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FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation

Wednesday, October 15, 2014 | 3 – 4:45 p.m.
Cohen Center, Room #213
Florida Gulf Coast University

Minutes

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 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.
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.

Agenda Items:

A. See Tab_1:

FLORIDA GULF COAST UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation

Thursday, November 13, 2014 | 1 – 3 p.m.
Cohen Center, Room #213
Florida Gulf Coast University

Minutes

Committee Members:
Present: Trustee Rob Wells – Chair; Trustee Joe Catti (until 2:49 p.m.); Trustee Shawn Felton; Trustee Blake Gable (via conference call until 2:33 p.m.); Trustee Tom Grady; Trustee John Little; Trustee Robbie Roepstorff.

Not Present: None

Others:
Trustees: Trustee Ann Hamilton (via conference call).
Staff: President Wilson Bradshaw; Vice President for Administrative Services and Finance Steve Magiera; Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Ron Toll; 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 and Roll Call
Meeting called to order with roll call at 1:07 p.m. and Chair Wells made opening remarks.

Item 2: Action: Approval of Minutes of October 15, 2014 (TAB #1)
Chair Wells asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the October 15, 2014 meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation. Trustee Little made the motion and Trustee Felton seconded the motion. There was no public comment. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Item 3: Chronology and Summary of Various Goals and Evaluation Documents (TAB #2)
Chair Wells opened with a chronological order of events and documents regarding the proposed Presidential evaluation tool, referencing the “Chronology and Summary of Various Goals and Evaluation Documents” sheet under TAB 2.
Chair Wells stated that in addition to deciding on an evaluation tool, there were two other items for the Committee to address: (1) the annual timing to conduct the President’s evaluation, and (2) the annual timing to approve the performance goals for the President for the upcoming year. (The Committee’s recommendations will be taken to the full FGCU Board of Trustees for final action.)

**Item 4: Committee Discussion on (1) Evaluation Tool; (2) Annual Timing for Approval of President’s Performance Goals; and (3) Annual Timing for Evaluation of President’s Performance**

Trustee Catti asked for clarification regarding the supporting documents included in the Committee packet that appeared to be similar, if not the same. Chair Wells asked Trustee Little to clarify the development of the two drafts provided by him which were included in the materials. Trustee Little stated that he provided an initial framework and later worked with staff to develop a revised draft.

Trustee Felton noted the Board had approved the President’s 2014-2015 performance goals at the June Board meeting and moving forward in the process, the Board needs to stay true to them and keep them in mind. He stated this would be a hybrid evaluation approach for the first year.

Chair Wells restated that the goals of the Committee meeting were to make decisions in three areas, including: (1) the evaluation tool, (2) annual timing for approval of the President’s goals, either June or September; and (3) the annual timing for determining the President’s performance goals for the upcoming year, either June or September.

Chair Wells called on Trustee Grady to present his draft proposal. Trustee Grady said the evaluation of the President, the chief executive officer, is the most important thing the Board does. He noted that feedback he heard at the previous meeting indicated that a trustee believed the review process was cumbersome and that the Sunshine Law presents challenges when publicly reviewing a President. He pointed out that soft characteristics are scored more highly in reviews when members are evaluating someone in a public setting, and when they are attempting to avoid confrontation. He said that objective evaluations are better than subjective evaluations, and he believes the Board Governors (BOG) agrees.

Trustee Grady said the titles on his draft proposal were taken from Trustee Little’s revised draft. He stated the primary goal of “Student Success” is, essentially, the metrics established by the BOG for performance funding. He said the use of the metrics by the BOG tells the Board that they are important to the BOG, therefore they are important to the Board and FGCU Administration. He recommended associating numbers with each of the goals to ensure clarity. He stated that it provides an objective framework for clear goals for the President and simultaneously builds a model for effective evaluations leading to performance-based funding down the road.
Trustee Grady said the second goal was kept brief intentionally. He explained that “Leadership,” “Academic and Institutional Excellence,” and “Operations” are all “baked into” the BOG metrics. He noted that Fundraising had been added. He mentioned that the $40 million included in the Fundraising section was a result of adding up Trustee Little’s revenue generation item. He stated that a President would not be successful in fundraising absent leadership or absent quality staff. He stated that he intended to use the U.S. News & World Report for the section on “Academic and Institutional Excellence,” but did not include it due to the previous meeting’s concerns of other Committee members. He instead elected to include language regarding the attainment of top-50 rankings in two well known regional public university rankings. Trustee Grady referenced Florida Statute Section 1001.7065 referring to academic and research excellence standards, stating it contributed to the development of the “Academic and Institutional Excellence” category. He commented that the BOG and others are currently using U.S. News & World Report to evaluate performance, including the new FSU President. He said the FSU President’s compensation is directly associated with its university ranking in the top 25 nationally in the U.S. News & World Report. He stated that the ranking impacts marketing, revenue generation, attracting clients and new professors, and attracting dollars.

Trustee Grady commented on the “Operations” category. He explained that the Board approves the Administration’s proposed budget; therefore, the budget is an objective document rather than a living document, and that he recognized the potential for changes. He said bond rating was included as a result of the review of other institutions’ evaluation tools. He explained the tool assesses the performance of the school and the Administration, and is an objective reflection of the Board’s expectations. He noted that many metrics go into agency bond ratings, much like the BOG metrics, and as a result they are objective external reviews of operations.

Trustee Grady said he appreciated feedback from Trustee Little regarding the proposed additions to Trustee Grady’s draft that included the sections: “Leadership Skills,” “Faculty & Staff Satisfaction,” and “SACS Accreditation.” He noted that accreditation is a minimal baseline and without it you are not in business. He said that if accreditation is not obtained, then you haven’t demonstrated leadership, institutional excellence, or doing your job. He reiterated that adding “Leadership Skills” and “Faculty & Staff Satisfaction” would lead to subjective reviews in those areas. He stated that obtaining $40 million, for example -- even if the number needs to be adjusted -- would demonstrate leadership skills, faculty and student support, achieving student excellence, and most importantly, student success.

Chair Wells opened discussion and asked for Committee feedback regarding Trustee Grady’s draft proposal. Trustee Little commented that he liked Trustee Grady’s draft proposal. He said that in the service industry and higher education overall performance is highly correlated to faculty and staff satisfaction. He made reference to Moorings Park’s use of a survey to evaluate staff satisfaction, but noted that such a survey may be too subjective. He said that the numbers related to turnover are readily obtainable and that satisfaction of both groups would correlate with those numbers. He said happy,
satisfied faculty leads to lower turnover, and unhappy faculty leads to higher turnover.
He commented that the evaluation tool needs to be kept simple, clean, and as sharp as possible; he also noted that a key element for an institution like FGCU is faculty and staff satisfaction.

Trustee Felton reminded the Committee that they’ve moved from a cumbersome process where they were not able to get clear measures in terms of the Presidential evaluation. He noted that historical perspectives from the viewpoint of a CEO or any “X” institution could determine if a President can handle crisis when it hits. He explained that every organization experiences crises at some point, whether it’s financial crisis such as the ’08-’09 downturn or physical or environmental crises, such as Southwest Florida hurricanes. He stated that in terms of economic crisis, President Bradshaw helped us survive: FGCU did not lose employees, and the University continued to grow.

Trustee Felton emphasized that performance metrics at FGCU were met before performance metrics were in place or official. He reiterated that even though the President’s evaluation has been described as a cumbersome process, we have been able to retain a high quality leader. He commented that the evaluation tool is missing how to capture and evaluate all that the President does, including external relationships.

Trustee Felton noted that the Committee and the Board may want to consider a 360 degree review in the future. He suggested a checklist with all expectations will help ensure that we have a leader that will get us through a crisis when one appears.

Chair Wells asked Trustee Catti about his suggestion from the last Committee meeting about weighting performance categories or goals.

Trustee Catti clarified that he wasn’t suggesting that the goals be weighted, but just put the idea up for consideration. He said he wanted President Bradshaw to indicate if each of the goals are of equal value. He said that if they are not, maybe they should be weighted; and if they are, then perhaps they shouldn’t be. Trustee Catti asked President Bradshaw if the BOG metrics were the best criteria to use in measuring student success.

President Bradshaw responded that the metrics are good in measuring student success in the collective – not any one of them on its own. The President explained that the BOG uses the metrics in the context of the system rather than in isolation. He stated that although still evolving, the BOG’s metrics have been used for two years and are getting better. He said as a whole they are a good indicator and appropriate measure of student success.

Trustee Catti recommended that the goal for fundraising, money raised outside of the operating budget through philanthropy, be in line with the Foundation’s goals. President Bradshaw agreed and stated that the Foundation Board has traditionally identified the fundraising goal for the year’s performance goals, and that the President reports that number to the FGCU Board of Trustees to place it in context of his overall evaluation.

Trustee Catti said in regard to the “Academic and Institutional Excellence” category, he does not like goals we do not have control over in our ability to rank. He asked where
the University is in regard to bond ratings. Mr. Magiera responded that there are three different kinds of bond ratings for the University: (1) Student Housing, (2) Student Union, and (3) Parking Garages. He said they depend on the rating agency, but that they are all very good; ratings are “A” or “A-.” Trustee Catti stated that “A” or “A-” for that category is reasonable.

Trustee Felton discussed the “Academic and Institutional Excellence” category. He said that the statute previously referenced by Trustee Grady applies to preeminent universities and state research institutions, and that there are a number of qualifications to become a preeminent school. Trustee Felton said the preeminent schools are receiving more base funding to achieve the preeminence piece. He stated that we all want to be the best possible, but cautioned that it is important to not set the bar so high that we cannot achieve the goals.

Trustee Roepstorff agreed that we need the aspiration of a ranking, since that is how we are measured in the market. She noted that we are a regional comprehensive university, and asked what the formula may be to justify rankings for the “Academic and Institutional Excellence” category. She suggested that we continue to focus on the research so we can take advantage of available grants and get additional funding. Trustee Roepstorff commented that there is a lot of grant money out there, and we need all of the revenue sources and talented staff that we have. She suggested that we start with a goal of ranking as a comprehensive university and build from there. She asked the Committee if the rankings are broken out that way at other universities.

Chair Wells asked Trustee Roepstorff if she was requesting that the Administration determine if there may be another type of ranking that may be more applicable to this University. Trustee Roepstorff restated her question by asking if within the U.S. News & World Report, do they break down the categories, and which category would the University fall under? President Bradshaw responded that the U.S. News & World Report is stratified, and clarified that the University wouldn’t be categorized as 87th in the nation, but “Southeast Regional,” for example. Trustee Roepstorff asked who would be included in the “Southeast Regional” category. She asked if UF, for instance, would be in that category. President Bradshaw responded that UF would be included in the category of research universities and be listed nationally. He noted that many universities that use U.S. News & World Report as a reference do not always indicate which subset they are in. He said that although popular, it is flawed and relies on self-reporting and depends on everyone using the same definitions. President Bradshaw noted that one of the definitions in the U.S. News & World Report contradicts one of the Board of Governors’ goals for reducing student expenses.

President Bradshaw reflected on feedback offered by FIU during a recent BOG meeting regarding the U.S. News & World Report. He said FIU suggested there may be a more appropriate report for their institution such as those under 50 years old, in which FIU is currently listed as number 10. President Bradshaw said he wasn’t sure if there was something like that for institutions under 20 years old. He suggested to the Committee
members that they really look into what goes into some of the rankings. He asked Dr. Toll to provide an overview of other reporting agency options.

Dr. Toll indicated with regard to U.S. News & World Report that FGCU has been climbing the ranks in recent years. Changes in the equation have contributed to significant fluctuations in rankings. Dr. Toll said there are reports such as Kiplinger and others in which we do not even appear. He said for many schools, age and metrics influence whether or not they show up in the rankings. Dr. Toll said he consulted with the BOG staff and verified one report that the BOG described as having credibility but not widely known: Educate to Career (ETC). In the ETC rankings, we are in the top third of more than 1,200 institutions and 3rd overall in the State University System behind University of Florida and Florida State, two preeminent schools. He read the description of the ranking system: “The Educate to Career (ETC) college ranking system empirically determines the economic value added by each college ranked within our system. We define economic value added as being the improvement in earnings and employability of graduates measured against the total cost of education.” He stated that he believed it was most applicable to the 10-metric model.

Trustee Roepstorff said she agrees with identifying a ranking system and understands the challenges posed by selecting the correct one. She said that if we currently rank within the ETC and it includes schools such as FSU and UF, then it may be a good option. She said although it may not be highly published, we could assist with promoting it ourselves. Trustee Roepstorff said they are measurable standards that tie into our mission, and she suggested that as the University grows the Board should aspire to be higher and may find a ranking system that works better for the its development at that time.

Trustee Little agreed that it is difficult to find a valid ranking system. He requested that Dr. Toll send the Committee information on Educate to Career. Trustee Little suggested we identify a way to measure the interests of potential students.

Trustee Grady stated that benchmarks are never perfect and do not measure exactly what we do. He suggested not to let perfect be the enemy of the good. He recognized that organizations with flaws prepare the reports, but said that does not mean they do not have value. He stated we need to consider whether or not our constituents use it. Trustee Grady suggested avoiding using a report that is less well known and instead use something that is more popular, even if it has flaws. He stated that fundraising – if that is a category to be added to the President’s evaluation – is something that is influenced by the ranking in something such as the U.S. News & World Report with parents, students and the media recognizing it as a valuable source.

Trustee Catti asked Administration if there is another metric that measures “Academic and Institutional Excellence” that could be used in conjunction with the metric they are considering for the category.
President Bradshaw responded that he supports Dr. Toll’s suggestion of using Educate to Career because of its consistency and applicability to the University’s goals. He stated that although it’s widely read, he is not sure how much the U.S. News & World Report impacts students’ decisions to attend. He reflected on Trustee Little’s comments about how the institution is perceived and how it can be measured. He stated that the 40% increase in student applications could be one way to determine how the University is viewed externally. He reiterated that Educate to Career is better for this type of institution, supportive of its mission and what the Board of Governors has charged universities like ours with doing.

Trustee Catti clarified his question: what other criteria, not including any ranking system, would you propose that the University use to determine “Academic and Institutional Excellence?” President Bradshaw said the academic profile of the entering student could be an indicator. Also, the National Survey for Student Engagement, which measures students’ perceptions of their engagement with an institution. President Bradshaw agreed with Trustee Grady’s statements regarding SACS accreditation being a foundational component of university success. He stated that the same is not true for AACSB for the College of Business; NASM for music programs; NCATE for the Teacher Education Program; nor true for Nursing or Physical Therapy accreditations. He said those types of accreditations are also indications of academic and program excellence.

Trustee Little agreed that SACS accreditation is vital and stated that people may be looking at our weaknesses rather than our strengths. President Bradshaw asked Dr. Toll to speak briefly about SACS accreditation. Dr. Toll stated said there are 90 standards that attribute to the broad review, such as ethics of senior administration, physical health, rates of graduation, and the review of faculty to ensure instructors’ credentials are genuine and appropriate for courses they are teaching. Dr. Toll explained that the University’s performance in regard to attaining accreditation has gone well due to its high standards of quality.

Trustee Roepstorff agreed that accreditation is a must. She suggested that we set goals that raise the bar and assist with branding. She indicated that high standards will help gain community support, even of those that did not graduate from the university or this area. She stated that our aspirational goals will help draw attention and assist with fundraising and branding.

Chair Wells recapped: at the last Committee meeting the consensus was to include a numbered rating system from 1 to 4. Additionally, the Committee is discussing the inclusion of four goals: (1) “Student Success” comprised of the Board of Governors’ metrics; (2) “Leadership” to be comprised of the seven goals included in Trustee Little’s revised draft, plus a new fundraising goal; (3) “Academic and Institutional Excellence” comprised of a predetermined ranking system identified by the Board, plus three selected external reviews; and (4) “Operations” as outlined in Trustee Little’s revised draft.
Trustee Little asked which metrics would be used to grade the President during the evaluation period, specifically the BOG metrics which are provided earlier in the year than the time scheduled for the President’s evaluation.

Trustee Roepstorff stated that 26 points or higher is the main goal for performance-based funding. She emphasized the importance of the need for Trustees to understand the Work Plan that is submitted to the Board of Governors with regard to our goals. Trustee Roepstorff said she supports the evaluation of the President taking place in September instead of June.

President Bradshaw stated that universities are allocated performance funding with respect to their base funding, regardless of the number of points they score on the BOG performance metrics. He said we have a smaller base and as a result get less funding than those universities with a larger base. He suggested that the language indicates the threshold for which funding would be allocated, unless the BOG allocation method is adjusted to include dollar amounts for a specific number of points; then, perhaps, a precise number can be identified.

Trustee Roepstorff and Chair Wells commented that the BOG metrics are an example of an external review of the University’s performance. Trustee Felton said the BOG metrics help define “Student Success,” but an aspect that may be missing is the performing arts. Chair Wells commented that an opportunity for including something like the arts would be under the “Academic and Institutional Excellence” category. Trustee Felton suggested adding licensure pass rates, such as those for Nursing and DPT students in the College of Health Professions, as well as certification pass rates for the College of Education; they indicate the likelihood of students obtaining jobs after college. He recommended including a component that speaks to the President’s working relationships with FGCU employees. Trustee Catti said that is encapsulated in Trustee Little’s “Leadership” category.

Trustee Grady stated that the U.S. News & World Report is an objective measurement of GPA, graduation rates and selectivity, among other things. He said that setting a goal for attaining a higher score on the BOG metrics, a 36 for example, may not get us additional performance dollars, but it will have an impact on our rankings in something such as the U.S. News & World Report.

Trustee Catti asked for clarification regarding (1) if the dollar amount under philanthropy would be added to the “Leadership” category, (2) “Academic and Institutional Excellence’s” added component, and (3) the definition of “Operations” as outlined by Trustee Little, less the bond rating language. Trustee Catti suggested the Committee use Trustee Grady’s definition for “Operations,” but remove the section regarding bond ratings. Trustee Little agreed. Chair Wells suggested the bond ratings be dropped, as the Financing Corporation makes the decision to borrow. President Bradshaw stated that the bond ratings are dependent on the nature of the bonds and the projects, and indicated that 9 of the 12 for FGCU are an “A-”; and 3 of the 12 are an “A.” He said that the ratings are influenced by the nature of the revenue streams – the three with “A” are...
the parking garages which are funded by mandatory parking fees. Trustee Catti said
that the current grades would mean the President would be out of compliance as
currently presented. Trustee Catti asked about the approval process for bonds.
President Bradshaw stated that the FGCU Board of Trustees is responsible for
approving the projects that the University bonds.

Chair Wells asked if it was reasonable to associate the President’s performance with
items that may be influenced by a number of variables. Trustee Catti suggested that the
rating requirement be changed from “A” to “A-.” Trustee Grady said that it would be fair
to change the language to General Obligation bond, although not currently applicable,
to ensure an accurate reflection of the University’s financial status.

Trustee Roepstorff said she believes the bond ratings are a reflection of the University,
Trustees included. She commented that perhaps it doesn’t belong in the evaluation, but
that Trustees keep it in mind in the future.

**Item 5: Action: Approval of (1) Evaluation Tool for President’s Performance; (2) Annual Timing for Approval of President’s Performance Goals; and (3) Annual Timing for Evaluation of President’s Performance (Includes Public Comment)**

A motion was made by Trustee Catti to accept the proposal with the changes
discussed. Trustee Little seconded the motion. Chair Wells reiterated the motion: a
numbered rating system from 1 to 4; the four goals of (1) “Student Success” comprised
of the Board of Governors’ metrics; (2) “Leadership” comprised of the seven leadership
items as outlined on Trustee Little’s revised draft and a to-be-determined fundraising
goal as proposed by Trustee Grady; (3) “Academic and Institutional Excellence”
predetermined rating service and three other predetermined goals that will rate
academic excellence as determined by the Board and Administration; and (4)
“Operations” as outlined by Trustee Grady with the addition of General Obligation bonds
language.

Trustee Grady asked if this overview would be a single recommendation to the full
Board. Chair Wells confirmed yes. Trustee Felton stated that he believed that the tool
could be used for future presidents. Trustee Little said the tool would evolve and change
over time. Trustee Roepstorff asked for clarification regarding the motion and if it was
only in support of the tool to be used to evaluate the President. She asked
Administration whether or not the President’s 2013-2014 goals approved by the Board
in June would be evaluated using this tool if approved. Chair Wells said no. Ms.
Leonard stated her understanding is that this tool would be used to evaluate the
President in 2015. Trustee Little responded that it would be for the 2015-2016 year. Ms.
Leonard said she believes the Committee is talking about two different things: (1) the
goals set for the President and (2) the tool to be used to evaluate the goals set for the
President. Ms. Leonard said that although she would not recommend it, it is under the
purview of the Board to modify the President’s goals which have already been
approved. Additionally, the tool could apply to the current goals, broken out by subject
matter. Chair Wells indicated that the Board would use the method used in previous
years to evaluate the President for 2014-2015, and the new tool that the Committee was
voting on would be used after the 2014-2015 presidential evaluation. He stated that the
headings identified by the Committee with the new evaluation tool may exclude some of
the goals currently included in the approved 2014-2015 goals due to the narrowed list of
subject matter.

Dr. Toll stated that the Committee should be aware that the numbers they would be
using would essentially be a year old. Chair Wells said that it would be too late at this
point in the year to change the criteria for the presidential goals and that the format
would be the same at the end of this fiscal year as it has been in the past.

Trustee Grady called the question to end discussion. He indicated that the suggested
modifications were all good efforts, but that he would be voting against the motion
because he was not persuaded that less is not more.

There was no public comment. A vote was taken regarding the evaluation tool for the
President’s performance. Trustees Wells, Catti, Felton, Little and Roepstorff voted in
favor of the motion; Trustee Grady voted in opposition to the motion, and Trustee Gable
was not present at the time of the vote. The motion passed with a 5-1 vote.

Chair Wells discussed the annual timing for the evaluation of the President’s
performance. He said that in June, the fiscal year has not concluded and the final
information used to evaluate the President is still pending. In September the final details
would be available. Trustee Grady made the motion to move the presidential evaluation
to September of each year. Trustee Roepstorff seconded the motion. There was no
public comment. Trustees Wells, Felton, Grady, Little and Roepstorff voted in favor of
the motion, and Trustees Catti and Gable were not present at the time of the vote. The
motion passed with a 5-0 vote.

Chair Wells discussed the annual timing for the approval of the President’s performance
goals. He stated that identifying the presidential goals in June of each year allows the
Board adequate time for evaluating and revising them as necessary. The Committee
members agreed that the President’s performance goals should continue to be
approved annually in June. It does not require a vote since it is unchanged from current
practice.

Item 6: Old Business
There was no old business for discussion.

Item 7: New Business
There was no new business for discussion.

Item 8: Closing Remarks, and Adjournment
Chair Wells thanked the Committee members and adjourned the meeting at 2:52 p.m.
Minutes submitted by Secretary Amber Pacheco.
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