

Assessing the Performance of the Chief Executive

Cindra Smith, Ed. D.
Community College League of California

Successful colleges depend on excellent CEO leadership. Excellent CEO leadership depends on strong board/CEO relations. Strong board/CEO relations depend on clear expectations and open communication.

Regularly assessing CEO performance fosters open communication and clarifies expectations, roles and responsibilities. Accreditation standards establish an expectation that boards adhere to a clearly defined policy for evaluating the chief executive. Effective boards and CEOs embrace the assessment process and often include it in board policy and CEO contracts. Given the unique nature of the partnership between the board and CEO, assessing CEO performance is, in many ways, assessing the performance of the board as well.

Roles

The board roles include: having and following a policy and fair process for the evaluation, establishing clear direction, providing constructive and honest feedback in a supportive manner, and protecting and strengthening the integrity of the CEO and board roles throughout the process.

The chief executive is responsible for assisting the board to develop the policy, process and criteria, providing information that enables the board to assess performance, responding to board concerns and direction, and protecting and strengthening both CEO and board roles.

Purposes and Outcomes

The primary purpose of an evaluation is to bring the CEO and the board together to discuss how their performance and priorities contribute to the effectiveness of the educational program and services for students and the community. The emphasis should be on identifying what works well and what needs improvement.

The CEO evaluation process should be designed to:

- Assess how well the institution is fulfilling its mission
- Examine and re-set, if necessary, goals for the institution and the CEO
- Support the CEO by providing constructive feedback on performance
- Develop plans to address issues identified in the evaluation process
- Provide an opportunity for the board to learn how its performance affects the board/CEO partnership

- Foster communication between the board and CEO

An evaluation process designed to "get the president/Superintendent/Chancellor" hurts the operations and morale of the entire institution and the image of the college in the community. Evaluations that have the potential for deciding to end an unproductive or unworkable situation need to be conducted in the most sensitive and professional manner possible.

The outcomes of an assessment should be:

- Clear expectations and realistic goals
- Strengthened communication
- Clarification of respective and distinctive responsibilities of the CEO and governing board
- Mutual trust, respect, and support between the CEO and governing board
- Renewed confidence in good governance
- A better sense of the district's agenda and the ways to address it.

Process

There are many approaches to CEO evaluation. The approach and process to be used should be developed jointly and mutually agreed to by the CEO and the board. Throughout the evaluation process, all parties involved should continually evaluate it to ensure that it is working to achieve the purposes.

Developing the process involves the following decisions, each of which is discussed in the following sections:

- When should the CEO be evaluated?
- What should the criteria be?
- What types of instruments, if any, should be used?
- Who should conduct the evaluation?
- Who should participate in the evaluation?
- How should the results be communicated?
- Should the evaluation be tied to compensation or contract extensions?
- How do we ensure that the process is done well?

Calendar and Timing

Ongoing evaluation occurs naturally as the CEO and board members discuss issues and come to mutual decisions on policy and directions for the college. However, a session devoted solely to an evaluation allows trustees and the CEO to pause and assess the past and plan for the future. Evaluations of this nature likely would occur annually. Districts with new CEOs or a significant number of new board members may wish to schedule evaluation sessions more often during the first year or two to ensure ongoing and productive communication.

Evaluation Criteria

The criteria used to evaluate the CEO must be defined well before the actual evaluation takes place so that expectations are clear. There are two general categories of criteria: those derived from the mission, vision and district goals, and those which are based on general leadership responsibilities, skills and characteristics.

District-Specific Criteria

Two types of criteria provide information on how the CEO and board are doing: information that measures the effectiveness of the institution, and the CEO's annual priorities related to the district's mission and goals.

Institutional Effectiveness. Chief executives are responsible to ensure that their institutions are successfully educating students and making a difference for their communities. Including institutional effectiveness indicators in the CEO assessment process focuses both the CEO's and board's attention on important goals and leads to valuable discussions on the opportunities, challenges, strategies and tasks needed to foster success. However, given the many variables that affect performance on institutional effectiveness, these indicators should never be the sole criteria for evaluating CEO effectiveness.

Using institutional effectiveness indicators require that the district have in place:

- *Institutional goals related to student success and other end products of the institution.* These goals are usually stated in the district's strategic plan. Student success may be further defined through the establishment of global student learning outcomes.
- *Key indicators or measures that assess progress on the institutional goals.* For instance, if students' ability to transfer is an institutional goal, the measure might be the increase in number over time or percent of students who are transfer-ready or who succeed at transfer institutions. If supporting community economic development is a goal, the measure might be the number, quality, and or impact of partnerships with business and industry.

There are dozens of possible indicators. The CEO and board together should determine a limited number (5-10) to use as evaluative data, selecting those deemed most important and that give the board an overview of institutional effectiveness.

- *Regular reports that describe how the district is doing on the key indicators of success.*

Annual Priorities or Performance Objectives: Effective boards and CEOs annually establish a list of goals, priorities, or performance objectives that are the strategies and tasks deemed necessary to make progress toward the district goals. Each year at a retreat, workshop, or as a part of the regular evaluation, the board and CEO review the district's mission and goals, major challenges and issues, and determine priorities for the coming year.

This list of CEO (and board) priorities, objectives and/or tasks becomes the basis for the next year's evaluation: did the CEO do what was agreed upon? The CEO may write a report detailing what was accomplished. The evaluation discussion reviews the accomplishments

and explores what worked and what didn't, and why. These evaluation discussions are great opportunities for exploring the policy direction of the district and what support is needed to meet those challenges.

Leadership Roles, Skills and Characteristics

The second general category of criteria includes the tasks, skills, and characteristics inherent in being the chief executive. The criteria may be derived from the CEO's job description, the job announcement for a new CEO, general areas of administrative responsibility, and the personal qualities that contribute to effective leadership. They address the overall day-to-day performance of the CEO role. (See the appendix for examples.)

What to Expect?

Should the criteria be such that trustees should expect to be fully satisfied with the CEO's performance? If that expectation is present, the goals that are set and the criteria developed may end up being safe and easily obtainable. CEOs of progressive, dynamic institutions often have risk-taking goals, some of which may not be able to be accomplished due to circumstances beyond his or her control.

Evaluation Strategies

The methods used to assess performance range from informal discussions, discussion of a specific set of criteria and questions, survey forms, to more formal processes facilitated by consultants that may involve interviews, survey forms and/or facilitated discussions.

- *Informal discussion.* The CEO evaluation session consists of the board members and CEO reviewing the past year (often using annual priorities or goals as the criteria) and discussing how the year has gone, what was accomplished, and what key issues were. This type of evaluation is not unusual when boards and CEOs have worked together for a number of years.
- *Discussion of specific criteria and questions.* In this approach, board members and the CEO have identified specific criteria and questions prior to the evaluation session and the CEO has provided a report to the board. Trustees are prepared to discuss their assessment of the criteria and questions; in some cases, a committee of the board may have received trustee responses and prepared a summary.
- *Survey forms.* Survey forms consist of a list of performance criteria, and responders are asked to rate each item using a rating scale. They usually include a space for comments as well as open-ended questions. Each trustee is asked to complete a survey. Individual surveys may be compiled and summarized by a board committee or consultant, or all forms may be provided to the CEO as part of the evaluation. Surveys are usually used when gathering information for the assessment from others.

The questions to be discussed or items on a survey form should be based on specific criteria determined by the board and CEO. Therefore, it is not possible to simply adopt a model instrument or another district's evaluation process. Boards and CEOs must adapt models and examples to their own needs (see the appendix for sample questions and criteria).

A committee of the board may be assigned the task of customizing sample evaluation instruments to its needs or creating its own form. Forms generally contain some type of rating scale as well as space for comments.

- *Interviews.* The chair of the board, other designated trustees or a consultant may interview each board member, and information from the interviews is summarized and discussed with the CEO. The questions used in the interview are derived from the performance criteria. If others in addition to trustees are included, a consultant should conduct the interviews.

No one method is best; the approach used depends on personal preference, the type of information, time available for the assessment process, length of tenure of the CEO and board members, and the like. The different approaches of evaluation processes and forms reflect the unique situation (which changes from year to year) and the preferences of the players involved.

Who Should Participate

The CEO and the board decide who completes the survey or checklist and how the results are compiled. All voting trustees should contribute to the evaluation of the chief executive officer, and input may be sought from the student trustee.

A committee of the board might be assigned the task of summarizing ratings and comments individual trustees. In addition, the CEO should provide the board with a self-assessment of his or her performance, which may include input from the cabinet and campus leadership.

Outside consultants and facilitators can be useful in developing evaluation processes, conducting planning sessions that result in criteria for evaluation, and working with boards and CEOs when there are problems.

“360” Degree Assessments

“360” degree assessment processes include board members, the CEO’s self-evaluation, and assessments of the CEO’s performance from college employees and perhaps even community members. Boards and CEOs may decide to conduct such an evaluation to broaden the scope of information they use.

“360” degree assessments require careful planning and significant time, thought, and resources if they are to result in useful information. Poorly planned and executed processes have the potential to harm the institution, the position of the chief executive, and the governing board. They should never be done when the major purpose is to explore or confirm concerns about performance or seek negative input. (If the board has concerns about performance, trustees should address those with the CEO.)

A comprehensive assessment such as this is the most extensive and therefore the most costly type of assessment. Boards should carefully consider if the cost is justified by the relatively limited value that is added to a board’s own assessment of the CEO. Trustees know the strengths and weakness of their CEO as well as if not better than most administrators, faculty, and staff—the assessment does not usually result in new and significant substantive information.

Positive aspects of engaging in a carefully planned and executed 360 degree evaluation include the opportunity for the CEO and board to learn, in a systematic way, how administrative, faculty, classified leaders (and perhaps community members) perceive the CEO and his or her leadership. Seeking input promotes open and inclusive values. The information may provide board members with a broader view of the CEO's accomplishments and skills. If done well, the process can help the staff and community understand the CEO's goals and expectations.

However, the potential problems with comprehensive evaluations generally outweigh the benefits. "360" evaluations rely on two basic assumptions: 1) that those responding have the same relative general knowledge of the president's performance and 2) that they want to be helpful. Neither of those assumptions is valid across all constituencies. In addition, confidentiality of the evaluation process prevents the results of their input from being shared with the evaluators—the responders may be frustrated because there is no feedback on their input.

If a board is interested in considering a "360" evaluation, it should ask itself the following questions

- What type of evaluative information is the board seeking? Will a comprehensive assessment provide that information? Is it the only way to get that information?
- Is the board willing to hire a consultant or service to help design the evaluation process and criteria, receive and summarize the results, and provide them to the board? Is the cost of the consultant the best use of district resources?
- Is the board concerned about the performance of the CEO? If so, then the board should work directly with the CEO regarding the concerns and avoid the potential harm of a 360 degree evaluation.

If the board and CEO determine that a 360 assessment is appropriate, the following guidelines can be used to design the process.

- A consultant should be hired to assist the board and CEO in designing the process, receive the surveys and/or conduct interviews with those involved in the assessment, process and analyze the information, write the report and submit it to the board and CEO.
- The board and CEO together must determine the criteria and format to be used. If the board allows others to be involved in the process, they abdicate their primary and key responsibility to evaluate the CEO.
- The format, purpose, and use of the assessment should be clearly communicated to employees and others who will be involved to avoid unrealistic expectations.
- The CEO identifies who should be interviewed or complete surveys. The board may identify certain types of positions, such as all senior administrators, as well as faculty, classified, and student leaders. Participants will include those with whom the CEO works most closely and who will be most likely to have the knowledge to be able to assess his or her performance.
- The assessment criteria should be limited to those which are able to be observed by the evaluators. Participants should be aware of what the board generally expects the

CEO to accomplish—criteria related to annual priorities or goals should be made public prior to the assessment process. The criteria should be designed to minimize the influence of evaluators' personal agendas.

- Written surveys and rating forms are the most common strategy used in 360 degree assessments. However, the validity of blanket surveys is weakened by the varying degrees of knowledge, motives, and standards of performance of those who complete the survey. Drawbacks include that those who disagree with the president are much more likely to respond than those who support them. To alleviate these concerns, the process might include educating participants about the CEO's role, limiting survey items to those about which the participants have knowledge, and follow-up strategies to seek and assure a high proportion of responses.
- Interviews conducted by a skilled consultant can be more valuable than distributing a survey form. Conducting such interviews requires significant time and commitment to the assessment process. However, an interview process ensures a high rate of participation and the opportunity to explore perceptions and probe concerns.
- Survey responses should be sent to a neutral source for processing, not a district or college office. Interviews and related notes should be conducted and processed by a neutral source, not college employees or the board.
- Open-ended survey and interview questions can provide valuable information; however, responses to them should not be provided to board members verbatim. A thoughtful analysis of the responses is required. A consultant skilled in qualitative analysis should summarize the responses and provide a report to the CEO and board. Verbatim responses can skew the results: it is human nature to attend more to verbose, articulate, and negative responses, but these rarely represent the general opinion of the responders.
- The CEO should have the opportunity to review a draft report prior to it going to the board in order to check for any misstatements of fact.

The Evaluation Session

Evaluations are confidential – evaluation sessions take place in closed sessions of the board. Written evaluations should be kept in a secure location.

The discussions between the trustees and the CEO about the assessment are generally the most valuable portion of the assessment process, and provide insights into ratings or written comments. Discussion will include a review of the ratings on the criteria, as well as such general questions as:

- What is your assessment of the past year, both successes and things that didn't go well?
- What is the institution's most significant achievement for the year?
- What difficulties were encountered?
- What aspects of the presidency are most interesting and rewarding?
- What aspects are most frustrating and least interesting?
- What do you, as the CEO, need from the board to ensure further success?

After an evaluation session, boards report in the public board session that the evaluation was conducted. Decisions about new goals and changes in policies may be discussed in more depth at board meetings. CEOs will share their annual goals with their cabinets, leadership groups and the campus community.

Addressing Problems

Boards will want to address problems with a CEO in a manner that maintains support for the position of the presidency. Communication to and about the CEO should always be respectful and professional.

Many problems can be prevented by establishing clear expectations and reasonable criteria, and ensuring that there are regular opportunities to discuss issues. Boards should not wait until the annual evaluation to raise questions and concerns...improving performance occurs best through ongoing feedback and discussion of how things are going.

Relationship to Contracts and Compensation

There are different opinions on whether or not contract extensions and compensation issues should be tied directly to evaluation results. The purposes of the evaluation are more than simply determining how long the CEO should continue in the position or how much the person is paid. Those decisions depend on many factors in addition to CEO performance.

Many CEO contracts contain extension or rollover provisions. Extensions are generally perceived as a vote of confidence and a result of satisfactory performance. However, making extensions contingent on a positive evaluation may deflect the board and CEO from the purpose of the evaluation, which is to improve CEO and institutional performance. The criteria are more likely to be “safe” criteria and the focus becomes performing to a minimum standard rather than exploring what needs to be done to move the district forward. Boards should discuss the pros and cons of tying contract extensions to the evaluation process.

Boards may wish to avoid tying compensation issues directly to the evaluation. Due to the many factors that determine compensation levels, the board may consider discussing and changing salary and other benefits separately from the evaluation process.

Common Pitfalls

Assessment processes that include the following are usually unsatisfactory for the participants and achieve few useful outcomes.

- Unstructured sessions or processes that encourage or allow feedback when no standards for performance have been set. Evaluating the CEO only against pre-established criteria is the fairest and best way to provide feedback.
- Violating the confidentiality of the process. The importance of maintaining confidentiality cannot be overemphasized. Rumors and leaks can divide a campus and exacerbate problems. They reflect poorly on the board and the institution, and are unfair to the chief executive officer.

- Spending more time on things that need fixing in a session, rather than focusing on what went well. Consider the motivating power of commendation and the debilitating effect of too much criticism.
- Focusing on a single issue, which does not provide a well-balanced assessment. Avoid too much emphasis on a current "hot topic" in an annual evaluation session.
- Don't allow personalities and personal agendas to play a significant role. They divert the focus of the evaluation from the achievement of institutional goals and performance against agreed-upon criteria.
- Scheduling evaluations during times of crisis on campus, as CEO and trustee energies will be focused on the crisis.

Failure to understand that the Evaluation must come from the Board as a whole and never as a compendium of individuals' comments or summaries from each board member. It must be a single document to which ALL Board members agree.

Summary

Personnel evaluations are not always comfortable, and trustees and CEOs often find it easy to put off formal evaluation sessions. However, engaging in regular and professional reviews of expectations and performance strengthens the board/CEO relationship. CEOs benefit from a discussion of board policies and criteria, which then benefits the institution. Boards benefit from the opportunity for trustees to share their perspectives and perceptions on CEO performance.

Given the unique nature of the relationship of the governing board and the CEO, the evaluation of the CEO is in many ways an evaluation of the board as well. As a result of the evaluation, board policy and the board and CEO's roles and expectations are clarified and strengthened.

NOTE: You may want to assess the role of the board in multi-college districts. It is important to note that in these instances the board evaluates the chancellor and the chancellor evaluates the presidents.

Appendix A. Evaluation Process Checklist

1. Roles:

- Who will be involved from the board?
- What is the CEO's role in designing the process?
- Is a consultant needed?

2. Purpose of CEO assessment:

- Are the purposes clear?
- What outcomes are sought?
- Is the evaluation to be tied to contract renewal, terms and salary?

3. Are the following district resources current and available? Define if and how each will be used in the CEO evaluation.

- District/college mission and long range goals
- Board annual goals and priorities
- CEO annual goals and priorities
- CEO job description
- CEO's ongoing reports to board
- Accreditation recommendations and progress reports
- Board policy manual
- Board self evaluation

4. Time frame and format:

- Will the evaluation be annual?
- Will the evaluation be held during a designated period prior to contract renewal?
- What is the date of the next evaluation?
- Will the evaluation be held during a board retreat, the board regular meeting of the board, or
- Will the evaluation be in conjunction with the board self-assessment

5. Criteria against which the CEO will be evaluated:

- Did the board and CEO together set an annual agenda of goals, priorities, and/or key tasks for the CEO?
- Which institutional effectiveness indicators, if any, will be considered in the CEO assessment?
- Which generic leadership characteristics should be included as criteria? Have those been clearly communicated and agreed upon? See the appendix for sample items in the following areas:
 - Board relations
 - Educational planning and institutional effectiveness
 - Fiscal and facilities planning and oversight
 - Human resources oversight
 - Administrative, faculty, staff, and labor relations
 - Community, state, and public relations
 - Personal qualities and professional development

6. Evaluation Process. Determine how the assessment information will be gathered:

- Will a consultant be used?
- Will the assessment information be gathered through a survey, interviews, and/or discussion?
- Who will design the survey and/or the interviews?
- Who will distribute and collect the survey, if used?
- Who will conduct the interviews, if used?
- Who will compile the results?

If the board and CEO have determined that a “360” assessment would be useful (see cautions in the CEO evaluation overview):

- Which staff will be asked to participate? Senior and other administrators, faculty leaders, classified leaders, other faculty and staff, student leaders?
- What information will staff receive to help them evaluate with wisdom?
- Will any community members be invited to participate? What information will they receive?
- Who will be the consultant who will conduct interviews (if used), receive the surveys and compile the report?
- At what point will the CEO receive a draft copy of the report?

7. Communication of CEO evaluation results (closed session)

- Will it be verbal?
- Will it be in writing?
- Will the CEO have the opportunity to reply to the evaluation?
- Is there a time frame in which the CEO must reply?

8. Assuring positive outcomes of evaluation

- How will it be used to set priorities and expectations for the coming year?
- How will it be used to help clarify CEO and Board roles and responsibilities?
- How will it be used for professional development of the CEO?
- Will it be used to determine length of contract renewal or to affect salary or other compensation or benefits?

Appendix B. Sample Criteria

Two categories of criteria are in CEO evaluation processes: those derived from the mission and district goals, and the generic leadership skills and characteristics expected of district chief executives.

Criteria in the first category include institutional effectiveness criteria and the tasks and priorities identified by the board and CEO as essential to further the institutional agenda. Criteria in the second category are derived from standards in board policy, the CEO job description, and generally recognized standards of CEO effectiveness. The criteria should be identified well in advance of the actual assessment process, and be mutually agreed upon by the board and CEO.

Survey Items

Survey forms may be used to gathering input from the CEO and/or trustees. They also may be used in evaluation processes in which staff input is sought, although much care must be taken to include only items about which staff have the knowledge needed respond validly.

Rating survey forms ask responders to rate performance on a number of items. The ratings are then averaged and reported to the board and CEO. The numbers are best used as a starting place for discussion, not as the evaluation itself.

Two examples of different types of rating scale are:

Numerical

- 5 = Outstanding: Consistently exceeds expectations
- 4 = Excels: Frequently exceeds expectations
- 3 = Good: Meets, and may exceed expectations
- 2 = Needs Improvement: Meets some, but not all expectations
- 1 = Unsatisfactory.
- N = not applicable, observed, or unknown

Level of agreement with a statement:

- 5 = Strongly agree
- 4 = Agree
- 3 = Neither agree or disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 1 = Strongly disagree
- U = Unknown or not observed

Sample Item Bank

Following are sample items that may be used in assessment surveys. The list has been compiled from many different evaluation forms. Boards and CEOs may select appropriate concepts from this resource and should adapt items to fit local situations. The more that the criteria used in the process reflect the expectations and standards of the local board and CEO, the more valuable the information gathered from the process will be.

Not all items should be used: generally, 20-30 items provide a sufficient overview. Boards and CEOs should feel free to craft their own items.

Category One: Specific Priorities, Tasks, Goals or Objectives

- Through the CEO's leadership, the institution is making progress toward its goals.
- The additional specific criteria (usually 6-10 items) would be the annual goals and priorities determined by the board and chief executive, based on district/college mission and goals.

Category Two: General Leadership Tasks and Characteristics

1. Relationship with the Governing Board

- Appropriately engages the board in setting the district's policy direction
- Provides accurate and sufficient information for board monitoring of board policy and district operations
- Offers professional advice to the board on items requiring board action, with recommendations based on thorough study and analysis and sound educational principles
- Interprets and executes the intent of board policy
- Treats board members fairly and equally
- Supports board policy and actions to the public and staff
- Communicates with the president and other members of the board in a timely manner
- Has a harmonious working relationship with the board
- Provides support for board teamwork and effectiveness
- Promotes and supports board education and development
- Understands, clarifies, and supports the differing responsibilities of the board and CEO
- Provides support for board roles in the community and as advocates for the college

2 Educational Leadership

- Effectively articulates and communicates the vision and goals for the district
- Promotes student learning and student-centered operations as fundamental to the college mission
- Provides leadership to assure that the educational programs and services respond to student and community needs and interests
- Identifies and analyzes problems and issues confronting the institution and recommends and implements appropriate changes and directions
- Encourages and promotes comprehensive and long-range planning process and the implementation of plans

- Solicits and fosters support for initiative and creativity within the institution
- Facilitates and provides leadership for participation in decision-making by faculty, staff, and students
- Willingly discusses the rationale of the leadership's actions and decisions
- Maintains and supports the value of excellence and quality within the institution
- Understands state trends and decisions and keeps others informed of their impact on the college
- Is knowledgeable about key aspects of the college's educational programs and services
- Works to empower those within the college to achieve goals and objectives and develop their potential, and supports them in their efforts to accomplish agreed-upon changes
- Provides leadership for/assures that there is an effective system for monitoring institutional effectiveness in promoting student success
- Supports strategies to assess institutional effectiveness and improve institutional performance

4. Human Resources and Employee Relations

- Provides leadership for developing and executing sound personnel procedures and practices
- Encourages good staff morale and loyalty to the organization
- Treats all personnel fairly, without favoritism or discrimination
- Delegates authority to staff members appropriate to the position each holds
- Encourages participation of appropriate personnel in planning, decision-making, and college operations
- Exhibits respect for all constituencies and gives their issues fair consideration
- Encourages the development of ideas and open communication within the college community, including students
- Exercises good judgment in dealing with sensitive issues between people and groups
- Recognizes staff, faculty, and administrative accomplishments
- Provides leadership in implementing an evaluation process for members of the college team
- Provides leadership in developing a recruiting and hiring process which results in employing highly qualified personnel
- Provides leadership for the professional development of college staff
- Represents the interests of the district fairly and forthrightly in collective bargaining
- Provides for involvement of students in decision-making which affects them
- Encourages and assists colleagues within the community and college system

5. Fiscal and Facilities Planning and Oversight

- Supervises and evaluates fiscal and administrative operations; expects quality performance
- Provides leadership for the development of a sound budget that is based on informed projections of revenues and expenditures
- Provides leadership for sound fiscal management practices and procedures
- Provides leadership for and supports appropriate strategies for attracting funds to the institution
- Provides effective leadership for the college's foundation
- Possesses a good understanding of the institution's financial needs and communicates them clearly
- Promotes college-wide understanding of fiscal issues as they affect the institution
- Provides leadership to assure the budget furthers the college mission, goals, and long-range planning
- Provides leadership for the development and implementation of a plan for short and long-term facilities needs
- Ensures adequate maintenance and security for college property

6. Community, State, and Public Relations

- Maintains positive relationships with community, business and civic leaders
- Represents the college to community groups/individuals, state agencies and state offices in an honest and positive manner
- Encourages community involvement in and contribution to the college mission
- Provides leadership in the community through participation on boards, community groups, and other appropriate venues
- Works effectively with local public and private agencies
- Provides leadership for positive relations with the media
- Provides leadership on behalf of the community college at the state and/or national level
- Advocates the needs of the college to appropriate federal and state officials and agencies

7. Personal Qualities

- Is well-organized and efficient in accomplishment of objectives
- Is tolerant and flexible; is comfortable with ambiguity and complexity

- Maintains high standards of ethics, honesty and integrity in all personal and professional matters
- Engages in ongoing professional development
- Effectively communicates verbally and in written form
- Shows sensitivity to and respect for others; exhibits concern for people as individuals
- Facilitates cohesiveness and team-building among those with whom he or she works
- Makes sound, logical decisions, even under stress
- Accepts responsibility for and is accountable for own decisions
- Is skilled at analyzing and addressing problems, challenges and conflicts
- Demonstrates ability to work with diverse groups and individuals
- Supports and fosters appreciation for diversity.

Appendix C. Sample Policy and Process

A Sample Policy

As a regular and scheduled activity, the Board will evaluate the performance of the chief executive based on goals and objectives and other appropriate criteria agreed to by the CEO and the Board of Trustees. The primary purpose of the evaluation will be to maintain high quality district and college administrative leadership. The evaluation process will be designed in accordance with the following principles.

- The CEO and the Board of Trustees shall mutually agree upon the goals and objectives to be considered for the following year as well as the format of any evaluation instruments
- The annual evaluation shall be scheduled for _____ of each year with a progress review scheduled in six months.
- The evaluation will be at a scheduled time and place, with no other items on the agenda.
- The final evaluation will be a composite of the evaluations by individual board members and shall be furnished in advance to the CEO. The Board, as a whole, will meet with the CEO to discuss the final evaluation.
- The evaluation shall include a discussion of both strengths and potential areas for improvement.
- The Board will limit its evaluation to those items that appear on the agreed-upon evaluation form.
- The Board will include in the goals and objectives for the next year those items that appear to have merit for future review.
- Each judgment will be based upon an objective review derived from an examination of available information.
- The evaluation will be signed by all parties when final. A signed copy will be retained by the CEO and a signed copy will be placed in the CEO personnel file.
- All materials pertaining to the evaluation and the CEO's file will be retained in an "Access by Board Only" file located in the Office of the Chief Executive.

A Sample Process

Three months prior to the scheduled evaluation, the board will initiate the annual evaluation process. The assessment will be based on a mutually agreeable format and criteria, which will reflect the goals and objectives of the past year and agreed-upon expectations for CEO leadership and performance, and other criteria as determined.

An ad hoc committee of the board may be appointed to develop the format and monitor the process.

A month prior to the evaluation session, the CEO will meet in closed session with the Board to review information relative to the evaluation criteria. The CEO may provide a written report pertaining to his or her annual goals and objectives.

Evaluation instruments, if used, will be distributed a month prior to the session, and completed separately by each voting board member. They will be given to the board president or committee for processing. The evaluations or a summary will be provided to all board members prior to the evaluation session.

If an evaluation instrument is not used, the board president or committee, in conjunction with the CEO, will identify the questions and criteria to be used in the evaluation discussion, and provide those to the CEO and board members prior to the evaluation session.

Mutually agreed-upon goals, priorities, tasks, and/or objectives for the following year will be identified at the close of the annual evaluation process.

Resources and References

Resources

The following organizations provide resource materials, sample evaluation forms, and consulting services for CEO evaluation:

www.ccleague.org. Community College League of California. Sacramento, California. 916-444-8641. cclc@ccleague.org

www.acct.org. Center for Effective Governance, Association of Community College Trustees. Washington D.C.

www.agb.org. Association of Governing Boards for Colleges and Universities. Washington D.C.

References

Carver, John and Mayhew, Miriam. *A New Vision of Board Leadership*. Washington D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1994.

Chait, R. P., Holland, T. P., & Taylor, B. E. *The Effective Board of Trustees*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press, 1993.

Ingram, Richard T. and William Weary. *Presidential and Board Assessment in Higher Education*. Association of Governing Boards, Washington, D.C. 2000.

Schwartz, Merrill. *Annual Presidential Performance Reviews*. Association of Governing Boards, Washington, D.C., 2001.

Smith, Cindra. *Effective Trusteeship: A Guide for Community College Boards*. Association of Community College Trustees, 2000.

Weary, William. Presidential and Board Assessment. Workshop at AGB National Conference on Trusteeship, San Diego, April 2005.