Florida Gulf Coast University Board of Trustees
December 10, 2014

SUBJECT: Minutes of October 15, 2014 Meeting

PROPOSED BOARD ACTION

Information only

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Florida Gulf Coast University Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation met on October 15, 2014. Minutes of the meeting were kept as statutorily required. The Committee approved the minutes at its November 13, 2014 meeting.

Supporting Documentation Included: Minutes of October 15, 2014 Meeting

Prepared by: Executive Assistant to the Vice President and Chief of Staff Valerie Whitaker

Legal Review by: N/A

Submitted by: Vice President and Chief of Staff Susan Evans
Committee Members:
Present: Trustee Rob Wells – Chair; Trustee Joe Catti (via conference call); Trustee Shawn Felton; Trustee Blake Gable (via conference call); Trustee Tom Grady; Trustee John Little; Trustee Robbie Roepstorff.

Absent: None

Others:
Trustees: Trustee Ann Hamilton (via conference call).
Staff: President Wilson Bradshaw; Vice President and Chief of Staff Susan Evans; Vice President and General Counsel Vee Leonard; Director of Board Operations, and Special Projects Amber Pacheco; Director of Media Relations Lillian Pagan; and Executive Assistant to the Vice President and Chief of Staff Valerie Whitaker.

Item 1: Call to Order, Roll Call and Opening Remarks
Meeting called to order at 3:04 p.m. and Chair Wells made opening remarks. He reviewed the meeting goals. Goals included developing a recommendation of a streamlined Presidential evaluation tool to bring to the FGCU Board of Trustees’ December 10, 2014 meeting; and whether the Board annually should conduct the Presidential evaluation in June or September due to the fiscal year’s not being concluded in June and final data not available at that time. He reminded the Committee that at the September 2014 Board meeting President Bradshaw described his evaluation the Board will make for the current year as transitional in nature since the Board in June approved his 2014-2015 performance goals.

President Bradshaw reviewed the evaluation process. He spoke about the draft evaluation tool that was presented at the September Board meeting including the added section on “Leadership.” He reiterated this year’s being a transitional year with regard to a new evaluation tool since his 2014-2015 performance goals already are in place having been approved by the Board in June. After a new evaluation tool is finalized he will present his future years’ goals in a manner that is consistent in format with the evaluation tool.
Chair Wells agreed this would be a hybrid process as the 2014-2015 goals have been approved. He asked President Bradshaw to discuss the outside performance review that was previously done. President Bradshaw said that as part of his initial contract an outside reviewer was required after his third year, but it is not a part of his contract extension.

**Item 3: Drafts of Evaluation Tool (TAB #1)**
Trustee Little described the current presidential evaluation process as cumbersome, and difficult to follow, and noted he was concerned it did not look specifically at the duties and responsibilities of the President. He said he did not feel as a member of the Board he is qualified to rate the President on some elements included in the performance goals. He said one of the most important roles of the Board is to evaluate the President, and to have credibility as a Board, Trustees need to look at the process they use. Trustee Little said keeping the evaluation tool simple would be best.

**Item 4: Committee Q&A and Discussion**
Chair Wells opened discussion of the Committee.

Trustee Catti asked if President Bradshaw reviewed and agreed with the primary and sub-goals on the draft scorecard. President Bradshaw agreed and said it reflects with less detail his 2014-2015 performance goals.

Chair Wells asked if Trustee Little considered using the same rating scale for all the goals. Trustee Little referenced a three-point scale: exceeds expectations, meets expectations and needs improvement.

Trustee Felton suggested adding a fourth point: partially met.

President Bradshaw reminded the Committee that the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) cautions against using a numerical scale for Presidential evaluations. He also said one Trustee suggested that using a 1 – 5 scale did not give enough degrees of freedom and maybe a 1 – 10 scale would be more precise way of assessment.

Trustee Grady questioned the feasibility of producing a recommendation to the full Board with only one Committee meeting. He stated it seems there are a couple of purposes to the evaluation tool: a rearview type of evaluation to evaluate the performance of the President, and also a prospective purpose to the employee with a clear vision to meet the expectations of the Board. He asked what the basic objective of the Committee is, and what the Board is rating. He said he liked Trustee Little’s draft of the evaluation tool because it is shorter than the current tool and asked if there is an alternative evaluation approach which is more objective, such as the rating of the University on a national rating scale.
Chair Wells said the Board feels the current evaluation process can be improved upon, which led to the creation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation and the draft evaluation tool provided to the Board in September. The Committee is comparing and contrasting the draft evaluation tool with the President’s 2014-2015 performance goals.

Trustee Roepstorff spoke about the draft evaluation tool’s being more specific and not as broad due to the importance of performance metrics funding. She said there are three key components to the evaluation tool: (1) assessing the President’s internal management to ensure results that produce the performance metrics funding; (2) the President’s community involvement as the President is the face of the University and the Board cannot rely solely on state funding; and (3) the President’s participation at Board of Governors’ meetings, interacting with other university presidents, and collaborative efforts between administration, faculty and staff. Also, she said the review process needs to be a dialogue between the President and the Board and that the President should continue to do a self-evaluation of performance.

Trustee Felton spoke about the draft evaluation tool being retrospective and that if there is a way to incorporate a futuristic piece so as the Board continues to evolve the evaluation tool it will ensure the leader of today is the leader needed as the University moves forward.

Chair Wells asked if there are any items to be added to or removed from the draft evaluation tool.

Trustee Catti asked about the reasoning behind Trustee Little’s version of the draft evaluation tool appearing to have no items that are measurable quantitatively other than the freshman-to-sophomore retention rate under the “Student Success” goal.

Trustee Little responded that many of the elements can be quantified like improving SAT/ACT scores for incoming freshmen and it is important to view the items longitudinally.

Trustee Catti asked if there are plans to quantify the items and what constitutes a satisfactory increase, for example, on the draft evaluation tool under “Student Success” -- Increases bachelors and graduate degrees in STEM.” In response to Trustee Catti, Trustee Little said he hopes to quantify elements on the draft evaluation tool.

President Bradshaw referred back to the approved 2014-2015 performance goals, which contain metrics that can be quantified, and have been. President Bradshaw observed the Board is asking how are metrics captured in a meaningful way and what is useful for the Board in evaluating the president at a higher level instead of, for example, the number of baccalaureate degrees conferred.

Trustee Grady mentioned more objective measurements and less subjectivity in the Presidential evaluation tool and when items can measured perhaps they should be. He
said they could replace the good intentioned, soft language with more specific language if the Board and the President find it useful.

Trustee Catti asked if the Committee and President feel the five goals on the draft scorecard are the best representation and are of equal weight.

President Bradshaw responded, yes, the five goals capture the major categories, but they are not all equally weighted.

Trustee Catti suggested considering whether the goals should be weighted, and that the President should define the best way to measure which goals are quantifiable and then articulate those goals.

Trustee Roepstorff reiterated including the performance-based metrics, leadership in the community, and collaboration between administration, faculty, and staff. She said she is comfortable using the four-point scale for the first year, which will be transitional. Chair Wells suggested the collaboration be listed under the “Leadership” goal.

Trustee Little suggested charging the administration with developing a revised draft based on the Committee’s discussion.

Chair Wells said there are two choices: for the Committee to review and draft a new evaluation tool, or to give direction to University staff to draft a further revised evaluation tool.

President Bradshaw told the Committee that he and staff had listened very intently and would follow the Trustees’ direction. He also mentioned the Board of Governors’ 10 performance based metrics, which could be adopted into a linear, quantitative evaluation tool; but also, other important presidential expectations should be included such as fundraising, and community involvement.

Trustee Catti and Chair Wells discussed the goals and if they are weighted and if not, should they be weighted. President Bradshaw noted that the Board of Governors does not weight its 10 metrics.

Trustee Felton brought up if the Committee is satisfied with the five overarching goals and said that the sub-goals may change annually. He said maybe an overarching goal of “Community Outreach” needs to be added.

Trustee Grady and Chair Wells discussed a narrower scope evaluation tool. Trustee Grady suggested “Leadership;” “Student Success” - incorporating the BOG metrics; “Academic and Institutional Excellence” - adopting one or more national ranking metrics; “Operations” - prepare, present and meet a budget; “Revenue Generation,” which could be collapsed into “Leadership,” for a total of 4 goals. And, it would be good to spend some time considering how to grade leadership recognizing the limitations of meeting in the Sunshine.
In order to give proper direction to University staff to draft a further revised evaluation tool, Chair Wells reviewed with the Committee Trustee Grady’s four goals. He asked if having only the BOG metrics under the goal “Student Success” would be sufficient or if there would be something missing.

President Bradshaw said that the BOG believes its metrics capture what is important for student success. He cautioned about national rankings due to imprecision and that the rankings are not considered hard measurements; he suggested considering other measures of quality such as degree program accreditations by top accrediting agencies, and the University’s reaffirmation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Trustee Roepstorff liked the direction for the “Academic and Institutional Excellence” goal of including a national ranking due to its marketability as long as it’s in line with the development of the future strategic plan focusing on the University’s mission statement.

Trustee Felton cautioned about the national ranking sources versus the top accreditation agencies. Trustee Grady added that there may not be any perfect organization; however, if students and constituents are reading the U.S. News and World Report then it is important and relevant. Trustees Little and Catti also cautioned against use of national ranking sources.

Chair Wells summarized the Committee’s discussion to include a four-goal evaluation tool with the potential for “Revenue Generation” to be collapsed into “Leadership,” and the tool’s also including the BOG metrics, ratings against outside competitors, and operations. He directed this to staff for the purpose of drafting a further revised evaluation tool.

Trustee Little suggested adding under “Operations” the retention of high quality staff.

President Bradshaw suggested the Board may expect a recommendation from the Committee possibly at the December 10 meeting and that maybe the Committee could consider an additional meeting to reach consensus on a recommendation.

The Committee had a discussion about the possibility of another meeting and concluded there indeed should be another meeting either by conference call or in person.

Trustee Grady volunteered to prepare a draft evaluation tool for the Committee’s consideration and further discussion.

**Item 5 Public Comment**

No public comment.
Item 6: Closing Remark and Adjournment

Chair Wells said the Committee also should consider including in its recommendation to the full Board whether to annually in June or September (1) approve the President’s performance goals, and (2) evaluate the President.

Chair Wells suggested if the new evaluation process will be more quantitative the Board should move to a September evaluation when all year-end data will be available to the Board and the President.

Chair Wells said the Committee would be notified as to its next meeting following receipt of Trustee Grady’s draft. With there being no further business to come before the Committee, Chair Wells adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Secretary Valerie Whitaker.
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