

Meeting Summary

**DELTA COLLEGE
BOARD OF TRUSTEES RETREAT
FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 2007
8:30 A.M. – FARMHOUSE**

Board Members Present: R. Emrich, K. Houston-Philpot, K. Higgs, T. Lane, K. Lawrence-Webster, J. MacKenzie, E. Selby, R. Stafford, E. Wacksman

Others Present: B. Baker, T. Grunow, J. Goodnow, L. Holoman, D. Lutz, T. Kubatzke, K. MacArthur, S. Montesi, M. Mosqueda, L. Myles-Sanders, N. Smith (Midland Daily News)

This session came to order at 9:05 a.m.

How Delta Assesses its Employees

The Delta College Performance Management System – T. Grunow

Ms. Grunow handed out a packet of information with an overview of Delta's Performance Management System. She provided a brief history of the system noting that this is the system used to evaluate Administrative/Professional (AP) and Support Staff at Delta. Ms. Grunow said that the system was developed after employees requested a new job evaluation system and an effective pay for performance system. Each employee is evaluated at mid-year and at the end of the year.

Human Resources (HR) conducted surveys to measure employee satisfaction with the performance management system. Ms. Grunow said that the overall survey results demonstrate that employees are satisfied with the system and that the system does facilitate feedback between supervisors and employees.

Ms. Grunow said that there are several benefits to this system. The system allows for performance improvement plans to be put in place at any time. Supervisors do not have to wait until mid-year or year-end evaluation time to set-up a performance improvement plan for an employee. 100% of AP and Support Staff are evaluated each year. All employee files are up to date.

Ms. Grunow added that there is not a lot of money associated with this system but people do appreciate being rewarded for performance.

Reports that the HR office creates annually provide the President and Executive Council with information that demonstrates that Delta does not have gender, ethnicity, and age bias in the evaluation system. HR reviews all evaluations for illegal practices. This has

been an excellent system for risk-management.

This year a section about strategic planning was added to the appraisal form. It was felt that this would be a way to tie in 2-3 specific actions that each employee would be responsible for (in relation to the strategic plan).

Ms. Wacksman asked if all employees are evaluated under this system (including Executive Staff). Ms. Grunow said that all employees (AP and Support Staff) are evaluated under this system.

Mr. Stafford asked how many factors are rated. Ms. Grunow responded that 9 are rated. The average of these ratings indicates the raise. She added that the average rating is 3.4. Ms. Lutz said that the system was developed on the basis that a “3” rating is great. The only way to get above a 3 is to go beyond doing the job well.

Ms. Houston-Philpot asked if employees are rewarded for going above and beyond. For example are they rewarded for working on committees or doing special projects? Dr. Goodnow said yes, the system gives the supervisor the opportunity to award for those extras.

Dr. Goodnow commented that although it is not perfect, we have built a standardized system that allows us to grow and develop our employees. Ms. Grunow has been working with supervisors to educate them in how to communicate with our employees. She has spent a number of hours working with personnel issues. We will continue to tweak the system.

Ms. Houston-Philpot asked if we have done any employee surveys. Ms. Myles-Sanders said that in the fall we will conduct a survey and will have more information as part of the strategic planning process. We will benchmark against Grand Rapids.

Faculty Evaluation through the Senate Process – L. Myles-Sanders

Ms. Myles-Sanders handed out the faculty job description and copies of Senate Policy 3.060 (currently under revision) and 3.061. She said that the Council of Chairs, Faculty Executive Committee (FEC), and Academic Office developed the description. She said that she has served on a number of Senate Ad Hoc committees to revise the policies that focus on the issues of faculty evaluation. In cases in which a faculty member, who in spite of the regular evaluations, is not meeting responsibilities, 3.061 is invoked. Senate Policy 3.060 spells out requirements for evaluations of non-tenured one-year renewable, tenure-track, and tenured faculty. Ms. Myles-Sanders said that she has evaluation records from Don Halog in the Academic Office. The records demonstrate that 3.060 is being followed and regular evaluations of faculty are taking place.

Ms. Myles-Sanders added that we have a standardized evaluation form that students use to evaluate faculty. At the end of each semester, the faculty member hands out the

questionnaires and has a student or colleague pick them up. The forms are delivered back to the division office for processing.

Faculty are evaluated during the promotion and tenure process by a Peer Review Committee. Proposed new policy language will formalize the practice that Peer Review Committees are made up of a faculty member selected by the faculty member being evaluated, a faculty member selected by the candidate's Division Chair, and a faculty member from outside of the Division. The evaluation that takes place during the promotion and tenure process is a rigorous one and includes student evaluations, peer evaluation, and evaluation by division chairs and the Academic Office. Promotion and/or tenure are not guaranteed in this process.

Ms. Houston-Philpot asked if candidates receive feedback when they are denied promotion and/or tenure. Ms. Myles-Sanders said that they receive detailed feedback from the Division Chair. Senate policy says that a faculty member should consult with their division chair before going up for promotion.

Mr. MacKenzie asked if classroom observations are scheduled. Ms. Myles-Sanders said sometimes yes and sometimes the Chair just drops by the class.

Dr. Emrich asked how adjuncts are evaluated. Ms. Myles-Sanders said that she did not bring a copy of the adjunct handbook but knows from personal experience in two different divisions that they are evaluated by their Division Chairs, colleagues, and by students.

Dr. Emrich asked that adjunct processes (evaluation, hiring, etc.) be a topic at a future Board Dinner Meeting.

Dr. Lane said that many of the faculty are looking for ways to make an impact. Measuring outcome as opposed to event is important. He said that he would like to know more about the impact that we are having on our external community.

Mr. Selby added that this would be external validation for what we've done internally. It's another way of doing assessment. How do we make that part of the model of evaluation and promotion and tenure?

Dr. Goodnow said that AQIP will give us opportunities for assessment. Ms. Myles-Sanders added that the CLARUS study will also help us understand community perceptions.

Dr. Lane said that he thinks we have impact. We never really test to get a sense of the impact that we have. Tools exist to begin to measure the reach that anyone's work has. Until you begin to purposely measure you have no idea of what the impact is.

Strategic Planning – J. Goodnow & L. Myles-Sanders

Dr. Goodnow handed out a copy of the latest strategic planning brochure. She said that the brochure will be available during Learning Days and will be made available to Summit participants.

She said that she feels good about our mission, vision, and values. Our mission describes who we are. Our vision describes what we strive for. Dr. Goodnow added that we have spent a considerable amount of time developing and defining our values.

Dr. Goodnow said that the Strategic Plan (2006-2010) gives the “view” of Delta from 30,000 feet. The plan is organized into 5 strategic focus areas. Those areas are student success, program and service excellence, people focus, community relationships, and financial stability. This plan represents the 5 year direction that we intend to take to move the institution forward using CQI.

The 2006-2008 Strategic Priorities represent what we’re doing now. Key performance indicators (KPIs) are the ways in which we will measure our progress in achieving the goals set forth by the plan.

Dr. Goodnow added that the College is working to get common definitions and working to create a feeling that everybody belongs to this plan. It takes time to bring people together and get them on the same page. She said that she feels very good about the involvement of all employee groups in this process.

Mr. Selby asked why academic programs are not included in program and service excellence. Ms. Myles-Sanders said that this category includes academic assessment but also gives a clear line of sight to those who are not directly working on academic programs. We have a strong investment in academic program and service excellence. We are part of AQIP and are also enrolled in the Academic Assessment Academy (through the Higher Learning Commission). A strong focus on academic program excellence is also evident in the student success area.

Dr. Lane said that he would like to know about more about the community relationships at Delta. Ms. Myles-Sanders said that every division has some kind of activity to bring in students (K-12) from community. She added that we are currently conducting the CLARUS survey. At the July Board meeting we hope to be able to give some idea of what we found out but we anticipate a more complete report in fall and will need to develop action plans based on the results.

Dr. Lane said that he continues to challenge Delta to think about the following question, “What do we think that the outcome is?” For example, the Possible Dream program has some measurable outcomes. He said that he needs to know that there has been some careful thought into what we should be doing. Dr. Lane also commented that there is value in measuring volunteerism. Doing so helps to demonstrate value back to the community.

Dr. Goodnow said that Delta has room to grow in this area. We have reached out to find out about AP staff and faculty who are serving on community organizations. We need to get a baseline for what we are doing right now. We are open to what we need to be looking for.

S. Montesi, L. Holoman, and M. Mosqueda arrived at 10:35 a.m.

Preliminary Report from the Centers Task Force – S. Montesi

Ms. Montesi handed out a preliminary report from the Centers Task Force. She said that the Task Force, made up of 10 staff members, has spent many hours pulling together the data in this report. The final report should be available in early fall.

She said that she has had some conversations with the Academic Area regarding the development of a schedule at the Centers. The Task Force is recommending that the offerings become more student-focused.

Ms. Montesi highlighted the following additional findings/recommendations of the task force:

- At this time, the Midland Center and Planetarium mirror the 60% female to 40% male ratio that we have on main campus. The Ricker Center has a higher percentage of female students.
- At all 3 of the Centers we need to be offering services to help students negotiate Delta College. These include student services and student support services.
- The Midland Center is the most diverse of the Centers.
- The five courses most frequently offered at the Centers are the same top 5 courses that are offered at main campus for freshman. None of the Centers are doing well in offering developmental courses in the evening.
- Transfer students enrolled at the Ricker Center can generally complete MACRAO agreement there. The Task Force is recommending a standard that all transfer students attending a Center can complete MACRAO there.
- Corporate Services and Workforce Development Center do not utilize off-campus services.
- The number of “gateway courses” (required in a program, occupational, taken in 1st or 2nd semester, directly related to the skills that a student will be expected to know) offered at Centers is limited.

Ms. Wacksman commented that this is an outstanding report with great data.

Ms. Montesi said that Delta is not waiting to begin improving things until this report is done. We are committed to the students at these Centers. For example, new signage is being installed before fall 2007 semester begins. This will bring the signage up to code

with the Office of Civil Rights. She added that the College is also working on improving the ambiance of the Ricker Center – including the office area.

Dr. Emrich asked if we will continue to lease Ricker or will we consider buying? Mr. Selby said that he does not want to take another year to get to a position to address this issue.

Dr. Lane said that he would like to see the measure of academic success for students who attend the centers. He commented that the list of recommendations is mostly operational, not strategic. He added that we should be thinking strategically based on community needs.

Mr. MacKenzie asked what the rate of the lease is at Ricker. Ms. Lutz said that the current rate is \$55,000 per year.

Dr. Goodnow said that she understands that the Board would like the Administration to make a recommendation in less than a year regarding the next steps for the Ricker Center. Dr. Emrich said that Delta needs to remain there. We are serving a community that needs us. However, he added that he doesn't want to commit a lot of money to a facility that Delta doesn't own. If we move it has to be in the neighborhood. Mr. Selby said that he would like to see an investigation of the alternatives.

Dr. Emrich said that this report needs to demonstrate the importance that the Centers have right at the beginning.

Ms. Houston-Philpot said the question is why do we have Centers? What's the point? She would like to know the rate of students who actually complete their degrees or certificates and what the goals are of students who attend the Centers. Dr. Goodnow responded that because we are a community college, student goals vary. We need a good way to find out what students' goals are.

Ms. Lutz pointed out that planning for the Centers also impacts the 5-year master plan for facilities which the College is required to submit each fall.

Diversity – M. Mosqueda

Ms. Mosqueda said that in an effort to provide an update on diversity at the College and illustrate how diversity is infused into our culture, Barry Baker assisted a team made up of Ms. Holoman, Ms. Grunow, and Ms. Mosqueda to create a DVD presentation.

The Board viewed the presentation. Ms. Mosqueda asked for thoughts and comments from the Board regarding the presentation. The Board responded positively to the DVD presentation.

Ms. Mosqueda said that the purpose of the DVD is to help us get a big picture view. She said that the team needs feedback from several groups. The DVD will be updated yearly

to make sure that we are making progress and sustaining. Karen Wilson will be taking it to a League meeting.

Ms. Houston-Philpot asked whether Delta has a common definition of diversity and how Proposal 2 has affected Delta's diversity efforts. Ms. Mosqueda said that she worked with Leslie Myles-Sanders to examine everything we do at the College. Those programs and services were compared to language in Proposal 2. Adjustments were made adjustments so that no groups were excluded from any of Delta's programs or services. Ms. Houston-Philpot said that she would like more detailed information regarding the adjustments that were made, at another time.

Dr. Goodnow said that this DVD demonstrates that there are many areas in which we have worked to promote diversity awareness. There is more that we can do. This fall Dr. Goodnow will appoint a task force to move our diversity efforts to the next level.

Ms. Lawrence-Webster arrived at 12:10 p.m. Dr. Emrich departed at 12:15 p.m.

At 1:15 p.m., it was moved and supported to move into closed session for the purpose of the President's evaluation. The vote was 7/1/1 to go into closed session with a roll call vote as follows:

Robert Emrich	Absent
Kim Higgs	No
Kimberly Houston-Philpot	Yes
Thomas Lane	Yes
Karen Lawrence-Webster	Yes
Jack MacKenzie	Yes
R. Earl Selby	Yes
Robert Stafford	Yes
Edith (Dee-Dee) Wacksman	Yes

Dr. Lane moved to come out of closed session at 4:30 p.m. Mr. Stafford seconded the motion. The motion passed and closed session ended at 4:30 p.m.

The Board Retreat adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Myles-Sanders, Board Secretary

Andrea Ursuy, Recording Secretary