

Delta College  
Board of Trustees  
Special Meeting – Evaluation and Compensation Committee  
March 31, 2015  
President’s Conference Room B-181  
9:00 a.m.

**Board Members Present:** R. Emrich, K. Houston-Philpot, M. Nash, D. Wacksman

**Others Present:** T. Brown, J. Goodnow, K. Randolph

**Press Present:** None

---

**Call to Order:** Evaluation and Compensation Committee Chair, M. Nash, called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

M. Nash called for the approval of the agenda. R. Emrich made a motion to approve the agenda with support from D. Wacksman. The motion passed unanimously.

M. Nash called for public comment. Hearing none, the meeting proceeded.

M. Nash started the discussion with a suggestion that the current process be evaluated and that changes be made along the way. He then asked J. Goodnow for her thoughts. She noted that when she arrived at Delta, she requested as part of her contract, that the Board conduct an evaluation before July 1 of each year. The instrument that has been used is the one included in the *Handbook on CEO-Board Relations and Responsibilities* by George R. Boggs. She works with the Board during the year to accomplish goals that are set in place at the beginning of the year. J. Goodnow noted that she has also been conducting a 360 evaluation with those who report directly to her. She handed out a timeline that was created for this process back in 2008/2009 by K. Houston-Philpot. J. Goodnow thought this may help with the process not being rushed or completed at the last minute.

D. Wacksman noted that this is a very important process that needs to be cleaned up and that she appreciates the best practices that were brought forward by J. Goodnow. J. Goodnow provided her job description since newer trustees and some employees may not be aware of all of her responsibilities. R. Emrich noted that the input of the support staff, faculty and students needs to be taken into account but very carefully. K. Houston-Philpot noted that when they hear things as Board members they don’t know if the concerns being brought forward represent one voice or many.

K. Houston-Philpot talked about the climate at Delta and trend lines. J. Goodnow noted the various instruments that have been used to capture the climate such as the PACE Survey, CCSSE, Noel-Lovitz along with the recent environmental scan. This also gives her an idea of where the college is and what needs to be improved. K. Houston-Philpot noted that Delta is a big organization with so much going on that this needs to be a focus. M. Nash noted that the Board needs to be more aware of these instruments and what the results are.

R. Emrich discussed the importance of the President's evaluation process which needs to be done by the Board. This was information that he received from a recent ACCT meeting. K. Houston-Philpot emphasized the importance of resetting the expectations of the Board. She along with R. Emrich noted the need to elevate the importance of this process and that it is not acceptable to not complete the evaluation. K. Houston-Philpot expressed her desire to continue with a mid-year update of the President's goals.

R. Emrich asked that another column, no knowledge, be added to the instrument used for the Board to evaluate the President along with the 360 evaluation completed by direct reports. The committee agreed that this was a good addition. K. Houston-Philpot said that both sides need to be measured. She suggested the Board be evaluating themselves. The timing is good because of the recent change over in the Board. M. Nash indicated that there needs to be a meeting to educate the Board on the process that will be used and how to complete the evaluation.

The committee agreed that Section F. Business and Finance and Section G. Personal Qualities be added back into the Board's evaluation. They also agreed that Section C. Staff and Personnel Relationship and Section D. Administration not be included in the instrument as in past years. It was suggested that Sections C and D could be added to the 360 evaluation of Dr. Goodnow's direct reports. M. Nash recommended adding an overall rating scale question to both surveys.

Those individuals receiving the 360 evaluation would include all direct reports to J. Goodnow along with leadership roles including the Support Staff Executive Committee Chair, Executive Committee for Administrative/Professional Staff Chair, Faculty Executive Committee Chair and Senate President.

In talking about the timeline, J. Goodnow suggested the idea of conducting her evaluation in June but to act on her compensation in December, similar to SVSU. K. Randolph noted that she liked the idea of separating the evaluation and compensation. With the budget, tuition recommendations and the president's compensation all happening at the same time, there may be the impression that they are connected to each other.

M. Nash noted that the timeline needs to be adjusted. He will send out an updated version for review. The committee agreed that a special meeting of the full board will be needed, at the end of April, to educate Board members on the process and their responsibilities in conducting the President's evaluation. M. Nash requested that a demo be done by T. Brown on how to use Survey Monkey in filling out the evaluation.

During Trustee comments, K. Houston-Philpot noted that it was a good meeting.

The meeting adjourned at: 11:05 a.m.

---

Talisa Brown, Board Assistant Secretary