MEETING OF THE CHANCELLOR SEARCH COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES HOUSTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE

May 22, 2013

Minutes

The Chancellor Search Committee of the Board of Trustees of Houston Community College held a meeting on Wednesday, May 22, 2013 at the HCC Administration Building, 3100 Main, 2nd Floor, Seminar Room A, Houston, Texas.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sandie Mullins, *Committee Chair* Herlinda Garcia, *Committee Member* Leila Feldman, *Alternate Committee Member* Bruce Austin Eva Loredo

ADMINISTRATION

Renee Byas, Acting Chancellor Art Tyler, Deputy Chancellor/COO Destinee Waiters, Acting General Counsel Shantay Grays, Executive Officer to the Chancellor William Carter, Vice Chancellor, Information Technology Charles Cook, Vice Chancellor, Instruction Diana Pino, Vice Chancellor, Student Success Margaret Ford Fisher, President, Northeast College Fena Garza, President, Southwest College William Harmon, President, Central College Zachary Hodges, President, Northeast College Irene Porcarello, President, Southeast College Betty Young, President, Coleman College Karen Edwards, Interim Chief Human Resources Officer

OTHERS PRESENT

Jarvis Hollingsworth, System Counsel, Bracewell & Giuliani Todd Bisch, President, Faculty Senate Other administrators, citizens and representatives from the news media

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Sandie Mullins, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:41 p.m. and declared the Board convened to consider matters pertaining to Houston Community College as listed on the duly posted Meeting Notice.

DISCUSS AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO THE INTERIM CHANCELLOR SEARCH, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO JOB DESCRIPTION, PROFILE, SEARCH PROCESS, AND TIMELINES; AND ANY OTHER RELATED AUTHORIZATIONS NECESSARY FOR FURTHER ACTION

Motion – Mrs. Feldman moved and Ms. Mullins seconded.

Ms. Mullins noted that there was a correction to the information regarding the committee. She informed that the information reads Chancellor Search Committee. Mr. Hollingsworth apprised that the agenda posting does state Interim Chancellor.

Mr. Austin asked for point of personal privilege and showed a video clip of community colleges from the American Association of Community Colleges. Mr. Austin noted that the purpose of the clip was to focus on where the community college should be headed.

Ms. Mullins advised that it is not her recommendation to spend funds for an interim search. She informed that there is an Acting Chancellor who has made adjustments and has followed the lead of the Board.

Ms. Mullins apprised that it was recommended by the Board to have the Interim Chancellor Search and noted that Mr. Rogelio Anasagasti was present to discuss procurement.

Mrs. Feldman informed that she associated with the feelings of Ms. Mullins; however, the Board has recommended the process. She apprised that keeping it internal and opening the application process to individuals within the college would make it more efficient and less costly. She noted that the energy and resources should be saved for the permanent Chancellor Search.

Mr. Austin informed that the process should be somewhat bifurcated so that the firm could be used for both the interim and permanent search. He apprised that the Interim Chancellor should have experience of actually working with a multi-campus large community college.

Mrs. Feldman noted that she would be reluctant to getting a new Chancellor prior to the end of the year since there are five members up for re-election. She informed that there should be a lengthy process identified to yield the highest qualified Chancellor.

Ms. Loredo echoed the sentiments of Mrs. Feldman and apprised that this particular step is unnecessary. She noted that the efforts and focus should be on the permanent Chancellor. She informed that she also associates with the possibility that the firm could conduct the search for both the Interim and Permanent.

Ms. Mullins apprised that the Interim would probably not carry the same requirements as the permanent. She noted that she is not certain how to begin the process for the Chancellor search. Mr. Austin informed that the same skill sets would be needed in identifying the interim as well as the permanent and an RFQ could go out for a search firm who has the capacity to do both searches.

Mr. Austin noted that the Committee could recommend to the Board that there should not be a search firm utilized for the interim to allow for the focus to be on the permanent. Mr. Austin informed that in researching for community college, the search firm normally works with the Board to shape strategies for identifying what direction the institution is headed.

Ms. Mullins recommended that the search firm assist the committee in working with the faculty during the search as well. Mr. Austin apprised that the search firm drafts the profile and designs what is needed in terms of community and college-wide forums. He noted that the firm is normally accessing a database to provide additional information.

(Mrs. Garcia arrived at 1:58 p.m.)

Mr. Anasagasti provided a draft of the RFP/RFQ regarding the Chancellor Search firm. He informed that the task would be expensive. He apprised that the position is maximized by leveraging price, which is an important criterion.

Mrs. Feldman inquired if the process would allow the ability for both an Interim Chancellor and Chancellor search. Mr. Anasagasti noted that there is a cost in doing an RFP. He informed that there are approximately eleven questions regarding timing and expectations.

Mrs. Garcia inquired as to what is to be accomplished today. Ms. Mullins informed that there has been a discussion on combining the Interim Chancellor and Chancellor searches.

Mrs. Garcia noted that there was a vote to move forward with the interim search and that the meeting today should be to look for a search firm. She informed that there will be a vast number of firms that will apply and the institution would select the firm in the best interest of the institution.

Mrs. Feldman apprised that the consensus of the committee's discussion thus far was to combine the solicitation for a search firm with the ability to handle both the interim and permanent chancellor searches.

Ms. Mullins noted that in discussion with Mr. Anasagasti it was determined that timing, pricing and structure were imperative. Mrs. Garcia informed that time is of essence and that a decision needs to be made. She apprised that once a firm is selected, they would assist with the process for the selection of the interim and the firm for the permanent.

Ms. Mullins noted that once the procurement process is completed and a search firm is recommended, the Board would have the opportunity to work with the firm to determine the desires of the Board.

Mrs. Garcia requested clarification from the Board Chair. Mr. Austin informed that the root conversation was to go out for a search firm that has the capacity to not only do the interim search but also the permanent. He apprised that the issue before the committee today is how to acquire the services needed to do both searches.

Mrs. Garcia inquired if the purpose to move forward with a search firm that would handle both. She noted that if the parameters are known from the previous Chancellor search, they should be used. She reiterated that the process would be to go out for a search firm and she inquired if the interim search would be eliminated.

Mr. Austin informed that the purpose would be to identify a firm with qualifications to do both the interim and permanent search.

Mrs. Garcia inquired if Mr. Hollingsworth would review the procurement information. Mr. Hollingsworth apprised that he would review the RFP/RFQ before it goes out.

Mr. Anasagasti noted that the idea is to seek a search firm to assist with an interim and eventually convert into the permanent search. He informed that his concern was selecting a firm based on their ability to do the interim search but then the firm may not have the qualifications to complete the search for the permanent.

Mr. Hollingsworth apprised that the idea effort would be to identify a firm with the capacity to handle both the interim and permanent search. Mr. Anasagasti noted that the effort would be to leverage the procurement to the maximum advantage.

Mr. Anasagasti requested guidance from the Board regarding the timeline for the Interim Chancellor search RFP/RFQ:

Mr. Austin informed that the vendor community should be able to give an idea of what is reasonable. Mrs. Feldman apprised that opening the search to internal applicants only would probably streamline the process as it relates to the Interim Chancellor. She noted that her thoughts for an internal individual would provide less change and create more contiguity for the institution.

Mrs. Garcia inquired of the minimum timeframe for the advertising of the RFQ/RFP. Mr. Hollingsworth apprised that the legal requirement is fourteen days and best practice is thirty days.

Mrs. Garcia noted that once the recommendations are presented to the Board, then there would need to be a discussion regarding the Human Resources (HR) procedures that allows external applicants to apply. She informed that there should be transparency and that there should be fairness where anyone is allowed to apply.

Houston Community College Chancellor Search Committee Meeting – May 22, 2013 - Page 5

Mrs. Feldman noted that she agrees that all qualified firms should be allowed to apply; however, if the firm understands that the universe of candidates will be limited, it will narrow the scope of work and reduce time and alleviate cost.

Mr. Austin informed that the one good thing regarding an RFP is that it is based on a responsive offeror. He apprised that some firms would have the capability of informing of the best fit for the desires of the Board. Mr. Anasagasti apprised that the firm would respond to what is asked for in the RFP/RFQ. He noted that the committee would be able to evaluate regarding the criteria noted. He informed if only qualifications will be asked, then it will not provide a true experience and the ability perform efficiently.

Mrs. Garcia requested that the committee move forward and noted the issues are (1) the search firm, which should be open and (2) the parameters.

Ms. Mullins apprised that she does not want to rush the timeframe regarding the responses and does not want to rush the search. She noted that there is a hesitation to place a deadline on the firm.

Mr. Austin informed that the search firm should be identified first and the firm would then adhere to the desires of the Board.

Mr. Hollingsworth apprised that when restricting at the procurement level, the most qualified firm might not be available.

Mrs. Feldman inquired if one firm could qualify for the interim and a second firm may qualify for the permanent. Mr. Hollingsworth noted that the solicitation needs to stipulate that a firm may be selected to deal with both searches or the interim and permanent separately.

Ms. Mullins informed that the purpose is to look for a firm to do the interim; however, the committee discussion is to search for a firm that is capable of doing both the interim and permanent.

Mrs. Garcia apprised that the scope of work should yield a firm that has the capabilities of handling the search for both the interim and permanent.

Mr. Anasagasti noted that an important question to consider is the possibility of the interim chancellor qualifying for permanent.

Mrs. Garcia requested to go through the questions and allow the committee to provide input.

Ms. Mullins informed that there should not be a rush for identifying a firm for the interim nor the permanent search.

Mr. Hollingsworth apprised that the Board should be focusing on the qualifications. He noted that the search firm would lead through the timeline and the applicants. He informed that the firm would assist in developing a characteristic model for the candidates.

The Committee considered the following questions:

- Does the Board anticipate a committee of the Board will evaluate the RFP/RFQ response? The committee concluded that administration should evaluate the responses.
- What special requirements/skills sets are desired? The committee recommended working with the search firm to develop skills needed.
- Does the Board envision community events or information sessions to gather input from businesses and the community? The committee determined that the community should be involved in both the interim and permanent search.

Mrs. Garcia requested Mr. Austin to provide input from the previous interim chancellor search. Mr. Austin apprised that the firm was engaged and then the interim was hired. He noted that the search firm should advise how to move forward.

Mrs. Garcia inquired if the there is a need to continue to going through the questions. She informed that the search firm would assist the Board in the hiring process.

Mr. Anasagasti apprised that the discussion provided the needed clarification. He noted that the description of the requirements are general characteristics to describe the firm. He informed that the idea is to leverage the procurement as broadly as possible.

Mr. Austin apprised that the RFP would be reviewed by Board Council. Mr. Hollingsworth asked for clarification regarding engaging multiple firms. Mrs. Feldman noted that the multiple firms was her recommendations; however, she is willing to strike the request.

Mr. Anasagasti inquired if there is a desire only for firms with community college experience or should firms with K-12 experience as well as business be included. The committee concluded that the broader sense should be used.

Mr. Anasagasti informed that the effort would be avoid a firm that specializes in this commodity to eliminate potential conflicts and restrictions. He apprised that the flush would be to make certain key experience is present.

Mrs. Garcia noted that she would review the draft RFP and provide recommendations to Mr. Anasagasti. Ms. Mullins informed that any changes should be brought back to the Board. Mr. Austin apprised that the committee is a sub-committee of the Board and noted that the entire Board should be notified.

Houston Community College Chancellor Search Committee Meeting – May 22, 2013 - Page 7

Mr. Hollingsworth recommended scheduling another committee meeting to review the changes.

(Mr. Austin stepped out at 2:50 p.m.)

(Mrs. Feldman stepped out at 2:51 p.m.)

Mrs. Garcia inquired if Mr. Hollingsworth will review the RFP prior to going out. Mr. Hollingsworth noted that the Board asked that Board Counsel review the RFP for bond related items and if the Board desires, he will review the RFP.

Mr. Austin recommended that the Committee provide their parameters to procurement for review by Board Counsel so that the efforts could move forward.

Ms. Mullins informed that she has confidence in the procurement department and advised that she would work with Board Services on posting of a meeting for early next week.

Ms. Loredo informed that the draft RFP is thorough and based on the draft, the committee should be able to make a good recommendation.

(Mr. Austin and Mrs. Feldman returned at 2:55 p.m.)

Ms. Mullins inquired if a vote is needed regarding the changes. Mrs. Garcia apprised that a vote should be taken regarding the search firm possibly doing both the interim and permanent search.

<u>Motion</u> – Mrs. Feldman moved and Ms. Mullins seconded to recommend to Procurement that the RFQ/FRP that include the possibility of the search firm conducting the interim search and the permanent search. The motion passed with a vote of 2-1 with Mrs. Garcia opposing.

Mr. Hollingsworth informed that a vote was not necessary, as the Committee had given directives to Procurement on the RFP.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:57 p.m.

Minutes recorded, transcribed & submitted by: Sharon Wright, Manager, Board Services

Minutes Approved as Submitted: June 25, 2013