League of Women Voters COD
Observers Report

Board meeting attended:  Regular Board of Trustees Meeting
Date and Location of meeting:  Thursday, July 20, 2017, SSC 2200
Meeting started:  6:54pm  Meeting adjourned:  8:11pm
League Observer(s): Di Niesman, Sue Williams

Board Members/Trustees present (P) not present (NP) tardy (T):

___P__Deanne Mazzochi, Board Chairman

___*__Frank Napolitano, Board Vice Chairman *On Phone (motion to allow him to participate remotely was approved)

____P_ Christine Fenne, Board Secretary

___P___ Alan Bennett

___P__ Charles Bernstein

___P____Daniel Markwell

__P___Joseph C. Wozniak

___P__ Anthony Walker, Student Member

Estimated Number Attending (excluding Board and Staff): 25

Meetings are Streamed and Archived at:
http://www.cod.edu/multimedia_services/botmedia.aspx

Agenda can be found at:

PUBLIC COMMENT(4):

There were 7 public comments, all from full-time COD faculty members who were members of two search committees. President Rondeau apparently was a member of
both search committees. Two faculty candidates were submitted for Board approval, but the candidates’ approvals were pulled from the consent agenda. The public comments all expressed bewilderment, concern, and dismay, and all hoped the Board would reconsider its decision. A petition from the faculty on this issue is being circulated. Following are highlights from each comment:

1) Richard Jarman, CODFA President - he felt the intrusion of the Board into academic matters was flaunting “norms,” and the Board should stick to governing. He felt the Board was modifying the process. He wanted the Board to reevaluate the 2 candidates.

2) Jackie McGrath, CODFA Vice President - she rhetorically wondered why the Board would deny the faculty appointments, knowing that she would not get an answer. She said the college’s probation had been hard on the faculty. She felt the Board had shifted attention to academic affairs, and asked the Board to rethink their decision to pull the approvals from the agenda without being told why.

3) Jennifer Kelly, from the Humanities Dept. search committee, praised Dr. Salerno and urged Board to approve hiring her

4) Timothy Clifford, from Humanities Dept. urged hiring of Dr. Salerno, who had an instant rapport with female students at her teaching demo

5) Brian Moran, from History Dept. urged hiring of candidate who is a specialist in Asian History

6) John Paris, from History Dept, urged hiring of candidate, who has all necessary credentials from the University of Chicago for her PhD but her dissertation (ABD), which will be later this summer. She is a very high caliber candidate who will fill a gap in department with her western civilization experience.

7) Sam Mitrani, from History Dept, said not approving the candidate would be a loss to COD. He remarked that the students applauded the candidate after her teaching demo, and he had never seen that happen before.

REPORTS (board members, staff, administrators) (5)

a. Chairman Mazzochi – thanked everyone involved in July 4th ceremonies to rename building and dedicate memorial to fallen students. She expressed overall satisfaction with the HLC report, stating there was still work to be done, but that is always to be expected.

b. Student Trustee Walker - announced he was part of a panel discussion on August 17th, “A Sense of Mattering” the role and impact of multicultural centers in supporting student success and inclusion.

c. President Rondeau – noted the attendance at the meeting of Mark Franz, the Village Manager of Glen Ellyn, highlighting the cooperative relationship between
the college and the village to have an Innovation Center in the Village Hall space previously occupied by the police department (consent agenda item 8g). She also announced that $1.2 million in MAP payments had been received, and the college was working to get the money to the students eligible for the payments. She then deferred to James Bente, VP Planning & Institutional Effectiveness to discuss the HLC Update and PACE Survey results. He presented the power points in reverse order from how they were on the original agenda, with PACE following HLC, so we are reporting them in that order.

- **HLC Update** – Inspectors who made a site visit (April, 2017) were asked for recommendations. They did not recommend any sanctions for the college. All criteria, which landed COD on probation in 2015, had been “met” or “met with concern.” There were no criteria deemed “not met.” Some of the highlights from power point presentation:

  The college’s mission is broadly understood, articulated publically and has a diversity of system.

  Criteria for Ethical and Responsible Conduct were “met” except 2.A was “met with concerns.” HLC wants to see a couple of years of data.

  Teaching and Learning Criteria were broadly “met.” Within Teaching and Learning, Quality, Resources & Support (3.A) was “met with concerns.” The Student Learning Outcomes were inconsistent in 25% of the courses that were reviewed. The auditors looked at course syllabi for the student learning outcome to be included. This is also a federal compliance issue and the College was only given a short time to have this corrected.

  Under Evaluation and Improvement - Evaluations Results all three were “met with concerns.” The lack of evidence that evaluations are being used to improve the programs was state as the concern.

  Under Resource, Planning and institutional Effectiveness, two of four criteria were “met” and two were “met with concerns.” They see that the data is systematically used to make decisions.

  Final comments from Bente:

  The next site visit will be in 2021.

  There will be interim report due.

  There is a report on Active Course File due 5/1518, because the Active Course File and the course syllabi are not aligned. Bente emphasized that
work needs to be done now, before the Fall semester, because there will be an audit in Spring 2018 based on course file in Fall.

Due 12/1/19- Documented anonymous climate survey & BOT training
Due 12/1/19- Report on deliverables
Due 12/1/19- Report on how data and metrics used for informed decisions. They need a peer review. Bente suggests that COD attend HLC meetings held in Chicago...HLC can be a resource for peer review.

On August 21st, HLC will send in another team that will set up meeting rooms at O'Hare Hilton and interview a select group of 8 from COD for an oral defense. VP Bente does not anticipate that the results of the site visit (no sanctions) will be overturned after this interview.

After power point and comments, VP Bente asked for questions. Trustee Wozniak asked which criteria related directly to the Board of Trustees. Answer: 5B and 2A. Trustee Bennett objected to fact that the 54-page HLC report was handed to the trustees just before the meeting, so they had no time to read and formulate intelligent questions. Chairman Mazzochi replied that this was just the initial presentation, and there would be more in depth discussions to follow. VP Bente said the report would be posted on Monday, July 24th on the website for the public (note: HLC report was dated June 30, 2017) Chairman Mazzochi asked rhetorically, in regard to open meetings criteria, “How do you prove a negative...we aren’t being sued anymore?”

• PACE Survey Results*- Personnel Assessment of the College Environment. This would constitute the “anonymous survey of climate” required by HLC. Results were not available at time of on-site visit. PACE consists of 5 standardized Reports, one report containing customized questions. It is 142 pages long. The purpose is to promote open communication. The “climate” is the prevailing conditions at the college. The theory is leadership plus institutional structure leads to student success. COD has participated in the PACE survey 6 years (6 times) since 1999, about every 3-4 years. The survey is open to ALL employees, full and part time. It is taken on line, and no data goes directly to COD....totally anonymous. 967 employees participated in the 2017 survey, which was the second highest number of participants. 2010 was the highest with a little over 1,000.

COD scored a high mean of 3.84, which ranked college higher than the previous surveys. The highest possible is a 5.0 Likert score. It showed a statistical difference in student focus questions. The customized questions mean comparison all went up over 2014 results*.
VP Bente concluded that he thought this was the best survey he’s ever seen.

PRESENTATIONS (6)
There were no presentations at this meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS (7)
a. Personnel Items

b. Financial Statements- Trustee Bennett commented that FY 17 showed the college $18M under budget (81%), which indicated an excellent financial situation, and he hoped that the press would share this fact with its readers.

c. Gifts & Grants Reports

d. Change Orders

e. Monthly Construction Update

f. Board Policy 5-15: Responsibilities of the Board-1st Reading

g. Board Policy 5-100: Committees of the Board of Trustees -1st Reading

h. In-Kind Quarterly Donations Report

CONSENT AGENDA(8)
a. Board Policies Regarding Travel: 2nd Reading
   • Board Policy 5-195: Trustee Conferences
   • Board Policy 5-200: Trustee Travel
   • Board Policy 10-190: Reimbursement for Employee Business Travel Expenses
   • Board Policy 20-105: Group Travel
b. Board Policy 5-180: Legal Counsel: 2nd Reading

c. Board Committee Charters: 2nd Reading
   • Academic Committee
   • Audit Committee
   • Auxiliary & Outreach Committee
   • Budget Committee
   • Construction & Facilities Committee
   • Governance Policy Committee
d. Computer and Equipment Purchases for the FY18 IT Replacement Plan

e. FY18 Payments for Space Rental at Technology Center of DuPage (TCD)
f. Agreement with Elsevier, Inc. for Testing Services for Associate Degree Nursing

2. Memorandum of Understanding with Village of Glen Ellyn and College of DuPage Related to Shared Architectural and Design Costs

3. Purchase of Paper for College-Wide Use

4. News Bureau Photography Services for FY18

5. Annual Purchase of Print and Digital Advertising with Daily Herald

6. Approval of Reimbursement of Business Expenses for President Rondeau

I. Minutes of the June 22, 2017 Regular Board Meeting / Special Board Meeting – Public Hearing – FY18 Budget

m. Personnel Action Items

n. Financial Reports

Items 8c, 8l, and 8n were pulled from consent agenda. Motion by Trustee Fenne to accept items a, b, d-k, and m was seconded by Student Trustee Walker, and motion passed unanimously.

Trustee Bennett moved to table item 8c (Board Committee Charters) to provide more descriptions of committees. Chairman Mazzochi seconded. Motion passed with Trustee Markwell voting “no.” Will bring back on August agenda.

There had been changes to the June minutes (item 8l), and Secretary Fenne moved to accept the minutes as amended. Trustee Bennett seconded, and the motion passed with unanimous vote.

Trustee Bennett moved and Trustee Markwell moved to accept the Financial Reports. Board Secretary Fenne publicly disclosed her relationship with AlphaGraphics, and stated that she will recuse herself from voting on Financial Statements for the purpose of transparency. The motion passed, with Fenne abstaining.

TRUSTEE DISCUSSION (9)

Trustee Markwell suggested that the trustees tour COD facilities. His suggestion was received positively. Trustee Fenne mentioned she attended a program about Women’s Studies and was impressed.

Calendar dates/Campus Events (10)

- Thursday, August 17, 2017: Regular Board Meeting @ 7:00PM- SSC 2200

Comments/Concerns: Our observer report is derived from on-site notes only. We recommend watching and listening to the audio stream and reading the HLC site visit
report, both available on COD’s website. This is link to the HLC site visit report: http://www.cod.edu/about/accreditation/pdf/2017-hlc-site-visit-report.pdf

*Regarding PACE survey results, observers wondered if high marks were somewhat skewed, because college is on probation and personnel might have wanted, consciously or unconsciously, the college to do well. Also, marks were compared to the last PACE survey in 2014, which was done in the midst of highly controversial time, especially with faculty and college president. Neither of these issues were brought up at the meeting.

General Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the meeting start on time?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were members attentive and prepared?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were members courteous to each other?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were members attentive to the publics’ comments?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>All the comments were directed to the Board specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the facility adequate?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the audience see and hear?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were visual aids easily visible to the audience</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the meeting facilities handicapped accessible</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOIA (Complete once, unless information changes.

Illinois Open Meetings Act requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the agenda posted 48 hours before the meeting? If yes, note where</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the agenda items clearly describe what was to be discussed?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were background materials made available to the public?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there adequate discussion of the issues?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*further discussion of HLC site visit report was tabled until August.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there a closed session before, during or after the meeting?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Before regular meeting only. It followed directly after ethics training, which ran a little late.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there was a closed meeting, was any action taken after the closed session? If so, what action?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>All regular meeting actions/votes were taken after the closed session.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Submitted:**

**By:**