

## FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 15–18

# Evaluation of Presidents and Chancellors

*Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee*

Whereas, in its recent examination by accrediting agency SACSCOC (the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges), LSU drew criticism for only one violation, the lack of a proper policy for the evaluation of the chancellor or president;

Whereas, in July 2015, the LSU System administration promulgated a policy, “Guidelines for Evaluation of Chancellors or Equivalent,” in an apparent attempt to respond to criticism by SACSCOC;

Whereas no evidence has arisen that the development of this policy involved consultation with faculty or any other groups whom presidents and chancellors lead, govern, and affect;

Whereas at least four of the evaluation criteria listed in PM–75—general administrative effectiveness; educational leadership and effectiveness; management of human, fiscal, and physical resources effectiveness; and internal relationship—are inextricably interwoven with faculty activities;

Whereas the evaluation criteria in PM–75 also include poorly defined objects of evaluation such as "personal characteristics";

Whereas PM-75 describes no mechanism by which any of the results of President or Chancellor evaluations will be shared, discussed, or reported to anyone outside of the Board of Supervisors, which may receive this information in secret, executive session;

Whereas, in September 2015, the LSU Board of Supervisors unilaterally and without publicity conducted what it called a "review" of the LSU President;

Whereas that review resulted in an extension of the contract of the LSU President up to a period equaling the AAUP-prescribed seven-year maximum probationary interval, even while the LSU President declines to allow due-process rights to contingent faculty who may face dismissal after the same term of service;

Whereas LSU A&M policy PS-111 specifies that "like other LSU personnel, administrators will undergo an annual review process" but then limits covered administrators to Deans, Provosts, and Vice-Chancellors, providing no procedure pertaining to presidents or chancellors (or, alternatively, suggesting that those top-level officers are not administrators);

Whereas both PM-75 and PS-111 are incongruous with the current consolidation program, by which the boundaries between Chancellors and Presidents and between campuses and the system have blurred;

Whereas the persisting presence of several Louisiana campuses, including LSU A&M, on the censure list of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) suggests that public scrutiny of administrative performance would be salutary;

Whereas the growth, improvement, and overall future of a university and all of its constituencies requires top-quality leadership;

Whereas measuring the achievements of campus and system leaders in a way that can convince stakeholders requires clear criteria, a predictable schedule, and engagement with those affected by leaders' actions;

Whereas an important way to elicit public support for universities is to convince voters that higher education officials are accountable for their actions and are not above the law;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU A&M Faculty Senate calls for the immediate establishment of a University committee to develop credible procedures for evaluation of the President of LSU and for campus Chancellors as well as for dissemination of those evaluations;

And therefore be it resolved that, if the administration declines this invitation, the LSU Faculty Senate will conduct and publish its own evaluations of the President of LSU and will work with the Council of Faculty Advisors to review the Chancellors of campuses other than LSU A&M.