

# **WLU Board of Governors**

Governance Committee

Monday, May 16, 2022 – 9:00 a.m.

Location: Shaw Hall Board Room

Meeting ID: 966 8891 3491

Passcode: 066207

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
  - A. March 17, 2022
3. Executive Session
  - A. Presidential Assessment Review Process
4. Actions Emanating from Executive Session
5. Adjournment

**West Liberty University  
Board of Governors**

---

**Governance Committee  
Minutes  
March 17, 2022**

Attendance:

Richard Carter, Ryan Glanville, Rich Lucas, David McKinley, Stephanie Shaw

Unable to Attend:

Arlene Brantley

Administration/Faculty/Staff:

W. Franklin Evans, Monique Akassi, Mary Ann Edwards, Diana Harto, Stephanie Hooper

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Chair Carter called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. with a roll call.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

**A. August 4, 2021**

**B. November 17, 2021**

**On motion by Rich Lucas and seconded by Ryan Glanville, it was unanimously adopted by the Governance Committee to approve the minutes of August 4, 2021 and November 17, 2021.**

**3. Board Self-Evaluation Outcome**

Chair Carter stated Dr. Evans will go through the document and explain the results to the committee. It was decided that Dr. Evans would review the outcome with the committee and then send it to the remaining board members.

Dr. Evans reviewed the Board of Governors Self-Assessment, noting that 11 members out of 12 completed the survey. Using the KEY for percentages each item was reviewed. The narrative responses covered the board's greatest strengths, major accomplishments of the past year, areas in which the board could improve, and what members would like to see.

A question and answer period followed on strengths and weaknesses, areas of improvement, a need for better understanding, and transparency. Discussed were DEI training and new member orientation and pairing with a seasoned board member who can explain some historical information and culture. Also discussed was community involvement and where things stand with the previous Strategic Plan. Members should be held accountable if they do not show up for a meeting or have not reviewed meeting information.

The end goal of the evaluation is to bring to light situations or items that are strengths or weaknesses of the board. At this point we record the fact that the evaluation has taken place. This is important and when asked, we are required to show evidence of the evaluation. This information will be shared at the full board meeting on March 30<sup>th</sup>.

**On motion by David McKinley and seconded by Ryan Glanville, it was unanimously adopted by the Governance Committee to bring the board self-evaluation results to the full board.**

**4. Presidential Assessment Review Process**

Mr. Lucas stated that he is working with Ms. Harto on developing the questionnaire and process. It's been quite some time since an evaluation has occurred, but the process should be completed with results to the board at our June 1, 2022 meeting.

Ms. Harto assisted with questions and information sharing from past evaluations and developed a 50 question evaluation, along with seven open-ended response available questions. The plan is to have this distributed within the next two weeks. Due dates were discussed, assessment groups, the google doc, and campus sessions.

Dr. Evans noted that this is to be an assessment, not the full-fledged 3-year evaluation process. Policy states that a performance evaluation shall be conducted every third year; why go through a full-fledged evaluation process? Mr. Carter had the same question. It is expected to have an internal evaluation after one year is completed, done as a board assessment. After three years you have the full faculty, staff, student, community at large involved as far as the evaluation process. This involvement is from far more groups than Dr. Evans thought, based on the goals he set, and appears to be the three year format. Dr. Evans publicly stated that he is troubled by this; Mr. Carter is, too.

A discussion followed on the one and three year evaluation processes. BOG Policy 2 was reviewed with the group. This is considered the annual evaluation and it's up to the board to choose how they want to handle the process and the manner of receiving feedback. The Board can change whatever piece they want; this is the first discussion. Mr. Lucas was going to check the public censure to be sure there wasn't something stated with regard to an evaluation. Dr. Evans noted that he has heard nothing else back since the censure.

There was a brief discussion regarding the faculty wanting to make the decision as to who will be provost, or for the Board to be able to choose the provost. Mr. Carter stated that he was told that faculty would like to choose who is on a selection committee, rather than a faculty member being assigned to a committee. Ms. Harto stated that it is up to the search committee chair to make sure there is proper representation on the committee.

The discussion returned to the presidential assessment with Mr. Lucas concluding a one-year assessment will be conducted. Mr. Carter still held that this should be the one-year assessment, not the entire three-year evaluation process. We as a board assess the president for his first year. Mr. Lucas stated it should be timely and complete by the June meeting.

Ms. Harto stated that with regard to making the assessment more or less elaborate, noted Section 5.1 of Policy 2, is that the board will have discussions with listed groups. We should be prepared for this type of set up. The other part is Faculty Senate has already distributed their own survey about this to campus, with their intention of giving the results to the board. Mr. Carter was told by Sean Ryan that they were doing an assessment of Dr. Evans and would the Governance Chairman be interested in seeing the results, to which he responded "yes." Whether those results should be given to the full board for them to utilize as information while they are filling out their assessment is to be decided. Mr. Lucas stated that he did delegate this process to the committee. Our purpose at a minimum is to conduct an annual assessment. Dr. Evans stated that he is transparent and keeps people informed. He is very disappointed and somewhat hurt that the faculty have put together some type of instrument, circulated for feedback, and not said anything to him about the process, which would be common courtesy – why? He is expected to do things a certain way, have things a certain way, but this is underhanded. Mr. Carter stated Dr. Evans has every right to be upset.

Dr. Akassi noted she had a concerned faculty member who felt the survey appeared to be bias and as a minority in the faculty senate, every time they raised a concern they were stymied and bullied. They felt as though they were pushed into responding to the survey in a certain way. Ms. Hooper stated to be sure to read Policy #2 regarding the annual review, which actually delegates to the executive committee and be mindful of stepping outside of that process. Chair Lucas understands Dr. Evans' concerns, but doesn't know within the university, HEPC, policies, procedures, how the situation is handled. If the faculty wanted to have a survey, they have it; is there a process to go through to get it anywhere? Ms. Hooper stated that nothing precludes a group from developing a survey or where it lands.

Mr. Glanville stated that the staff council is in the exploratory phase for a survey, and whether it would benefit him as the representative and better represent his constituents. He has not been contacted by faculty or seen the faculty survey.

Ms. Hooper stated there could be a difference between action items to the public in response to the censure, and action items decided as a committee that are private in nature as employment matters. You may be thinking of items you intend to cover from a disciplinary point of view, but its public and

goes in the files and considered or viewed as part of the annual review process. As far as other specific relations, they were probably not public; you may have a document as a committee.

5. On motion by Rich Lucas and seconded by Ryan Glanville, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Richard Carter \_\_\_\_\_  
Chair