

PRESIDENTIAL ANNUAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
BOARD OF ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT NO. 519
Counties of Stephenson, Ogle, Jo Daviess and Carroll

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting of the Presidential Annual Review Committee of the Board of Illinois Community College District No. 519 was called to order by Mr. Blake Musser, Board Vice Chairperson, at 12:03 p.m. on August 21, 2019, in room H-206 in the Highland Community College Student/Conference Center, 2998 West Pearl City Road, Freeport, Illinois in said district.

The following members were present: Dr. Steve Jennings, Mr. Blake Musser, and Ms. Pennie Groezinger

The following members were absent: None

Also present: Mr. Samuel Fiorenza, Faculty (departed 12:20 p.m.); Mr. Alan Nowicki, Faculty (departed 12:20 p.m.); Ms. Carol Wilhelms, Faculty (departed 12:20 p.m.); and Ms. Terri Grimes, Board Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Jennings moved and Ms. Groezinger seconded the motion to approve the agenda, as presented. The vote being unanimous, the motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Samuel Fiorenza, faculty member, addressed the committee by reading a prepared statement on behalf of Faculty Senate (see attached letter). Mr. Alan Nowicki, faculty member, also made public comments. He stated that faculty are familiar with complaints because students complain a lot about tests and other things, and Mr. Nowicki does not feel good about new faculty until he hears students complaining about them. Although not all complaints are baseless, some are anecdotal and "single story." He reminded committee members that a couple years ago there was a proposal to spend \$1 million on keyless door locks. Due to concerns, a Protection, Health, and Safety (PH&S) committee was convened, which resulted in other projects being proposed instead of the keyless door locks, including new fire alarms, remodeling of classrooms, the solar array project, and the lighting efficiency project. He noted that these new projects were able to be funded because complaints about the door lock project led to a systematic change in the process, which would not have happened under the previous administration.

GENERAL OVERVIEW OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Musser reported that one of the goals of the committee is to work on an evaluation process and report back to the Board because the President serves at the pleasure of the Board. His hope is that this ad hoc committee will develop into a standing committee to make sure that the

President's Office is guiding the institution in the best way possible. This ad hoc committee will give the evaluation the attention it deserves and fulfill the President's contract requirements. Although the committee is not starting the evaluation process from scratch, it is the hope of Mr. Musser that the process can be standardized.

Dr. Jennings noted that the committee is not trying to take up complaints, but trying to establish better guidelines for what the President is doing, and maybe the Executive Vice President, although at this point, the committee is only looking at what the President is doing.

Dr. Jennings received a communication from former trustee Mr. Rob Urish, indicating that the Board had charged Mr. Hood with trying to do different things, including recruitment and idea generation, although it had not worked as well as was hoped. Mr. Hood was also told to spend half of his time working with the Foundation, and a determination needs to be made regarding what the Board wants Mr. Hood to do. Dr. Jennings remembers clearly what Mr. Hood was told to do, and Dr. Jennings thinks this is worthy of discussion because he does not believe everyone is on the same page.

Mr. Musser stated that a piece of the larger organizational process is seeing that the President's contract and the needs of the institution align. We need to evaluate, review, coach, and guide the President in the process of making the organization better. This needs to be done in a consistent, transparent, and standardized way so that all parties are informed. Dr. Jennings expressed his belief that the Board was very polite and vague with the former President.

CLOSED SESSION

Dr. Jennings moved and Ms. Groezinger seconded the motion to move into Closed Session for the purposes of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the public body or legal counsel for the public body, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee of the public body or against legal counsel for the public body to determine its validity, pursuant to the Open Meetings Act, and to return to open session for possible action. The roll call on the motion was as follows:

AYES: Musser, Groezinger, Jennings
NAYS: None

At 12:21 p.m., the Chairperson declared the motion carried and the meeting in Closed Session.

Dr. Jennings moved and Ms. Groezinger seconded the motion to end the Closed Session. The roll call on the motion was as follows:

AYES: Groezinger, Jennings, Musser
NAYS: None

At 12:37 p.m., the Chairperson declared the motion carried and the Closed Session ended.

Ms. Grimes will send committee members a copy of Mr. Hood's contract, the goals he submitted, and the goals trustees submitted for Mr. Hood, the evaluation matrix Mr. Musser developed, the survey results from Full Cabinet, the evaluation tool used with classified, professional, and administrative employees, Mr. Hood's job description, and the job description and contract for Ms. Chris Kuberski, Executive Vice President. These documents will be used as educational pieces and foundational documents to be better able to determine a focus for Mr. Hood.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Musser ran today's committee meeting as Vice Chair of the Board, but Mr. Jim Endress, Board Chair, will make a formal appointment of the chair of the committee at the next regular Board meeting.

The next meeting of the committee will be held on either September 24 at 1:30 p.m. or the afternoon of October 2.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Jennings moved and Ms. Groezinger seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. At 12:54 p.m., there being no further business, Mr. Musser declared the motion carried and the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



Terri A. Grimes, Board Secretary
Illinois Community College District No. 519

August 19, 2019

Dear Members of the Highland Community College Board of Trustees:

While the Faculty Senate recognizes it is ultimately the responsibility of the Board of Trustees to conduct evaluations of and appoint the President and Executive Vice President at Highland Community College, in the spirit of shared governance, we are writing to request a voice in this process.

We appreciate that the Board has created The Presidential Annual Review Committee to work on the President's annual evaluation.

Given that this committee is charged with creating a new process for this important performance evaluation, we find it necessary to have the Faculty's voice included. We believe a systematic evaluation completed annually by faculty, such as a survey-based assessment of performance based on job duties and expectations, for each executive position would provide the Board with more complete data to utilize in the evaluation process.

Best practices for managerial evaluation prescribe that job performance should be evaluated by both those "above" and "below" (the 360-degree approach) an individual in an organization. For example, here at Highland, both faculty and deans are evaluated using the 360-degree approach: as faculty, we are evaluated both by our students and our supervisors, and our deans are evaluated by the faculty and the EVP. Among the many benefits to this system is the emergence of a more complete and accurate representation of the individual's strengths and weaknesses in all aspects of their job.

The Higher Learning Commission has been clear that they value shared governance, systematic assessment, and data-driven decision-making, and Highland has been working diligently for the last few years to assess and revise our shared governance practices and principles to better align with HLC's values. Creating an evaluation process for the top positions at Highland Community College that includes the faculty and others is systematic and provides data on which to base an overall evaluation of performance is one additional step the college can take to systematize these practices and principles in the future and provide more complete and systematic data for the Board to utilize in evaluations of the President and Executive Vice President.

We thank you for considering this addition to the evaluation process and look forward to hearing your response. We would be more than willing to work with the Board and the new committee to create and implement an appropriate assessment instrument.

Sincerely,

The Faculty Senate