

## EDUCATIONAL APPROVAL BOARD

Meeting of Wednesday, June 23, 2004

1:00 p.m.

*(via teleconference)*

30 W. Mifflin Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor

Madison, WI 53703

**Members Present:** Christy L. Brown, Michael Cooney, Terry Craney, Joe Heim, John Scocos, Monica Williams

**Absent:** Rick Raemisch

**Others Present:** David Dies, Blanca James, Educational Approval Board; John Rosinski, WDVA

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Terry Craney, chair of the Educational Approval Board (EAB). Roll call indicated a quorum was present. Mr. Craney stated that the meeting was specific to addressing the performance and compensation of the executive secretary, as well as a process to evaluate the executive secretary. [Ms. Brown joined the meeting at 1:02 p.m.]

Mr. Craney identified two issues he would like the board to discuss: 1] The discretionary compensation of the executive secretary; and 2] A formal evaluation process for the executive secretary. Mr. Craney indicated that the board should view the performance evaluation process as a long-term issue (something that would happen every year), and that the board would look at how closely it ties the formal evaluation to any consideration of the discretionary compensation. It could be tied very directly to it or it could be started and at some point a recommendation on the discretionary compensation package could be made.

Mr. Craney suggested three options on the issue of the discretionary compensation. The first option is for the board to delegate to the executive committee the complete responsibility for doing the performance evaluation as well as for awarding any discretionary compensation. The second would have the board delegate to the executive committee the responsibility of reviewing or formally evaluating the executive secretary and then make a recommendation back to the board. [Mr. Heim joined the meeting at 1:06 p.m.]

The third option would be for the board to ask the executive committee to set criteria, put the performance review process in place, and then have the board be actively involved with the performance evaluation and the awarding of discretionary compensation to the executive secretary.

Mr. Cooney suggested the board pursue option two and moved to direct the executive committee the responsibility of evaluating the performance of the executive secretary and for the purpose of making a recommendation regarding the discretionary compensation of the executive secretary for board consideration at its next board meeting. Ms. Brown seconded.

Mr. Heim asked whether this action would be something the board would be doing on a one-time basis or was the board going to set a policy. Mr. Craney responded that the more formal performance review should be a long-term process, whereas the discretionary compensation issue was more of a short-term situation and could be considered at any time.

Mr. Cooney asked whether or not an evaluation of the executive secretary's performance had been done in the past. Mr. Scocos responded that he was deputy chief of the Department of Veterans Affairs at the time Ray Boland was chair of the EAB, and that while the EAB is attached to the Department of Veterans Affairs for administrative purposes, it was up to the board to make any evaluations of the executive secretary. Mr. Scocos said his personnel staff would support and assist the board with performance goals and the necessary forms, but that the evaluation of the executive secretary was the responsibility of the board. Mr. Rosinski concurred.

Mr. Dies clarified the motion – the board would delegate to the executive committee the responsibility of evaluating the performance of the executive secretary and for the purpose of making recommendations regarding discretionary compensation to the board for its consideration.

Mr. Scocos indicated that he could ask the former board chair (his predecessor) to prepare a performance evaluation of Mr. Dies in order to keep a complete personnel file. He pointed out that his file would not be complete without an evaluation. Mr. Rosinski raised concerns about the standing of a former board member and suggested it would be more appropriate for the current board (or if delegated, the executive committee) to consider such input as part of any review it conducts.

Ms. Brown and Mr. Scocos asked whether or not the previous board had been prompted to do an evaluation. Mr. Dies said that he had asked Mr. Boland verbally and via e-mail for some formal indication of his performance. Ms. Williams asked whether it would be sufficient to have the former board members give a letter of recommendation and have it added to Mr. Dies' file. It was reiterated by Mr. Craney that part of the evaluation process should be to contact former board members should the motion pass. He pointed out that the input from the former board would be critical to the process. ~~Ms. Brown concurred.~~

Mr. Heim recommended that additional language be added to the previous motion for further clarification. A motion (Cooney/Scocos) to include “for the 2004 evaluation period we move to direct the executive committee”. Mr. Heim also suggested that Mr. Dies provide the board with a self-evaluation to assist the board with the evaluation process since it lacked a historical knowledge of Mr. Dies' performance. Mr. Dies indicated that he would work with the committee in that regard. He also noted the goals and accomplishments paper presented to the board at its March 2004 meeting as evidence of his performance. Further discussion took place and Mr. Craney recommended that the time period referenced be more specific to indicate the fiscal year and the motion read, “for the July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 evaluation period”.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion as amended passed unanimously. There being no further business, a motion (Cooney/Williams) to adjourn was unanimously approved at 1:30 p.m.