

President Susan Martin

## Summary 2011-12 Performance Evaluation

October 19, 2012

On behalf of the Board of Regents we want to extend our appreciation for the efforts put forth during this review period (July 2011 to July 2012). For FY 2012, your goals were mutually developed and agreed to. The metrics and timing of those goals in many instances reflected a continuance from prior review periods. You accomplished and met a number of the goals and failed to meet others.

You successfully met and exceeded the fundraising goal. Residential housing contracts were increased and exceeded budget. In concert with the Provost, you presented to the Board a FY13 enrollment goal recommendation. A process to review Academic Programs, which began in a previous review period, was finalized and implemented.

You reorganized and transferred responsibility for enrollment management to the Provost. This has brought about a positive change. It appears that many structural/process issues are being addressed. However, many of those recommended by Grant Thornton were to have been completed by May 1, 2012. To date they remain incomplete.

Enrollment goals for FY 12 were not met. Student credit hour production was behind budget. Graduate enrollment continues to decline and this trend needs attention. This shortfall in enrollment resulted in a budget deficit of \$1.54 million and overall it lead to an approximate \$2 million shortfall. This is the first budget deficit under your tenure and we will expect that a strategy to address this matter is forthcoming.

Improvements in retention and graduation rates were first discussed in 2009 through the Faculty Affairs sub-committee of the Board. Plans were submitted to the entire Board of Regents as a result. This review period we saw an improvement in the 6 year graduation rate. The 4 year rate has not yet been impacted. This should remain an area of focus for you and the institution as a whole.

For the past three review periods, we have agreed on a goal to develop a comprehensive vision and strategic plan for EMU; this goal remains unmet. The initial date this was to have been presented to the Board was June 30, 2009. This is an important tool to guide the institution and involve all stakeholders.

There were two new goals this review period specifically aimed at measuring satisfaction and evaluating the process and performance of those administrative areas that provide service to students, faculty and staff. Neither of those goals was met. A review of the ombudsmen function and how this is performed at other Universities was not completed. An independent evaluation and review of the human resources operation was not completed. A report with

actionable items and key dates to improve service levels was not completed by June 30, 2012. In addition, layoffs and payroll issues were not properly handled.

You have made a number of leadership changes. It is important that those leaders are evaluated. You did not complete 2011 FY evaluations for your direct reports and are late on 2012 FY evaluations. As part of that process we expect you to identify personal skill sets and provide assistance in your leadership groups' professional development. When doing so you should discuss and develop a chain of succession. As you work with your team, individually and collectively, developing a collegial environment within your Executive Council will be important. All members of the team should feel encouraged and supported.

In terms of your leadership you are without question a visible and active President – on campus and throughout the community. With this visibility comes responsibility to represent the University at all times in the best possible light.

As you and your team continue to move the University forward it is imperative that all Regents are viewed by you as equals and part of the decision making process. Therefore, all Regents should feel informed and updated on all matters requiring Board engagement to their particular level of interest and satisfaction. Performance in this regard has been inconsistent. Board input on significant policy direction merits more serious attention. Regents are sometimes not alerted to major issues affecting the campus, an example would be the closure of satellite campuses.

While not within the time period for this review, the completion of all three union contracts in a timely manner is a notable achievement. The planning process, new bargaining team, and work done prior to the successful ratification were evident.

Based on the quantitative measures which were agreed upon and input from board members, some goals were met, others not, and in some cases improvement is required. A clear focus should remain on goals that are important and unmet as well as a commitment to devote attention to areas that require your improvement.

As we look forward to the 2012-2013 year, the University continues to have many opportunities to improve its perception and image. Attention to these opportunities especially as it relates to our accessibility and service levels will garner increased satisfaction and student credit hours that will lead to a more stable financial future.

Name of Evaluator: FRANCINE PARKER  
Title: Vice Chair  
Signature of Evaluator: [Signature]  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Evaluator: Roy E Wilbanks  
Title: Chair  
Signature of Evaluator: Roy Wilbanks  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Evaluator: [Signature]  
Title: CHAIR ATHLETIC COM.  
Signature of Evaluator: MICHAEL D. HAWKS  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Evaluator: Michael G. Morris  
Title: CHAIR FINANCE  
Signature of Evaluator: Michael G. Morris  
Date: 10-19-2012

Acknowledgement by Employee

My signature acknowledges that I have received a copy of this review.

Susan W. Martin 10-19-2012  
Dr. Susan W. Martin Date