

**DELTA COLLEGE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES SPECIAL MEETING
Delta College Main Campus
Wednesday, April 29, 2015
6:00 p.m.**

- BOARD PRESENT** R. Emrich, K. Houston-Philpot, K. Lawrence-Webster, D. Middleton, M. Morrissey, M. Nash, M. Rowley, E. Selby, E. Wacksman
- BOARD ABSENT** None
- OTHERS PRESENT** J. Goodnow, T. Brown, P. Clark, M. Mosqueda, K. Schuler, A. Ursuy
- PRESS PRESENT** J. Becker (Midland Daily News), M. Brown (Delta Collegiate), K. Skrzypczak (Delta Collegiate)
- CALL TO ORDER** Board Chair, M. Rowley, called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.
- APPROVAL OF AGENDA** Board Chair Rowley called for approval of the agenda. He asked that an item be added to the agenda, "Approval of Location Changes for Board Meetings for 2015." R. Emrich made a motion to approve the amended agenda with support from D. Middleton. Motion passed unanimously.
- PUBLIC COMMENTS** Board Chair Rowley called for public comments.
- APPROVAL of LOCATION CHANGES FOR THE 2015 BOARD MEETINGS (5091)** It is the recommendation of the Administration that the Board of Trustees approve the following location changes for 2015 Board Meetings:
Tuesday, May 12, 2015 – Move from Ricker to Main Campus
Tuesday, September 8, 2015 – Move from Planetarium and Learning Center to Ricker Center
Tuesday, November 10, 2015 – Move from Main Campus to Planetarium and Learning Center

R. Emrich made a motion to approve the recommendation with support from D. Middleton. Motion passed unanimously.
- DISCUSSION OF BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCESS FOR CONDUCTING THE PRESIDENT'S EVALUATION AND COMPENSATION** E. Wacksman said that the members of the President's Evaluation and Compensation Committee requested this special meeting so that there was an opportunity to discuss the importance of the President's evaluation procedure with the entire Board.

R. Emrich said that the Board has often put this process off until the last minute resulting in a rushed evaluation of the President. He said that he recently attended a session at ACCT in which the importance of the presidential evaluation was emphasized. He referred to the Trustees' responsibility to evaluate the President which is outlined in the Board Bylaws.

R. Emrich said that in the past certain Trustees have not participated in the process. He said that it takes the participation of all nine Trustees to conduct an evaluation of the President.

M. Nash reviewed the timeline for completion of the President's evaluation.

- May 6 –May 20: President updates goals with year-end accomplishment information.
- May 6 –May 20: Completion of 360 Review.
- May 18 –May 21: Hold for a special meeting of the President’s Evaluation and Compensation Committee.
- June 1 –June 12: Evaluation open for Trustee’s completion.
- June 22 –June 25: Special meeting to conduct President’s Evaluation.
- July 1: Process is completed.

M. Nash asked T. Brown, Assistant Board Secretary, to provide a demonstration on how to complete the evaluation through Survey Monkey. T. Brown provided the Board with an example of the email that they will receive on June 1. She then walked them through the proposed survey instruments (the Board evaluation instrument and the 360 instrument).

It was suggested that the area of “How the Board Could Assist” be removed from the goals document when it is inserted in the evaluation instrument.

J. Goodnow said that in development of the proposed evaluation tool and the 360 degree feedback survey, she asked Michigan Community College Presidents and League Presidents to share their assessment instruments. She said that she also included the President’s Job Description as a reference for Trustees as they participate in this process.

J. Goodnow shared the proposed list of individuals who would be asked to complete the 360 degree survey instrument. She recommended that the 360 review feedback be sent to the Board Chair and then shared with the President. This is the practice that is used at other colleges.

There was some discussion regarding inclusion of additional faculty members as well as students on the 360 feedback survey.

K. Lawrence-Webster said that she thought more faculty should be included. She also said that students should get a chance to provide feedback.

R. E. Selby said that he also agrees that more faculty should be a part of the process.

J. Goodnow reminded the Board that the College collects a significant amount of student feedback through instruments such as CCSSE, Noel Levitz, and through internal surveys. A. Ursuy added that the recent environmental scanning process included a student survey in which 1440 students responded.

A. Ursuy also said that faculty and staff input is collected every other year using the Personal Assessment of College Environment (PACE) instrument. In addition, faculty and staff were asked for input as part of the recent environmental scan process.

K. Houston-Philpot said that she would like to hear more about the results of each of these instruments so that she can be assured that the Board has a good understanding of where we are and how we compare to other institutions.

K. Lawrence-Webster suggested that the timeframe for administering faculty and staff feedback instruments should align with the timeline for the President's evaluation so that the faculty and staff will feel that the Board has listened to their voices.

R. Emrich suggested that one student be added to the 360 list. E. Wacksman suggested the possible addition of the AAUP President on the 360 list as well.

**BOARD ACTION –
APPROVAL OF
PROCESS FOR
CONDUCTING THE
PRESIDENT'S
EVALUATION
(BA5092)**

M. Nash made a motion that the Board adopt the proposed process including:

- The timeline as presented.
- The proposed evaluation instrument.
- The proposed 360 feedback instrument.
- The list for the 360 remain as 19 (as originally proposed)
- The PACE results be available to the Board as a reference during completion of the evaluation and
- If Trustees do not participate in the process, it will be publicly noted.

R. Emrich supported the motion.

R. E. Selby said that it is not appropriate and could pose a legal issue to disclose participation of Trustees in this process.

K. Lawrence-Webster made a motion to amend the original motion to include that 5 additional faculty members would be added to the list of 19. R. E. Selby seconded the motion.

The results of the roll call vote on the amendment to the original motion are as follows:

- R. Emrich – No
- K. Houston-Philpot – No
- K. Lawrence-Webster – Yes
- D. Middleton – No
- M. Morrissey – No
- M. Nash – No
- M. Rowley – No
- R. E. Selby – Yes

E. Wacksman – Yes

The motion failed with a vote of 3 in favor, 6 opposed.

R. Emrich made a motion to amend the original motion by adding 3 additional faculty members who would be determined by the President. K. Lawrence-Webster seconded the motion.

The results of the roll call vote on the amendment to the original motion are as follows:

R. Emrich – Yes

K. Houston-Philpot – Yes

K. Lawrence-Webster – Yes

D. Middleton – Yes

M. Morrissey – No

M. Nash – Yes

M. Rowley – Yes

R. E. Selby – Yes

E. Wacksman – Yes

M. Nash made a motion to strike the language in the original motion which would allow public announcement of Trustees who do not participate in the evaluation process. D. Middleton seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair called for a vote on the amended original motion. Motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Board Chair Rowley adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Andrea Ursuy, Board Secretary