

**COCONINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD**

WORK SESSION

FEBRUARY 17, 2021



**COCONINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MINUTES OF A WORK SESSION
OF THE
DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 17, 2021**

A Work Session of the Coconino Community College District Governing Board was held via interactive videoconferencing (Zoom). Board Chair, Dr. Nat White, called the meeting to order at 4:33 pm.

PRESENT: Eric Eikenberry
Patricia Garcia
Patrick Hurley
Joseph R. Smith
Nat White

ABSENT: None

Also Present: Dr. Colleen Smith, CCC President; Mr. Anthony Williams, Ms. April Sandoval, Mr. Bob Voytek, Mr. Brian Harris, Mr. Brian Wilson, Ms. Cindy Scott, Ms. Colleen Carscallen, Mr. David Borofsky, Mr. David Prieb, Mr. Dietrich Sauer, Ms. Isabella Zagare, Dr. Jami Van Ess, Ms. Kay Leum, Ms. Kimberly Batty-Herbert, Mr. Kurt Stull, Ms. Lina Wallen, Dr. Lisa Blank, Dr. Michael Merica, Dr. Nate Southerland, Ms. Randi Axler, Ms. Sarah Benton, Mr. Steve Peru, and Ms. Suzzanna Rodriguez.

Reports, summaries, background material, and other documents referred to in these minutes can be found in the February 17, 2021 documents file.

Follow Up

- Policies 35-00 Discussion/Voting, 36-00 Self-Assessment/Annual Goals, 37-00 Media, 38-00 Communication with College Employees, 91-00 Professional Development, and 39-00 Travel will be brought forward for approval at the next meeting with the suggested changes.
- Policy 92-00 Retreat will be marked as reviewed on this date.
- Dr. White asked for a summary of the tuition survey report, and Dr. Merica will prepare that for the Board.

1. FOLLOW UP ITEMS

Dr. Nat White reviewed the Follow-Up items with the Board.

2. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Discussion of Order of Agenda – Dr. Nat White

Dr. Nat White would like to consider flipping the order of action items and reports in the regular meeting. He suggested that the Board make that change by voting on it during the agenda approval item. If the Board likes that order, he would suggest that Procedure 31-01 Agenda Building be revised to indicate that Board meetings would include a list of agenda items without following a specific order.

Board members supported trying this change and would like to do so at tonight's regular meeting.

B. Policy and Procedure Review – Dr. Nat White

Dr. White talked about the policy and procedure review process. If the Board reviews an item and makes no changes, the review date is indicated in the policy or procedure. These items do not have to be action items unless revisions are being made.

i. Is there a need for a Policy for Appointing a New District Governing Board Member?

The Board discussed if there was a need to create a policy in this area. Some of the discussion topics included:

- Mr. Eikenberry suggested possible revisions to the questionnaire used for Board Member applicants to make it more appropriate to post-secondary institutions.
- The confusion some Board Members have experienced in various appointment processes.
- The appointment process changing with the appointment of a new Superintendent of Schools.
- Whether or not the Board should provide information to the Superintendent on what the Board is looking for in a Board Member.
- By State Law, the Board does not have decision-making authority in this process. That is delegated to the Superintendent. There have been different levels of responsiveness and involvement from the Superintendent's office over the years.
- The Board's concern in creating a policy that would address what is possibly a past issue.
- A suggestion to draft a policy that states that after consulting with the Board, the Chair would provide an outline to the Superintendent with the Board's requests for a candidate. The purpose of this would be to help ensure diversity in representation and have Board Members reflective of the communities the College serves.
- The Board would like to be included in the interview process but recognizes that the Superintendent does not have to allow that.
- Further suggestions for the policy were to mention that the Board may come up with a list of items they think would be important for the community and the College in the case of a vacancy.
- Ms. Patricia Garcia suggested that revisions to the candidate questionnaire could have legal ramifications and that if the College were to suggest changes, legal counsel should review them.
- Mr. Eric Eikenberry suggested that the policy include language on being as representative as possible but not setting formulas for representation.

ii. 35-00 Discussion/Voting

This draft of the policy includes minor corrections and the addition of relevant state statute references. The Board had no further suggestions, so this item will be moved forward as an action item at the next meeting.

iii. 36-00 Self-Assessment/Annual Goals

The Board had no further suggestions, so this item will be moved forward as an action item at the next meeting.

iv. 37-00 Media

The Board discussed possibly adding a designee for the Chair in case the Chair is unavailable. The Board was not in consensus on that suggestion and had no further suggestions so this item will be moved forward as an action item at the next meeting.

v. 38-00 Communication with College Employees

The changes in this policy were designed to provide Board Members with a guideline for handling these kinds of issues. The Board had no further suggestions, so this item will be moved forward as an action item at the next meeting.

vi. 91-00 Professional Development

The Board had no further suggestions, so this item will be moved forward as an action item at the next meeting.

vii. 39-00 Travel

A section from the professional development policy has been moved to this policy to set up the financial parameters and cover travel expenses for professional development or other activities that benefit the College. The Board had no further suggestions, so this item will be moved forward as an action item at the next meeting.

viii. 92-00 Retreat

No changes were suggested for this policy. The Board was given a chance to review the policy and see if they suggested any changes. The Board discussed possibly adding a specific date for retreats, but since retreat scheduling has been problematic, that change was not made. No other changes were suggested, so the policy will be marked as reviewed on this date.

C. Budget Retreat Follow-up (please review February 2, 2021 Minutes)

Dr. Jami Van Ess gave a presentation on the proposed budget, including the options the Board had requested at the previous meeting. The presentation covered revenue updates, tuition survey results, tuition and fees, Arizona community college compensation plans, faculty and staff compensation, budget forecast, and direction for tuition and fees and salary and benefits. For additional details on the presentation, please see the February 17, 2021 documents file.

The Board asked for clarification on what the Transwestern Pipeline was. This item references a successful lawsuit to have Transwestern's property taxes reduced. The monies due to Transwestern would come from either an additional levy on taxpayers or a proposed bill in the legislature.

Dr. Michael Merica joined the Board to discuss the outcomes of the Spring 2021 tuition survey. The survey was conducted using a different approach this year. The survey consisted of three quick questions: How did you first hear about CCC; Why did you choose to attend CCC; and How important was tuition in your decision. The survey was distributed to three different groups based on their residency status. This change allowed the College to look at the results by residency status. The answers to the first two questions were very similar across all three groups. For the third question, all three groups mentioned that tuition was important, but the out-of-state and out-of-district groups felt the tuition was very affordable and tuition cost was most important to in-district students.

Some of the survey takeaways are how important the College's high school recruiting efforts are, even out of state. Students come to CCC because they want to be in this location and tuition costs are very affordable compared to NAU.

Dr. White asked for a summary of the report, and Dr. Merica will prepare that for the Board. Dr. White asked Dr. Merica to highlight the items with some statistical significance and what was important to students.

Mr. Eric Eikenberry commented that the College must be doing something right with high school student recruitment. He also felt it was a great thing that family and friends refer people to the College because of their positive experience.

Mr. Patrick Hurley asked for follow-up on his idea of budgeting for a raise but giving it mid-year if the budget still had the capacity for that change. Dr. Van Ess stated that most community colleges had not done this, and the ones that have suggested being very careful and ensuring the raise's criteria was very clear and that contracts were written very carefully. Based on this advice, Dr. Van Ess also talked to legal counsel, who confirmed that it could be done but has to be done very carefully. No matter how carefully these items are worded, this kind of raise can be seen as a gift of public funds.

Mr. Eikenberry asked if the College thought an increase in tuition for out-of-county students would be a disincentive for this group. Dr. Van Ess reviewed the history of out-of-county tuition increases and how that enrollment has not decreased, despite the tuition increases. There have not been any changes to out-of-county enrollment, and it increased one year.

Mr. Smith had a similar question as Mr. Eikenberry. Because the tuition increases for out-of-county students have not decreased enrollment in this group, he supported a 5% increase in tuition for out-of-county students. Mr. Hurley and Ms. Garcia concurred.

The Board expressed consensus for the proposed course fees, no tuition increase, and increasing the out-of-county tuition rate by 5%.

The Board extensively discussed the salary and benefits options and how they would affect the College's contingency funds.

- Dr. White was in favor of Option C for salaries and benefits. He would support any one of these budget scenarios as the expenses are less than the revenues, and all of them would allow for additions to the College's contingency funds.
- Mr. Hurley did not support Option C and suggested no salary increase, that the College absorbs costs related to medical increases, and the remaining funds are diverted to contingency funds.
- Mr. Eikenberry favored Option C and preferred that funds be put towards salaries rather than medical benefits as not all College employees receive medical benefits.
- Dr. White did not feel it was necessary to hold off on salary increases or paying for medical benefits to increase the College's contingency fund.
- Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Eikenberry and felt that the College covering medical benefits would benefit higher-paid employees more than lower-paid employees. Only covering medical benefits only affects those covered by the College's medical plan.
- Ms. Garcia expressed her support for Option B.

- Mr. Hurley mentioned that Option C does not include the 5% out-of-county increase but could be added easily. He felt that having a contingency of more than \$350,000 was sufficient and supported splitting the medical between the College and the employees or covering all of that increase to keep employees whole.

Dr. Van Ess felt that she had enough direction from the Board to create an action item for them to review during the regular meeting. She will prepare an action item that includes Option C with the addition of the out-of-county tuition increase.

ADJOURNMENT: The Work Session Adjourned at 6:30 pm.

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Ms. April Sandoval
Board Recorder

Mr. Joseph R. Smith
Vice Chair/Secretary of the Board

Dr. Nat White
Board Chair