

## **AGENDA**

### **COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY PERSONNEL**

**Meeting:**      **8:00 a.m., Wednesday, January 28, 2015**  
                 **Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium**

Hugo N. Morales, Chair  
Lillian Kimbell, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg  
Douglas Faigin  
J. Lawrence Norton

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 13, 2014

#### **Discussion Items**

1. Executive Compensation: Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, *Action*
2. California State University Chancellor's Evaluation Policy, *Action*
3. Executive Compensation: Individual Transition Program, *Information*

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF  
COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY PERSONNEL**

**Trustees of The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor  
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California**

**November 13, 2014**

**Members Present**

Lillian Kimbell, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg  
Douglas Faigin  
J. Lawrence Norton  
Timothy P. White, Chancellor  
Lou Monville, Chair of the Board

Trustee Kimbell called the meeting to order.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of July 22, 2014, were approved as submitted.

**Executive Compensation: President – California State Polytechnic University, Pomona**

Chancellor Timothy P. White proposed an annual salary of \$292,000 and a monthly auto allowance of \$1,000 for Dr. Soraya M. Coley as president of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. He noted that the proposed compensation was equal to the current president's pay and the auto allowance was in accord with existing policy. He stated that Dr. Coley will be required to reside in the official university residence for the president and she will receive standard benefits for Executives including relocation benefits. The item was adopted as submitted. (RUF 11-14-07)

**Annual Report**

Ms. Lori Lamb, vice chancellor of human resources, presented the annual report on vice presidential compensation, executive relocation expenses and executive transition programs. She provided the board with historical context noting that the annual report was established by the board as a result of recommendations by the Bureau of State Audits in 2007.

Referring to the vice presidential compensation items listed in the attachment to Agenda Item 2, Ms. Lamb stated that salaries for new vice presidents and compensation changes to existing vice presidents fell within salary guidelines and were reviewed by human resources and by the chancellor. She noted that the system has brought transparency and consistency to vice presidential salary setting as was the intent of the board's resolution.

With regards to executive relocation costs, Ms. Lamb indicated that the system could not attract or recruit executives without providing this benefit. She stated that relocation costs are monitored to ensure compliance with applicable rules and regulations and to ensure the system is relocating individuals in a cost effective manner. Details are provided in the agenda item.

Ms. Lamb continued with an update on executive transition programs. She explained that in the past trustees provided for the transition of leadership with a trustee professorship which was replaced by the Executive Transition Program and later, the Executive Transition II Program. She noted that the CSU has a contractual obligation to executives hired under the earlier programs. There is only one trustee professor continuing to serve and only a single current president remains eligible for a trustee professorship. She referred to the agenda item noting that three individuals are currently in a transition assignment and one of those assignments will end by December 31, 2014.

Trustee Eisen asked if the Executive Transition II continues to be in effect and if so, is there a date when it expires and a new program has to be considered. Ms. Lamb responded that the Executive Transition II continues to be in effect and there is no sunset on the program so it does not have to be reviewed unless the trustees so choose.

Ms. Lamb stated that staff fully supports providing this report in the spirit of transparency and compliance with the previous board resolution; however, the information, particularly on vice presidential compensation, is difficult to understand because it lacks appropriate context. She recommended a more thorough evaluation of compensation issues for all employees rather than the current report methodology which views only a specific segment of the university's population. She solicited board input to re-examine the resolution in favor of receiving a more comprehensive report. Chair Monville agreed and asked that staff work with the Committee on University and Faculty Personnel and report back to the board.

Trustee Glazer noted that the policy on presidential compensation expired in January of this year. Chair Monville clarified that the policy did not expire rather the language called for a review of the policy; however, he did agree that it would be appropriate to review the policy at this time. Ms. Lamb responded that the policy review is in the queue and would go hand in hand with a thorough review of compensation issues.

### **Compensation for Unrepresented Employees**

Ms. Lamb provided a brief update on the 2014/2015 compensation pool for Management Personnel Plan, Confidential, and Excluded employee groups. She explained that consistent with the amounts negotiated for other employee groups, Chancellor White authorized a three percent compensation pool for eligible unrepresented employees effective July 1, 2014. She noted that while salary lags will not be corrected overnight, incremental salary increases and targeted equity adjustments over the next several years will help narrow the gap.

### **Compensation for Executives**

Trustee Kimbell noted that the item would be presented by Chancellor White, Trustee Garcia and Chair Monville.

Chancellor White stated that he would make compensation recommendations for campus presidents and system executives. Compensation for the vice chancellor and chief audit officer would be recommended by the chair of the Committee on Audit.

Chancellor White stated that executives have not received a salary increase since 2007 and last year's 1.34 percent increase was not extended to executives. He recommended a three percent increase, the same amount authorized by the board for faculty and staff. He further recommended that, where necessary, the three percent increase be implemented with respect to the executive's total compensation. He indicated that he intends to return to the board to discuss remaining market and equity issues for executives; this aligns with ongoing efforts to address these same issues for faculty and staff.

As chair of the Committee on Audit, Trustee Garcia recommended compensation to the full board for Mr. Larry Mandel, vice chancellor and chief audit officer. She acknowledged that the chief audit officer should be compensated in the same manner as other executives. Trustee Garcia explained to the board that pursuant to the Audit Committee Charter, compensation for the chief audit officer is set at the recommendation of the Committee on Audit in consultation with the chancellor. On behalf of the Committee on Audit, she recommended approval of a three percent increase for Mr. Mandel.

Chair Lou Monville presented a compensation increase for Chancellor White. He recommended a three percent increase be applied to the chancellor's total compensation. He indicated that it was fair to compensate the chancellor in the same manner as other employee groups across the CSU.

Trustee Kimbell called for a motion and second which was followed by a discussion.

Trustee Garcia indicated that she supported the three percent increase; however, she did not support applying state funds to supplemental income. She recommended having the foundations assist with the three percent as it applied to supplemental income. She also noted that increases were recommended for individuals hired over the last couple of months which she felt was not necessarily the best approach going forward.

Trustee Day agreed with Trustee Garcia's concerns adding that he felt it was inappropriate for a portion of executive pay to come from a foundation. He indicated that since the policy was in place he would support the foundation picking up its share but in the future would like to see a policy that was more equitable. He recommended this be brought back to the board with thought given to structure to avoid any controversy when establishing pay for these positions. He discussed a tiered approach based on factors such as size, number of students, budget, geographic location, cost of living, etc., and as vacancies occur, the salary is based on those factors and established market rates so expectations are clear upfront.

Trustee Faigin also agreed with Trustee Garcia's concern about state funds being applied to foundation dollars. He noted that when the salaries were set using foundation dollars it was indicated that the supplements were fully supported by the foundation and now, state dollars are being added on top of those foundation dollars. He added that while the amounts are not large, it is the context and philosophy that is of concern.

Trustee Eisen asked for clarification that a president whose compensation was approved today would also receive an increase under this item. Chancellor White indicated that it was understood at the time of recruitment that the individual would be eligible for the three percent increase.

Trustee Achtenberg pointed out that our executives continue to be up to 40 percent below the market, and as a business practice, this poses a challenge to the university. She acknowledged that it is not popular, but it is something that needs to be taken into account as upcoming policies are reviewed and as today's compensation actions are considered. She indicated her intent to vote for this item and recognized the comments and concerns expressed by others.

Trustee Garcia reiterated that her concern is not about the increase specifically but rather the approach that is being proposed. Trustee Glazer indicated that he was prepared to support the three percent increase; however, he agreed that the three percent should not be applied to foundation funds.

Chancellor White acknowledged the concerns expressed by Trustee Garcia and other board members in regards to the three percent being applied to foundation monies. He indicated that with the presidents sitting on the foundation board, as opposed to when they were initially appointed, it has created a difficult situation within our current policy. He noted that only six presidents receive a supplement as part of their total compensation and the adjustment from state funds would range from 3.2 percent to 3.4 percent. He continued that these presidents are not being treated differently than faculty who will likely receive up to 4.6 percent due to the GSI and SSI negotiated for those respective colleagues.

Ms. Lamb indicated that asking the foundations to give a raise to a sitting member of the board would in fact create an appearance of a conflict of interest. She added that going forward the issue of supplemental compensation from external sources needs to be addressed. Additionally, market rates need to be clearly established and compensation set accordingly as opposed to using foundation funds. She added that while not ideal from a human resources and compensation perspective, it is a step towards dealing with market issues and opens up dialogue on how this might be done more effectively in the future.

Mr. Fram Virjee, executive vice chancellor and general counsel, remarked that from a conflict of interest perspective going back to a foundation with a sitting president on the board and asking that they participate in this creates more than an appearance of conflict, it creates a conflict. Mr. Garrett Ashley, vice chancellor of university relations and advancement, added that if this were to go before the respective foundation boards, they would not necessarily treat this request in the same manner and timeframe.

Stating that the board's wishes would be respected in this regard, Chancellor White also remarked that these are the consequences of a policy that was put in place at a different time. He agreed with Trustee Day and others who called for a comprehensive review of the compensation policy and bringing it back for future discussions with the board.

Trustee Garcia remarked that it appears we are living with an inherent conflict of interest because foundations continue to provide supplemental income. She found this concerning and agreed with Trustee Day that the policy be re-evaluated to avoid these situations going forward.

Trustee Faigin indicated that he supported the overall three percent but he did not support the three percent being applied to the foundation monies. He called for a motion to amend the proposed compensation whereby the three percent is not applied to foundation monies. Additionally, he encouraged the various foundations apply a similar amount to the supplemental compensation of the respective presidents. Trustee Kimbell called for a second on the amendment; a brief discussion followed.

Trustee Norton brought up the fact that there is no guarantee that the foundations would act in a consistent manner if this request went before them which brings up the issue of fairness. Trustee Faigin remarked that the foundation money has created unfairness among the presidents with those who receive foundation money benefiting. He stated that the issue of using tax dollars to supplement private money is what bothered him.

Trustee Fortune raised the point that the motion to amend appeared to have failed for lack of a second by the committee. Trustee Kimbell asked again if there was a second from the committee to amend the item as submitted by Trustee Faigin. With no second, the motion to amend did not pass.

Trustee Norton indicated that it was important to follow through and come up with a comprehensive and rational salary structure so these issues do not arise in the future. Chair Monville responded that he has asked the chancellor and staff to bring this issue at it relates to policy back to the board in January. He anticipates ongoing discussions to address this long term. He urged the committee to support the item as recommended.

Trustee Eisen noted that while the amount of money being discussed was exceedingly small, the principle is the issue. She agreed that all of this be revisited and a comprehensive plan be developed for the future.

Trustee Kimbell asked if there was any further discussion or questions. The item was adopted as submitted. (RUF 11-14-08)

Trustee Kimbell adjourned the meeting.

## **COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY PERSONNEL**

### **Executive Compensation: Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs**

#### **Presentation By**

Timothy P. White  
Chancellor

#### **Summary**

In anticipation of the appointment by the Board of Trustees, the proposed compensation for Dr. Loren J. Blanchard as executive vice chancellor for academic and student affairs for the California State University will be presented.

#### **Background**

Dr. Loren J. Blanchard currently holds the post of provost and senior vice president for academic affairs at Xavier University of Louisiana.

He holds a B. S. degree in Speech Pathology Education from Xavier University of Louisiana, a M. Ed. degree in Educational Administration and Supervision from McNeese State University, and a Ph. D. in Educational Psychology from the University of Georgia.

Prior to his appointment at Xavier University, Dr. Blanchard was the associate vice chancellor for academic and multicultural affairs at Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center. He also served as provost and senior vice president for academic affairs at the University of Louisiana System of Colleges and Universities.

#### **Executive Compensation**

As executive vice chancellor for academic and student affairs, Dr. Blanchard will receive an annual salary of \$319,300. He is expected to assume the position of executive vice chancellor for academic and student affairs on or before July 1, 2015. In accord with existing policy, Dr. Blanchard will receive the following benefits:

- An auto allowance of \$1,000 per month;
- Standard benefit provisions afforded CSU Executive classification employees;
- A transition program for university executives provided he meets the eligibility requirements passed by the Board of Trustees on November 15, 2006 (RUFP 11-06-06);
- A temporary housing allowance of \$5,000 per month for six months; and
- Reimbursement for actual, necessary and reasonable moving and relocation expenses.

In addition, Dr. Blanchard will hold the academic rank of full professor with tenure at California State University, Long Beach, subject to faculty and presidential consultation.

This salary is commensurate with the salary for the other two executive vice chancellors in the California State University.

**Recommended Action**

The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that Dr. Loren J. Blanchard shall receive a salary set at the annual rate of \$319,300 effective the date of his appointment as executive vice chancellor for academic and student affairs for the California State University; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, Dr. Blanchard shall receive additional benefits as cited in Item 1 of the Committee on University and Faculty Personnel at the January 27-28, 2015 meeting of the Board of Trustees.



## **COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY PERSONNEL**

### **California State University Chancellor's Evaluation Policy**

#### **Presentation By**

Lou Monville  
Chair of the Board of Trustees

#### **Summary**

The Chancellor is the chief executive officer of the system and is responsible for the day-to-day management of the system. The Board of Trustees has a responsibility to ensure that the Chancellor is performing at the highest level, and that the Chancellor has the support and guidance from the Board necessary to be successful. To this end, it is critical that the Board of Trustees engage in periodic evaluations of the performance of the Chancellor as they do with the presidents.

#### **Background**

The Board of Trustees governs the California State University by:

1. Developing broad administrative policy for the campuses;
2. Providing broad direction and coordination to campus curricular development;
3. Overseeing the efficient management of funds, property, facilities and investments by the system and the campuses;
4. ***Appointing the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors for the system, and the Presidents for the campuses as chief executives with certain delegated responsibilities; and***
5. Communicating to the people of California an understanding and appreciation of the current effectiveness and the future needs of the California State University.

To date, there has not been a systematic or written process articulated for the evaluation of the Chancellor, nor are there formal criteria determined upon which the evaluation will take place. In Chancellor's White's ongoing efforts to bring transparency and accountability throughout all levels of the system, he and Chair Monville have agreed that a process for regular evaluations of the performance of the Chancellor should be implemented.

Objectives of the performance evaluation process include:

- A. To promote accountability and transparency.
- B. To promote the success of the Chancellor and the system.
- C. To provide a continuing assessment of overall operations and effectiveness of the system, and an assessment of the leadership and management of the Chancellor.

- D. To provide the Chancellor with an evolving understanding of his/her role, rights and responsibilities; the plans, goals and expectations mutually agreed to; and the criteria against which progress is to be measured.
- E. To provide open and honest conversations between the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees regarding the conditions or state of the system, desirable courses of action, progress, and ideas for improvement or redirection of effort.
- F. To provide an overall opportunity for the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor to reassess CSU missions, goals, policies and the resources needed to facilitate and enhance system activities.

### **Recommended Policy**

#### **Proposed Process and Timelines**

The Chair of the Board recommends that the Chancellor's evaluation process begin, with a level-setting annual conference in March of 2015, and proceed thereafter on a regular schedule. Consideration has been given to future timing of the Chancellor's evaluation and it has been incorporated into the annual calendar of the Board of Trustees events and major decisions. The recommended timing is as follows:

- 1. January 2015 – approve process, timelines, elements and criteria
- 2. February 2015 – preparation for evaluation of the Chancellor
  - a. February 2015 – self-assessment by Chancellor
  - b. February 2015 – information collection and assimilation from Board of Trustees members
- 3. March 2015 – closed session annual conference with Chancellor (following preparatory work as described in paragraph 2 above)
- 4. September 2016 – closed session annual conference with Chancellor (following preparatory work as described in paragraph 2 above)
- 5. September 2017 – closed session three year evaluation process (following preparatory work as described in paragraph 2 above, plus input from campus presidents, vice-chancellors, and other stakeholders)

#### **Review and Approval of Elements and Criteria for the Evaluation of Chancellor**

There are no existing formal criteria for evaluation of the Chancellor. However, the Board of Trustees has developed formal criteria for the evaluation of presidents.<sup>1</sup> Given the many similarities for competencies in leadership across the system and the need for consistency and ease of administration, it makes sense initially to develop criteria for the evaluation of the Chancellor that are similar to those used to evaluate system presidents. It is worth noting that the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Attachment A – Board of Trustees Policies and Procedures for Review of Presidents, adopted January 25-26, 1994, modified November 13-14, 2001.

evaluation criteria for presidents were adopted in 2001 and should also be reviewed, at a later time, to ensure they are sufficient to meet the current needs of the system.

In addition, best practices indicate that the evaluation process should include the following elements:

- a self-assessment related to the major accomplishments of the chancellor
- a review of general criteria that are indicative of success, and
- a formal process of setting goals and/or priorities for future evaluation.

The recommended elements and criteria include:

A. Self-Assessment of Major Accomplishments and Achievements During the Evaluation Period by the Chancellor

The Chancellor will submit to the Board of Trustees, through the Chair of the Board, a brief report summarizing the major accomplishments and achievements during the evaluation period.

B. Evaluation of General Performance Criteria

The Board of Trustees will evaluate general criteria related to the operations and condition of the system as well as the leadership and management effectiveness of the Chancellor which include, but are not limited to:<sup>2</sup>

1. General Administrative Effectiveness Including Management of Human, Fiscal and Physical Resources

Evidence in system operations of effective planning and decision making; development and delegation to system office executive team and to presidents; accomplishment of plans and objectives; flexibility in approach to solving problems and willingness to change programs and methods to keep up with current needs and developments; commitment to equal employment and programmatic opportunities and wise utilization of staff in the Chancellor's Office; effective relationships with statewide collective bargaining units.

2. Working Relations with the Board of Trustees, Presidents, and System Executives  
Evidence in system operations that there are open lines of communications; work is accomplished effectively with and through others; the suggestions of others are solicited and considered in good faith and that the Chancellor and executive team have established

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: The criteria above are modified from the Policies and Procedures for Review of Presidents, which are provided in Attachment A.

credibility; working effectively with the Chair of the Board, board members and committees of the Board; keeping the Board apprised effectively and consulting appropriately on policy and decision-making.

Evidence that the Chancellor, in serving as the chief executive officer of the system, establishes and implements the mission of the CSU; ensures that the mission of the CSU is understood and advanced by all constituent groups.

3. Educational Leadership and Effectiveness

Evidence across the system of development, maintenance and renewal of academic and student success plans and programs that meet long-range needs; ensures periodic evaluation of educational progress and accomplishments by campuses that support overall student success; creating a systemwide environment that stimulates system, campus and individual success for students; supporting innovation in academic and student support services.

4. Community, Legislative and National Relations

Evidence of effective work with local, regional, state and national community and legislative leaders; representing the CSU on all levels to advance the mission; effective relations with the media; service to and from the community at all levels; local, regional and national reputation; support of the systemwide advancement and outreach efforts.

5. Personal Characteristics

Evidence of the Chancellor's knowledge of the job, judgment, leadership, planning and organizing ability, drive, vision, human relations and communications skills, objectivity and fairness, ability to articulate ideas and concepts, ability to innovate, ability to take into account the public relations and political implications of his/her actions, ability to deal with many different problems and events at the same time, ability to withstand any criticism and to direct opposition into productive channels, ability to get to the key parts of complex problems, evidence of having sufficient facts before making decisions and ability to promote coordination and efficiency of programs and operations.

C. Establishment of Goals and/or Priorities for the Future

The Board of Trustees and the Chancellor will have a conversation and develop a shared understanding regarding goals and/or priorities for the future evaluation period and measures or indicators of success.

**Recommended Action**

The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Chancellor's Annual Conference and Evaluation Process begin in March 2015, and proceed thereafter in the manner as presented in Agenda Item 2 of the Committee on University and Faculty Personnel at the January 27-28, 2015 meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees.

## **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF PRESIDENTS**

### **I. Coverage:**

This document establishes policies and procedures for the review of presidents in the California State University.

### **II. Responsibilities:**

Decisions regarding appointment, salary, and continuity of presidents are made by the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the chancellor.

### **III. Objectives:**

The objectives of the review are to provide the chancellor and the Board of Trustees with an understanding of the unique characteristics of the campus, a continuing assessment of campus operations and educational effectiveness, and an assessment of the leadership and management performances of the executive.

The review provides the presidents with an evolving understanding of their roles, their rights and their responsibilities; the plans, goals and expectations mutually agreed to by the president and the chancellor; and the criteria against which progress is measured. The review is also to provide an opportunity for open and frank discussions between the president and the chancellor of the conditions or state of the campus accomplishments, desirable courses of action, progress, and ideas for improvement or redirection of effort.

The review also provides the chancellor with information upon which to reassess CSU missions, goals, policies and the resources needed to facilitate and enhance campus activities.

### **IV. Procedures:**

#### **A. Frequency of Review**

1. The scheduling of reviews will be determined by the date of assumption of duties.
2. Newly Appointed Presidents:

Newly appointed presidents meet with the chancellor during the first year of service (preferably between the third and ninth month of the executive's incumbency). The president discusses his/her assessment of the state of the campus, goals and objectives and possible plan(s) for their implementation. During this meeting the

president makes an assessment of the needs of the campus and proposes goals and objectives and plans for action; after discussion with the chancellor an agreement is reached on needs and expectations.

One year later, there is a discussion between the president and the chancellor on progress, achievements, any changes in original plans or directions and general performance.

Approximately two years later, the president becomes part of the regular three-year review process.

### 3. Annual Conference:

Each president has a review conference with the chancellor once a year. These meetings focus on progress toward meeting campus missions and goals, program accomplishments, campus activities, problems and proposed solutions, the state of the campus and supplement the continuing interchanges about campus and system events between the president and the chancellor. The chancellor, following completion of an annual conference, may report results and findings to the Board of Trustees.

### 4. Triennial Review:

At the outset of the third academic year of the president's tenure, and every three years thereafter, the chancellor will conduct a review based upon the information collected pursuant to B.1. below which will be discussed with the president concerned in the annual conference (A.3. above). The chancellor, following completion of the triennial review, will report results and findings to the Board of Trustees. The chancellor will distribute to the board a summary document which also defines goals and criteria for subsequent reviews.

Depending on the circumstances, the board or the chancellor, with the concurrence of the board, may initiate a brief meeting of the board with the president in conjunction with the review.

### 5. Six-Year Review

A regular review of the campus and the stewardship of the president, involving an off-campus committee, occurs approximately every six years.

The chancellor, the board, or the president may request accelerated reviews.

## B. Background Information and Its Collection

### 1. Triennial Review:

The triennial review is based on information about activities of the campus collected by the chancellor in whatever manner is deemed appropriate. The president being reviewed presents information about the progress being made and the state of the campus.

The chancellor will request factual information from appropriate sources in the CSU community including, but not limited to, the ongoing leadership of the local academic senate, the student association, the alumni organization and the appropriate community-based advisory group. The chancellor will also request information from other faculty of distinction, alumni or community individuals, campus administrators, and Chancellor's Office personnel. The chancellor may utilize information gained from such sources as everyday working relations with the president, and internal and external reports on programs, operations and achievements.

The chancellor will issue an "open letter" to the affected campus to inform of the routine review, the time frame, the criteria, and the methodology. The letter will also give direction to anyone who is not contacted either randomly or by virtue of office held but feels compelled to participate. Petitions and unsigned letters will continue to be disregarded.

After the Board of Trustees has received and discussed a triennial review, the chancellor will prepare a brief report to the campus community that brings conclusion to the review and informs the campus community of the major findings and the goals for the president and the campus for the next period.

The chancellor and the president have the option to augment the triennial review framework when deemed beneficial for the president, the campus, or both. Aspects of the six-year review methodology or other models may be appropriate.

### Confidentiality:

Confidentiality will be preserved in obtaining information and in preparing the report.

### 2. Six-Year Review:

The six-year review will utilize assessments made by an advisory committee composed of individuals from off-campus. The chancellor, in consultation with the president, will appoint three persons to an advisory committee, two of whom may be from outside the



CSU. The chair of the Board of Trustees will appoint a fourth member from the current membership of the board to the advisory committee.

When assessing a campus, the advisory committee utilizes information obtained from visits to the campus, review of written reports and interviews with members of the campus community, the community at large and appropriate CSU personnel. The advisory committee's assessment is directed toward the review of campus operations and the president's stewardship. The review shall be in the same academic year as the WASC review, whenever possible.

Questionnaires:

Questionnaires or other survey instruments will not be used.

Report of the Advisory Committee:

The advisory committee makes a confidential written report of its findings to the chancellor. Prior to submitting its final report to the chancellor, the committee furnishes a draft copy of its findings to the president of the campus being reviewed, and affords an opportunity for the president to make a written response and to discuss the findings with the committee. Upon receipt of the committee's final report, the chancellor furnishes a copy of the final report to the president and affords the president an opportunity to make a written response. The chancellor discusses the committee's findings and the response with the president.

Following completion of a six-year review of a campus, the president of that campus will be invited to meet with the Board of Trustees in closed session.

Confidentiality:

Confidentiality will be preserved in obtaining information, in implementation of the procedures, and in the reporting procedure.

## **V. CRITERIA FOR PRESIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT**

General criteria for consideration of both the operations and condition of the campus as well as the leadership and management effectiveness of the president include, but are not limited to, such factors as the following:

### **1. General Administrative Effectiveness Including Management of Human, Fiscal and Physical Resources:**

Evidence in campus operations of effective planning and decision making; development of and delegation to a management team; accomplishment of plans and objectives; flexibility in approach to solving problems and willingness to change programs and methods to keep up with current needs and developments; commitment to equal employment and programmatic opportunities and wise utilization of faculty and staff.

## **2. Working Relations with the System and the Campus:**

Evidence in campus operations that there are open lines of communications; work is accomplished effectively with and through others; the suggestions of others are solicited and considered in good faith and that the executive and the management team have established credibility.

Evidence that the president, in serving as executive officer of the campus, maintains a perspective of the mission of the CSU and cognizance of the special demands placed on the system; participates productively in deliberations in systemwide academic and administrative matters.

## **3. Educational Leadership and Effectiveness:**

Evidence in campus operations of development, maintenance and renewal of academic plans and programs that meet long-range needs; periodic evaluation of educational progress and accomplishments; the establishment of an environment that stimulates teaching, learning, scholarship, professional development and the pursuit of support to enhance academic programs and innovation.

## **4. Community Relations:**

Evidence in campus operations of community understanding of and support for the campus; good relations with the media; service to and from the community, alumni support, effective “Town and Gown” activities; local, regional and national reputation; and an effective institutional advancement program, including fundraising.

## **5. Major Achievements of the Campus and the President.**

## **6. Personal Characteristics:**

Evidence in campus operations of the president’s knowledge of the job, judgment, leadership, planning and organizing ability, drive, vision, human relations and communications skills, objectivity and fairness, ability to articulate ideas and concepts, ability to innovate, ability to take into account the public relations and political implications of his/her actions, ability to deal with

ATTACHMENT A  
U&FP – Item 2  
January 27-28, 2015  
Page 6 of 6

many different problems and events at the same time, ability to withstand any criticism and to direct opposition into productive channels, ability to get to the key parts of complex problems, evidence of having facts before making decisions and ability to promote coordination and efficiency of programs and operations.

Adopted January 25-26, 1994  
Modified November 13-14, 2001  
Board of Trustees CSU

## **COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY PERSONNEL**

### **Executive Compensation: Individual Transition Program**

#### **Presentation By**

Lori Lamb  
Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

#### **Summary**

Information will be provided on the transition of Dr. J. Michael Ortiz from his position as president of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

#### **Background**

At the November 14-15, 2006 meeting of the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees a resolution (RUF 11-06-06) was adopted requiring the chancellor to report on new individual transition programs in an open meeting of the Committee on University and Faculty Personnel.

Trustee policy provides for an executive transition program for individuals appointed into an executive position between November 18, 1992 and November 14, 2006 (RUF 11-92-04). Under the provisions of the program, the executive is entitled to a paid transitional period of one year.

#### **Information**

On December 31, 2014, Dr. J. Michael Ortiz retired from the position of president of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. His transition assignment to which he is entitled under the executive transition program is effective January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

During his transition assignment he will be reassigned into the Management Personnel Plan (MPP – Administrator IV) and is eligible for standard benefits applicable to MPP employees. Dr. Ortiz will have a salary set at the annual rate of \$226,987. His auto allowance and housing arrangement as president were discontinued effective December 31, 2014. Duties during his transition assignment include:

- To continue representing the CSU on the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) Board through the end of his HACU term (November 2015).

U&FP

Agenda Item 3

January 27-28, 2015

Page 2 of 2

- To be available at the request of the new president of Cal Poly Pomona for advice and counsel on issues pertaining to the university.
- To assist CSU San Bernardino at the request of the president with enrollment, academic and philanthropic matters.
- To be available to the chancellor and other system vice chancellors for advice and counsel on matters pertaining to the California State University.