

CCATT Webinar: Assessing the Performance of the CEO

Susan Moore-Fontenot, Lee College Regent

CCATT Education Committee Chair

Dr. Lynda Villanueva, Lee College President

Our Why

An effective assessment leads to rewards:

- Commitment to **nurture & support** the President
- Greater **clarity** in goals and priorities
- Greater **respect** and improved **communications**
- Better Board **group and planning skills**
- Opportunity to **reflect** and provide important **guidance** to the President
- Greater **trust** between the Board and President
- Enhanced **knowledge** of LC by the Board and greater understanding of the complexity of the Presidency
- **Commitment** to hold on to a good President

Our When

- o Comprehensive, annual process (usually March) by Board Policy
- o President presents state of the college
- o Regents complete online evaluation
- o Regents meet to review results and finalize evaluation with President
- o Regents vote on contract extension and compensation adjustments

Our How

- o Two Parts
 - o I- Leadership & Management (general/day-to-day)
 - o II- Strategic Goals (specific)
- o Regents review President's "State of the College" presentation and supporting information aligned to Parts I & II and score online evaluation
- o President completes a self-assessment

Our How (con't)

- o Domain and Indicator scores are averaged – Overall Score for Parts I & II
- o Strategic Outcome: Provide the President with strategic feedback
 - o Identify Strengths/Accomplishment and Concerns/Growth Areas
- o Regents formalize decisions
 - o Contract Renewal
 - o Compensation and Benefits
 - o Market Analysis
- o Board approves

Our How (con't)

Two Key Scoring Factors – Quality and Quantity

- o Domains - 9
 - o Critical Attributes – 62
 - o Open Ended Questions- 2
- o Quality in Executing the Critical Attributes
 - o Strength
 - o Impact on the College
 - o Variety of Inputs - internally and externally
 - o Alignment - Strategic Plan, Board Policy, Mission, and Objectives

Our How (con't) – Quantity Indicators

5	4	3	2	1	0
Clearly Outstanding <i>(Performs clearly with little to no supervision)</i>	Exceeds Expectations <i>(Performs like an experienced or competent employee)</i>	Meets Expectations <i>(Average performance)</i>	Below Expectations <i>(Generally fails to meet job expectations)</i>	Unsatisfactory <i>(Consistently fails to meet job expectations)</i>	N/A
(All/Almost All) 90-100%	(Most) 80-89%	(Frequent) 60-79%	(Some) 50-59%	(Less than Half) 49% or Less	Not enough data to evaluate or did not observe
Consistently: Highly predictable Seamlessly Uniformly	Generally: Common practice Predictable Typical Prevalent As a rule	On Average: Moderately Irregular	Occasionally: Sporadic Random Seldom	Rarely: Infrequent Nonexistent Not attempted Minimal Hardly ever	

Regents provide **fact-specific, evidence-based** comments when rating:

Clearly Outstanding (5)

Below Expectations (2)

Unsatisfactory (1)

Our What and Who

2021-22 Part I Results by Category

	Categories	Regents	President
A	Relationship w/Board		
B	Leadership		
	Community		
C	Relationships/Advocacy		
D	Staff and Personnel		
E	Business & Finance		
F	Personal Qualities		
G	Physical Plant		
H	Curricula		
I	Student Services		
	TOTAL		

2021-22 Part II Results by Category

Categories	Regents	President
A Develop Strategic Plan		
B Complete instructional reorganization		
C Create Center for Basic Needs		
D Develop strategies to increase FT enrollment		
E Scale Guided Pathway Initiatives		
F Expand hi-wage, hi-demand workforce program		
G Develop strong partnerships with ISDs we serve		
H Train faculty for Empirical Education Center		
I Develop equity-oriented practices & policies		
J Complete SACSOCC Fifth-Year Interim Report		
K Complete Institutional Master Plan		
L Resume Athletics Program		
M Implement Online Learning at Huntsville		
TOTAL		9

Summative Score Results

Summary of Cumulative Scores:

- o Clearly Outstanding: 4.76-5.00
- o Exceeds Expectations: 4.00-4.75
(Y1:___) (Y2: ___)
- o Meets Expectations: 3.00-3.99
- o Below Expectations: 2.00-2.99
- o Unsatisfactory: Below 2.00

Board Recommendations

- Rate top 3-5 strengths/accomplishments
- Rate top 3-5 growth areas
- Reach consensus



Compensation Considerations

1. Response to prior year's expectations
2. Accomplishment of hiring goals
3. Performance evaluation (Part I & II)
4. Retention goals
5. Benchmarks/External equity with Gulf Coast CEOs
6. Comparison with local superintendent (Y1)
7. Short term incentives/performance bonus
8. Impact on college
9. Affordability – college budget
10. Community receptivity/support
11. Other

Contract Renewal Recommendations

o Contract

- o Current: 3 year (common)–February 1, 2021 – January 5, 2024
- o Approve: 1 year extension to January 1, 2022 – January 5, January 2025

o Compensation/Salary

- o Current Base Salary:
- o Approved _____% Increase

o Benefits

- o Membership Dues and Fees
- o Business Travel
- o Housing (home or annual allowance)
- o Auto and Expenses (company car lease, expenses, etc.)
- o Cell Phone Stipend (use of college phone or personal allowance)
- o Health/Dental/Life Insurance (same as all administrators or special)
- o Retirement (same as all administrators or special)
- o Sick Leave/Personal Leave (same as all administrators or special)
- o Vacation (total hours in Y1; accumulation, max hour accumulation)
- o Paid Holidays (same as all administrators or special)
- o Moving Expense (amount of 1x expense)

Evaluation Process

Recommendations/Challenges/Best Practices

1. Decided if you will use a **consultant** or design a local instrument
2. Decide if you will use a **weighted evaluation process**
3. Incorporate **data** and explanatory notes **provided by CEO**
4. Assure Regents have understanding and **consensus** on **scoring criteria**
5. Reach consensus around issues where Board has **differing options** on **strengths/weaknesses** in order to send one message to the CEO.
6. Determine if results reflect true performance, trending concerns, scoring system issue, lack of information, or emerging skills?
7. Determine in advance how you will handle Regents' comments that are **outliers?**
8. Address how you will reach consensus: **CONGRUENCE, THEMES, OVERLAP. REDUNDANCIES**
9. Decide if goals will be written for **single year vs. multiple year.**
10. Provide **refresher on process annually** to assure consistency in scoring.
11. Consider **prior year's evaluation results** and recommendations.
12. Will you incorporate 360 Evaluations into the process?

Timeline

Action Step	Action Item	Responsible Party
1	Consult with President to review evaluation criteria	Board Chair and Regent
2	Meet to review timeline for evaluation	Evaluation Committee
3	Poll Board to set dates for: a. President's State of the College Presentation (closed session) b. Board e-evaluation and President self-evaluation via Survey Monkey c. President's evaluation (closed session)	Chief of Staff
4	Part II – President's goals are entered into Survey Monkey and Part I (leadership skills and roles) and Part II (college mission and goals) links are tested	Regent Technology
5	Complete individual confidential evaluation ratings	Board and President
6	Tally results	Regent and Technology
7	Review evaluation results and create SWOT analysis	Regent
8	Review comparable compensation data	CFO, Board Chair, Regent
9	Review results with Board (closed session)	Regent
10	Arrive at consensus on evaluation results (closed session)	Board
11	Review results with President	Board Chair
12	Sign evaluation summary with summative score	Board Chair and President
13	Provide follow up meeting with President to create Part II Goals, priorities and tasks related to mission and goals, for the next year	Board Chair
14	Approve contract extension and compensation at next Board Meeting	Board
15	Consult with attorney (if warranted) and update contract	Board Chair, President
15	Evaluate your process and modify evaluation instrument, if necessary	President and Board
16	Plan for succession if warranted	Board