# MINUTES

**Members Present** – Thomas Beaucham, Tom Bryan, Annie Eagan (via telephone), Wilfredo Gonzalez (via telephone), Adam Hollingsworth (via telephone), Kevin Hyde, Stephen Joost, Paul McElroy, Hans Tanzler, Radha Pyati, Sharon Wamble-King

**Members Absent** (excused) – Douglas Burnett, Oscar Munoz

## Item 1 Call to Order

Chair Hyde called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. and welcomed the Trustees who were appearing by telephone. President Delaney appeared by telephone also but left the meeting at the conclusion of Item 3.

## **Item 2 Public Comments**

Chair Hyde offered those in attendance an opportunity to comment on the agenda. There were no public comments.

## **Item 3 FY 18 Performance-based Funding Data Integrity Audit Report**

Chair Hyde introduced Julia Hann, Director Internal Auditing, to present the Performance Based Funding Data Integrity Audit Report.

Ms. Hann advised the Board that each year the BOG requests an audit of the control testing around the performance-based metrics. Ms. Hann said in conducting the audit, she worked closely with Abby Willcox, the Director of Institutional Research (IR), who was invited to attend the Board meeting with her. As you will note, the report is similar to last year’s format and the audit did not find any significant deficiencies. This audit includes a form certification that Chair Hyde and President Delaney sign assuring that the controls are in place. While there were no significant deficiencies, there were four areas of opportunities to further enhance controls around data structure. Both Ms. Willcox and Jay Coleman, Associate Provost, have commented on those opportunities, which are included in the audit and have already implemented changes to the opportunities identified. One opportunity to highlight is the data governance structure. Last year, IR started developing a more formalized data structure by implementing a university data dictionary, known as a data cookbook, which defines terms. Data governance initiatives will continue this year with a formalized data committee. Further, IR will formally document office procedures. IR has also identified areas where they
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may need to have audit logs and have implemented procedures to verify access to shared network folders. Ms. Hann asked if there were any questions. Upon receiving none, she advised Chair Hyde she needed a motion to approve the report so that it is reflected in

the record. Chair Hyde asked President Delaney is he had any comment who said that Institutional Research always has done a good job but that Abby is taking it to better level. President Delaney also said that Julia was the best auditor we ever had and he feels good about numbers reported. He noted that the error in a calculation in metrics was the BOG’s error and not ours.

Trustee McElroy made a MOTION to accept the FY 18 Performance Based Funding Data Integrity Audit Report. Trustee Joost SECONDED the motion and the motion was APPROVED unanimously.

## Item 4 Presidential Search Update

Chair Hyde updated the Board on search activities, including the search committee’s February 1 screening of the search pool which was followed by twelve semi-finalist interviews on February 6 and 7. Semi-finalists interviews were 75 minutes in length and the interviews covered a wide range of topics. Eleven of the twelve semi-finalists interviewed in person, with one interviewing via video conference. At the conclusion of the semi-finalist interviews, the Search Committee recommended five candidates for on campus interviews. One of the selected finalists, Roger Thompson, withdrew from the search and declined further consideration. Chair Hyde expressed regret that Mr. Thomas would not be coming to campus for final interviews and noted that Mr. Thomas was extremely gracious in his notification of withdrawal from the pool.

Chair Hyde then identified the final four candidates recommended by the Search Committee to the Board for further consideration and provided detailed background information for each candidate.

The candidates are:

Dr. Kevin Carman, Executive Vice President and Provost, University of Nevada, Reno

Dr. John Floros, Dean of the College of Agriculture, Kansas State University

Dr. Rhonda Phillips, Dean, Honors College, Purdue University

Dr. David Szymanski, Lindner College of Business, University of Cincinnati

## Item 4 Presidential Search Update (continued)

Trustee Tanzler initiated and led a discussion about the composition, quality and professional diversity of the recommended finalist pool. He complimented the Search

Committee for their diligence but questioned why there were no nontraditional, nonacademic candidates among the proposed finalists. Chair Hyde explained that the search firm actively recruited both traditional and nontraditional candidates. He noted that his initial goal was to have a candidate from the business sector, from the academy and from the military. He described his own efforts to recruit from the business sector.

Chair Hyde explained that the Search Committee had a lot of discussion about the varying backgrounds of potential candidates, including potential candidates from the private sector. There was no purposeful exclusion of nontraditional candidates. Instead, Search Committee deliberations were based on the available pool of applicants, as well as the Search Committee’s assessment of candidate qualifications and experience, regardless of whether they had an academic or non-academic background. Chair Hyde expressed belief that the Board has a variety of backgrounds from which to choose.

Trustee Hollingsworth commented that he too initially wondered why there wasn’t a nontraditional candidate from the business sector in the semi-finalist pool. However, as he sat through the deliberations to screen the initial pool and identify semi-finalists, he did not see a nontraditional candidate that in his judgement was earnestly capable to lead our university. Trustee Hollingsworth pointed out that nine people on the Search Committee, including Governor Wendy Link, were non-academic and, as a result, would have no pre-disposed bias for an academic-only pool. The field of candidates just did not offer that opportunity. Trustee Hollingsworth said that he is truly excited about this field and that it reflects the skills and qualities needed during the next season of UNF’s continued positive trajectory. He believes these candidates would all serve the university well and be a catalytic leader just as President Delaney has been.

Trustee McElroy and Trustee Wamble-King, who both served on the Search Committee, agreed. Each said that they had their eyes on looking for a strong nontraditional candidate at each stage, but that candidate never surfaced.

Chair Hyde stressed that while the proposed finalists have academic backgrounds, all have different experiences. Chair Hyde concluded by noting that all of the proposed finalists are outstanding, highly qualified candidates. Following a substance discussion
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by the Trustees, there was concurrence by the Board to move forward with the recommended pool of finalists.

Board members then reviewed resource materials related to the search process, including detailed information concerning each candidate’s background and each candidate’s interview schedule. It was noted that in order to accommodate candidate travel schedules, there was a shift in the interview schedule.

The candidate interview schedules are as follows:

Dr. Kevin Carman February 11th and 12th (Sunday/Monday)

Dr. John Floros February 12th and 13th (Monday/Tuesday)

Dr. Rhonda Phillips February 13th and 14th (Tuesday/Wednesday)

Dr. Dave Szymanski February 15th and 16th (Thursday/Friday)

Board members were reminded that all meetings are open and were encouraged to attend candidate interactions with various constituents, including community, faculty, staff, and students. Trustee Pyati said that during the faculty forum, each candidate will be asked to give a ten-minute presentation on “Why UNF” to be followed by a question and answer session, to include questions of each candidate and questions by the candidates.

Board members were encouraged to review various resource materials in preparation for the on-campus interviews and Board selection process. These resource materials include the position announcement, major themes from the on-line survey, the Board adopted ‘Setting a Strategic Course for the University of North Florida’, and President Delaney’s remarks about qualities important in the next president.

Given the shift in candidate interview schedules, the Board agreed to reschedule its deliberative meeting to Monday, February 20th at 6 p.m. and discussed a proposed format for the meeting. Chair Hyde suggested that the meeting start with open comments, then a discussion of feedback, presentation of each candidate, and finally, selection of the president elect, for confirmation by the Florida Board of Governors. The Board agreed that finalists would not be asked to participate in a final video conference interview at this Board meeting.

## Item 4 Presidential Search Update (continued)

Staff will work with Parker Executive Search to assure that Board members receive constituent feedback from the on campus interviews on Saturday, February 17th. This will insure that Board members have ample time to fully review and consider constituent feedback prior to the decisional meeting.

## **Item 5 Discussion of Interview Questions**

The discussion next turned to interview questions for the finalists. Trustee Hollingsworth provided ten questions for the Board to review. He noted that he had looked to the six areas that the Board determined were the areas of importance and crafted a question around each. Additionally, Dr. Matt Corrigan, who has been involved in the search process from the beginning, suggested four questions to ask each candidate and Trustee Hollingsworth incorporated those four questions with his six. Trustee Hollingsworth suggested that about half of the Board’s time with each candidate should be assigned to formal interview questions with the other half available for open discussion. He also suggested that questions be assigned so that each assigned person asks the same question of each candidate.

Following extensive discussion, the Board agreed to the following structured questions and made assignments as follows:

1. Given what you have now learned about us, tell us how and why your background, experience and skills are the right fit for UNF? (Chair Hyde)
2. As you know, the state of Florida has established performance metrics for each of our state universities. Tell us how you have used performance standards as a way to hold yourself, your team, and your organization accountable for results and success. (Trustee Joost)
3. What is the best hiring decision you have ever made? What is the worst hiring decision you have ever made? (Trustee Tanzler)
4. We want to understand who you are as a leader of a multi-dimensional complex organization.

Item 5 Discussion of Interview Questions (continued)

1. a. What are the key leadership characteristics and behaviors to effectively lead UNF?

b. Described how you would engage, align and ensure commitment to your vision for UNF. (Trustees Wamble-King and Trustee McElroy)

## **Item 6 Terms of Contract**

The Board then moved into a discussion of key contract terms, utilizing the attached [Exhibit A](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CN00011712%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CINetCache%5CContent.Outlook%5CSZP231QM%5CContract%20Terms%20Condensed%202018%200208%20-%20Exhibit%20A.pdf) as a point of reference.

Prior to discussing the various outstanding issues, the Board agreed that these discussions would provide a framework of direction for Parker Executive Search with the understanding that the Board would have further discussion of these issues prior to contract negotiations.

Length of Contract – Chair Hyde informed the Board that according to our search firm, it can be difficult to recruit a candidate from her or his current position for a three year contract term. Following discussion, the Board agreed that a 4 year contract would be acceptable for the right candidate.

Tenure/Sabbatical/Post Tenure provisions – The Board discussed tenure, sabbatical and post tenure provisions, including a review of standing practices within the Florida State University System. The Board agreed to defer any decision on these issues until its next discussion after on campus interviews. While no decisions were made, there was strong support for setting post presidency salary to the average of the three highest three salaries in relevant the academic college.

Termination for Cause– The Board was comfortable with a standard termination for cause provision.

The Board then discussed the current compensation range approved by the Board in September 2017, as well as the traditional emoluments previously discussed by the Board.

## **Item 6 Terms of Contract (continued)**

Vice President Shuman shared models for both a three and a four-year contract that included all standard elements of compensation, including base pay, incentive pay, deferred compensation plus other traditional elements, including a housing allowance, automobile allowance, executive physical and club membership.

Chair Hyde noted that the final negotiations of a package will depend on the selected candidate. These negotiations could evolve based on the quality of the candidate selected and their current compensation package. He suggested that the Board clearly communicate to the search firm that contract terms will not be finally determined until we have an individual to negotiate with. It was suggested that, if necessary, the Board could increase base pay, consider an increase in other elements of compensation, and re -evaluate the incentive pay pool or structure.

## **Item 7 Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Hyde adjourned the meeting at 1:50 p.m.