The Board of Trustees of St. Petersburg College met on Tuesday, March 20, 2018 at the St. Petersburg College EpiCenter, 13805 58th Street N., Clearwater, Florida. The following Board members were present: Chair Nathan Stonecipher, Vice Chair Katie Cole, Bridgette Bello, and Bill Foster, and Trustee Deveron Gibbons. Also present were Tonjua Williams, President of St. Petersburg College and Secretary to the Board of Trustees, and Joseph H. Lang, Board Attorney. Proof of public notice of this meeting is included as part of these minutes. Notices were duly posted.

NOTICE OF MEETING BOARD OF TRUSTEES, ST. PETERSBURG COLLEGE

The Board of Trustees of St. Petersburg College met on Tuesday, March 20, 2018 at the St. Petersburg College EpiCenter, 13805 58th Street N., Clearwater, Florida. The meeting will be held for the purpose of considering routine business of the College; however, there are no rules being presented for adoption or amendment at this meeting.

A copy of the agenda may be obtained within seven (7) days of the meeting on the <u>SPC Board of</u> <u>Trustees website</u> at <u>www.spcollege.edu</u>, or by calling the Board Clerk at (727) 341-3241.

Members of the public are given the opportunity to provide public comment at meetings of the Board of Trustees concerning matters and propositions on the agenda for discussion and Board action. At the Board meeting, in advance of the time for public comment on the agenda, individuals desiring to speak shall submit a registration card to the Board Clerk, Ms. Rebecca Turner, at the staff table. Policy and procedures regarding public comment can be found on the <u>SPC Board of Trustees website</u> at <u>www.spcollege.edu</u>

If any person wishes to appeal a decision made with respect to any matter considered by the Board, he or she will need a record of the proceedings. It is the obligation of such person to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made. Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this meeting is asked to advise the agency five business days before the meeting by contacting the Board Clerk at 727-341-3241. If you are planning to attend the meeting and are hearing impaired, please contact the agency five business days before the meeting by calling 727-791-2422 (V/TTY) or 727-474-1907 (VP).

<u>18-03.</u> In accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, the following Agenda was prepared:

AGENDA

52690

ST. PETERSBURG COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES March 20, 2018

EPICENTER MEETING ROOM (1-453) 13805 -58th STREET N. CLEARWATER, FL **REGULAR MEETING:** 9:00 A.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

- A. Invocation
- B. Pledge of Allegiance

II. RECOGNITIONS

- A. Presentation of Retirement Resolutions and Motion for Adoption
 - 1. Roxann Rogers (Not Attending)
 - 2. George Parker (Not Attending)
 - 3. Sharon Setterlind (Not Attending)
- B. Announcements
 - 1. John Long, Acting Dean, College of Computer and Information Technology-Dr. Cooper, Anne Cooper, Senior Vice President, Instruction and Academic Programs (*Presentation*)

III. COMMENTS

- A. Board Chair
- B. Board Members
- C. President
- D. Public Comment pursuant to §286.0105 FS

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board of Trustees' Meeting of February 20, 2018 (Action)

V. MONTHLY REPORTS

- A. Board Attorney
- B. General Counsel

VI. STRATEGIC FOCUS AND PLANNING

- A. STUDENT SUCCESS AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
 - 1. Student Survey of Instruction Dr. Sabrina Crawford, Executive Director, Institutional Research and Effectiveness and Ms. Maggie Tymms, Director, Institutional Effectiveness (*Presentation*)
 - Student Government Association Budget Process Ms. Barbara Fumano, Coordinator, Student Life and Leadership, Tarpon Springs Campus, Ms. Fallia Zacharopoulou, SGA President, St. Petersburg Gibbs Campus and Mr. Jerrick Rivera, SGA President, Seminole Campus (*Presentation*)

- B. BUDGET AND FINANCE
 - 1. Monthly Budget Report Ms. Janette Hunt, Associate Vice President, Budget and Compliance (*Presentation*)

C. ADMINIST RATIVE MATTERS

- Human Resources

 Personnel Report (Action)
- 2. Faculty and Dean Evaluation Process Dr. Anne Cooper, Senior Vice President, Instruction and Academic Programs (*Presentation*)

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. OLD BUSINESS (items previously considered but not finalized) None
- B. NEW BUSINESS
 - 1. Workforce and Professional Development Curriculum Changes (Action)
 - 2. GRANTS/RESTRICTED FUNDS CONTRACTS
 - a. Lyle Spencer Foundation The Economics of Community College Guided Pathways Reforms (*Action*)
 - b. U.S. Health and Human Services Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services

Administration – Garrett Lee Smith Campus Suicide Prevention (Action)

- c. Lumina Foundation Talent Hubs (Action)
- d. Lumina Foundation Lumina Fund for Racial Justice and Equity (Action)
- 3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

a. Annual Membership Assessment in Florida College System Risk Management (*Action*)

VIII. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS – None

IX. PROPOSED CHANGES TO BOT RULES MANUAL – Public Hearing – None

- X. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
- XI. NEXT MEETING DATE AND SITE

April 17, 2018, EpiCenter

XII. ADJOURNMENT

If any person wishes to appeal a decision made with respect to any matter considered by the Board at its meeting March 20, 2018, he or she will need a record of the proceedings. It is the obligation of such person to ensure a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, §286.0105, Florida Statutes.

Items summarized on the Agenda may not contain full information regarding the matter being considered. Further information regarding these items may be obtained by calling the Board Clerk at (727) 341-3241.

*No packet enclosure Date Advertised: March 9, 2018

<u>18-034</u>. Under Item I, Call to Order

The meeting was convened by Chair Stonecipher at 9am. The invocation was given by Chair Stonecipher and was immediately followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

18-035. Under Item II-A, Presentation of Retirement Resolutions and Motion for Adoption

Chair Stonecipher noted that the three retirees were unable to attend the Board meeting. He encouraged everyone to reach out to them and thank them for their service and congratulate them on their retirement.

<u>18-036</u>. Under Item II-B, Announcements

- B. Announcements
 - 1. John Long, Acting Dean, College of Computer and Information Technology-Dr. Cooper, Anne Cooper, Senior Vice President, Instruction and Academic Programs (*Presentation*)

Dr. Cooper introduced Mr. John Long, Acting Dean for the College of Computer and Information Technology. John Long has a Master in Business Administration degree with a specialization in Information Systems Management from the University of South Florida. He has nineteen years of industry experience as an auditing manager and software trainer. Mr. Long was an adjunct instructor for CCIT from 1999 until accepting a position as an Academic Chair for the department four years ago. At the same time, he transitioned from working for Pinellas County Schools as a Staff Developer and Industry Certification Exam Coordinator in the Career, Technical, and Adult Education Department where he spent nine years. John has numerous industry certifications in database administration, computer networking, and IT security. Dr. Cooper expressed her pleasure in welcoming Mr. Long to this acting position.

<u>18-037</u>. Under Item III, Comments

Opportunity was given for comments from the Board Chair, Board Members, the President and the public.

A. Board Chair

Chair Stonecipher stated that it has been a fun and interesting month for him. He got a chance, along with Vice Chair Cole, to tour some of the college's real estate assets throughout Pinellas County. He said it was a good chance to get an idea of the type of buildings, facilities, and infrastructure the college has; it was a good brainstorming trip to see how the college can use these sites in the future and how the college can maximize what it already has. He added that the trip started some great conversations for what things look like long-term. He thanked those who organized the trip and the bus driver. He shared that it was good to see, with his own eyes, exactly what SPC has; it is better than reading about it or seeing photos.

Chair Stonecipher thanked Dr. Williams for her work in Tallahassee, adding that he is thankful the Legislative Session is over. He said that there was some damage done, but SPC also made some progress. He thanked Dr. Williams for her leadership and her time spent there. Some of the key important items from this legislative session were: the college received \$3.5 million to finish the Gibbs construction projects; and the college received a little more funding for the operating budget. He admitted it was not easy for Dr. Williams to tackle that much in year one. He expressed his thankfulness for Dr. Williams' leadership.

Chair Stonecipher shared that Dr. Williams has been in meetings and throughout the community more and more. For example, she was the keynote speaker at a recent Downtown Partnership lunch. He added that Dr. Williams has been having conversations with community leaders, who are asking how to get involved with the college. Dr. Williams has been having many meeting and lunches. Chair Stonecipher said that this is a big step - a plan the Board laid out years ago. He opined that it is very important to being a leader in the county and that SPC should be the one to educate the workforce. He expressed appreciation for the steps taken so far to start those conversations. Chair Stonecipher said he feels it is just the beginning and there are lots of great things to come.

B. Board Members

Vice Chair Cole shared that tomorrow is the Foundation Scholarship Appreciation Luncheon; Vice Chair Cole and Chair Stonecipher will be attending. She thanked the Foundation and all who fund scholarships. She opined that it is a wonderful and inspiring event. Vice Chair Cole shared that last year, after she was appointed to the Board, she attended the Foundation Scholarship Luncheon just two days later. Vice Chair Cole said that the Foundation luncheon really shows the college and community as a whole and the messages of the student speakers were very meaningful.

C. President

Dr. Williams shared that it has been an exciting month. She thanked the Board for being active participants by visiting Tallahassee, talking with legislators, and keeping SPC's name at the forefront. She stated that it is important to faculty and staff to know that they have a strong

Board that will stand with the President. She thanked the Board specifically for making so many calls and texts last week as the state budget was being finalized.

Dr. Williams shared that six SPC students were named to the 2018 All-Florida Academic Team, which recognizes outstanding academics, leadership, and commitment to community. The six students were: Alexandria Bryant, Dawn Lewis, Max Matheu, Makayla Syrstad, William White, and Grace Zani. Dr. Williams said she is very proud of these students. Twelve students from the College of Education were granted scholarships for Hispanic and minority students. SPC had the largest number of recipients from the state, and Dr. Williams expressed how proud she is of the students. The twelve students were:

BS Elementary Education	BS Exceptional Student Education	BS Middle Grades Math
Michelle Feo	Michelle Remy	Brandon Karasick
Telia Hann	Kennon Gilson	
Lashaquonta Longstreet		
Tabetha McGann		
Veronice Metts		
Gabriela Perez		
Nicole Schrader		
Vance Sinclair		
William White		

Dr. Williams also shared that she had a great partnership meeting with Pinellas County Schools. Dr. Grego, the Superintendent of Pinellas County Schools, was pleased with the strengthening of the partnership. The partnership helps provide an academic pathway for students in the county.

Dr. Williams stated that Governor Scott announced a \$22 million investment for job growth. SPC received \$1.5 million to create a Mechatronics and Electromechanical Technician training program. Dr. Williams stated that SPC is proud to be one of eleven chosen groups.

D. Public Comment pursuant to §286.0105 FS

None

<u>18-038</u>. Under Item IV, Review and Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 20, 2018 Meeting were presented by the chair for approval. Mr. Gibbons moved approval of the minutes as submitted. Ms. Bello seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>18-039</u>. Under Item V, Monthly Reports

Under Monthly Reports

A. Board Attorney

John Lang had nothing to report.

B. General Counsel

Suzanne Gardner had nothing to report.

<u>18-040</u>. Under Item VI – A Strategic Focus and Planning

- A. STUDENT SUCCESS AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
 - 1. Student Survey of Instruction Dr. Sabrina Crawford, Executive Director, Institutional Research and Effectiveness and Ms. Maggie Tymms, Director, Institutional Effectiveness (*Presentation*)

Dr. Crawford stated that she would be talking about the Student Survey of Instruction (SSI). She shared that SPC does several surveys, including the entering student survey, surveys during enrollment, surveys of graduating students, surveys of alumni, and surveys of employers (to see if SPC is teaching the correct skills.) SPC utilizes two national surveys: the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE). SPC also uses the SSI.

Dr. Crawford shared that the SSI went through a revamp in 2009, when a committee consisting of the Faculty Governance Organization (FGO) president, faculty, and administrators pulled together all the paper surveys into one modality-neutral survey based on a Likert scale of 1-7 and including two open-ended questions. The goal of the committee was to increase the response rate. At that time, there were only two major changes: (1) changing the language from 'instructor' to 'faculty' and (2) allowing students to be aware of the survey.

Dr. Crawford stated that the SSI results are accessible by faculty a week after grades close. At the beginning of each semester, faculty get an email with information about the SSI, including FAQs and tutorials. Faculty receive follow-up emails five days before the survey opens, 50% into the survey administration period, and 75% into the survey administration period.

Maggie Tymms said that enhancements made in 2015 allowed for improved data in the SSI results. She explained that students get notified via MyCourses one week prior to the SSI opening; the notice changes to a new message when students can begin the survey. She pointed out that the SSI response rate at SPC is between 54-60%. By comparison, 20-30% is the standard. She showed that the response rates continue to improve slightly across time. She pointed out that in 2015, there was a spike and that is when enhancements were made; the response rate increased by 20%. The final table Ms. Tymms shared showed the course score for each of the areas: course instruction; preparation and organization; and faculty engagement. Average scores were between 6.4-6.7 on a 7-point scale; she added that these numbers are consistently high.

Ms. Tymms next shared the faculty views of SSI scores, which faculty can see one week after grades are posted. Faculty have scores for each of the eighteen questions for the section they taught. Comparison data is also presented for the overall course and for the department, along

with composite scores. Those are the same categories and scores that are transferred over to Faculty180.

Next, Dr. Cooper talked about the faculty evaluation process. She stated that the majority of faculty fall between 6.4-7 on a 7-point scale. She said that if someone is, for example, falling below 4, it is a red flag. She said in that case, she would look to see if it was the faculty member's first semester. She would work with their Dean help them with ideas to adjust. If she does not see a change based on an overall perspective, she may delay a contract decision or not offer the faculty member a contract.

Mr. Gibbons asked if the students were a part of the process in terms of the questions when the revamp took place in 2009. He added that the questions seem very vanilla; for example, there is no question regarding if the student felt they learned anything. He said that of course the ratings are high, because most of the questions are about how prepared are the faculty and how well do they know the material. He pointed out that there is only one question about whether the student was engaged. He opined that the survey should be asking question such as: 'Would you take this course again?'; or, 'Would you take this faculty member again?' Mr. Gibbons stated that if SPC revamps the SSI again, he wants the students to have input on the questions. He opined that the SSI still has some flaws as it relates to getting real feedback from the students.

Dr. Crawford said that Mr. Gibbons made excellent points. She shared that at the time of the revamp in 2009, the committee took five different paper surveys and standardized it. She added that it was a great first attempt.

Mr. Gibbons agreed that it was great first attempt, but that the Student Government Association (SGA) and other students should be involved. He added that for the students in Veterinary Technology, for example, the questions might need to be different; students are looking for different things. He said that there should definitely be some student involvement, and that the current questions do not sound like student questions – they sound like administrator questions.

Chair Stonecipher agreed with Mr. Gibbons that it is a great idea to have students involved; however, he cautioned again using questions that may encourage or allow bias.

Mr. Gibbons said that the end user is the student and that there is nothing in the SSI for the students.

Dr. Williams stated that the CCSSE and SENSE national surveys catch that information and that is why SPC does several surveys.

Mr. Gibbons asked when students get the Enrolled Student Survey.

Ms. Tymms replied that students receive the Enrolled Student Survey every Fall – once a year.

Dr. Williams said that SPC can certainly go back and include the student voice and get students to share with administration. She added that she liked what Chair Stonecipher said – that SPC needs to ask questions like, 'Would you take this professor again?' Dr. Williams added that questions should not be so granular that the responses become personal against the faculty.

Dr. Crawford added that the development of the SSI was faculty-led with FGO and that no administrators were involved.

Mr. Gibbons said that Dr. Crawford made his point – that it is faculty rating faculty; the student does not have a voice.

Chair Stonecipher noted that the percentage of students who take the SSI is impressive. He asked if there is any incentive to taking the SSI.

Ms. Tymms replied that there are no incentives. She explained that what has worked best is when faculty express to students that it is important because faculty will make changes to the course based on the responses.

Dr. Crawford added that the open-ended questions really help with that.

Vice Chair Cole asked if there are any national standards that SPC strives for.

Dr. Crawford replied that the questions are very similar to other institutions; she is not sure if that is intentional or not.

Vice Chair Cole asked about national standards and if there is any national compilation of the benchmarks for comparative analysis.

Ms. Tymms replied that there is not for the SSI, but that CCSSE and SENSE are the benchmark.

Dr. Crawford added that in the beginning, there was fear of students not completing it in an online format. There was discussion about making the SSI mandatory, but it was decided not to; instead, SPC used an awareness campaign.

Mr. Gibbons recommended looking at AACC and/or AACT to see if there is a guide which could be used as a starting point to revamp the SSI.

 Student Government Association Budget Process – Ms. Barbara Fumano, Coordinator, Student Life and Leadership, Tarpon Springs Campus, Ms. Fallia Zacharopoulou, SGA President, St. Petersburg Gibbs Campus and Mr. Jerrick Rivera, SGA Secretary and Treasurer, Seminole Campus (*Presentation*)

Ms. Barbara Fumano stated that Student Life & Leadership is here to provide transformative outof-class opportunities for students to further develop themselves as productive citizens within their community.

Ms. Fallia Zacharopoulou shared that the purpose of the Student Government Association (SGA) is to represent the interests, concerns, and needs of the student body; liaison between the student body and college administration; and be fiscally responsible for the allocation of a portion of student activity fees. She shared that the 2017-18 projected student activities revenue is \$4.3

million, and that the SGA allocation is \$1.07 million (25%). The budget is distributed proportionately to the campuses based on enrollment. Each Fall and Spring, the Campus SGA Executive Board presents their plan and budget to Dr. Williams and the Vice President of Student Services. Ms. Zacharopoulou elaborated that the Fall presentation explains where money will go, and the Spring is coming back and describing how SGA used the money, how they have been fiscally responsible, and where they plan to go from that point.

Ms. Zacharopoulou next shared the SGA budget process. She stated that the SGA Executive Board meets over the summer to determine their campus' budget using the pillars of diversity, leadership development, service, student success, and wellness as guidance to help them develop activities and events throughout the year to meet the needs of the student body. She added that incorporating the pillars helps to gauge student needs and desires; it helps SGA to optimize and organize. When considering budget allocation, the two pillars of leadership development and service are especially important. Ms. Zacharopoulou stressed the importance of talking to students and asking what they want.

Ms. Zacharopoulou stated that SGA meets twice a month to discuss funding proposals. She said that the proposal is pretty basic; it asks for information such as the benefit to students, the campus, and the college. SGA senators vote on proposals. SGA follows Robert's Rules of Order to conduct meetings in a fair way. Ms. Zacharopoulou shared two examples of funded proposals: a Student Veterans' conference in Texas, which was a great opportunity to enhance their skills; and a Phi Theta Kappa (PTK) conference where PTK won many awards for SPC. She also shared that each club is granted seed money at the beginning of each year to help grow their club involvement and membership.

Ms. Zacharopoulou shared an example of a budget breakdown from the Downtown campus. The chart included columns for events, money spent, and remaining balance. SGA also incorporates the pillars by breaking down the spending by pillars. Ms. Zacharopoulou stated that SGA keeps a certain amount of money on reserve in a contingency fund in case of unforeseen circumstances.

Ms. Zacharopoulou said that leadership development is one of most important things SGA has taught her; she has gained confidence in public speaking. She stated that SGA attends conferences throughout year, and that one of most impactful trips was the President's trip to Tallahassee, where SGA members had the opportunity to talk to state senators. The trip showed her and her peers what student engagement is and that the student voice counts. She said that SB 540 was one of biggest things SGA fought against. She added that it was great to be in Tallahassee with Dr. Williams and Board; and learning that the bill did not pass.

Mr. Jerrick Rivera presented on the student success pillar. He gave a few examples: SGA funding the PSTA initiative to provide students with free bus fare; SGA funding and supporting clubs and organizations; and SGA funding campus tutors.

Mr. Rivera next discussed the third pillar, which is service. He provided a few examples: Holiday Blessings, where the Downtown SGA helped five neighbors in need by putting together a basket of supplies and food and figuring out which students would benefit most from these baskets; the Florida Dream Center, through which SGA collaborated with Dr. Williams, the Center of Civic Engagement with Dr. Newsom, and Bless the Children to bring a huge truck to

the Tarpon Springs campus, which they filled with surplus medical supplies to be shipped to Guatemala – SGA will be sending another truckload of medical supplies to Guyana in a couple weeks.

Mr. Rivera shared that under the forth pillar of diversity, SGA tries to better connect with students from different backgrounds and upbringings by hosting cultural events, and events such as the Martin Luther King, Jr. Parade.

Mr. Rivera stated that under the pillar of wellness, SGA funds the BayCare Student Assistance Program (SAP) and health fairs; Tarpon SGA initiated a personal trainer to help with physical and mental health of students; and the Seminole SGA established a Recreation Center Partnership to provide gym access for students since there is no gym on campus.

Mr. Rivera shared that he has learned many things through his participation in SGA. He said that SGA is really big on team building, which helps him get to know people from different backgrounds and areas of study. He likes that students have the opportunity to have a big say in where the SGA money goes. Within the SGA program, Mr. Rivera has noticed the reason why SGA says 'yes' or 'no' to funding proposals – it is about who SGA represents and what SGA wants to bring back to SPC. Mr. Rivera said that he can really use this experience as a business major. He shared that he has been learning a lot of skills, such as public speaking and budgeting. Mr. Rivera stated that he is greatly appreciative of the experience.

Mr. Gibbons asked if SGA members are happy with the process.

Ms. Zacharopoulou replied that she is definitely happy with the process – that SGA follows the guidelines, has structure, and has the ability to change things if they want to.

Mr. Gibbons thanked the presenters.

Mr. Foster praised the presenters on a well-done presentation; he particularly appreciated that they addressed the pillars. He said he is most appreciative of their fiscal responsibility. He noted that SGA holds money in reserve; he praised SGA for realizing they need a healthy reserve, even under a recurring funding stream.

Dr. Williams said she is most proud of this process. She praised the students for taking on the challenges of handling the budget, telling people no, understanding enrollment, and understanding what to do if the funding does not come. Dr. Williams encouraged the Board to look at the notebook SGA prepared for them. She added that SGA students present twice a year, and that they always put together great presentations and notebooks. Dr. Williams again stressed what a great job the presenters did.

Chair Stonecipher asked for more details on the structure and organization of SGA; specifically, he asked if each campus has their own representatives and if there is a president over all the campus SGAs.

Ms. Fumano explained that there is an advisor, a president, a vice president, a treasurer, a secretary, and an historian on each campus. Each campus also has an executive board which works with their advisor to figure out the budget.

Dr. Williams suggested the students go one step higher to discuss the Student Council of Presidents (SCOP).

Mr. Rivera explained that SCOP works on college-wide initiatives.

Ms. Zacharopoulou added that SCOP recently worked to increase awareness of the Bay Care Student Assistance Program (SAP) to Summer students.

Chair Stonecipher stated that it is an outstanding process and that it is impressive to see the thought that goes into the budget and where SGA chooses to allocate their resources. He praised the students for their professionalism and seriousness. He opined that SGA provides a special opportunity for students to have some control and to work through issues and find consensus or to move in a certain direction if they do not find consensus. Chair Stonecipher said that he loved the presentation and he thanked the presenters.

<u>18-041</u>. Under Item VI – B Budget and Finance

- B. BUDGET AND FINANCE
 - 1. Monthly Budget Report –Ms. Janette Hunt, Associate Vice President, Budget and Compliance (*Presentation*)

Ms. Hunt stated that she had a brief report. She first discussed revenue, stating that student tuition and fees are at about \$52 million, which is about 85% of the year-to-date budget. State funding is at \$41 million, which is 57% of the year-to-date budget. This amount includes the first lottery payment of \$2.8 million. Total revenue is at \$98 million, which is 68% of the year-to-date budget. The tuition projection is 0.7% above last time, which is about \$250,000.

Ms. Hunt next discussed personnel and benefits, which is at \$73.5 million, or 65% of the year-todate budget. Current expenses are at \$16 million, which is 57% of the year-to-date budget. Capital is at \$1.6 million, which is 56% of the year-to-date budget. She added that spending is a bit less than last year. Overall, revenue-over-expense is at about \$7 million. Ms. Hunt explained that over the next few months, the variance will decline, being that SPC received 85% of tuition and the rest of SPC's appropriation but will continue to spend preparing for Summer and Fall.

<u>18-042</u>. Under Item VI - C, Administrative Matters

The Board considered Personnel Items VI - C.1a. Mr. Foster moved approval. Vice Chair Cole seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Information regarding these items is as follows:

C. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- 1. Human Resources a. Personnel Report (Action)
- 2. Faculty and Dean Evaluation Process Dr. Anne Cooper, Senior Vice President, Instruction and Academic Programs (*Presentation*)

Dr. Cooper presented two different evaluation processes: the faculty evaluation process and the dean evaluation process.

Regarding faculty evaluation, Dr. Cooper explained that six years ago, a team of faculty and administrators reviewed the faculty evaluation process based on changes in legislation that changed continuing contract from three years to five years within the Florida College System. This change also required certain areas to be assessed in regard to the faculty evaluation process. Dr. Cooper shared that one thing SPC does that not all colleges do is evaluate faculty members on an annual basis even with continuing contract status.

Dr. Cooper stated that the faculty evaluation sub areas are generated by committee and that all the information is in the online portfolio that faculty keep. The faculty evaluation categories include: instructional strategies; scholarly contributions and creative productions; contributions to college, mission and values, discipline, and campus; and data such as the SSI reflection and narrative data and student success rates. SPC asks faculty to take all that information and reflect on what it is telling them, what they might want to change, and if there are specific professional development activities that they are interested in. Faculty also include on their evaluation what professional development they have done and their plan for going forward. Dr. Cooper said that the evaluation focuses on continuous improvement. The last evaluation category is community service and engagement outside the college.

Dr. Cooper said that for each category, SPC wanted to make sure that all faculty are doing a selfassessment and that the deans who review those assessments are thinking along the same line as far as exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, and progressing toward expectations. SPC has rubrics with separate examples of how one might achieve the various categories.

Dr. Cooper shared an example of how faculty document things they have done to increase student engagement and how they have incorporated new technology. Dr. Cooper said that faculty self-assess, and the dean would review.

Dr. Cooper next shared an example that illustrated how faculty receive success rate data for all courses taught. The example showed the percentage of W, WF, and incompletes; data from the same course taught by other faculty; the overall success rate for a particular course; and the program success rate for courses. She added that it is a wealth of data to look at and make comparisons.

Dr. Cooper stated that deans review all the information, perform a teaching observation (unless the faculty member is on continuing contract, in which case they may opt to have a peer do the

observation), and make comments and discuss a growth plan for continuous improvement. She concluded that the faculty evaluation process is very thorough and taken very seriously. For example, this year SPC is delaying decisions on two faculty until May and there is one faculty member who will not be renewed.

Mr. Gibbons requested more details about what is in the growth plan.

Dr. Cooper explained that it is the faculty development plan going forward; for example, faculty may focus on online pedagogy or more active engagement; faculty may attend more Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) seminars; or faculty may seek outside professional development. Each of the approximately 370 faculty have a growth plan.

Mr. Gibbons asked if the growth plan is done every year.

Dr. Cooper confirmed that the growth plan is done every year.

Mr. Gibbons asked about community service being part of the evaluation process.

Dr. Cooper responded that faculty might, for example, be part of Rotary, volunteer at church, or volunteer at a food bank; faculty can document these activities.

Mr. Gibbons clarified that the community service does not have to be related to the college.

Dr. Cooper confirmed and explained that these activities relate to the community engagement pillar.

Mr. Gibbons asked if SPC documents the evaluation process in terms of the observations.

Dr. Cooper confirmed and added that the form is uploaded into the faculty portfolio.

Mr. Gibbons asked if feedback is made available to the instructor.

Dr. Coopers responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Bello asked how many people chose dean observation over peer observation.

Dr. Cooper replied that interestingly enough, more faculty choose the dean observation.

Dr. Cooper next outlined the dean evaluation process. She shared that about seven years ago, since dean positions are college-wide, and deans are expected to be on different campuses engaging with faculty, SPC began using a Program Administrator Appraisal. Staff and faculty anonymously evaluate their dean based on five categories: continuous improvement; enabling others to act; supportive relationships; shared vision; and role model. The evaluation is on a five-point scale.

Dr. Cooper explained that after all the data from the evaluations is available, she receives a copy of the information for each dean including individual scores in each category as well as overall

scores for all of the deans. She looks at areas where maybe a dean is below average, and they will discuss why this is happening and how they can improve. Dr. Cooper asks deans to use the information as a piece of data to form their growth plan so that they are continuously improving their leadership skills. Strategic goals are housed in SPC's PlanIt system. Dr. Cooper explained that performance planning is based on the following strategic goals: three-year financial plan to include the three-year facilities plan; college-wide recruitment and retention plan; Pathways initiative to include the College Experience; SACS-COC Accreditation Reaffirmation and the Quality Enhancement Plan; and employee professional development.

Dr. Cooper stated that after reviewing goals, she discusses with the dean if they need to strengthen or add any goals or if they did not include something they should have. They are expected to incorporate SPC's operating principles for the academic side of the house into their goals. Dr. Cooper stated that after reviewing program administrator information, goals, her interactions with them, and their interactions with the dean team, she provides them with her overall sense as to how they are doing, their strengths, areas for improvement, and goals to bring them in the right direction. Dean evaluations are performed on an annual basis.

Mr. Gibbons asked if the deans have any contact with students.

Dr. Cooper said yes.

Mr. Gibbons asked if SPC goes back to those students regarding those interactions as part of the evaluation process to see how they received their interaction with the deans; he clarified that he does not necessarily mean if the student got what they wanted.

Dr. Cooper replied that SPC does not at this time.

Mr. Gibbons asked who else deans interact with; he specifically asked if deans interact with career services staff and if these interactions are reflected in the evaluation process.

Dr. Cooper replied that deans' interactions with career services staff are not reflected in the evaluation process at this time.

Dr. Williams added that faculty do not get evaluated by staff they do not supervise. She stated that the deans work a lot with the chairs and the faculty. Dr. Williams also noted that deans interact with career services staff, provosts, community members, and the executive team.

Mr. Gibbons asked if those folks are included in the evaluation process.

Dr. Williams said no and added that SPC will not have everyone evaluating everyone at the college. She pointed out that SPC is just starting the president's evaluation process. She stated that SPC will not have individuals who do not interact with the person evaluating them.

Mr. Gibbons stated that if he were an employee, he would not say anything bad about his boss in an evaluation.

Dr. Williams pointed out that the evaluations are anonymous.

Mr. Gibbons argued that anonymous is not always anonymous; that leaks happen all the time. He stated that he meant no disrespect, but that he sees the process as a bunch of friends evaluating each other. He added that the boss is being evaluated by a bunch of underlings and that there is no real input from students. He wondered how SPC will ever get the output they are looking for. He said he feel like it is a 1950s evaluation process.

Dr. Williams disagreed. She stated that there are several colleges that do not evaluate deans at all. She said she is proud that SPC has anonymous evaluations that provide positive information that suggests corrective action. She said that Mr. Gibbons has challenged her to be evaluated by the entire college.

Mr. Gibbons disagreed, stating that he challenged Dr. Williams to a 360 evaluation that allows for different groups.

Dr. Williams asked for better direction regarding evaluations. She said she would like to bring that evaluation plan going forward back to the Board if they would allow it.

Mr. Gibbons stated that he is one person.

Chair Stonecipher said that he will give his input when the data is presented. He said he understands the concerns that Mr. Gibbons is raising. He stated that the bulk of the information, no matter how the evaluation process is changed, will have to come from the people underneath individuals – especially for the dean evaluations – because they are most affected by their work. He reiterated the importance of anonymous evaluations.

Dr. Williams stated that the deans do not give any feedback to the provost evaluations, and the provosts do not give feedback to the dean evaluations, even though they do interact regularly.

Vice Chair Cole stated that SPC clearly has lots of surveys; some are performance-based, and some are strategy-based. She said that in trying to determine if the college is effectively meeting its goals and objectives, two things would be helpful: (1) having those buckets more clearly defined; and (2) on a semester basis, to see a metric or a report that shows if SPC's constituents think SPC is meeting the college's overall goals. She added that from an employment standpoint, SPC needs to ask specific questions but with college goals, the questions can be holistic.

Dr. Williams said that Vice Chair Cole is right on point with where SPC is going with the Executive Leadership Council and bringing monthly reports on the three pillars and where SPC is at. SPC has expanded that team to a large number of individuals to address that and to be open and transparent. The Executive Leadership Council has already discussed bringing that on a monthly basis so that they do not wait until the end of the year and then realize that the college has not met or addressed an issue. She again stated that Vice Chair Cole is right on point and thanked her for her input.

Mr. Gibbons said that to Vice Chair Cole's point, community colleges are under attack. He opined that the quality of instruction and output is what will save community colleges. He added

that SPC has to fix this, to know and be able to show how people are hired and fired. He stated that SPC will not survive if they do not put out the product they need to put out into the workforce. Mr. Gibbons said that he has been involved in five legislative session, and that they evaluate on the product colleges put out. He added that SPC needs to have a survey process that evaluates people based on their ability to get the student to where they need to be; that starts with the deans and then the instructors. He stated that SPC needs to show a high percentage of people getting jobs. Mr. Gibbons said that accountability starts with the process of evaluation – if SPC does not do that, they will be put in the same box that they have always been put in as the thirteenth grade. He shared that this is what he hears in Tallahassee – that is the criticism from the Senate. He said that SPC must take a critical look at the things that matter. Mr. Gibbons added that he is not picking on anyone, but that at the end of the day, this is what SPC will be judged on. He said that is why SPC does not get the funding they used to get, that people think SPC is the thirteenth grade. He said that SPC changes that by holding people accountable.

Chair Stonecipher thanked Mr. Gibbons.

<u>18-043.</u> Under Item VII - A, Consent Agenda

Under Old Business

A. OLD BUSINESS (items previously considered but not finalized) – None

<u>18-044</u>. Under Item VII – B, New Business

- 1. Workforce and Professional Development Curriculum Changes (Action)
- 2. GRANTS/RESTRICTED FUNDS CONTRACTS
 - a. Lyle Spencer Foundation The Economics of Community College Guided Pathways Reforms (*Action*)

b. U.S. Health and Human Services Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services

Administration – Garrett Lee Smith Campus Suicide Prevention (Action)

- c. Lumina Foundation Talent Hubs (Action)
- d. Lumina Foundation Lumina Fund for Racial Justice and Equity (Action)

3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

a. Annual Membership Assessment in Florida College System Risk Management (Action)

Chair Stonecipher said that he is curious as to why the dollar amount went up for the annual membership assessment in the Florida College System.

Jim Waechter, Associate Vice President, Facilities, Planning, and Institutional Services, explained that it is based on all three components: (1) the Worker's Compensation part, (2) the property value; (3) and the annual assessment, which is based on FTEs. Each of those three components are funded from balances. Mr. Waechter said that this year, the consortium

identified that the balance of that annual assessment has been diminished to the point that they want to replenish it appropriately. He stated that is the only part of those three that did go up.

Dr. Williams noted that it went up 7%.

Chair Stonecipher agreed that it was a substantial increase. He clarified that it is assessed every year.

Mr. Waechter confirmed and added that SPC brings it to the Board each Spring for the subsequent year's assessment.

The Board considered Items VII-B.1-3. Mr. Foster moved to approve. Mr. Gibbons seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

18-045. Under Item VIII, Informational Reports - None

<u>18-046</u>. Under Item IX, Proposed Changes to BOT Rules Manual – Public Hearing - None

18-047. Under Item X, President's Report

Dr. Williams thanked the Board again for all of their work in Tallahassee, particularly for the five days during spring break.

Dr. Williams shared that the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) visit went well. Out of the ten or eleven different components that the OCR looked at, they asked for SPC to address three. The first area was dealing with making sure communications are in other languages. Dr. Williams stated that SPC needs to do this college-wide. The second area had to do with the accessibility of buildings, such as elevators operating correctly and sounds working properly as they move from floor-to-floor – all minor things. There were no findings with financial aid. Dr. Williams noted that SPC needs to help SPC support students with intellectual disabilities and utilizes the resources that the state provides to help SPC support students with intellectual disabilities. Dr. Williams shared that Dr. Misty Kemp has already reached out to the state to see how SPC can access those funds to provide students with intellectual disabilities with services on campus at SPC. Dr. Williams applauded all who were involved in the OCR visit. She stated that SPC did very well in the audit.

Dr. Williams next gave a Legislative Update. She said she is very proud of the college on getting \$3.5 million for the Gibbs building project; that was the big signature piece SPC was focusing on. She shared that she is working on a monthly plan to engage legislators in SPC's district and beyond to be better prepared for the next session; to give them a better understanding, so they do not see SPC as the thirteenth grade and understand the value that SPC brings to the table.

Dr. Williams said that Mike Meidel shared in an article yesterday that about twenty businesses are moving to the county. She emailed Andrea Henning, Executive Director, Collaborative Labs and Workforce Institute right away so that SPC can be the first step with the new businesses moving into the county. She learned that Andrea had already started reaching out and making the contacts. Dr. Williams stated that the Downtown Partnership demonstrates what training and collaboration can bring to downtown. Dr. Williams thanked everyone for getting SPC moving in that direction. She thanked the Board for their continuing support.

<u>18-048</u>. Under Item XI, Next Meeting Date and Location

The Board confirmed its next meeting date and location as Tuesday April 17, 2018, 9:00 a.m., at the EpiCenter.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Stonecipher adjourned the meeting at 10:21am.

Tonjua Williams Secretary, Board of Trustees St. Petersburg College FLORIDA Nathan Stonecipher Chairman, Board of Trustees St. Petersburg College FLORIDA