The Board of Trustees of Harford Community College met on Friday, October 7, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. in the Chesapeake Center dining room south.

**Trustees present:** Mrs. April L. Fritts; Mr. John F. Haggerty; Mr. Bryan E. Kelly; Mr. Bradley R. Stover; Dr. James J. Valdes; and, Dr. Dennis Golladay as Secretary-Treasurer

**Trustees absent:** Mrs. Doris G. Carey; Mr. Howard K. McComas, IV; Mrs. Susan E. Mull; and Dr. Douglas G. Wright

**Staff present:** John Cox, Deborah Cruise, Annette Haggray, Brenda Morrison, Annie Pagura, and Carol Sherman

**Call to Order.** B. Kelly called the work session to order.

**Board Orientation Manual and Process; New Member Mentoring Program.** As part of formalizing a new trustee orientation program, a Board of Trustees Orientation Manual was prepared and shared with the Board in August. Board members were asked to review the manual and offer suggestions. Items noted included:
- Consistently keeping the manual updated could be challenging.
- Include pictures of the leadership team.
- Add more Board details, i.e., rules of order, interaction with the media, how the Board functions.
- Make information accessible electronically.
- Add a section on the Foundation.

Additional aspects of the new trustee orientation program include campus tour and a one-on-one mentoring program by a Board member. By consensus, the Board agreed that the Chair will appoint the mentor from the existing Board.

Other discussion followed on the appointment process and ways to facilitate the process. With the Middle States Accreditation team visit scheduled for March 2012, concerns were noted with the number of pending appointments/re-appointments.

Also discussed was relationship between the Board of Education and the Board of Trustees. Currently, the Superintendent of Harford County Public Schools and the College President and their respective senior staff members meet quarterly to discuss collaborative projects and issues of mutual interest. Suggestion was made to provide updates to the Board following these joint meetings.
Board Evaluation Instrument and Results. Summary of responses to the 2010-2011 Trustees Evaluation of Board Performance was distributed. In reviewing results, there are some areas that the Board may wish to suggest and recommend change. The continual process of assessing, reviewing results, and implementing change is an emphasis of Middle States. The Board evaluation process is an example of the Board’s commitment to continual review and improvement.

Board participation/representation at campus and community events was discussed. It was noted that a better process to ensure representation at events needs to be developed. It was also noted that trustees in attendance should be recognized and acknowledged at the event.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Visits. Dr. McMenamin, chair of the MSCHE visiting team, will be on campus on October 18 for a full day of meetings with various campus constituencies in preparation for the March 4-7, 2012 full team visit. She will meet with the Board Chair and Vice Chair and have dinner with the Board of Trustees. Her discussions with the Board will focus on general perspective of the Board’s role, fiduciary responsibilities, knowledge of the College, and how the Board operates.

In preparation for the October 18 visit, specific materials were shared with the Board:
- Schedule for Dr. McMenamin on October 18.
- Information from the 2002 Middle States visiting team report related to (1) Organization, Administration and Governance and (2) the Governing Board.
- Current self-study draft on Standard 4: Leadership and Governance.

Dr. Golladay shared sample forms, checklists and schedule from the 2002 team visit to Harford which he chaired. He also provided an overview of the team’s role noting that in its report the team can offer commendations, suggestions, recommendations, or requirements. If a team report includes “recommendations,” the team may propose that the Commission require the institution to (1) address specific issues in the next periodic review report or self-study; (2) submit a progress letter; or (3) submit a monitoring report. If a team report includes “requirements,” the team may propose that the Commission (1) warn the institution that accreditation may be in jeopardy, (2) place the institution on probation; or (3) require the institution to show cause why accreditation should not be removed. Dr. Golladay further advised that at the conclusion of the team visit in March, the Chair will give an oral report to the campus community of the team’s findings. This will likely occur mid-day on March 7. Trustees are encouraged to attend; specific time and location will be provided once the schedule is set.

Tenure and Promotion: Processes and Criteria. Dr. Haggray presented an overview of the processes for promotion and tenure. She indicated that they had been reviewed to make certain there were appropriate processes in place with appropriate rigor and which recognized and rewarded quality. The processes needed to ensure that those recommended to the Board had achieved the criteria and that there was clarity in expectations.
With regard to tenure, expectations at four-year institutions differ from two-year institutions in that four-year institutions place significant emphasis on research, while at the community college some scholarly work is expected, the emphasis is on classroom excellence. Some have viewed tenure as a lifetime guarantee of employment; however, that perception is in error. At Harford, tenure affords a faculty member a continuing contract. The annual evaluation re-affirms that employment is continued. Should performance decline, the evaluation provides the basis for corrective action or termination as appropriate.

For tenure, evidence to support tenure is provided in the tenure portfolio. The portfolio is a compilation of requested documentation prepared by the faculty member to substantiate that he/she meets the requirements for tenure. Criteria for tenure are identified in the Faculty Handbook. The documentation includes verification of degree and years of teaching, teaching (documentation of 9 teaching criteria), professional growth, leadership and college and community service.

The criteria for promotion are outlined in the Faculty Handbook and the faculty member presents a portfolio identifying with supporting documentation how he/she meets each criterion. Movement through the promotion ranks requires the faculty member to demonstrate increasingly significant achievements and contributions to the College as well as continuous improvement in his/her professional development. Rating rubrics for both tenure and promotion portfolios are clearly stated in the tenure and promotion guidelines.

Board Goals: 2011-2012. Proposed goals for 2011-2012 for the President and the Board of Trustees were distributed. B. Stover suggested that advocacy both on and off-campus be added as a goal. With regard to on-campus, he noted it is not the role of the Board to be involved in the detail work, but a presence at campus events. J. Valdes also suggested that trustees attending events be acknowledged.

B. Stover commented on the importance of the Board’s input on capital projects, i.e., the allied health and nursing building and being kept abreast of activity.

Board scheduling for work sessions and retreats was also discussed. Request was made to develop a long-term schedule so that trustees can reserve the dates well in advance. Work session focuses suggested were budget, capital projects.

Three Board goals were identified:
1. Increase Board advocacy both on-campus by participation in campus events and off-campus through attendance at state and national meetings and professional development opportunities.
2. Provide insight and input on forthcoming capital projects such as the Nursing and Allied Health building.
3. Assist the Harford Community College Foundation with major gifts and other fundraising efforts.
Dr. Golladay suggested a fourth goal – attendance and participation in state and national meetings – be added.

Goals for the president were reviewed and B. Kelly suggested that the goal to strengthen ties to county political leaders and members of the state delegation be expanded to included community leaders.

**Student Housing.** Over the last several months, the Board has discussed opportunities for student housing. Significant data was provided and site visits to two colleges with student housing were made. In reviewing the pros and cons for moving forward with residence halls, the major concern is the impact and limitations that the construction of student housing would place on future development of College property due to wastewater requirements since public water and sewer are not available.

By consensus, the Board agreed that providing residence halls has considerable merit, but construction of residence halls will not be pursued at this time. The matter may be re-considered should conditions for the development of the land change with respect to public utilities. The Chair will report the Board’s decision at the October Board meeting.

**College Reporting: Data and Benchmarks.** For several months, information has been provided to the Board on how the College is advancing or not advancing on goals. Presentations have included assessment of benchmarks set by both the College and external agencies. Some of the data is hard data, i.e., number of students, GPA; while other data is soft data, i.e., student perceptions. Since concerns have been voiced regarding the supporting data, the Board was asked to provide some direction on measurements. J. Valdes indicated that analysis of hard data is appropriate. With the soft data, it is appropriate to report the findings, however, analysis is inappropriate. Presentations should simply state the soft data. Notes can be included on what the soft date may mean, but definitive conclusions can not be drawn..

**Other.** J. Valdes referred to an article on programs sponsored by Council on Undergraduate Research and funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) for projects to develop programs involving students in research. Copies of the article will be provided to the Board.

The work session adjourned at 12:45 p.m.