Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation

Tuesday, May 12, 2015 | 12:18 p.m. – 1:40 p.m.
Cohen Center Ballroom, Room #203-B
Florida Gulf Coast University

Minutes

Committee Members:

Present: Trustee Rob Wells – Chair; Trustee Joe Catti; Trustee Shawn Felton; Trustee Blake Gable; Trustee Tom Grady; Trustee Robbie Roepstorff.

Not Present: None

Others:

Trustees: Trustee Thieldens Elneus; Trustee Dudley Goodlette; Trustee Dick Klaas; Trustee Price; Trustee Ken Smith.
Staff: President Wilson Bradshaw; Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Ron Toll; Vice President for Student Affairs Mike Rollo; Vice President for University Advancement and Executive Director of FGCU Foundation Chris Simoneau; Vice President and Chief of Staff Susan Evans; Vice President and General Counsel Vee Leonard; Director of Internal Audit Carol Slade; 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
Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation Chair Rob Wells called the meeting to order at 12:18 p.m., following the conclusion of the Special Committee for Review of Academic Degree Programs Meeting. Roll call was taken with 6 of 6 Committee members present, thus meeting quorum requirements.

Item 2: Historical Minutes of Committee’s Meetings (TAB #1)
Chair Wells indicated that the minutes of the Committee’s previous meetings were provided as part of the agenda meeting packet.

Item 3: Review of Committee’s Work to Date, and Items needed for Complete Proposal to Recommend to FGCU Board of Trustees (TAB #2)
Chair Wells said the materials for today’s meeting include a review of the Committee’s work to-date and its previous recommendation to the full Board. Chair Wells indicated
that the goal of the meeting was to develop a more complete proposal to recommend to
the full Board. He said Chair Roestorf asked the Committee to reconvene to fill in the
blanks on the evaluation goals and determine specifics regarding how the Board can
operationalize the rating system from 1 to 4 points.

Chair Wells provided a brief history of the development of the Committee and its
purpose. He said the previous presidential evaluations did not have a lot of quantitative
measurements and resulted in what has been described as a “love fest.” He explained
that the intent of the Committee is to develop something that will be more constructive
with regard to the evaluation of the President. He said the Committee has made
progress over the last couple of meetings and that a few items remain to be addressed,
including “outside rating agencies” and “fundraising” with regard to how it relates to the
University President and the FGCU Foundation.

Chair Wells asked President Bradshaw to offer his thoughts. President Bradshaw said
the “love fest” is likely describing the portion of his evaluation that allowed for Trustee
comment, and he clarified that his written report reflecting on set goals and
accomplishments was quantitative. He said there are two areas that need to be
resolved, including the “fundraising goal,” which is set by him in consultation with the
FGCU Foundation Board of Directors. He said the FGCU Foundation Board includes a
voting member of the FGCU Board of Trustees (BOT) who is appointed by the BOT
Chair and affords the opportunity to provide direct input in determining the FGCU
Foundation Board’s goal for the year. He suggested the process for establishing the
fundraising goal remain the same as it has been for each of the FGCU presidents. The
Executive Committee of the FGCU Foundation Board of Directors meets to determine
the goal, which is then presented to the full FGCU Foundation Board of Directors for
approval. Following approval, the FGCU Board of Trustees would approve the goal and
include that number in the Work Plan.

Chair Wells asked the Committee to review Tab #2, which includes feedback from
Committee members and Former FGCU Trustee John Little. He said the “FGCU
Presidential Performance Evaluation Goals” document is a result of two proposals
combined into one. He said the full FGCU Board of Trustees voted in favor of
conducting the President’s Annual Evaluation in September instead of June of each
year. He explained that the full Board will be evaluating President Bradshaw in
September 2015 on the goals set in June 2014, regardless of the Committee’s progress
on the new evaluation tool being discussed today.

President Bradshaw addressed the second outstanding item discussed at previous
meetings: a national ranking of the University. President Bradshaw explained that two
handouts were being distributed: one labeled “Methodology A” and the other labeled
“Methodology B” which included input factors and related output factors/student
outcomes. He explained that when comparing both methodologies, he believes
“Methodology B” captures the outcomes that have been deemed important by the
Committee, such as percentage of graduates employed, average salary earned,
persons employed within one year of graduation, loan default rates, and years to
graduate. He said “Methodology A” focuses on academic rank, class section size, faculty salaries, alumni giving, perceived reputation – which is weighted – and indicated that the outputs have little to do with students getting jobs.

**Item 4: Committee Discussion**

Chair Wells opened with three topics for discussion: (1) fundraising, (2) way in which the ranking is scored, and (3) outside rating system.

With regard to fundraising, Trustee Catti said the FGCU Foundation Board goal has historically been aggressive. He said the fundraising goal by which the President will be evaluated should continue to coincide with the goal set by the FGCU Foundation Board of Directors. Trustee Catti said the President is instrumental in the attainment of the goal. Chair Roepstorff agreed with Trustee Catti and said she respects the recommendation of the FGCU Foundation Board of Directors.

Chair Wells asked Vice President for University Advancement and Executive Director of the FGCU Foundation Chris Simoneau to provide input regarding the appropriate fundraising goal for the President this June. Mr. Simoneau said the FGCU Foundation Board has not yet determined its goal for the upcoming year. He said the Executive Committee will meet on May 12, 2015 and the full FGCU Foundation Board of Directors will vote on the recommended goal as determined by the Executive Committee at its June 12, 2015 meeting.

The consensus of the Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Evaluation was to continue to be consistent with past practice: the President brings to the FGCU Board of Trustees the fundraising goal as determined by the FGCU Foundation Board of Directors by way of the President’s Work Plan.

Chair Wells requested feedback regarding “outside rankings.” Trustee Catti suggested none be used. President Bradshaw said Senior Associate Provost Paul Snyder conducted research on various national rankings in anticipation of this meeting. President Bradshaw said that they found the methodologies to be inconsistent and that they oftentimes vary from year to year. He said the U.S. News & World Report does not have just one category of university and instead includes regional, private, and national universities. President Bradshaw said he was not sure how well an outside ranking, such as the U.S. News & World Report, would do in capturing the work of the President and the Administration, partially due to over-stratification of information.

President Bradshaw referred to the handout and said “Methodology A” was U.S. News & World Report, and “Methodology B” was Educate to Career (ETC). He said on the last page of the ETC document it showed that FGCU was ranked in the top 1/3 of all university rankings conducted by that organization.

Trustee Gable agreed with Trustee Catti’s earlier comment that a national publication should not be used.
Chair Wells said that if the consensus is to remove an outside ranking from the metrics by which the President is measured, the “Academic and Institutional Excellence” section would be removed from the evaluation tool. Trustee Catti asked if there was another way to measure that category without using a national publication. Trustee Felton agreed that the ranking agencies are subjective and said that much of the “Academic and Institutional Excellence” is captured in the performance funding metrics, but said he does not believe it captures entirely the successes of our programs, specifically specialized accreditations and licensure exams. He said those components are included in the Work Plan but not the performance-based funding metrics.

Chair Roepstorff stressed the importance of accreditation, the work required to attain it, and suggested it be included in the evaluation.

Trustee Grady said he believed the primary goal is student success, also described as outcomes. He said the description under the “Student Success” portion of the FGCU Presidential Performance Evaluation Goals document states “The President will meet or exceed the Board of Governors Performance Funding Metrics (see attached Exhibit)” and is quite good; he suggested eliminating the rest of the page. With regard to “Secondary Goals,” he said they are basic job description pieces for the Office of the President and asked how one would measure, for example, “Exhibits sound decision making and problem solving.” Trustee Grady suggested as measurable examples of leadership the 4-year and 6-year graduation rates, or other metrics within the Board of Governors (BOG) materials, be evaluated as “met” or “exceeded.” Trustee Grady said consumer perspective is also important and is the reason he favors U.S. News & World Report; because it is something that students and potential faculty use to determine if they would like to attend FGCU or be hired by FGCU.

Trustee Grady said without good “Operations” you will not have good student success. He said the metrics attached as “Exhibit A” (Board of Governors Performance Model Overview) include nine BOG selections and one selection determined by the FGCU BOT. He said the performance funding model’s inclusion helps to streamline the mirroring of the BOG’s performance funding model with the President’s Performance Evaluation Goals, and that nothing else is needed other than the one “Student Success” line.

Trustee Price agreed that the BOG performance-based funding model be the core of the evaluation. He said the mission of the University will impact the focus of the goals. He said with regard to employment, the “FGCU External Scan” stated regional employers identify “qualified workforce” as the highest barrier for growth. Trustee Price suggested the information be used as a feedback loop to determine how the University can respond and impact it. He suggested the University identify the top 25 employers of FGCU students on an annual basis and ask them on a 5-point scale if the University is meeting their needs.
Chair Roepstorff stated she liked that idea, especially for major employers. She said we should identify who is important to us and ensure we are supporting their needs, an outcome of which can be measured.

Chair Roepstorff asked Dr. Toll to comment on the Board of Governors’ (BOG) metrics with regard to the performance-based funding points that FGCU is currently receiving in the “improvement” category, and how the perception of FGCU’s overall performance may be affected if that number decreases, even if our numbers increase in the “excellence” category. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Toll said FGCU has been scoring well in both the “improvement” and “excellence” categories, but the challenge he foresees is when a school approaches its highest levels of improvement it can get and the improvement curve changes. He said in the next couple of years, a number of schools could show a decrease in points, but it does not mean that the institutions are performing less well. He said tying any University President to those numbers would be difficult because a decrease in points would be a result of the model’s limitations, not of the President’s leadership.

Trustee Felton agreed with Trustee Price’s earlier comment about a 360-degree view, talking with donors, employers and students. He recommended that as the Committee makes adjustments to the evaluation document that they consider the other aspects of the President’s performance that are not reflected in the BOG metrics.

President Bradshaw said the initial accreditations and reaffirmations of University programs were incorporated into his goals. He said passing of licensures exams have not been part of his previous goals, but if the Board wishes to have both accreditation and passing of licensure exams included, they could be legitimate metrics, although he believes they reflect more the performance of the students taking the exams than his performance.

President Bradshaw said the metrics by which the BOG measures performance are not flawed, but that the formula used to assess where an institution is within the metrics is what needs improvement.

Chair Wells recapped the suggested changes to the evaluation tool as a result of the discussion. He stated “Student Success” would remain under “Primary Goal;” under “Secondary Goals” the “Leadership” category, which includes “fundraising,” would remain in place; “Academic and Institutional Excellence” could include something like Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation with a pass/fail ranking; and the goals outlined under “Operations” would remain as is. He said if the Committee decides on an evaluation tool that includes both pass/fail items and items that are scored with a 1(exceeds expectations) through 4 (fail) rating, no total could be determined at the end.

Trustee Grady recommended the Committee consider tying in the Work Plan that the Administration is responsible for developing and implementing, because it specifically identifies the initiatives of our institution, including academic quality, return on
investment and operational efficiency. He proposed the “Primary Goal” of “Student Success” be revised to read “The President will meet or exceed the Board of Governors performance funding metrics (see attached Exhibit) as adjusted by the Board of Trustees in its annual Work Plan, and the President shall fulfill FGCU’s mission.” He said that although the mission may change, it is the purpose of the University, so Administration can use it as a reference point. He said that may allow the President to adjust annually the initiatives used to accomplish the mission, vision and Board of Governors (BOG) obligations, and allow the BOT to continue using the same criteria each year.

Trustee Grady made a motion to modify the presidential evaluation goals and restated the language to include: “The President will meet or exceed the Board of Governors performance funding metrics (See attached Exhibit) as adjusted by the Board of Trustees in its annual Work Plan, and shall fulfill FGCU's mission.”

Chair Wells clarified the proposed changes to the “FGCU Presidential Performance Evaluation Goals” document and said the “Primary Goal” under “Student Success” would include the proposed language, and the “Secondary Goals,” including “Leadership,” “Academic and Institutional Excellence,” and “Operations,” would be eliminated from the page. Trustee Grady agreed and clarified that the “Secondary Goals” would not be dropped from the evaluation at all, but instead be incorporated in the Work Plan.

Trustee Catti seconded the motion. He asked if the items currently listed under “Secondary Goals” are incorporated into the motion. Trustee Grady noted the Work Plan covers each of those areas. Trustee Catti asked President Bradshaw to comment on the proposed changes. President Bradshaw reiterated that previous evaluations incorporated quantitative goals that were measurable, and that the “love fest” portion of the evaluation was during the open portion of the conversation, which allowed for Trustee comments.

President Bradshaw said the items that are currently under “Leadership” lend themselves to a 1-4 rating, but asked how that would be known without broad-based surveys. He said at some point in the future a 360-degree evaluation of the President would assist in gathering that information. He added as a follow up that the fundraising goal is included in the Work Plan.

Trustee Smith said he agrees that achieving the performance-based funding metrics is one of the most important components, in addition to fundraising. He said that if we reach a plateau with regard to performance funding metrics, then it’s the Board’s responsibility to determine if it is a result of the President’s performance or an inherent problem with the process. He recommended including the Board of Governors (BOG) performance-based funding metrics and a fundraising component, and possibly opportunity for trustee comments at the end. Trustee Smith said tangible, quantitative results and numbers are better, and that he doesn’t believe a yes/no approach is the best option.
Chair Roepstorff said she recommends Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation and licensure pass rates be included, as they are reflections of “Institutional Excellence.”

Trustee Price said everything comes back to the Work Plan. He said the performance metrics are the lagging indicators; key initiatives and investments are leading indicators and are what should be measured. He said if we all agree to focus on the key initiatives and how the success in each will be measured – regardless of whether or not we score well on performance-based funding metrics – we know that if we do these things right, we will get there. He suggested instead of measuring success in “outcomes,” that we measure success by leading indicators, ones we can control and on which we can place a greater emphasis.

Chair Wells asked how the Committee should determine which sections of the Work Plan should be used. Trustee Grady said he views the Work Plan as a blueprint for the one-year plan, guided by the five-, ten-, and twenty-year plans. He suggested the BOG metrics be used, and one to three key initiatives. Chair Wells talked about implementation of the evaluation form and said he envisioned it as a document that could be completed by the trustees individually and details discussed at the open, public meeting.

Chair Wells asked which components of the Work Plan President Bradshaw would recommend be incorporated into his evaluation. President Bradshaw suggested all of page 6, “Performance Funding Metrics.” With regard to scoring, he suggested rankings of “Does not meet,” “Meets” or “Exceeds.” He also suggested page 8, which includes “SAT Score” and “Operational Efficiency”. President Bradshaw asked Dr. Snyder what the number “3” represented on page 8 indicating first-time pass rates of licensure exams. Dr. Snyder said it includes Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy and Nursing. President Bradshaw said those examples could be measured, if the Committee thought they would be meaningful to the evaluation.

Trustee Felton said the performance metrics are tied to traditional First-Time-in-College (FTIC) students, and that other pieces of the President’s performance may be left out. He said the Work Plan will help capture some of those pieces. Trustee Felton clarified that when he was referring to accreditations, he was suggesting accreditations at program-specific levels as opposed to SACS.

Trustee Goodlette asked about timing with regard to the Work Plan and the performance evaluation of the President. He asked when the 2015 Plan successes and failures would be factored into his evaluation. President Bradshaw said it would be for 2016. He said his evaluation for this year will be the same as it always was, but the revised tool will inform the goals he sets for this year.

Dr. Toll responded to Chair Roepstorff’s question about timing with regard to the BOG’s validation of our numbers. Dr. Toll discussed the performance-based funding numbers and stated that it is essentially a one-year delay. He said if the President had an
initiative he wanted to launch now, it would not affect the performance number next year but the year after. He said that in 2016, the most recent data we'll have from FETPIP (Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program) to include in the cells on page 6 of the Work Plan will be 2013-2014 data. He said, as a result, we have aspirational goals that are retrospective by two years.

Trustee Grady suggested the President be evaluated with the information that is available at the time. Trustee Price asked about information on page 8 of the Work Plan, the “Actuals.” He described them as instantaneous and accurate. He said he considers those items to be “leading indicators;” and because they can be measured, they be the only categories measured. Dr. Toll said that is more correct on page 8 than page 6, but some information will always be outdated, such as 4- and 6-year graduation rates.

Chair Wells asked Trustee Grady to restate his motion. Trustee Grady said the motion was informed by the Committee’s comments and stated “The President will meet or exceed the goals set forth in the University Work Plan, including the Board of Governors performance funding metrics.” Trustee Wells asked Trustee Grady if he foresees how each of those goals would be evaluated, collectively or individually. Trustee Grady said each of them could be scored, and he agreed with President Bradshaw’s approach to “meet expectations” or “exceed expectations” instead of a 1-4 scoring method. Trustee Grady and Trustee Price said the “key performance indicators” would be the page that lends itself to quantitative measurements.

Trustee Grady suggested the Committee take a vote to determine if the suggested metrics be included in the President’s evaluation, and at a later time determine the method to measure each of the items. Trustee Catti seconded the motion. There was no public comment. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

President Bradshaw said his goals are set in June and he is evaluated in September. Chair Wells suggested the Committee continue to discuss the scoring method for the evaluation tool to allow the President to prepare for the development of his goals. President Bradshaw recommended that “Does not Meet,” “Meet,” “Exceeds” with a column for the current year a goal for the next year; and a section for special initiatives that would be consistent with the Strategic Plan and the Work Plan that could be added by the President in a narrative format.

Chair Wells recapped the next steps and said the President will prepare his goals starting in June based on today’s discussion; he said the goals will include the anticipated rating system of “Does not meet,” “Meets” or “Exceeds.” He said the Board will evaluate the President in September 2015 using the previous year’s goals; and moving forward, the new evaluation tool will be in place.

Trustee Price asked if the Committee thought it would be important to weight any of the goals or if they should be considered equally important. The Committee agreed to reevaluate weighting systems at a later time.
**Item 5: Public Comment**
There was no public comment.

**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 and adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Director of Board Operations, and Special Projects Amber Pacheco.

**Agenda Items:**
A. See Tab_1: [http://www.fgcu.edu/Trustees/AgendaFile/2015/05-12-2015(Presidential%20Evaluation)/TAB_1.pdf](http://www.fgcu.edu/Trustees/AgendaFile/2015/05-12-2015(Presidential%20Evaluation)/TAB_1.pdf)
B. See Tab_2: [http://www.fgcu.edu/Trustees/AgendaFile/2015/05-12-2015(Presidential%20Evaluation)/TAB_2.pdf](http://www.fgcu.edu/Trustees/AgendaFile/2015/05-12-2015(Presidential%20Evaluation)/TAB_2.pdf)

**Handouts:**
A. Facts on Ranking Methodologies “A” and “B”