

THE OFFICIAL MINUTES

The Big Bend Community College Board of Trustees held a study session Monday, October 15, at 10:00 a.m. in the ATEC Hardin Community room in Building 1800 on the Big Bend Community College campus.

Call to Order

Present: Anna Franz
Jon Lane
Stephen McFadden
Thomas Stredwick

1. Board Self-Evaluation

Dr. Humpherys presented information on the board self-evaluation process. He stated that self-evaluation is part of continuous improvement and required by the NWCCU accreditation standards that state "the board regularly evaluates its performance."

The board discussed BP1000.1 regarding End Statements and reflected on their engagement in the process as a group. Trustee Anna Franz stated there is significant room for improvement in this area. She shared there is a need to work on the board's self-evaluation process and for the group to gain a better understanding of the Carver model, statutory requirements, and processes as the board works through meetings. Board chair Jon Lane stated the primary responsibilities of the board are to hire and fire the president, adopt the budget, grant tenure, and review board policies. Trustee Thomas Stredwick suggested a cyclical process of annual trainings including milestones and a dashboard of progress toward metrics would be helpful. Trustee Anna Franz commented the systematic review of board policies and the modified report identifying trustee activities is working well. She would also like the board to have a better understanding of the evaluation tools such as the monitoring reports and data for integrating them into the evaluation process. Trustee Franz stated some of the questions in the monitoring report process were vague and more focused toward employees than trustees. Could some of the evaluation pieces be accomplished quarterly rather than annually?

VP Bryce Humpherys stated for continuous improvement purposes, the board evaluates the extent to which the college is meeting elements of the mission, which are the core themes and objectives that are aligned with board end statements. Employees and board members are the audience for the monitoring reports, and data elements are included to help understand issues at a detailed level. The board may appreciate less detail with the policy level in mind.

Trustee Franz stated the employee perspective is helpful to the trustees' review process. VP Humpherys stated the mission fulfillment review questions will be revised based on employee and trustee feedback. From an operations standpoint, the process is to review data, draw conclusions, and make resource allocations for the following

fiscal year. He asked for specific feedback for board input on the process and the data. Trustees responded that their input should not be related to the "weeds." The board needs to review the process as a whole at the 30,000 foot level and review responses rather than control operational responses. Questions appropriate for employees are different than questions relevant to the board. It is acceptable for the board to review the process and make recommendations for the next year's process during the retreat or activity in the summer.

President Leas stated the focus and questions for the trustees should be different than for the employees. There is some tension with the Carver model. How does the board evaluate something in which they are not directly engaged? Does the board want to develop their own questions or mechanism to evaluate the college at the policy level?

Trustee Stephen McFadden stated the board assesses performance of the college by reviewing trends to identify quantifiable progress. Trustee Franz stated the board evaluates the college through the president. The board evaluation process needs to be narrow and functional. Trustee Jon Lane stated BCC is a Hispanic serving institution and asked if the board has policies that help solve the achievement gap between student populations including historically underrepresented groups (HUGs). Are there community outreach policies, and how are they evaluated? Trustee Franz asked if the directives are clear to the president and college. Dr. Leas stated the trustees have articulated climate and inclusion as priorities. Our service to HUGs is an important component of climate and inclusion.

The board discussed BP1000.2 regarding executive limitations and BP1000.4 regarding board staff linkage. Trustee Anna Franz stated there have been improvements in this area, and there is room for more improvement. An annual calendar detailing evaluation information to review would be very helpful. The trustees discussed the strengths and weaknesses of stakeholder forums and a 360 evaluation of the president. Issues included how to choose forum attendees, outliers' information in the 360 evaluation, and getting into the details or "weeds" of the college. This board functions differently than school district boards as the Carver Model takes a more strategic, policy-level position.

VP Kim Garza stated a 360-type survey is provided to all full-time and part-time faculty and staff on odd numbered years for the president and vice presidents. Participant rates vary. It is useful to look within feedback for trends over a period of time and how the feedback correlates with observations or other data. Every community college performs presidential evaluations differently. Trustee Stephen McFadden stated 360-survey information is a data point and contributing element to a good evaluation. Trustee Anna Franz stated the previous 360 survey was specifically about the president. It is difficult for outside groups to understand the ends and college performance. How do we get to the perception of the college rather than the personal judgement of the president? Education of the board is important regarding Carver policy. How can a formal process of gathering community perspective of the college be developed?

President Leas offered as a good example the recent display of community displeasure regarding the design phase of the Workforce Education Center (WEC) and moving the aviation maintenance technician facility away from the flight line. It was not personal and the community responded. Trustee Stephen McFadden stated it is very common for people with issues to find opportunities to discuss difficulties. President Leas stated part of the board members' role is to communicate with constituents. He asked if the timing of board meetings is a barrier to public; should meetings be moved to the evenings? The board agreed with daytime meetings.

Trustee Anna Franz stated a process to gather community feedback needs to be developed. Trustee Stephen McFadden stated assembling assessment of other boards for evaluation processes and working with the SBCTC are the next steps.

Board Chair Jon Lane announced a 5-minute break at 11:07 a.m. The board reconvened at 11:12 a.m. with no action taken.

The trustees agreed to consider workshop sessions regarding the Carver Model, president's evaluations, and board evaluations. It was suggested that ACT Executive Director Kim Tanaka could give a presentation. Trustee Thomas Stredwick also requested a template for cyclical board actions.

The board discussed BP1000.3 regarding the governance process. The updated board activity template is an improvement and can be used as an indicator. The trustees could also choose to identify the end statement tied to their board motions. The activities template shows constituent engagement, and there are varying degrees of impact for different activities. President Leas stated this conversation about tying activities to ends is appropriate and helpful.

VP Humpherys indicated that accreditation requires the board to conduct a self-evaluation, president's evaluation, and evaluation of the college. It is up to the board to determine how to implement evaluations, processes, and improvements. The data provided in the evaluation processes shows emerging patterns, and the trustees interpret the information and form conclusions.

The trustees reviewed the 2017-18 evaluation and goals included in the December 14, 2017 meeting minutes.


Board Chair Jon Lane suggested the board continue to work to further refine the evaluation of the board and the president. Community outreach is a focus with the board and the president.

Trustee Franz stated the board is performing well at periodic review of policies and could improve the board self-evaluation process by establishing a process moving forward.

The trustees discussed liaisons to committees, for example, the Foundation and the ACT Legislative Action Committee provide verbal reports during board meetings. Liaisons may have different perspectives to share than the staff.

The trustees concluded that they want to use study sessions to discuss community college board self-evaluations, activity report template, liaisons' reports (Foundation, WEC, Foundation, ACT Legislative Action Committee, and Transforming Lives), and a cyclical annual plan including periodic training, events, and assessment activities.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 a.m.


Chair Jon Lane

ATTEST:


Terrence Leas, Secretary