, and will be provided to the review committee along with the solicited letters.

At the conclusion of the leadership development assessment, should the SMG administrator being assessed request access to the confidential letters, a summary of responses will be prepared. This summary will be written so as to protect the confidentiality of the letter writers.

**MODEL TIMELINE FOR FIVE-YEAR SENIOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
ASSESSMENT OF SMG ADMINISTRATORS**

Action	Initiated By	Due Date
Advise SMG member under assessment that the assessment is to be undertaken; request self-evaluation and list of suggested reviewers and constituencies (2 internal and 2 external)	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	
Apprise Senate that assessment is initiated	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	
Request from the Academic Senate Committee on Committees a slate of suggested faculty for Review Committee	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	
Request from the Staff Assembly a slate of suggested staff for Review Committee	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	
Appoint and charge the review committee chair and members	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	
Convene the review committee	Chair	
Solicit written input for the review committee	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	
Prepare report for the Chancellor and/or P/EVC	review committee	
Meet with review committee regarding the outcome of the assessment	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	
Provide SMG administrator with a redacted copy of the report	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	
Meet with SMG administrator regarding the outcome of the assessment	Chancellor and/or P/EVC	

Review Procedures for Deans and Vice Provosts
University of California, Merced
To be effective December 1, 2015

This document outlines the procedures governing the review of Deans and Vice Provosts.

Interactions with advisory committee members and other review participants should be conducted with great sensitivity, along the lines of the care given to the executive search process.

1. The review process should begin with a meeting – between the individual being reviewed and the Provost/EVC – to discuss the upcoming review. This discussion should occur in the final year (year five), no later than the beginning of the spring semester. The format for the pending review should be discussed and the desire of all parties to proceed with the review confirmed. The Dean or Vice Provost should be asked to a) suggest individuals to serve on the advisory review committee and b) identify individuals who they believe will have a conflict of interest. The Dean or Vice Provost should also be asked to suggest potential reviewers, both to receive letters soliciting input and to be interviewed by the advisory committee.
2. The committee should be composed of one academic Dean/or Vice Provost, two or three senate faculty members and one staff member. The Provost/EVC should write to the Academic Senate Committee on Committees to request a slate of names of faculty members for the advisory review committee. The Provost/EVC will designate the committee chair.
3. The Provost/EVC writes to the Dean or Vice Provost requesting him/her to provide a self-assessment. The self-assessment should include both accomplishments and unfulfilled goals. This statement will be made available to the advisory review committee.
4. A short briefing and charging memo should be prepared and presented by the Provost/EVC to the advisory committee when he/she charges the group:
 - The advisory committee should be asked to complete their deliberations and present their report within three months.
 - The Provost/EVC should convey the necessity that all of the committee's deliberations remain strictly confidential.
 - In addition to soliciting letters (for Deans, from the senate faculty who hold appointments in the area(s) overseen by the Dean as well as from others in the senior leadership, such as Deans, Vice Provosts and Vice Chancellors), the committee should be charged to determine the most effective means to

assess how different constituents of the Dean or Vice Provost's unit evaluate his or her performance.

- The advisory committee should have access to documents pertinent to the review including: i) a self-statement composed by the Dean or Vice Provost; ii) the unit's most recent strategic plan and program reviews (public documents); iii) other items submitted by the Dean or Vice Provost.
- The committee's deliberations must focus on identifying both the individual's strengths and possible areas that need further attention.
- The Academic Personnel Manual states: "a Dean's overall performance should be judged as distinguished or highly meritorious in order to be reappointed." The Provost/EVC should make clear that the committee is being asked to provide a reasoned overview of the Dean or Vice Provost's performance to contribute to the Provost/EVC's knowledge in making a final evaluation.
- A copy of these procedures should be given to each member of the advisory committee.

5. The individual under review should be invited to meet with the advisory committee at the beginning of their deliberations, prior to conducting other interviews. At this meeting, the individual's self-statement should be discussed.

6. The primary challenge before the advisory committee is to obtain the input necessary to obtain an accurate and broad understanding of the Dean or Vice Provost's activities and performance in these activities. The advisory committee's first task should be to assess the expertise available within the group itself, identify where expertise is lacking and how to fill that gap, and the most effective means to gather data to aid the committee's deliberations. The committee should have two primary means by which to obtain input:

- Interviews should be conducted with non-committee members. Notes should be taken of these interviews but not minutes. These notes are taken with the sole purpose of assisting the chair of the advisory group in summarizing the deliberations of the committee and will, therefore, be destroyed after the written report is composed.
- Solicitation letters should be sent to all senate faculty and unit staff who fall within the areas under a Dean's purview. Additionally, and in the case of Vice Provosts, letters should be solicited from the Deans and Vice Provosts. Letters may be requested from those individuals for whom an interview is not necessary or practical. A standard solicitation letter for reviews of Deans and Vice Provosts should be used, with modifications as required made by

the committee to make the document applicable to the specific Dean or Vice Provost. The Provost will make the request for input. Letters received should not be made available to the Dean or Vice Provost.

7. The advisory committee should seek a balance amongst individuals to interview and/or solicit letters. Due to the seniority of the individual under review, it is understood that the majority of opinions available will be from subordinates or relevant faculty; but the committee should also seek out input from peers and knowledgeable leaders, even when these individuals may be external to UC Merced and UC.

8. The advisory review committee should draft a report of its findings at the conclusion of their deliberations. To ensure confidentiality is maintained, the draft report should be reviewed by the Vice Provost of the Faculty's Office. When the review is of the Vice Provost of the Faculty, the Provost's Office will maintain the confidentiality of the review materials. Once accepted, the draft report should be sent to the Dean or Vice Provost with an invitation to meet, for a second time, with the advisory committee should they so wish. The report should not be finalized until this invitation has been extended and, if requested, the meeting with the individual occurs.

9. The review should conclude with a final meeting attended by the Provost/EVC and/or the Chancellor and the advisory committee. At this meeting the committee should present its findings and submit its final report. The committee should then be disbanded.

10. The Chancellor and/or Provost/EVC should meet with the individual under consideration and share the insights of the review, presenting the individual with the advisory committee's final report.

11. The candidate has 10 days to respond to the final report.

12. Following this meeting and supporting current practice, the final written report of the committee can be made available for 30 days to senate faculty who wish to review it.