The Chancellor Evaluation Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Houston Community College System held a meeting on Tuesday, June 19, 2007, at the System Administration Building, 3100 Main, 12th Floor Chancellor’s Office Conference Room, 12D11, Houston, Texas.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
Richard Schechter, Committee Chair
Bruce Austin, Committee Member
Diane Olmos Guzman, Committee Member
Abel Davila
Yolanda Navarro Flores

ADMINISTRATION
Mary Spangler, Chancellor
Doretha Eason, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
Irene Porcarello, Vice Chancellor, Student Success
Gloria Walker, Vice Chancellor

OTHERS PRESENT
Maureen Singleton, System Counsel, Bracewell & Giuliani
David Ross, President, Faculty Senate
Other administrators, citizens, and representatives of the news media

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Schechter called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. and declared the Committee convened to consider matters pertaining to the Houston Community College System as listed on the duly posted Meeting Notice.

DEVELOPMENT OF CHANCELLOR EVALUATION
Mr. Schechter informed that the purpose of the discussion was to begin the process for development of the Chancellor’s evaluation document for the year 2007. He asked Dr. Spangler if you had any suggestions that she would like for the Board to consider as it relates to her evaluation.

Dr. Spangler informed that the Board letter dated June 1, 2007 included material from George Boggs’ recent book “CEO-Board Relations and Relationships (2006)” and noted that the information is similar to the documentation submitted by Mr. Austin.
Dr. Spangler suggested a couple of recommendations for consideration that would be useful in the evaluation process. She noted that one recommendation would be for her to identify three or four goals for the year that would be used as a measurement for her to conduct a self-assessment. She also recommended the possibility of utilizing a 360-degree evaluation process in which an external team could hold meetings over a two-day period with faculty and student representatives.

(Mrs. Guzman arrived at 5:35 p.m.)

Mr. Austin informed that business practices from the public sector and evaluation of essential duties are the basis for the survey that he handed out. He apprised that a management feedback instrument similar to a 360-degree evaluation could be useful in the evaluation process since it would allow input from faculty, students, administrators, and community leaders. He agreed that the Chancellor should prepare a self-evaluation of goals and objectives.

(Mrs. Flores arrived at 5:42 p.m.)

Trustee Guzman informed that she supports the plan presented by Trustee Austin and noted that the external and internal input is vital. Trustee Guzman noted that she would like to see an assessment of where the college is going added to the evaluation process.

Mrs. Flores inquired if the Board Retreat will be the kickoff for the standard template in evaluating the Chancellor.

Mr. Schechter recommended identifying the goals prior to the retreat.

Mr. Davila stated that he likes the 360-degree evaluation; however, he would like to see some projections and quantitative results. He expressed confidence in Dr. Spangler, but mentioned that the numbers are important.

Mr. Schechter suggested approaching the Chancellor’s first evaluation differently since she has only been here three months. He noted that there are some mission critical issues to be considered, such as having a staff in place, whether the strategic plan is ready for launching, etc. Mr. Schechter noted that a quantitative evaluation should be in place based strictly on identified goals set by the Board and Chancellor.

Mrs. Guzman inquired if the strategic plan would have measurements and noted that the evaluation for 2008 would be based on the strategic plan developed in 2007.

Mr. Schechter apprised that the Board should identify six to seven goals to be used in evaluating the Chancellor. Mr. Schechter requested that the Trustees forward their goals to him. Mr. Schechter further apprised that a combination of quantitative and 360 degrees evaluation process should be used.

Mrs. Flores suggested the development of a schedule.
Mr. Schechter requested a Chancellor Evaluation Committee meeting prior to the Regular Board meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 28, 2007. He apprised that he would like the entire Board to provide mission critical goals prior to the meeting and requested that a notice be sent to the Board.

Mr. Schechter concluded the Board should circulate the ideas and develop a plan of evaluation.

**ADJOURNMENT**
With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

*Recorded, transcribed, and submitted by:*
Sharon Wright, Executive Administrative Assistant, Board Services

**Minutes Approved as Submitted:**  *August 23, 2007*