Florida Gulf Coast University Board of Trustees  
Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation  
May 12, 2015

SUBJECT: Review of Committee’s Work to Date, and Items needed for Complete Proposal to Recommend to FGCU Board of Trustees

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTION

Approve evaluation tool and scoring mechanism for annual performance evaluation of University President

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Florida Gulf Coast University Board of Trustees’ Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation met at the call of Committee Chair Rob Wells on October 15, 2014 and November 13, 2014. In its November meeting, the Committee approved two items for December 10, 2014 recommendation to and final approval by the full FGCU Board of Trustees: (1) a tool for the Board’s annual performance evaluation of the President, and (2) changing the annual timing for the President’s performance evaluation from the June Board meeting to the September Board meeting. (Note: The Committee also recommended the annual timing of the Board’s approval of the President’s performance goals to remain at the June Board meeting. This would require no Board vote since it is unchanged from current practice.)

The Committee’s two recommendations were presented to the full Board on December 10, 2014, with the following results:

(1) **Tool for the Board’s Annual Performance Evaluation of the President.** Following Board discussion on the Committee’s proposal, FGCU Board of Trustees Chair Robbie Roepstorff asked the Committee to reconvene at a later time for additional discussion and action on the Committee’s recommendation, including on several items indicated with blank lines denoting “To Be Determined,” and also on how to operationalize the Committee’s proposed evaluation mechanism.
described by Committee Chair Rob Wells as a rating system of 1 to 4 points. Chair Wells noted the challenge associated with a rating system of 1 to 4 points when many of the proposed evaluation tool items are written in a “pass” or “fail” type of question. A motion and second for the full Board to defer a vote at this time unanimously was approved.

(2) **Changing the Annual Timing for the President’s Performance Evaluation from the June Board Meeting to the September Board Meeting.** Chair Wells noted that changing this annual timing will provide the time needed for the Board to have end-of-fiscal-year results on evaluation metrics prior to the evaluation of the President. A motion and second unanimously was approved.

Today’s May 12, 2015 meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation is being held to determine the following previously undetermined aspects of the Committee’s proposal to the full Board on December 10, 2014 in order to have a more complete recommendation to take to the full Board for recommended approval:

- **Under “II. Secondary Goals” – “Leadership” -- #8:** “Engage the University community to ensure private fundraising support of $ ________.”
- **Under “II. Secondary Goals” – “Academic and Institutional Excellence” -- #1:** “FGCU will attain a _________ ranking on a pre-agreed-upon, external rating entity.”
- **Under “II. Secondary Goals” – “Academic and Institutional Excellence” – #2:** “FGCU will attain a _________ ranking by three, pre-agreed-upon, external reviewing entities that rate academic excellence.”
- **Specifics on how to operationalize the evaluation mechanism of a rating system of 1 to 4 points.**

---

**Supporting Documentation Included:** Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation’s December 10, 2014 Recommendation for FGCU Presidential Performance Evaluation Goals

**Prepared by:** Vice President and Chief of Staff Susan Evans

**Legal Review by:** N/A

**Submitted by:** Vice President and Chief of Staff Susan Evans
FGCU PRESIDENTIAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

GOALS

I. Primary Goal:

Student Success
The President will meet or exceed the Board of Governors Performance Funding Metrics (see attached Exhibit).

II. Secondary Goals:

Leadership
The President will:
1. Professionally and effectively direct FGCU’s program of work, administration, staffing and infrastructure.
2. Positively represent FGCU and its mission with internal and external constituencies.
3. Effectively carry out FGCU Board of Trustees’ directions and initiatives.
4. Communicate important information in a timely fashion to FGCU Trustees.
5. Exhibit sound decision making and problem solving.
6. Demonstrate high ethical standards.
7. Lead the development of FGCU’s new five-year strategic plan.
8. Engage the University community to ensure private fundraising support of $______.

Academic and Institutional Excellence
1. FGCU will attain a _____ ranking on a pre-agreed-upon, external rating entity.
2. FGCU will attain a _____ ranking by three, pre-agreed-upon, external reviewing entities that rate academic excellence.

Operations
1. The President will prepare, present and obtain approval annually of a budget consistent with the vision of the FGCU Board of Trustees and the Board of Governors, and shall meet or exceed all budget expectations.
2. The University’s General Obligation bond rating (by all nationally recognized rating agencies) on all debt, including that of affiliates, shall be “A” or better at all times.

(END)
The Performance Funding Model includes 10 metrics that evaluate the institutions on a range of issues. Two of the 10 metrics are Choice metrics; one picked by the Board and one by the university boards of trustees. These metrics were chosen after reviewing over 40 metrics identified in the University Work Plans.

The model has four guiding principles: 1) use metrics that align with SUS Strategic Plan goals, 2) reward Excellence or Improvement, 3) have a few clear, simple metrics, and 4) acknowledge the unique mission of the different institutions.

Key components of the model:
- Institutions will be evaluated on either Excellence or Improvement for each metric.
- Data is based on one-year data.
- The benchmarks for Excellence were based on the Board of Governors 2025 System Strategic Plan goals and analysis of relevant data trends, whereas the benchmarks for Improvement were determined after reviewing data trends for each metric.
- The Florida Legislature has approved $100 million in new funding for performance funding and a proportional amount to total $65 million would come from each university’s recurring state base appropriation and another $35 million from other system initiatives.

Metrics Common to all Institutions:
Seven metrics apply to all eleven institutions. The eighth metric, graduate degrees awarded in areas of strategic emphasis (8a), applies to all institutions except New College. The alternative metric for New College (8b) is “freshman in the top 10% of graduating high school class.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics Common to all Institutions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percent of Bachelor’s Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further</td>
<td>6. Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates</td>
<td>7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>8a. Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)</td>
<td>9. Board of Governors Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)</td>
<td>10. Board of Trustees Choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Choice Metric - The Board has approved metrics that focuses on areas of improvement and the distinct missions of each university. UF and FSU have a metric measuring faculty awards to represent the research focus of these institutions. New College has “national ranking for institutional and program achievement.” The remaining eight institutions all have the “percentage of students graduating without excess hours”.

Board of Trustees Choice Metric – Each Board of Trustees has chosen a metric from the remaining metrics in the University Work Plans that are applicable to the mission of that university and have not been previously chosen for the model.