

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
FACULTY SENATE

GOVERNANCE HANDBOOK

Prepared by the Governance Committee  
of the  
SUNY Faculty Senate

1994-1995

[April 1995]



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| <b>Section</b>                                                               | <b>Page</b> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Preface and 1994-1995 Governance Committee Members                           | iv-v        |
| Preface: Original Preface and Committee . . . .                              | vi-vii      |
| Introduction: A Focus on Faculty Governance on SUNY Campuses . . . . .       | 1           |
| I. University Faculty Senate . . . . .                                       | 2           |
| II. Campus Faculty and Professional Staff Governance Bodies . . . . .        | 4           |
| III. Faculty Governance: General Areas of Involvement                        | 5           |
| A. Academic Programs and Policies . . . . .                                  | 5           |
| B. Budget and Planning . . . . .                                             | 6           |
| C. Calendar . . . . .                                                        | 6           |
| D. Governance and Students . . . . .                                         | 6           |
| E. Governance and College Councils/Boards of Trustees . . . . .              | 7           |
| F. Academic Freedom and Governance . . . . .                                 | 7           |
| G. Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action .                                | 8           |
| IV. Searches -- Presidents, Provosts, Vice Presidents, Deans . . . . .       | 9           |
| V. Evaluations and Reviews of Administrative Officers and Functions. . . . . | 11          |
| VI. Governance Leaders' Conferences . . . . .                                | 12          |
| VII. Visitation Procedures. . . . .                                          | 13          |
| VIII. Governance Committee of the SUNY Faculty Senate . . . . .              | 15          |

**TABLE OF APPENDICES**

## Appendix I

|                                                                                                                                                                      |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Statement of Professional Responsibilities and Rights and Guidelines for Adjudicating Allegations of Unprofessional Conduct in Violation of That Statement . . . . . | 16 |
| (Revised for 1995 <u>Handbook</u> )                                                                                                                                  |    |

## Appendix II

|                                                                                                                                           |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Academic Governance in the State University of New York: Precepts for Campus Presidents and Faculty, Chancellor Johnstone, 1991 . . . . . | 21 |
| (Unchanged from 1991 <u>Handbook</u> )                                                                                                    |    |

## Appendix III

|                                                                            |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Chancellor's Statement on Campus Governance, 1973, reissued 1982 . . . . . | 25 |
| (Unchanged from 1991 <u>Handbook</u> )                                     |    |

## Appendix IV

|                                                                                                                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Board of Trustees Revised Guidelines for the Selection of State-Operated Campus Presidents, (1991), with accompanying memos . . . . . | 27 |
| (Added to 1995 <u>Handbook</u> )                                                                                                      |    |

## Appendix V

|                                                                                                                                                                             |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Board of Trustees Guidelines for the Evaluation of Campus Presidents (1986) and Details regarding Time Frames and Participants in Presidential Evaluations (1991) . . . . . | 35 |
| (Addition to material from 1991 <u>Handbook</u> )                                                                                                                           |    |

## Appendix VI

|                                                                                                                                              |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Resolution on Guidelines for Campus Governance Involvement in Presidential Reviews, passed by the SUNY Faculty Senate, April, 1991 . . . . . | 41 |
| (Added to 1995 <u>Handbook</u> )                                                                                                             |    |

|                                              |    |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| References and Additional Readings . . . . . | 43 |
| (Updated for 1995 <u>Handbook</u> )          |    |

**Supplementary Readings . . . . . 47**

#1 National Education Association's 1994 Policy State-  
ments on Higher Education Reform and Community  
College Governance  
(Added to 1995 Handbook)

#2 Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and  
Universities, AAUP Policy Documents and Reports,  
1990  
(Added to 1995 Handbook)

**Preface to the  
1995 Edition of the  
Governance Handbook**

Participation of faculty in governance of the State University of New York has been a demonstration of civic responsibility and dedication to the best traditions of American higher education since the University's founding in 1948. Today, as we approach our fiftieth anniversary, this 1995 edition of the Governance Handbook amply demonstrates the active involvement of faculty and professional staff in the full range of governance matters from academic policies and curricular programs to the evaluation of campus presidents and budget planning.

Governance at SUNY has worked because of the commitment of dedicated men and women who occupy faculty and administrative offices. During the 47 years since SUNY's establishment, faculty and administrators have respected their differences and worked collegially toward the common good. This is truly a tribute to effective governance practices in the University.

That this Governance Handbook will prove useful in strengthening effective governance on SUNY campuses is the major premise underlying the tremendous efforts of the current Governance Committee in bringing the Handbook to press. Professors Ivan Brady, Chair, and Sharon Cramer are to be commended for their special efforts on this project and for providing the opportunities that enabled committee members to work at their creative best.

Congratulations to each and every member of the Committee.

James R. Chen  
President  
University Faculty Senate

1995

April 1995

THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - 1994-1995

Membership

Home Campus

|                           |                                                             |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ivan Brady, Chair         | College at Oswego                                           |
| Thomas Barthel            | Herkimer County Community College                           |
| Paul Brodsky              | SUNY College of Optometry                                   |
| Sharon Cramer             | College at Buffalo                                          |
| Keith Elkins              | Empire State College, Buffalo                               |
| O. P. Malhotra            | College of Technology at Farmingdale                        |
| William A. Miller         | SUNY Buffalo                                                |
| John Kares Smith          | College at Oswego                                           |
| Marie Smith               | College of Agriculture and Technology at Morrisville        |
| Paul Smith                | SUNY Binghamton                                             |
| Margaret Tumilowicz       | SUNY Stony Brook                                            |
| Paul W. Wallace           | SUNY Albany                                                 |
| Michael Williams          | Student Assembly                                            |
| Carl Wiezalis, ex-officio | Health Science Center, Syracuse                             |
| Craig Clark, ex-officio   | College of Technology at Alfred                             |
| James R. Chen, ex-officio | College at Geneseo; President, Faculty Senate               |
| Sherwin Iverson, liaison  | SUNY Central; Assistant Provost for Policy Analysis<br>1995 |

State University of New York  
Thomas A. Bartlett, Chancellor

April 1995

**Preface to the**  
**1991 Edition of the**  
**Governance Handbook**

The purpose of the State University of New York Faculty Senate Governance Handbook is to improve faculty governance, a worthy goal capable of transforming campuses. Ideally, governance brings together articulate, creative, and concerned members of the college community who share responsibility for their campus and beyond. They inspire us to grow intellectually, aesthetically, and socially in a diversities milieu. Governance reminds us that collegiality is the essence of the college community, that at its best a college can be an extraordinary place to live, work, and study. When we fall short of this ideal, we are all diminished.

The Governance Handbook is the first major publication of the University Faculty Senate's Governance Committee. Many people contributed their knowledge of faculty governance to create this handbook. Most, but not all of them, are members of the Governance Committee who worked under the direction of Professor Kelsie Harder, a Distinguished Teaching Professor of the State University of New York at Potsdam.

The Handbook is meant to be consulted, copied, and quoted. It is the latest in a series of Faculty Senate publications and, like the others, offers practical advice. I trust that this Handbook will be immediately useful to many audiences, faculty and staff, administrators and student leaders. I am grateful to members of the Governance Committee for their contribution to the University.

Karen Markoe  
President,  
University Faculty Senate

1991

April 1995



**Developers of 1991 edition of the Governance Handbook  
The Governance Task Force  
1990-1991**

| <b>Membership</b>          | <b>Home Campus</b>                                      |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Kelsie B. Harder, Chair    | College at Potsdam                                      |
| Phillip W. Alley           | College at Geneseo                                      |
| John M. Anderson           | College of Technology at Alfred                         |
| Maren Brown                | Onondaga Community College                              |
| Ruth D. Bryant             | SUNY Buffalo                                            |
| Diane D. Elliott           | College at Brockport                                    |
| Joseph G. Flynn            | College at Alfred                                       |
| Norman Goodman             | University Center at Stony Brook                        |
| Paul Hayre                 | Cornell University; Student Representative              |
| Garrison B. Lewis          | College of Agriculture and Technology<br>at Morrisville |
| Thomas J. Peterson         | SUNY; Deputy to the Chancellor                          |
| Robert N. Seidel           | Empire State College, Rochester Center                  |
| William L. Vincent         | Faculty Council for Community Colleges                  |
| Samuel von Winbush         | College at Old Westbury                                 |
| Carl Wiezalis              | Health Sciences Center, Syracuse                        |
| Conrad Youngren            | Maritime College                                        |
| Karen Markoe, ex-officio   | Maritime College; President, Faculty Senate             |
| Marilou T. Jarvis, liaison | SUNY Central; Executive Assistant to the<br>Chancellor  |

**State University of New York  
D. Bruce Johnstone, Chancellor**

April 1995

## **Introduction: A Focus on Faculty Governance on SUNY Campuses**

Groups of scholars organized in colleges have governed themselves since the days of the earliest academies and the establishment of the early university. Governance within European universities has been participatory for over 700 years. No other participatory governing system approaches this role of faculties in terms of historical longevity.

Today, participatory governance is a key element in American higher education. It is a necessary condition for the maintenance and improvement of this critical sector of democratic societies. College and campus presidents and other administrators responsible for the management of their institutions recognize that the health and vigor of the college or university depend fundamentally upon the vitality, creativity, intelligence, and commitment of academic and professional staff.

An apparent recent decline in faculty governance has resulted in heightened advocacy efforts. The National Educational Association, one of many concerned groups, issued a strong statement in 1994 asserting the need for reinvigoration of participatory governance (see Supplementary Reading #1) as did the American Association of University Professors in 1990 (see Supplementary Reading #2).

The SUNY Faculty Senate re-established its Governance Committee as a standing committee in 1988. The Committee began its work that year with two major assignments: preparing a Governance Handbook and conducting a survey of campus governance leaders to determine the status of governance in the constituent SUNY units. The Committee distributed a detailed analysis of the survey's findings to the 35 campus governance leader respondents, to all senators and others concerned with governance in SUNY, and to every campus library. References to survey responses may be found in several passages in this Handbook.

The Governance Handbook reflects a culmination of efforts by the Governance Committee and the entire SUNY Faculty Senate to provide information on the main areas that comprise governance. The authors of this reference guide see it as an aid to increasing the effectiveness of faculty and professional staff participation in academic and institutional planning and decision-making at all SUNY units.

A determined advocate of faculty participation in college and university affairs, Dr. Karen Markoe, President of the University Faculty Senate (1987-91), endorsed the first edition of the Handbook (see her Preface in the present edition). Encouraged by Dr. Markoe's firm support, the Governance Committee was pleased to make this Handbook available to SUNY's faculty senators, Faculty Senate standing committee members, campus governance leaders, and campus presidents in its initial draft in 1991. The 1995 revised version of the document was completed during Dr. James R. Chen's term as President of the University Faculty Senate (1991-95). The Committee has appreciated his extensive support and encouragement throughout the editorial process. Additional commentary is welcomed from all readers.

-- I --

### **University Faculty Senate**

Article VII of the Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York is the authority upon which the University Faculty Senate, also called the SUNY Faculty Senate, is established.

Title A of Article VII states that the Senate "shall be the official agency through which the University Faculty engages in the governance of the University. The Senate shall be concerned with effective educational policies and other professional matters within the University." Article VII also outlines the Faculty Senate's membership, which includes the Chancellor and representatives from each State-operated unit and each contract college, its terms of office and officers, its meeting schedule, and its committee structure. Finally, the Policies delegate to the Faculty Senate the right to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws that must be consistent with Article VII. To become effective, the Chancellor must recommend bylaws amendments to the Board of Trustees. The Board must approve them, and the professorial staff of a majority of the State-operated units and contract colleges must ratify them.

The University Faculty Senate is the successor of a previous organization, the State Teachers College Faculties Association, which in 1950 began the process of creating a genuine University-wide governance structure. Following the preparation of a constitution in the spring of 1953, which was ratified the following fall, the Faculty Senate held its inaugural meeting in Albany in December 1953. (For a fuller account, please see the University Faculty Senate Handbook: Bylaws, Procedures, and History, revised edition, April 1991.) In September 1994 the Senate approved revisions to the Bylaws.

The Faculty Senate meets in plenary session three times a year. The Senate's presiding officer is the President, who serves a two-year term and sits as an observer at meetings of the Board of Trustees. The Senate's work is guided by a ten-member Executive Committee, which prepares the Senate's agenda, acts for the Senate when necessary, and responds to issues submitted by the Chancellor and individual campuses. The Executive Committee convenes about eight times during an academic year and occasionally in the summer as well.

The Faculty Senate has established six standing committees to carry on particular activities and discussions. These standing committees are Governance, Graduate Academic Programs and Research, Student Life, Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies, University Operations, and University Programs and Awards. Each committee has ten or more members, who often are not Senators. The University Faculty Senate President is an ex-officio member of every committee; a representative of the Chancellor serves as a liaison to the Senate and each of the committees.

The Faculty Senate convenes annual retreats to facilitate communication within and among its standing committees, the assembled campus governance leaders of SUNY institutions, and the campus governance leaders of the community colleges of New York State.

The Faculty Senate has also been responsible for sponsoring the publication of useful reports and other documents produced by the various committees. Among these are the Operations Committee's A Longitudinal Profile of the Faculty by Gender and Ethnicity (1993), the Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee's Faculty Perspectives: Sharing Ideas on Assessment (1994), and this Governance Handbook.

An office of the University Faculty Senate is located at SUNY Plaza in Albany with staff provided by the State. Funding for Faculty Senate operations is derived from an assessment contributed by each member campus according to a simple formula. Expenses of persons attending the various meetings are paid either by the Faculty Senate office or by the home campus according to rules explained in the Handbook: Bylaws, Procedures, and History.

-- II --

### **Campus Faculty and Professional Staff Governance Bodies**

Article X of the Policies of the Board of Trustees requires that the faculty of each member college of the State University of New York prepare and adopt bylaws. This document establishes a campus faculty governance body to play an active role in decision making, as an informed advisor to the campus president.

Each set of bylaws contains common elements. The bylaws have a preamble and name the organization. They define membership; special faculty groups, such as a graduate faculty, where this is necessary; and governance powers and responsibilities, such as the meaning and modes of consultation. Bylaws also ordinarily specify frequency of meetings and elections, name key officers, state their duties and terms, outline amendment procedures, give simple rules for keeping minutes and other records, stipulate the mode for conducting business meetings, and sometimes allow recall. Of critical importance are procedures for the campus president's acceptance of bylaws and bylaws changes within a year of the president's assumption of office and on a regular basis.

Article X of the Policies of the Board of Trustees also defines faculty membership in Section 1, "College Faculty":

The faculty of each college shall be comprised of the Chancellor, the chief administrative officer and other members of the voting faculty of the college, other members of the academic staff of the college, and such non-voting administrative officers and professional staff as may be designated by the faculty bylaws of the college.

A survey conducted by the Governance Committee in 1988 indicates that some SUNY units do not distinguish between academics and professionals in terms of either voting or holding office in the governing structure. A few units have two sets of bylaws, one for professionals and one for academics. Others have combinations as specified in their bylaws.

There are perceived advantages and disadvantages to the merging of teaching faculty and professional staff in a single governance system. On the positive side, when the two groups are combined, common concerns can be expressed; this can yield more effective cooperation and reduce friction between them. On the other hand, such a merger may neglect concerns that primarily affect the professional staff. Some campuses have handled this situation by maintaining both combined and separate governance systems.

-- III --

## Faculty Governance: General Areas of Involvement

### A. Academic Programs and Policies

The National Education Association's 1987 statement on faculty governance reaffirmed the NEA's 1966 position that "faculty members in higher education should have primary responsibility to . . . determine the curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, and other academic standards and processes." This is further supported by the NEA's 1994 publication (see Supplementary Reading #1). The Policies of the Board of Trustees of the SUNY authoritatively affirm this position: "The faculty of each college shall have the obligation to participate in the initiation, development and implementation of the educational program" (Article X, Par. 4).

Campus presidents and academic administration are statutorily responsible for the quality of academic programs and policies. However, the presidents and administrations cannot develop and implement curricula without the active participation of the faculty. Scholars must periodically review their work and its contexts. They must set and uphold quality standards for teaching and scholarship, maintain and improve academic performance, and be accountable themselves for academic honesty and equality of treatment for students and others.

Some academic functions are best performed at the level of departments, some in divisions, and some at college-wide levels. The departmental structures that deal with curricular and teaching matters may vary within a campus, depending on the size and complexity of the individual unit. A small department may function as a committee-of-the-whole. A large department may organize itself so that, for example, members of an undergraduate committee perform this function as their primary contribution to the department.

College-wide academic functions include such matters as setting admission requirements and participating in admitting of students; setting academic standards for measuring satisfactory progress toward a degree; advising the administration on graduation requirements; and reviewing departmental curricular proposals to assure that general college guidelines are followed. These tasks are usually the obligation of one or more standing committees of faculty governance. Such committees may be responsible only for developing and proposing academic policy, which in turn is recommended to the administration for implementation, or they may also make decisions in individual cases. The latter means more work for committee members, but it keeps the faculty in touch with the effects of faculty-generated legislation and provides an excellent basis for policy review.

Most campus procedures mandate that regular governance channels be utilized to deal with issues of academic program and policy. Ad hoc committees are formed only in rare circumstances, and they should have the approval of the faculty.

### **B. Budget and Planning**

About half of the SUNY campuses have proactive planning committees that work with administrators to develop the budget. The majority of the members of these committees are usually administrators. However, active standing governance budget committees in some units of SUNY both create policy and respond to the budget provided by the administration via reactive governance committees.

The most critical phase of the campus budget cycle occurs during the summer months when many faculty members are not present. Some schools have adapted to this schedule by creating special governance committees, which attend to budgetary concerns, as well as to other matters, during the summer.

The Budget Handbook prepared by the SUNY Faculty Senate (May 1988) fully and succinctly covers the budgetary process in the SUNY system. It offers specific recommendations for campus budget committees.

### **C. Calendar**

The academic calendar impacts on teaching in a variety of ways. It can be a source of widespread faculty complaint if no regular mechanism exists for administrative consultation with the faculty to consider the positive and negative features of calendar alternatives. Experience teaches that no other topic can so engage the faculty in debate; in practice, calendar issues can appear critical and solutions to them are often not at all obvious. The governance executive committee or some other assigned governance group should routinely review the academic calendar and propose changes on behalf of the faculty. In this manner legitimate concerns related to teaching can be debated and the faculty will become aware of non-curricular issues related to the calendar that must also be considered. The final calendar, of course, is often a compromise of various purposes and interests.

### **D. Governance and Students**

The 1988 Survey indicates that the relationship between faculty governance and student government appears to be harmonious in all SUNY units. Standing faculty governance committees normally invite students to serve on them. Student members of such committees participate in discussion, and occasionally preside. On some campuses, student representatives also are voting members of the governance body itself. At a few units, an over-arching governance structure includes all campus constituencies in a campus-wide organization.

Some SUNY units seat students as observers at faculty senate meetings. Students reciprocate by inviting faculty observers to student government sessions. When actions by either group affect the other, observers are asked to enter the debate, but generally they do not vote. Student participation is likely to be improved if information about the rights and responsibilities of students in college governance is clearly specified and widely disseminated.

Faculty bylaws should stipulate the numbers of students authorized to be members of the governance body, standing committees, and ad hoc committees that may be formed. Meeting times of the campus governance committee should be arranged to accommodate the sometimes complex schedules and other commitments which student participants may encounter.

### **E. Governance and College Councils/Boards of Trustees**

The Governor appoints members of each college council, which has limited and carefully defined authority. College councils normally invite a faculty representative to attend their meetings. Thus the campus governance leader or designee often sits with the college council and enters freely into the discussion, but does not vote. The faculty representative often reports on faculty concerns and business, such participation being governed by rules made by each board or council. Unless specifically invited, the governance leaders do not attend the college councils' executive sessions. However the New York State Open Meetings Law (1976) guarantees that sessions of college councils and university trustees be open; any faculty member who so desires may attend.

Each college council or board of trustees includes a student member who has full voting privileges. Resolution 79-98 of the Board of Trustees of SUNY, approved April 24, 1974, authorized "University and College Councils and the Board of Trustees of the College of Environmental Science and Forestry [to] invite a representative of the students, faculty and alumni from their respective campuses to attend regular meetings of such bodies."

### **F. Academic Freedom and Governance**

The principles of academic freedom are a foundation for all scholarly pursuits; they also constitute good reason for strong faculty governance. The SUNY Faculty Senate adopted the original Statement of Professional rights and Responsibilities and Guidelines for Adjudicating Allegations of Unprofessional Conduct in Violation of the SUNY Statement of Professional Rights and Responsibilities in 1973. In 1986, the Senate, out of concern about assaults upon the independence of scholars and scholarly work then in evidence, reaffirmed its 1973 Statement on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, and the accompanying Guidelines for Adjudicating Allegations of that statement. This statement was revised for the present edition of the Governance Handbook (see Appendix I). Academic governance precepts for campus presidents and faculty were articulated by Chancellor Johnstone in 1991 (see Appendix II). Apparently the most current statement on campus governance appears in the 1982 Policies manual (see Appendix III).



### **G. Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action**

The Board of Trustees of SUNY, the SUNY Central Administration, and the administrations of the individual campuses each have a deep commitment to the principles and practices of equal opportunity and affirmative action for students and faculty. Each campus has an Affirmative Action Officer, reporting to the President either directly or as a part of an administrative office, who is responsible for monitoring compliance with state and federal guidelines as well as locally developed policies and programs.

Federal laws prohibit the denial of equal educational opportunity or equal employment opportunity on the basis race, religion, sex, color, national origin, age, disability, marital status, or status as a disabled or Vietnam-era veteran. The State of New York also prohibits discrimination due to sexual orientation. Where evidence of direct discrimination is insufficient to provide equal educational and employment opportunities for any affected group, SUNY Central and the individual campuses have instituted, and are expected to expand, affirmative action programs to help overcome existing barriers to equality of opportunity.

The SUNY Faculty Senate Bylaws assign special responsibility for "the effective participation of the professional staff in University personnel policies including equal employment practices and affirmative action" to its University Operations Committee. The charges to the other SUNY Faculty Senate Committees do not specifically spell out a concern for equality of opportunity and affirmative action to overcome the effects of past inequality. However, all Faculty Senate committees have considered the enhancement of access and the diversity of students and faculty as important components of the quality of campus life.

Campus governance bodies have a responsibility to assure the support of faculty and other members of the professional staff for SUNY and local efforts to promote equal opportunity and affirmative action. Where the campus appears to lag in these efforts, the campus governance leader may recommend local campus policy or changes in procedure to enhance campus efforts. The faculty's commitment to the principles and practices of equal opportunity and affirmative action may be spelled out in the introductory statement of its governance document. Responsibility for monitoring campus progress can be assigned to the executive committee and/or to other appropriate governance committees, such as those concerned with student life and personnel policies.

In the area of curriculum, the SUNY Faculty Senate takes the position that the SUNY faculty has a special responsibility for assuring that courses and academic programs reflect the growing diversity of persons both on campus in the state and nation.

-- IV --

### Searches -- Presidents, Provosts, Vice-Presidents, Deans

The search for a president, provost, vice president, or dean will depend on many factors. Only one SUNY unit maintains a permanent search committee. Some units authorize the executive committee of the local senate or assembly to form search committees as needs arise. Some select by direct vote of the affected faculty at special meetings.

Search committee structure and procedures should be included in the bylaws approved by the faculty and president. Preliminary investigations, campus visitations, and local arrangements to meet affected constituencies are under the direction of the search committee. Searches do cost money, and committees should have a clear understanding of their budget before the search proper begins.

#### Presidents:

A major responsibility of a faculty is to participate in the search for and selection of a college president. The number of faculty members serving on a search committee for a president will be determined by the college council or board of trustees.

The Policies of the Board of Trustees, Article IX, Title A, Section 1, stipulates that "The chief administrative officer shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees, after receipt of recommendations of the college council and also of the Chancellor.... Before making its recommendations the college council shall consult with the committee of the college faculty designated for such purpose by the faculty and with representatives of the administrative staff and student body."

Further, Section 356 of the New York State Education Law provides as follows: "...in accordance with rules established by the state university trustees, the council... shall...recommend to the state university trustees candidates for appointment by the state university trustees as head of such institution."

On December 12, 1991, the Board of Trustees approved revised Guidelines for the Selection of a President When a Vacancy Occurs at a State-Operated Campus of the State University of New York. These guidelines specify that the council shall appoint a committee from the council's membership to serve as its official Presidential Search Committee. The guidelines also require consultation with faculty, students, and staff, as stated in the Policies.

Over the past several years, councils have enlarged their search committee to include representatives of all constituencies, including alumni, in order to accomplish the required consultation. Constituencies select representatives, but the number of search committee representatives from each constituency is determined by the council. Recent SUNY presidential search committees have consisted of four to seven academic staff members, two to five students, a representative of management confidential staff, a support staff person, an

alumni member, a professional staff member, plus several, or occasionally all, of the council or board members.

The chair of the college council or board of trustees charges the search committee to recommend from one to three candidates for a final action by the council or board, which in turn makes its recommendation directly to the Chancellor and SUNY Trustees.

It is not possible here for faculty bylaws to specify the structure of the council's search committee. It is permissible for a faculty advisory committee, separate from the council's search committee, to be formed. This group can be constituted as desired by its consistency. However, such a structure of faculty involvement can reduce considerably the committee's involvement in and influence on the search process.

For suggestions on conducting searches for presidents, see Proceedings of the 68th SUNY Senate Meeting, April, 1981, on file in the various college libraries, and the SUNY Senate Presidential Search Handbook which is currently being revised. See Appendix IV for relevant current materials.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **Provosts, Vice-Presidents, Deans:**

The president of the college or university is the final authority for selection of senior-level personnel. In almost every unit, the president appoints a committee to make a search to fill vacant positions at higher administrative levels. The governance executive committee is asked to propose faculty representation. The Affirmative Action Officer is consulted at each stage of the selection process to determine whether the search is compatible with affirmative action guidelines.

Different search committee structures exist for various positions; and units generally structure the committees to fit local conditions. For the offices of provost and academic vice-president, the committee probably will be formed with significant participation from teaching faculty; students may be invited to join the committee and vote.

The search committee for a vice-president for student affairs may have a proportionately higher number of professionals from the student affairs area. Several students may also join the committee. A committee to search for a vice-president for administration will probably be comprised by a majority of professionals; faculty and students should be represented.

Search committees for deans are usually selected from the faculty of the schools or divisions in which vacancies occur. Students and faculty from outside the division may be invited to serve on them.

Each unit has its own method for making the selection of the candidate or slate of finalists to be recommended to the president.

-- V --

### **Evaluations and Reviews of Administrative Officers and Functions**

Some campuses have established time frames and procedures for the systematic review of administrators. However, on many SUNY campuses, no policy, or no consistent policy, on this review exists. Where policies exist, the evaluation and review processes for administrative officers and management functions vary from campus to campus. Generally, administrative processes that involve faculty are initiated by the faculty and carried out by a committee, which reports outcomes to the faculty and to the person who is under review. In a few cases, the occupant of an office will specify a periodic review, usually every three to five years.

Evaluations of administrators should include the systematic collection of information from faculty and students on a regular basis. Data about administrators should include competency, leadership ability, soundness of judgment and effectiveness. SUNY governance leaders, at their 1986 conference, identified criteria for local assessment of the effectiveness of the chief administrative officer in areas such as: demonstration of academic responsibility; consultation and interaction with relevant constituencies; adherence to the college's mission statement; budget preparation; teaching climate; quality of relationships with students; and the public image of the college. The review policy on each campus should provide for peer review and the solicitation of comments from appropriate campus constituencies.

Under Chancellor D. Bruce Johnstone, the evaluation of presidents at State-operated campuses was resumed in 1989. Dr. Johnstone stated his intention to follow the 1986 revised Guidelines for the Evaluation of Campus Presidents [Appendix V], and he announced the inclusion of two new administrative steps in the process:

1. Approximately three months before a possible visit, the president will be asked to prepare a written self-assessment. The statement should be of moderate length -- 5-10 pages, covering goals, achievements, personal qualities, the state of governance, and other items as listed in a personal letter from the Chancellor. When forwarded to the Chancellor, the self-assessment should be shared with the College Council and the constituency representatives who are specified in the guidelines. The Chancellor will accept a short confidential addendum, if desired by the president.

2. The Chancellor will request from each of the SUNY vice-chancellors and the provost a brief confidential report of campus issues and concerns, along with an assessment of the strength of campus administration from the perspective of their area of cognizance.

A resolution from the Governance Committee, passed by the SUNY Senate in 1991 [Appendix VI] may be of assistance to campuses engaged in this process.

April 1995

-- VI --

### **Governance Leaders' Conferences**

It has been the experience of the members of the Governance Committee that local governance leaders benefit greatly from an opportunity to share concerns and discuss common problems. Based upon the belief that campus governance leaders should have a more visible interactive line of communication with the Senate, the Local Governance Leaders' Conference was initiated in 1982.

The governance leaders of the various SUNY campuses usually gather at the beginning of each academic semester. The September meeting occurs at the time of the SUNY Faculty Fall Assembly at SUNY Central. The February meeting coincides with the winter meeting of the SUNY Faculty Senate.

A Convenor, elected from the local governance leaders at the February session, notifies the campus leaders of the time, place, and agenda. The President of the SUNY Faculty Senate, the Convenor, and the Chair of the Governance Committee coordinate sessions at which the Chancellor and other SUNY Central personnel meet with the leaders to discuss complexities of the SUNY system and its relationship with the Executive and Legislative branches of state government. Time is provided for SUNY officials to answer questions on such matters as budget, programs, academic policy, and personnel, among other issues.

The governance leaders from the SUNY Community Colleges are also invited to participate in these meetings. This inclusion of community college faculty governance leaders began in February, 1988. The President of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges (FCCC) is an official observer of the SUNY Faculty Senate. All governance leaders from the community colleges are invited to participate fully at the gatherings of governance leaders throughout SUNY, and FCCC members serve on all Senate standing committees.

The leaders discuss both common and unique problems that occur on their campuses. They also explore possible solutions. The Convenor, as a member of the Senate Governance Committee, keeps the leaders aware of the Senate agenda.

Campus governance leaders sometimes pass resolutions. Resolutions passed by the Local Governance Leaders' Conference are sent to the Executive Committee for SUNY Faculty Senate for action. The exchange of information and experience that occurs among these leaders is of great value to them. They return to their campuses with increased knowledge of SUNY-wide issues and concerns as well as of those of their own college.

-- VII --

**Visitation Procedures Pursuant to a Joint Request  
from Campus Governance Leader and the Campus President**

Occasionally governance and administration on a campus experience conflict as they carry on their efforts to foster responsible participation and consultation on college affairs.

When a prolonged dispute on faculty governance does exist between the president and the faculty governance body on a SUNY campus, the campus president and the campus faculty governance leader(s) may jointly request the help of the SUNY Faculty Senate in resolving the dispute. They should make this request in the form of a letter of invitation to the President of the SUNY Faculty Senate asking the Senate President to render assistance by appointing a Visitation Committee to come to the campus.

The Visitation Committee will serve in the capacity of making an inquiry, in cooperation with the campus governance leader and the campus president, and of submitting a report. The report may include suggestions and recommendations to the local governance body and administration. [Copies of sample letters of invitation are on file in the University Faculty Senate Office in Albany.]

The President of the SUNY Senate appoints the Visitation Committee, names its chair, convenes it for its first meeting, and prepares a carefully developed charge.

Before forming the committee, the Senate President will consult with the SUNY Faculty Senate's Executive Committee, past Senate presidents, persons who have previously chaired such committees, and possibly the faculty senator(s) from the campus in question.

For Visitation Committee membership, the Senate President will seek people with broad governance experience. They should be distinguished by reputations for reasonableness and integrity, and for their capacity for avoiding being either advocates or adversaries in their dealings with administrators and faculty. The Senate President will also aim to establish a committee that is representative of the diversity of the "SUNY family."

The Visitation Committee's membership will always include a person from SUNY Central Administration. This individual will act as a member of the committee for the Senate and not in an official capacity as a Central administrator. Such a person will often have had prior service on the Senate and/or have served as a SUNY Central liaison to the SUNY Faculty Senate.

It is not required or necessary that current members of the SUNY Faculty Senate be appointed to the Visitation Committee. Experience in governance is the most important qualification.

The Senate President or Visitation Committee Chair solicits all relevant campus documents from the campus governance leader and the college president. Both the college president and the faculty governance leader may send materials independently; however, they are obligated to share with one another the materials they transmit.

In every instance, the Senate President and the Visitation Committee will be careful to respect the authority, prerogatives, and responsibilities of the campus president and the campus governance leader.

After the campus visit, the President of the SUNY Faculty Senate, or a designee of the President, will write the report, with recommendations that represent the Visitation Committee's findings. It is most fitting that this final report be delivered to the campus in person by two members of the Visitation Committee and that they present it to the campus governance leader and college president in a meeting with both parties. The Committee members may also at this time discuss with the two campus officials steps that they might take to review and respond to the recommendations. [Sample copies of Visitation Committee materials are on file in the University Faculty Senate Office in Albany.].

-- VIII --

### The Governance Committee of the SUNY Faculty Senate

#### Establishment of the Committee:

When the SUNY Faculty Senate reformed its committee structure in 1980, the Governance Committee was consolidated under the authority of the University Operations Committee. It remained a subcommittee until 1988.

Working toward the Senate's goal of more direct communication between the Senate and local governance bodies, the Senate initiated the Local Governance Leaders' Conference (see Section VI) and established an Ad Hoc Committee on Governance. After several meetings in 1987 and early 1988, the Ad Hoc group recommended to the Senate the re-establishment of a standing Governance Committee. In 1988 the Senate re-established the Governance Committee as a standing committee.

#### The Committee's Charge

The Governance Committee of the SUNY Faculty Senate is to be concerned with university-wide governance and provide guidance on matters of campus governance. The committee is to interact with campus governance leaders of the University.

#### Composition

The Committee is to be appointed by the Executive Committee of the SUNY Faculty Senate. Recognizing that occasionally one person can properly and constructively serve in more than one role, and with the requirement that least one member must be a SUNY Faculty Senator, the committee is to be composed as follows:

- Six members from SUNY units; the Executive Committee of the SUNY Senate shall choose the chairperson from this representation.
- One observer from a community college, who will also be a voting member with all rights.
- One student representative.
- One liaison representing SUNY Central.
- The current convenor of the State University Campus Governance Leaders' Conference, ex-officio.
- The President of the SUNY Faculty Senate, ex-officio.

Guidelines for all SUNY Faculty Senate committees appear in the University Faculty Senate Handbook: Bylaws, Procedures, and History (revised February 1988).



## **APPENDIX I. STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS**

The professors of the State University of New York, in order to define their professional responsibilities and rights, make the following statement:

### **I. OVERVIEW**

- (1) The responsibilities of professors in the State University of New York derive from their membership in a learned profession whose members, within a faculty, perform the dual function of cultivating areas of knowledge as coherently structured intellectual disciplines, and of educating students in these areas. Professorial responsibilities are thus dedicated primarily to this profession, to students, and to colleagues. Obligations to the University and to the society at large are discharged by fulfilling these responsibilities.
- (2) The rights of professors in the State University of New York derive, in turn, from membership in the University. In addition, professors retain all the civil rights belonging to citizens in general.

### **II. RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### **A. SCHOLARSHIP**

- (1) As scholars, professors have the responsibility to learn and to advance learning by disciplined inquiry.
- (2) They should pursue studies in the areas of their own scholarship both to keep abreast of the work of fellow scholars and to contribute through individual or collaborative study to the development of knowledge in these areas.
- (3) They should defend scholarly positions which in their judgments are well-founded, and they should modify or abandon positions which in their judgments have been shown to be faulty or untenable.
- (4) They should allow no subsidiary interests to occupy their time and energies to the detriment of their scholarly and faculty roles.
- (5) They should cooperate with fellow scholars within the University and in the profession at large to promote learning in their areas of expertise, and they should help to establish within the University the best conditions for the pursuit of scholarship.

(Appendix I, continued.)

**B. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS**

- (1) As teachers, professors are responsible for educating students in their area of knowledge, seeking in the process not to indoctrinate but to enlighten. As freely and completely as the level of student development permits, professors should share the knowledge they have verified to their own satisfaction with students, and they should nurture understanding of the methods by which the students themselves may in turn become self-disciplined scholars.
- (2) Professors should distinguish fact from opinion, hypothesis from conclusion, and critically present varieties of scholarship.
- (3) They should respect the dignity of students as persons, defend their intellectual freedom and the confidential nature of professional relationships with them, and evaluate their work in a positive effort to enhance their understanding, without regard to considerations other than the quality of the work itself.
- (4) They should be conscientious in meeting students in class and privately at their mutual convenience, and should make themselves available to students in a manner consistent with their other responsibilities.
- (5) They should choose teaching materials and structure their courses in a way that, in their judgment, will best enable them to facilitate student learning and related teaching responsibilities.

**C. COLLEGIALITY**

- (1) As members of a faculty, professors are responsible for promoting effective collegiality.
- (2) They should collectively ensure that administrative structures, rules, and regulations of the University, and of their own institution within it, are consistent with the effective discharge of their scholarly and teaching responsibilities. Furthermore, while they should not violate existing rules, they should be constructively critical of them in an effort both to prevent what in their judgment may hinder their own teaching and scholarship, or that of their colleagues, and to improve the conditions in which these activities are carried on. They should study these conditions, participate in decisions respecting them, and counsel administrative officers candidly in the light of their best professional

(Appendix I, continued)

judgment, insofar as that may be done without neglecting their other responsibilities.

- (3) They should abide by the rules and regulations arrived at by their colleagues, even when they disagree, until such time as they may persuade the others differently, so long as that action does not violate the academic freedom of any parties involved.
- (4) They should take deliberate and appropriate action in evaluations of candidates for appointment or reappointment to the faculty of their institution, basing their judgment only on professional grounds.
- (5) They should participate in the governance of the University and their own institution, and in the establishment of procedures determined collectively by the faculty.
- (6) They should conduct themselves in the affairs of their campus, and exercise their rights as scholars and teachers, always with consideration for the welfare of their students, their colleagues, their institution, and the University as a whole.
- (7) When speaking outside the University on any matter, professors should avoid creating the impression that they speak for the University or their institution within it, except when they are acting as duly appointed agents in that capacity.

### **III. RIGHTS**

#### **A. SCHOLARSHIP**

- (1) As scholars, professors have the right to define the areas of their scholarship, in accordance with their professional training, abilities and interests; and to pursue their studies and share their results subject to no restraints save their own professional integrity and the collective judgment of their work by fellow scholars. Because only scholarly peers are competent to evaluate such work, professors have the right to have their intellectual work judged exclusively by such persons.
- (2) Professors have the right both to determine the minimal and to promote the optimal conditions within the University for the discharge of their scholarly responsibilities.

(Appendix I, continued)

April 1995

**B. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS**

- (1) As teachers, professors have the rights and freedom to present the results of their studies to students, irrespective of who may be offended by such ideas or knowledge.
- (2) Professors have the further right to determine the conditions necessary for the effective exercise of this right, including among others the selection of instructional materials, prerequisites and the number of students that can be taught effectively in each classroom situation. They also have the right to determine the style in which teaching can best be done, provided always that this right is exercised in such a way as not to neglect their responsibilities as scholar, teacher, and colleague.
- (3) Professors have the collective right to establish and enforce criteria for the attainment of academic degrees within their respective disciplines, within the context of relevant education law or regulations.

**C. COLLEGIALITY**

- (1) As members of the faculty, professors have the right to speak freely within the University on all matters ultimately affecting their scholarship and teaching; they have the right to participate in discussions with colleagues and students on such matters without fear of overt or covert reprisal, and to be accorded the dignity of a responsive hearing when they offer counsel.
- (2) They have the collective right to evaluate candidates for appointment or reappointment to institutional positions on their respective campuses, and thereby to define the membership of the profession within the University.
- (3) They have the right to be judged in the discharge of all their responsibilities by the fellow members of their profession.

(Appendix I, continued)

**GUIDELINES FOR ADJUDICATING ALLEGATIONS  
OF UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT IN VIOLATION OF THE  
SUNY STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

In order to provide a means for professional self-regulation and to assure procedural due process in proceedings involving charges of unprofessional conduct in violation of the SUNY Statement of Professional Rights and Responsibilities, a procedure should be established on each SUNY campus to provide collegial consideration of such allegations. Such procedure should encompass the following:

1. Judgments of unprofessional behavior should emanate from professional peers.
2. Adherence to the basic concepts of procedural fairness should be required, including the following provisions:
  - a. Allegations should be documented.
  - b. The burden of proof should rest with the complainant.
  - c. The respondent should have full access to all allegations and documentation, and ample opportunity to respond.
  - d. Appropriate and reasonable professional behavior and confidentiality should be maintained in the proceedings.
  - e. Provision for appeal should be afforded.
3. The review or hearing body should be empowered to resolve the complaint or grievance informally, through reasonable conciliation, prior to instituting more formal proceedings.
4. Several levels of appropriate action (including reprimand and censure), insofar as may be consistent with contractual agreements in force at the time of review, should be provided to the review body.

\* It is understood that, at any given time, there may be in force contractual agreements concerning terms and conditions of employment of members of the professional staff of the State University of New York. No item in this Statement of Professional Rights and Responsibilities should be construed as violating or abrogating such agreements. The Statement is intended rather to assert that, as participants in a professional collegiality, professors in the State University of New York undertake the responsibilities and enjoy the rights set forth herein, quite apart from such contractual agreements made by them and on their behalf as persons employed by the University.

April 1995

## Appendix II.

### **Academic Governance in the State University of New York: Precepts for Campus Presidents and Faculty**

D. Bruce Johnstone  
Chancellor  
1991

Presidents, provosts, academic vice-presidents, deans, and other academic officers are charged by the Trustees and the Chancellor, either directly or by delegation, with ultimate authority and responsibility for the academic well-being of their campuses. However, SUNY Trustee policy and the traditions of American academic governance call for a sharing of this responsibility with the faculty. The faculty role, either collectively or departmentally, should be particularly substantial in, e.g.:

- \* The establishment of general and departmental academic requirements and of standards for admission and for the awarding of degrees;
- \* The establishment of general criteria for appointment to, and promotion within, the instructional faculty;
- \* The evaluation and recommendation of individuals for initial appointment, renewal of term, promotion, and continuing appointment;
- \* The establishment and deactivation of new degrees, specialties, or scholarly orientations; and
- \* The articulation of the overall mission of the campuses and any substantive changes pertaining thereto.

Faculty involvement in governance may, and desirably should, occur in a variety of forms and at a variety of organizational levels. The principal formal mode in SUNY is an elected faculty senate (or similar body, often including professional staff and possibly students, but always dominated by the teaching faculty) consistent with Article X of the Policies of the Board of Trustees. Departmental and school (as in "school" of law or medicine) governance, faculty membership on college- or university-wide ad hoc committees or task forces, or faculty serving in part-time advisory or quasi-administrative capacities all constitute important forms of faculty participation in the formulation of policy. The inclusion of administratively appointed faculty on various policy-advisory or policy-making bodies is legitimate and useful, but should not be thought of as substituting for the governance role that can be played by faculty elected or designated by themselves.

April 1995

(Appendix II, continued)

Academic governance can be positive or less-than-positive, strong or weak. But "strong" or "positive," while implying substantial influence to the faculty, does not imply a commensurately weak administration or a lessened need for presidential leadership. Strong academic governance, rather, requires strong and effective leadership from both faculty and administration. Strong academic governance is a mark of strong -- meaning effective and well-regarded -- colleges and universities. Strong academic governance is marked by:

- \* Extensive deliberation on critical issues and policy formation, maximizing the wisdom and the perspectives that lie behind the critical decisions that must be made on all of our campuses;
- \* A wider ownership of decisions and programs, with faculty and staff more likely both to generate and to better accept new ways of doing the work of our colleges and universities.
- \* More effective communication and a greater level of trust and cooperation, not only between faculty and administration, but among schools, departments, offices, and other divisions of the institutions; and
- \* Better morale...and thus more effective teaching, research, and service.

The following precepts for campus presidents and for faculty are suggestions of ways to strengthen academic governments toward the goal of more effective campuses. The seven precepts for faculty participation were first shared with campus governance heads and the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee at a Faculty Governance Seminar held in Saratoga Springs in September 1991. Although I am grateful to those whose advice to me has, I believe, strengthened the advice that I would pass on to my colleague presidents and faculty, the "precepts" at this time remain my own and do not purport to carry the authority of the SUNY trustees, of University policy, or the formal concurrence of either my faculty or presidential deliberative and advisory bodies.

### **Seven Precepts for Campus Presidents**

1. Respect your elected faculty senate and seek to involve and strengthen it. View it positively, as a partner and indispensable helper, rather than as a natural adversary or as a body whose enhanced strength or effectiveness need to diminish yours.

(Appendix II, continued)

2. Be comfortable with the principle and essence of collegial governance; a faculty role that is advisory and therefore limited, yet that can be real and beneficial and powerful. Do not let honest differences of viewpoint between you and your faculty governance body become tests of will or strength or credibility, either of you or your faculty governing body. Be willing to give and to "lose" at times; be willing, at other times, to hear the faculty and, in the end, to disagree and exercise your necessary authority. Be assured that faculty governance bodies understand that overwhelmingly advisory role and know that presidential decisions from time to time will be made that will not please them. But recognize the faculty's legitimate and strongly felt sense of entitlement to be included in the deliberations that affect the mission and academic character of the campus.
3. Be generous and slow to anger. Know that men and women of lively intelligence will differ, perhaps profoundly, even in adherence to similar goals and standards. Do not allow personal agendas onto the governance table and keep the process of governing on the highest road.
4. While democratic principles are laudable, and while students, professional staff, and others can contribute much to the formulation of policies and have voices that need to be listened to, the historic tradition of University governance accords a special role to the teaching faculty.
5. Have high expectations of your faculty governing bodies and convey this to them. Recognize that faculty governance, for a variety of reasons, may not be strong at a particular campus at a particular time, and that an uninspiring quality of faculty leadership or a poor quality of reports and official faculty actions may reflect a widespread lack of faculty interest in the concept of shared governance or in their own governance body -- which may, in turn, reflect the faculty's perception of your or your administrative colleagues' lack of interest in, or esteem for, their advice and counsel. Do not gratuitously ignore shoddy or mean-spirited actions if you should observe them in your faculty senate, but demand better -- and know that the best way to strengthen weak faculty governance may be to take it more seriously.
6. Faculty governance and collective bargaining can co-exist and flourish, even with overlapping membership, but the differences must be carefully respected. The union must be the sole representative of the faculty in matters that properly belong on the bargaining table. By the same token, the faculty, through its governance bodies, both can, and has an academic responsibility to, engage in deliberations and the provision of advice on a wide range of policy matters, both academic and financial.
7. Insist on a respect for the principles of collegial governance from all of your management team.

(Appendix II, continued)

### **Seven Precepts for Faculty**

April 1995



1. Begin with a sense of purpose that is positive, not negative; that strives to make things happen, rather than to prevent them; that makes the institution a better and stronger place, rather than merely controls or watches over the administration.
2. Be concerned for the institution as a whole, in its full breadth and depth, rather than for a single part, particularly a single part that you as a faculty representative may most narrowly represent. Be concerned for the institution in the long run, not just for the moment.
3. Be comfortable with the principle and the essence of collegial governance; a faculty role is advisory and therefore limited, yet it can be real and beneficial and powerful. Remember that it is the exchange of views and the lively interaction that conveys the most information and therefore which influences most greatly, not simply a final tally of votes on a particular resolution. Be confident of your influence and tolerate some ambiguity in the matter of final authority.
4. Be generous and slow to anger. Know that men and women of lively intelligence will differ, perhaps profoundly, even in adherence to similar goals and standards. Do not allow personal agendas onto the governance table and keep the process of governing on the highest road.
5. Be courageous. Be willing to take difficult stands and to make tough discriminations.
6. Work hard at the tasks of governance. These are part of your job. Take pride in the product of your work, whether in the form of written or oral augmentation. Demand the same or higher standards of integrity and of academic quality in governance that you would demand of colleagues in articles you might review for a juried publication, or the academic work of your students for which you are expected to give academic credit.
7. Keep governance in perspective. Do not let it crowd out your teaching or your scholarship. Know when to let go. Be able to turn over the reins of governance when the time has come, not just to friends or to those necessarily like-minded, but to others, to new blood.

**Appendix III.**  
(Statement by Chancellor, April 9, 1973)

**Campus Governance**  
(page 123 of December, 1982 Policy Manual)

The University reaffirms the validity of governance as the appropriate and organic process for the involvement of constituent groups in campus decision making. University faculty, staff, and administration are reminded of the charge contained in the 1972 Master Plan that

the governance arrangements within the University will be increasingly clarified and improved methods of consultation will be developed to reflect the need for effective governance based upon widespread participation... .

Since these challenges go to the very heart of the University, it is appropriate to underscore the traditional legal framework which establishes and protects University governance.

The Education Law established the Board of Trustees and charges it with the responsibility for and conduct of the University. The Trustees, in turn, have promulgated Policies that represent a constitution which provides basic principles of policy and organization. The Policies vest authority in the Chancellor of the University and in campus Presidents and legally establish governance as the appropriate vehicle for the involvement of all constituents: faculty, staff, administration, and students. In this regard, the Policies accord official recognition to the close interrelation between the exercise of the legal authority of the campus President and his obligation to accept constituent participation through governance.

Article X of the Policies, among other provisions, empowers and directs the faculty to develop bylaws for the conduct of its affairs. Substantive actions taken in the course of that conduct are advisory upon the campus President and are a recognition of his legal authority. Furthermore, those provisions of bylaws concerning consultation -- how, when, and where the campus President consults with his faculty -- are subject to his approval. It is understood, of course, that bylaws often contain certain procedures for consultation among faculty in addition to provisions for presidential consultation with faculty. The latter is spoken to only in Article X.

When the campus President accepts provisions of local bylaws concerning consultation, the Trustees, through Article X, and the Chancellor respect this endorsement and these provisions become, thereby, part of local policy and must provide a reliable framework for campus governance. In this regard, a campus President is expected to adhere to policies which he has accepted for his administration.

(Appendix III, continued)

April 1995

Since governance must remain responsive to changing conditions on each campus, the validity of bylaws rests firmly upon the continuing confidence in which they are held. Bylaws, once approved, should not be used to require adherence to outmoded or bad practice by either the faculty or the campus President. The campus community must remain ready to recognize legitimate objections to practices or procedures which no longer adequately meet the needs for which they were designed. In order for governance to operate effectively, provisions must exist in each set of bylaws to permit the campus President and any constituent included in the governance vehicle to initiate review and modification when bylaws fail to command the confidence of those who are expected to observe them.

Bylaws are the manifestation of the University's commitment to governance. They have their legal basis in authorization by the Board of Trustees and their effectiveness results, in the most practical sense, from the confidence they enjoy in the campus community. If governance is to survive, it must draw strength from its success in meeting the needs for which it was designed. It must not rely upon external forces. Its validity is adequately supported in the legal recognition of governance by the Trustees Policies as essential to the proper conduct of a University.

## Appendix IV

### Timeframes and Participants on Presidential Searches

#### Office of the Chancellor

July 27, 1994

Dr. James R. Chen  
President, State University Faculty Senate  
State University Plaza  
Room N-110  
Albany, New York 12246

Dear Jim:

In December 1991, the SUNY Board of Trustees approved an update to the Guidelines for Selection of Presidents which has governed the selection of new presidents since that time. The experience with this process has led to several changes adopted by the Board. Its members want more information about final candidates before the campus Council makes a recommendation to the Board. Moreover, they believe that they should have more discussion about the mission of the campus, and have a summary of the Board's impression of the campus condition and its future needs delivered to the search committee early in the process.

As a result of these continuing concerns about the process, the Trustees had a useful discussion in June about some modifications to the current Guidelines. Four new steps have been suggested that would give the Board of Trustees more opportunity for involvement in the selection process, but would not intrude on the role of Councils.

I would appreciate your comments on the proposed changes, since I hope to submit the amendments to the current Guidelines at the Board's September 21 meeting. If you have any questions or concerns about these four points, please get back to me as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Joseph C. Burke  
Interim Chancellor

Enclosures

Copy: Mr. Walling  
Dr. M. Jarvis  
Mr. Levine

April 1995

(Appendix IV, continued)

DRAFT - 7/27/94  
Guidelines - MTJ/vl

**Guidelines for the Selection of a President  
When a Vacancy Occurs at a State-operated Campus of the  
State University of New York**

Proposed Amendment to Procedures for Search and Nomination

1. Assessment of Campus Condition

When it is known that a presidential vacancy will occur, the Chancellor will present to the Board of Trustees an assessment of the current condition of the campus.

2. Board Statement of Desired Presidential Qualities

Following discussion of this assessment at a Board meeting, the Chancellor will prepare a statement for Board approval that presents the Board's view of desirable qualities and characteristics for the next president of that campus and present this statement to the campus Council and the Presidential Search Committee.

3. Continued Search Update

The Chancellor's liaison to presidential searches will report significant search developments at the Executive Sessions of the Board. The Board will regularly include this subject on the agenda.

4. Candidates Campus Visits

At the time when candidates are invited for campus visits, the Trustees will receive their resumes and the Chancellor's liaison will make a special report on the campus reactions to those visits at the next Board meeting in Executive Session.

(Appendix IV, continued)

**Memorandum to Presidents**

|          |                                                                             |               |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Date:    | January 30, 1992                                                            | Vol. 92 No. 2 |
| From:    | Office of the Chancellor                                                    |               |
| Subject: | Revised Guidelines for the Selection of<br>State-operated Campus Presidents |               |
| To:      | Presidents, State-operated Campuses                                         |               |

The Board of Trustees approved on December 12, 1991 a revision of the 1972 "Guidelines for the Selection of a President When a Vacancy Occurs at a State-operated Campus of the State University of New York." While recent presidential searches have ended positively, there has been growing evidence of a need to remove procedural ambiguities that have resulted in occasional confusion and misunderstanding and to bring the substantive requirements of the guidelines into accord with current search practices.

The revised guidelines (copy attached) maintain and continue the fundamental authority and responsibility of the Board of Trustees under the Education Law to appoint the president of a State-operated campus and preserve the traditional and statutory authority of the campus council to select the members of a presidential search committee and the final candidate for consideration by the Trustees. The revised guidelines clarify and specify the customary role of the Chancellor in providing cooperative liaison with the ongoing work of the search committee and forming a recommendation to the Trustees prior to their final action on a nominee.

A major change in the revised guidelines is provision for a single search committee composed of campus council members and constituency representatives rather than the separate constituent advisory procedure called for by the earlier guidelines. Members of campus constituencies, including faculty, administration, students, and alumni, would select their representatives and recommend them to the chair of the council for committee service. There is also explicit recognition of the predominant role of the faculty in the deliberations of the search committee. Of course, the members of the campus council maintain their right to select the nominee to be recommended to the Chancellor and the Trustees.

Other significant features of the revised guidelines include recognition of the need for confidentiality, a statement of the Trustees' expectations regarding affirmative action, clarification of the appropriate role of retained executive search consultants in relation to the responsibilities of the search committee, specification of the procedures and timing leading to the Chancellor's recommendation for Trustee action on a nominee, and a statement of qualities expected in a presidential candidate.

(Appendix IV, continued)

April 1995

The revised guidelines have been extensively reviewed by the Board of Trustees, Council of Presidents, Association of Council Members and College Trustees and the University Faculty Senate. Formal rule making procedures will be commenced to revise the language of Article IX of the Policies of the Board of Trustees to bring that policy into accord with the language of the guidelines.

Thank you for your assistance in developing the new guidelines.

D. Bruce Johnstone

Attachment

Copy: Chairs, Campus Councils and  
Board of Trustees, College of Environmental Science and Forestry

This memorandum for information to:

Presidents, Community Colleges  
Deans, Statutory Colleges  
President Coll  
Provost Nesheim

April 1995

(Appendix IV, continued)

**Guidelines for the Selection of a President When a Vacancy  
Occurs at a State-operated Campus of the  
State University of New York**

A. Legal Authority for Nomination and for Appointment

The legal authority to appoint the president or chief administrative officer of a State-operated institution of the State University is vested in the University Board of Trustees by Section 355(2)(g) and Section 6004(c) of the Education Law. the council of each such institution is given responsibility for recommending a candidate or candidates to the Board by Section 356(3)(a)(Section 6004(c) for the Trustees of the College of Environmental Science and Forestry). The Board of Trustees may also appoint in the event that no council recommendation is made or where a council recommendation fails to comply with the Trustees' standards and procedures.

B. Procedures for Search and Nomination

The procedures below are intended to assist the councils of State-operated campuses in the search for, and nomination of, individuals to fill the position of president. It should be noted that the term "council" in the following is intended to refer equally to the Board of Trustees of the State University College of Environmental Science and Forestry.

1. As soon as is practical after it is known that a presidential vacancy will occur, the council chair shall consult with the Chancellor for advice in planning for the search and selection of a new president. Important initial actions include:
  - (a) deciding upon the composition of a search committee, to include council members and representatives of principal campus constituencies;
  - (b) initiating the process of constituency recommendations for positions on the committee;
  - (c) appointing a chair; and
  - (d) establishing an expected timetable for the search and nomination process. The council must have a significant and continuing involvement throughout the search activities.
2. The chancellor shall immediately designate a liaison representative to serve as a nonvoting member of the presidential search committee. That representative shall have full access to files of the committee, and shall



(Appendix IV, continued)

be responsible for reporting to the Chancellor and the Trustees regarding the progress of the search and the work of the committee.

3. The council shall specify the number of its members to serve on the search committee and the number of other representatives as well as the constituencies from which they will come: e.g., faculty, professional employees, administration (management confidential), students, and alumni. Reflecting the predominant role that faculty are expected to play in academic governance, the faculty should predominate among the non-council constituencies on the search committee. The constituency representatives, selected by the members, shall be recommended to the chair of the council for appointment to the search committee.
4. At the first presidential search committee meeting, the chairperson of that committee, along with the Chancellor's representative, should acquaint the committee members with search procedures in general and any specific instructions from the council. The search committee should be advised of the number of nominees desired, and whether or not they should be ranked. The Chancellor, or a designee, shall be afforded an early opportunity to meet with the search committee to discuss the procedures and qualifications which are desirable in a president.
5. The council should take advantage of the presidential vacancy and the representative wisdom available within the search committee to consider the special leadership needs of its campus at that particular moment of history. A written expression of desired qualifications and invitations to suggest candidates should be developed by the council and the search committee. Both should be widely distributed on campus and to the wider academic community.
6. A good search must actively seek qualified candidates, and not confine its work to the screening of applications and nominations. Telephone calls, for example, should go to those in key national network positions. top prospects may have to be convinced to become declared candidates. In many cases, a spouse may also have to be attracted, and assistance, including information about the campus and the surrounding community, should be provided. It is particularly important that the search, in the spirit of affirmative action, reflect good faith efforts to generate a substantial and diverse pool of applicants. Some campuses may utilize the services of a nationwide search firm to, e.g., present additional candidates, conduct reference checks, and collect background information on the finalists. The selection and rejection of all applicants and nominees must be accomplished through and by the search committee.

(Appendix IV, continued)

7. Confidentiality is most important, and anyone agreeing to serve on a search committee must respect this principle. In the early stages, external contacts and the solicitation of personal opinions about any candidates must be limited to sources agreed upon and approved by the individual candidates. Later in the search, and generally before any actual interviews, candidates should be willing to have inquiries about them collected from a broader set of sources than their designated references. At a very end of the search, when the finalists number two to four, it is generally best to invite the candidates to the campuses and expose them to many constituencies. Thus, the names of final candidates may be known and confirmed, although what is said about any candidate in the search committee or the council should remain forever confidential.
8. In the final stages of the search, all of the members of the council should actively participate in the final interviews and in the deliberations of the search committee. The recommendation of a single candidate to the Chancellor and Trustees for the presidency is the prerogative of the council alone. The view of the search committee, however, should have great weight. Consensus or near consensus, both within the council and between the council and the search committee, should be sought and expected. Serious disagreement about the final candidate or candidates, particularly any disagreements that clearly follow major constituency lines, suggest a potentially serious problem and may call for a reexamination of the final candidates or, in extreme cases, a reopening of the search.
9. Before a final vote of the council, when the finalists number two to four, the Chancellor must be given the opportunity to meet with them, to study their written dossiers, and to discuss the names with the Trustees in executive session. If any of the finalists appear to be unacceptable, such that a positive recommendation for appointment could not be conveyed from the Chancellor to the Trustees, or such that Trustee appointment would be for any reason problematic, the Chancellor shall so inform the council chair and, if requested meet with the full council to discuss reasons for the unacceptability.
10. The final nomination of the council shall be communicated to the Chancellor who shall transmit it, with a positive or negative recommendation, to the Trustees for action at the earliest possible date. The Trustees or a committee thereof will expect to meet with the nominee in executive session before a final presentation and vote. The timing of these events -- final council action to recommend, and trustee appointment -- should be as proximate in time as possible. If the time between the council action and anticipated Trustee confirmation is short and confidentiality has been maintained, it would be well to attempt to maintain confidentiality

(Appendix IV, continued)

through the Trustee action. If the time is too great to provide a reasonable assurance that confidentiality can be held, or if the confidentiality of the

council vote is unlikely to be sustainable, an announcement may be made by the campus of that individual whom the council has chosen to be presented to the SUNY Trustees for action and confirmation. Any such announcement must make it clear that final confirmation requires Trustee action.

11. Notwithstanding the procedures followed or the qualifications of the candidate, the Board of Trustees, by law, reserves the right in its judgment, to reject any nominee.

C. Qualities to be Sought

Although a list of qualities to be sought should not be viewed as absolute requirements, and while the qualities most appropriate will vary by campus and historical moment, the following qualities are generally expected for the presidency of a State-operated campus of the State University of New York.

- \* academic credentials and accomplishments supportive of the professorial status that, by Trustees' Policies, accompanies the presidential appointment;
- \* successful administrative experience appropriate to the requirements of the presidency;
- \* qualities of educational leadership and ability to maintain effective relationships with faculty, students, administrative staff, alumni, and others;
- \* commitment to the mission of public higher education, generally, and to the specific mission of the campus for which the candidate is being considered;
- \* evidence or distinct promise of the ability to build productive relationships with community leaders and groups, elected officials and agencies at all levels of government, and other important constituencies;
- \* evidence of distinct promise of the ability to general external support;
- \* commitment to the principles of diversity and equal opportunity; and
- \* personal traits necessary for the most exacting of executive responsibilities among which are strength of character, intelligence, integrity, humor, fortitude, judgment, flexibility and openness to new ideas, sensitivity to human values, and a capacity for hard work.

[Revised December 12, 1991]

## Appendix V

### STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

State University Plaza  
Albany, New York 12246

Office of the Chancellor

June 18, 1991

#### **Evaluation of Campus Presidents**

The Guidelines concerning evaluation of campus presidents within State University of New York were adopted by the Board of Trustees on February 19, 1986. The Guidelines constitute both the philosophy and basic procedures governing presidential evaluations.

As outlined in the Board of Trustees' policy, the primary purpose of the evaluation process is to strengthen the role of the President. The Guidelines give discretion to the Chancellor regarding certain aspects of an evaluation. They also call for some flexibility in the evaluation process both to address the variations among campuses and the differences among presidents as to experience and length of service.

Over time, certain clarifications have been made by the Chancellor in the implementation of the evaluation procedures. The most recent update of these procedures (June 5, 1991) details the time-frames pertinent to evaluations.

The Guidelines appear below, in total, as Section I, followed by the clarification noted above as Section II.

April 1995

(Appendix V, continued)

## Section 1

Board of Trustees Guidelines:

### **Guidelines for the Evaluation of Campus Presidents**

(Adopted February 19, 1986)

#### **Purposes of Presidential Evaluations:**

The basic purpose of Presidential evaluations is to strengthen the role of the President and to offer to each President a more flexible approach to his or her duties, while emphasizing accountability in the leadership role. The Presidents are responsible primarily to the Chancellor and the Trustees. Therefore, a continuing review process, as provided for in Article IX, Title A, Section 1, of the Policies of the Trustees (as amended September 24, 1980), requires the full involvement of the Chancellor so that the President is made aware of how colleagues perceive his or her service. The process provides for constituent input, as required by the Chancellor, and at his option may include an on-site evaluation by an outside peer group. The process is flexible to account for differences among Presidents as to length of service and experiential levels.

#### **Procedures for a Presidential Evaluation:**

1. At appropriate intervals, the Chancellor will hold a special extended meeting with each State-operated campus President as part of the ongoing evaluation process. The meeting should provide an opportunity for the President to discuss campus problems and SUNY-wide problems that affect his or her campus, as well as to give the Chancellor an opportunity to express his views about the service of that President. The Chancellor, in preparing for these periodic evaluation meetings, will depend upon ongoing communications with campus Councils, and with faculty, students, and other campus constituent groups, as required.
2. The Chancellor, or his designated representative, will meet at appropriate intervals with the Council on each State-operated campus to assess the health of that campus, to review SUNY-wide concerns, and to review the stewardship of the President. The following general guidelines shall be applicable:
  - a. Plans for such a meeting shall be announced at least three weeks in advance, and those three weeks should be coincident with the College in session;
  - b. Since the meeting is one at which the performance of an individual is to be discussed, the Council would be expected to move into an executive session;

April 1995

(Appendix V, continued)

- c. The faculty observer who normally attends meetings of the campus Council shall be invited to the meeting by the Chancellor;
  - d. On campuses where there is a separate governance body for professional employees, the presiding officer of that body shall be invited by the Chancellor to attend the meeting. Where such a body does not exist, a representative can be selected through local governance procedures;
  - e. If there is an alumni representative who normally attends Council meetings as an observer, that person should be present at such a meeting;
  - f. Presence of the representatives from alumni, faculty, and professional employees at the Council meeting is preferable. If there are unusual circumstances in which there are concerns about the ability to raise sensitive matters within the full Council session of the discussion it may be possible for the Chancellor, or designee, to meet separately with one or more of the above representatives. Only the duly-selected representative from each constituency shall attend such a separate session, which shall be arranged in advance of the Chancellor's visit.
3. Whenever possible, the monthly meeting of the Board of Trustees should set aside a block of time for one or more Presidents to make presentations on campus activities, highlighting both accomplishments and problems. A rotational plan should be developed to give all Presidents such opportunities to appear periodically before the Board of Trustees.
  4. In the judgment of the Chancellor, he will determine the timing of the above process for each campus, as well as the method of his personal involvement. This informal ongoing method would not preclude the involvement of an outside peer evaluation group, for example, if the Chancellor deemed that necessary.
  5. The Chancellor shall report periodically to the Trustees on the service of campus Presidents. Such reports may or may not coincide with his meetings with the President, the Council, or campus constituent groups. Such reports will be made by the Chancellor to the Trustees in complete confidence. The president will be informed by the Chancellor of the nature of the report, since its purpose would be to emphasize the strong points to be continued and to pinpoint problem areas that need attention. Subsequent to his confidential report to the Trustees and the ensuing interaction with the President, the Chancellor, either directly or through his designee, will share the major points of the evaluation with the Councils.

April 1995

(Appendix V, continued)

## Section 2

### **Details Regarding Time Frames and Participants in Presidential Evaluations**

(Memorandum to Presidents - June 5, 1991)

1. The initial notification of intent to conduct an evaluation will continue, as in the past, to be a confidential exchange between the Chancellor and the President. The preparation of a self-assessment paper will then be started by the president.
2. At least six weeks before the planned date of the visit, the president's self-assessment report will be submitted to the Chancellor, with a copy given by the president to the Council Chair.
3. At least five weeks before the date of the campus visit by the Chancellor, the president will send copies of the self-assessment session with the Council. Those parties, as listed in the 1986 Guidelines are to include: the full membership of the Council, the chosen faculty representative, the chosen professional employee representative, and the chosen alumni representative.
4. Following the visit, the Chancellor will prepare a report of the evaluation and send it first as personal/confidential to the president, and then as a completed evaluation, still marked "confidential," to all those who participated in the search with the Council. Any wider distribution should be at the discretion of the president.
5. A separate meeting with any of the invited representatives may be arranged only under the conditions specified in the 1986 Guidelines, paragraph 2 (f).

Moreover, it should be noted here that the above time periods are in working weeks, when the campus is in session.

April 1995

(Appendix V, continued)

June 5, 1991

To: Presidents, State-operated Campuses

From: D. Bruce Johnstone  
Chancellor

Subject: Presidential Evaluations

In my memo of September 8, 1989 I advised you of a new requirement for a presidential self-assessment as part of the procedures for evaluation of presidents. The basic elements of the process remain as described in the Guidelines approved on February 19, 1986 by the Board of Trustees.

Over the past two years, there have been a few questions raised and points of concern expressed which suggest that I provide further specific details concerning the evaluation process and the participants as follows:

- The initial notification of intent to conduct an evaluation will continue, as in the past, to be a confidential exchange between the Chancellor and the President. The preparation of a self-assessment paper will then be started by the president.
- At least six weeks before the planned date of the visit, the president's self-assessment report will be submitted to the Chancellor, with a copy given by the president to the Council Chair.
- At least five weeks before the date of the campus visit by the Chancellor, the president will send copies of the self-assessment report to all parties involved in the closed evaluation session with the Council. Those parties, as listed in the 1986 Guidelines, are to include: the full membership of the Council, the chosen faculty representative, the chosen professional employee representative, and the chosen alumni representative.
- Following the visit, the Chancellor will prepare a report of the evaluation and send it first as personal/confidential to the president, and then as a completed evaluation, still marked "confidential," to all those who participated in the session with the Council. Any wider distribution should be at the discretion of the president.

(Appendix V, continued)

April 1995



- A separate meeting with any of the invited representatives may be arranged only under the conditions specified in the 1986 guidelines, paragraph 2 (f).

Moreover, it should be noted here that the above time periods are in working weeks, when the campus is in session. Any questions concerning the procedures and the process should be directed to Dr. Marilou Jarvis, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor.

Copy: Board of Trustees  
Executive Council  
President, University Faculty Senate (Markoe)  
President, Association for Council I  
Members and College Trustees (Conte)

## Appendix VI

TO: University Faculty Senate

FROM: Governance Committee

SUBJECT: **Guidelines for Campus Governance Involvement in Presidential Reviews**

### RATIONALE

The evaluation of a campus president by the Chancellor is a serious matter of importance to the entire campus community. While this evaluation is not intended to determine whether a president should continue in office, it does provide a remarkable opportunity for the campus to undertake an organized review of the president's performance and to communicate that assessment to both the president and the Chancellor. This review should be comprehensive and balanced: it should provide a view of those things a president is judged to be doing well along with those things for which improvement is desired. The tone of this review should be constructive, reflecting the goal of providing the president and the Chancellor with the campus' thoughtful and objective assessment of its administrative head.

The following are suggested guidelines for involving campus governance organization(s) in the periodic review of the campus president at the time of the Chancellor's review. It is intended to make this cooperative endeavor a useful, collaborative, and productive activity. The guidelines are general, having been drawn from the experiences of those campuses where reviews have recently occurred. It is quite likely that they will have to be adapted to the needs of the individual campus.

### RESOLUTION

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Faculty Senate urges the Chancellor to approve these guidelines for campus involvement in presidential reviews.

1. When the Chancellor decides to review the campus president and officially notifies the president, the local governance leader(s) should be notified by the Chancellor of the decision and be given the guidelines that the Chancellor will use in this process.
2. For the review to be maximally beneficial, there should be six to eight weeks (excluding vacations and intersession) between the Chancellor's notification of the impending review and the actual visit to the campus for this purpose.

(Appendix VI, continued)

3. The local governance leader(s) should be given a copy of the president's self-evaluation at the same time that it is transmitted to the Chancellor.

April 1995

4. The local governance leader(s) should be afforded the opportunity to meet separately with the Chancellor, as well as to meet jointly with the Chancellor and the college council.
5. The Chancellor should forward to the local governance leader(s) a copy of the evaluation at the same time as a copy is sent to the president of the campus.
6. The results of the evaluation and the meeting with the Chancellor should be reported to the faculty governance executive committee and to the campus community.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University Faculty Senate urges local governance organizations to incorporate the following guidelines into their procedures for campus involvement in presidential reviews:

1. The local governance leader(s) should notify the campus of the forthcoming review of the president and, in consultation with the faculty governance executive committee and the University Faculty Senator(s) organize a process to focus the campus effort on appropriate modes of eliciting from the campus informed views of the performance of its president.
2. The local governance leader(s) and the local faculty governance executive committee should review all the material received in this process, evaluate it, and use it to formulate a comprehensive response for the Chancellor's review of the president.
3. The local governance leader(s) should discuss this response (or in the event it takes the form of a written report, give a copy and discuss the report) with the president prior to the Chancellor's visit. If desired, the faculty governance executive committee or its equivalent may participate in these discussions.
4. Comments on how this process worked and any suggested revisions should be communicated to the President of the SUNY Faculty Senate.

April 15, 1991

**98 - 4 - 1**

**(Passed)**

**References and Additional Readings**

\* \* \* \* \*

April 1995

These SUNY materials are available and may be considered "must" reading by all campus and state-wide governance leaders: Policies of the Board of Trustees, the SUNY Faculty Senate Handbook, and the SUNY Senate Budget Handbook.

### **Suggested Additional Readings**

Alfred, R.L. (1985). "Organizing for Renewal Through Participative Governance," New Directions for Higher Education, No. 49 (Leadership and Institutional Renewal), 13, 57-63.

American Association of University Professors. (1994). "1994 Standards for Committee Investigations in the Area of College and University Government," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 80, 69-70.

American Association of University Professors, (1990). AAUP Policy Documents & Reports (The "Redbook").

American Association of University Professors. (1985). "AASCU's Statement on Academic Government: A Response from Committee 'T'," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 71, 60.

American Association of University Professors. (1984). "Statewide Boards of Higher Education: The Faculty Role," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 70, 16A.

Baldrige, J.V., et al. (1981). "Assessing the Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining," AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, No. 8.

Bergman, B.R. (1991). "Bloated Administration, Blighted Campuses," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 77, 12-16.

Bing, R. and L. Dye (1992). "The Danger of Hierarchical Decision-Making," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 78, 16-18.

Chen, J. R. (1994). "System or not? Governance and Faculty Voice at SUNY," Studies in Public Higher Education, 5, 31-38.

Davidson, J. F. (1982). "Tenure, Governance and Standards in the Academic Community." (1982). Liberal Education, 68, 35-42.

Finkelstein, M. and A.O. Pfnister (1984). "The Diminishing Role of Faculty in Institutional Governance: Liberal Arts Colleges as a Negative Case." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE).

Flynn, J.G. and K.E. Markoe (1988). "Faculty Senates: A Case for Reinventing the Wheel," AAHE Bulletin, 41, 8-9.

Ganna, J.M. (1984). "Employing Part-Time Faculty: Thoughtful Approaches to Continuing Problems," AAHE Bulletin, 37, 3-7.

Gilmour, J.E., Jr. (1991). "Your Faculty Senate: More Effective Than You Think," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 77, 16-18.

Hanna, C. and L.B. Mayhew (1984) "Governance Styles: Affirmative Action at Two Universities." Paper presented at the Joint Conference of the Association of the Study of Higher Education and the American Educational Research Association, Division J, San Francisco, CA.

Mason, H.L., et al. (1982). "Four Issues in Contemporary Campus Governance," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 68, 3A-14A.

Miller, G. R. (1993). "Budget Cuts and Shared Governance," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 79, 12-14.

Nelson, J.L. (1982). "Collective Bargaining's Myths and Realities," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 68, 9-12.

O'Neil, R.M. (1983). "A President's Perspective," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 69, 17-20.

Polishook, I.H. (1982). "Unions and Governance --The CUNY Experience," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 68, 15-17.

Reezes, P. and G. Smith (1987). "Faculty and Academic Staff Participation in Academic Governance: The Social Contract Model." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE).

Regan, G.M. (1981). "Faculty Governance: Some Tensions in the Contemporary University," Canstone Journal of Education, 2, 35-50.

Ridgely, J. (1993). "Faculty Senates and the Fiscal Crisis," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 79, 7-11.

State University of New York. (1973). "Resolutions on Professional Rights and Responsibilities," Faculty Senate Bulletin, 8.

Strohm, P. (1981). "Faculty Governance in the 90's: Adverse Conditions, Diverse Responses -- A Preliminary Wingspread Report," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 67, 383-386.

Watts, E.S. (1991). "Governance Beyond the Individual Campus," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 77, 28-32.

Williams, D., et al. (1987). "One Faculty's Perception of Its Governance Role," Journal of Higher Education, 58, 629-657.

Wolvin, A.D. (1991). "When Governance Is Really Shared: The Multi-Constituency Campus," Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, 77, 26-27.

Zirkel, P.A. (1986). "Faculty Bargaining and Campus Governance: Rhetoric vs. Research," Administrator's Update, 6, 1-7.

### **Supplementary Readings**

The following documents, and items included on the References and Additional Readings List, are presented as resource material only. Their inclusion implies no endorsement of the contents.