

- Good afternoon. I'd like to call to order the August 15th 2019 meeting of the Johnson County Community College Board of Trustees Meeting to order and welcome to all of you. Would you please stand and join me in the Pledge?

- [All] I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

- Next item is the roll call and recognition of visitors, Ms. Schlicht.

- [Terri] This evenings visitors include Laura Smith-Everett, Kevin Whimpey, Lori Bell, Michael Tracey, Matt Kortney, Dick Carter and Roberta Everslage.

- Thank you and thanks for being here, welcome. Awards and recognition, Dr. Sopcich.

- [Joe] Thank you Dr. Cook. I'd like to turn this over to Dr. McCloud.

- I'd like to take a moment to recognize Professor Andrew Lutz. If you'll come up and we'll talk a little bit. Andrew came to us a couple of years ago having been adjunct at several places and having worked some time in industry. And what he brought to the table was a really interesting approach to how we work in our classrooms and how we think about what our newer programs need to be. During that time, his chair at the time, Mazen Akkam, who had worked on a grant for us to get a designation that not many schools have achieved. As we worked through from Mazen to Chair Tom Renfro and then through to Andrew, they managed together to kind of pull that grant together and work a central position where we have become a National Center of Academic Excellence for cyber defense, allowing us to be a two-year school with a designation that puts us on par with universities who have cyber opportunity programs. And it allows us to really build a pipeline for students to move forward into cybersecurity as a way for us to train newer cyber defense professionals. Andrew has been a great leader for this group. He has worked diligently, a lot of extra hours, spent a lot of time working with external folks, pulling through our mentor from the mentor links branch and our other institutions for us to make sure that our curriculum is aligned and that we have done the really hard lift of getting, in just a couple of years, a completely new program built, sanctioned, given a national accreditation and now we're on our way to making some formal connections with KU and some schools in the cyber defense realm. A lot of that is due to this young man's work and I think we really need to give him not only a round of applause, but a huge thank you for all of the extra hours that he spent trying to make sure that we were top notch.

- Thank you. That was very kind. I appreciate it. Just wanted to say a couple of things. First of all, I'm very honored to be here, extremely honored to be here. Honored to accept this on behalf of my team and

our team. Couldn't have done it without any of them. We all played a role for certain. One thing I really wanted to touch on here is that this is an institutional designation, not just our departmental designation. There were many departments in this institution that assisted in achieving this designation and without any of them we could not have done it. So I did wanna take a brief moment and mention some of the critical players there: Health Information Systems, Paralegal, Personal Computer Applications, Nursing, Medical Information and Revenue Management, Information Services and our Registrar's Office and others. But to all the players in those departments, faculty, staff, otherwise, I'd like to offer my personal thank you. I'm not exaggerating when I say if any one of them would have not followed through, this would not have happened. So there's credit to be brought all around for that. Aside from that, I'd also like to thank administration; Dr. McCloud and other administrators. Without their support this also would not have been possible. So it was truly a team effort and I'm happy to accept this on behalf of that team. Thank you very much.

- On behalf of the Board and the Trustees, thank you for everything you do. I really appreciate your commitment to and collaboration with all the departments, but it takes strong leadership and that's you and so thank you very much.

- Thank you sir, appreciate it. Any others?

- [David] That's it.

- Next item is the open forum, the open forum section of the board agenda is a time for members of the community to provide comments to the Board. There'll be one open forum period during each regularly scheduled Board Meeting. Comments are limited to five minutes unless a significant number of people plan to speak. In that instance the Chair may limit a person's comments to less than five minutes. In order to be recognized individuals must register at the door at each Board meeting prior to the open forum agenda item. When addressing the Board, registered speakers are asked to remain at the podium and should be respectful and civil and are encouraged to address individual personnel or student matters directly with the appropriate college department. As a practice the college does not respond in this setting when the matter concerns personnel or student issues or matters that are being addressed through our established grievance or suggestion processes or are otherwise the subject of review by the college or Board. We have one registered speaker this evening. Beth Edmonds, if you would come to the podium and name and address. Appreciate you being here tonight.

- Good evening, my name is Beth Edmonds. I am a Professor and Chair of the Johnson County Community College Mathematics Department and the current President of the JCCC Faculty Senate. I have timed my remarks to five minutes so I will read quickly and get it done. To quote the Higher Learning Commission's upcoming 2020 release of its criteria for accreditation, shared governance at the institution engages its internal constituencies, including its governing board, administration and faculty,

staff and students through planning policy and procedures. Since its inception, the JCCC Faculty Senate has been dedicated to promoting the principles of shared governance. If you read our Constitution written eight years ago, you will find a rich document which includes the following statement. "The Senate maintains that high-quality education "and student success depend on faculty engagement "beyond basic teaching duties "and those goals depend on faculty members being involved "in decisions that impact the instruction." The Higher Learning Commission or HLC has expressed that it expects JCCC to make improvements in two areas: Govern in structure and communication. We are tasked with submitting a report by May 1, 2020 which will outline, and I quote, "faculty voice within the shared governance system at JCCC." At the same time, the HLC with some insight provides a natural pathway to resolve these issues in which the JCCC Faculty Association and the Faculty Senate and I quote again, "coexist as long as their respective areas "of responsibility and authority are clear." I would like to share two examples which demonstrate that the structure of the Faculty Senate is unique and that it enables it to bring to light issues affecting students and faculty from all areas that might otherwise be overlooked. My first example is the most recent push to talk about diversity, equity and inclusion, also known as DEI, again, at JCCC at the September 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting a task force was created to address diversity issues at JCCC. Coincidentally this was also one area of concern mentioned by the HLC. Last May the Task Force, an energetic and caring group of concerned faculty, staff and students met with college executives. As a result of these meetings, it was decided that JCCC would commence a DEI assessment to determine needs and actions for addressing DEI on campus. This task force created through the Faculty Senate has taken on a life of its own and while their work is still in the early stages, this is something the entire JCCC community should be proud of. My second example is the action taken in May 2019 in which the Faculty Senate approved a faculty-created model for shared governance to be used as the template or a starting point for future implementation correcting the CAO's model which omitted the Faculty Senate. It remains our position that the Faculty Senate should be the body overseeing all faculty-based non-contractual campus committees and the first point of contact for the JCCC administration to seek faculty input for non-contract issues. Our model will provide the JCCC academic branch with a starting point for meaningful discussion about shared faculty governance. The JCCC administration has a unique opportunity here, because the proposed template starting point model has the added benefit of incorporating an excellent and very natural means of facilitating and evaluating effective communication. Which allows me to briefly segue into the topic of communication at JCCC. As a result of the HLC's insistence that communication must improve, JCCC has endeavored to make notable changes, but it is significant that in the past year we have backslid a little bit within the community. Basic information has at times become more difficult to obtain. Two examples of this are the credit course listings which no longer give information about courses and our general announcements of daily campus activities which now require a login in order to actually see the announcements. In the coming academic year, the Faculty Senate will urge the JCCC administration to seek open dialogue with faculty, to work from our template model and turn this unique opportunity into the reality of shared faculty governance in more than just name only. This dialogue will allow us to stay focused on the pathway toward a resolution for the HLC's two concerns of shared governance and communication. In fact, since the Faculty Senate is mentioned multiple times throughout the accreditation documentation, I take this as a strong indicator that the HLC has expectations of the integral role that the Faculty Senate should play in this process. We hope and intend to participate despite objections that are voiced in various arenas across campus. Before I conclude, I will add this: I ask to be included on the agenda for tonight's meeting. As President of the JCCC Faculty Senate this

seemed reasonable. I was refused. I will continue to request this privilege, but will utilize the public forum if refused in the future. Thank you.

- Thank you Beth and does Dr. McCloud have a copy of that template?

- [L. Michael] I do.

- Okay, good. Thank you very much. That concludes the open forum.

- [Man] Dr. Cook, if I may? Mayor Kelly did arrive right after we got done with the pledge and with your indulgence I think he would like to present to the board.

- I did have a call from Trustee Snider that you would be here to make a presentation in the open forum regarding the seminar upcoming and I think that if it's okay with the Board, we will allow that presentation to be made. Please Mayor.

- Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. To the entire Board I apologize for my tardiness, hit a little bit of traffic on the way from the Plaza. As you can imagine, it's the summertime so there's a couple of things to run into and no real good way to get down here, but regardless, thank you very much for the indulgence and thank you very much for the invitation of Board member Snider or Trustee Snider. My name is Mike Kelly I'm the Mayor of the city of Roeland Park. I'm also the Co-Chairman of the Metropolitan Kansas City Climate Action Coalition. It's a group of elected officials as well as local leaders that are focused on drawing down greenhouse gases while also implementing the co-benefits that comes with that, including improvements to public health, improvements to economic vitality and improvements to job training opportunities of which Johnson County Community College has been an absolute leader for our region and congratulations to you, to Dr. Antle and to this entire Board for the good work that's already been done. I appreciate President Sopcich inviting me to meet with him. When we started the coalition we had a very pleasant conversation and we talked about ways that we might support each other's efforts. One of those was the upcoming Climate Action Summit which was gonna be hosted here on September 14th and we are very excited to host the event here. The event is an opportunity for not only elected officials, but also leaders from throughout the metropolitan area to come together to celebrate successes that have been achieved in our region and the college is a great representation of those successes, but also to discuss emerging trends and to bring some national voices together to talk about how Kansas City can remain a leader in the climate resilience movement for the United States. The event is sold out for our registrations and we are excited to bring together leaders, over 40 speakers are confirmed for the day. Some of the highlights include our congressional representatives from the Kansas City metropolitan area, but also some interesting perspectives on a changing environment in mitigation and adaptation that that brings, including the Lieutenant Governor,

Lieutenant Governor Lynn Rogers as well as Brigadier General Dr. Christopher King to talk about the national defense perspective on climate change. We'll also have breakout sessions from such things as agriculture in the environment to the transportation case. We'll have the architect of the new airport as well as Secretary Lorenz, the Kansas Secretary of Transportation. But also, one that I'm particularly interested in is Mayor Brainard from Carmel, Indiana who's a four-term republican mayor. He can have a moderated conversation with the new mayor of Kansas City, Missouri Mayor Lucas and it'll be a really interesting dynamic from a difference in experience, a difference in parties, but both committed to making their communities climate resilient and investing in the future opportunities that are available for our community to be the leaders in renewable energy and energy efficiency. Kansas City's quite a design exporter for the world and to be at the forefront of that gives us some real opportunity. So I appreciate your indulgence. I'm happy to answer any questions that the Board may have, but we very much appreciate your partnership and we appreciate that you recognize the importance that this has for our residents and training them to be future leaders in these endeavors is not only good for our community and for our public health, but really good for our economy too.

- Mayor when you say you're sold out, how many people are you expecting?

- We are expecting 500 for the day, but thanks to the generosity of the foundation, I am bringing in Paul Hawken who's a worldwide leader. He's spoken with kings and queens, as well as given the commencement speech at just about every Ivy League university in the nation. The Foundation's been kind enough to help us bring him in. So the afternoon's gonna be open to the general public. So from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. you'll have an opportunity to hear not only from Paul Hawken, but also from Congresswoman Davids, from Mayor Lucas and Mayor Brainard, as well as some of the leaders of the Metro KC Climate Action Coalition.

- [Jerry] Thanks Mayor, appreciate it and thanks for your leadership in the project. We look forward to it.

- Well thank you for the leadership of the sustainability initiative here, from Dr. Antle to this Board. We appreciate everything that you do.

- So after this, after that Saturday what are you gonna do next?

- Well we're actually been selected by a group called The Global Covenant of Mayors. It's a group that includes about 10% of the world's population's leaders have come together to put together an opportunity to do climate action planning for various cities. Kansas City has applied as a region. So we will be the first region in the United States to receive that technical assistance to do an emissions inventory, but also to come up with a plan and that plan includes investments in renewable energies, but also opportunities to invest in things such as innovation or new technologies, so that

entrepreneurship and startup initiative. So we'll be working with that international partner and creating the model that can be taken to other regions that share statewide borders, that share multiple county areas where really they rely upon each other and they work together and it makes sense to do things at a regional level. What a weak regionalism we have here in the metropolitan area with an end to the border war. Who'd have thought stopping playing basketball would lead to such great opportunities for our city? That's the next big plan and so we'll be excited to launch that climate action plan. We hope it'll be very dynamic and successful for our community and we look forward to working with the college moving forward.

- [Jerry] Thank you. Thank you Mayor, appreciate it very much.

- Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much to the Board.

- Next item our Board Reports, College Lobbyist Report, Mr. Carter.

- Good evening, you've got my report and so I won't go through it in detail, but I'll raise three issues that I just wanna call your attention to. The first is the interim committee's been appointed and we're not on the agenda for the next couple of months. But we anticipate that in October is when the legislative budget committee will take up the issue of college budgets and some of the detailed information that is included in my report of just about exactly what the mission of the community colleges are and we'll be putting that into the report. So we're looking forward to October for when that particular meeting rolls around. The Regents recently met in retreat, they do every year around this time and part of their discussion entailed a system-wide request for higher education. And while they didn't put numbers to that request during their retreat, we had a call today with the folks that represent the various educational institutions and some numbers are beginning to at least be formed. That total number for the system looks like it's approximately, and again, this has not been presented to the Board yet, so it will require Board approval and then that would be part of the regents system-wide request that goes to the Governor's Budget Office. Right now those numbers are looking like around 65 million or so in total for new dollars. The breakdown looks approximately like this: Approximately 50 million for the state universities or the four-years, 8.5 million for the two-year sector, 4.5 million for the Excel and CTE program and about 1.6 million for Washburn. That totals about 65 million or so. I didn't add it up specifically, but that's the breakdown that I was given over the phone. There's another interesting component that is being discussed and we'll see how it continues to play out. It's not a new concept or a foreign one by any means, but we haven't really looked at it in Kansas in the past, although it's been briefly discussed and that is the notion of around 10 million dollars in state aid to be used for need-based scholarships. There would be a one-to-one match component for foundations. My question was, would a institution like JCCC be able to participate in that program and the answer that I got at my level, the folks that talk on my level was yes. So that puts us in a different ball field than maybe some of the other community colleges in the state of Kansas. So we'll see how that continues to play out. That certainly is something that will need to be played out in the budget and in the legislature. The other

piece that the Regents talked about was a deferred maintenance bond for state institutions and that would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 to 800 million dollars bonded over a multi-year period to be paid back in part some with funds universities are already using for their infrastructure as well as the Educational Building Fund, the EBIF, I can't remember what the I stands for, but it's part of the 1% or the one mil that the state collects over and above K12 education on property tax that goes for that Educational Building Improvement Fund. And then the final piece is a driver education instructor update. This is very fresh. There's no new news per se, however, the Board of Education had a very robust conversation about this issue. They had several action items on their agenda. Most of them sailed right through with little or no discussion. This one had a little bit more discussion and dissent from the Board members. It did end up passing in the end six to three and so I think what begins now is once those new criteria come out from the Board of Education, it's going to be a conversation that probably takes place two places on this campus, in Dr. McCloud's operation and in Karen Martley's operation because we have two components where we address driver education. I don't think we're finished with the issue. We still have some room where we're going to have to figure out how that impacts us. We continue to receive calls from educators wanting the instruction, wanting to take driver's education instruction so that they can be certified to take that back and teach at their school. Again, this movement from the Board of Education at the state level sets all of that in motion. And so it will be I would think spring at the earliest and that is at the earliest before any type of credit course could be offered and we have the ability to act quicker than maybe some of the region's institutions. But again, that's a conversation that we'll have to have moving forward. So Mr. Chairman, I would stop there and if there's questions, I'd be happy to attempt to answer those.

- Any questions of Mr. Carter? Any questions? Thank you Dick. I think you've explained that well. Good luck and finish summer camp and get ready for the next session, legislative session. Faculty Association, Dr. Harvey.

- Thank you. So this has been our professional development days this week. It's been incredibly busy. We had an all faculty meeting this morning that was pretty intense and a bit chaotic. It was a challenging meeting to be a part of. But then I just finished a Faculty Association meeting with a packed room of people where I witnessed some incredible collegiality and respect, mutual respect, and it was a very encouraging environment. I would say the general message and the theme that I got from my colleagues on the topic of shared governance is that we still very much feel like it's gonna be possible for all of us to sort out any details we need to amongst ourselves without a problem, but we still have the concerns of how we are included by the administration and the Board and such in decision making, in decision making that impacts the faculty. So that is still our biggest concern about shared governance, but we had a very nice meeting this afternoon. I went to one of the engagement listening sessions. I was able to go to one and I have to say that Karen Martley does an amazing job of leading those and really creates an atmosphere that makes people feel comfortable sharing their concerns and their experiences and maybe explaining some of the why's of how they responded to the survey which I think was the intent of it. I do have one concern that I did feel should be shared with you and I wanna keep it fairly generic, but there was an individual that apparently shared some things in the listening session and then later was sort of confronted by their supervisor about some of the things that they had said where other people

were in the room and told them what they said and that sort of thing. And so my concern is this, we create this very safe feeling environment and ask people to be honest and then it's not really a safe environment and if everybody is gonna be coming back at you and say you can't say things like that in public. So I want you to just be aware of that because this process is supposed to be a legitimate useful process. But if it happens to one person, I can only imagine that there's other people that don't feel comfortable sharing things and they don't know, if I say this, even if they do it in a survey, is this gonna be used against me in some way. The faculty have, we have our due process rights and we have we have a level of job security that's not necessarily experienced by all the employees of the institution. So I think while I don't know how you can run that meeting any differently based on the plan, but I do think that the idea that you get honest, open feedback at the listening sessions and that that is gonna be a safe environment for our people to share things like that, I'm just not sure. I feel like that needs to be considered. I did have the opportunity to attend and participate in the Wall of Honor Ceremony, that was yesterday. There was two faculty that were put on the Wall of Honor. One was Steve Wilson who is one of our math professors and I'll be honest one of the smartest people I've ever known. He has made huge contributions to the department, to the Association in helping us with leading research team efforts and he retired we were like, we don't know how we're gonna replace him because he's brilliant. We managed to muddle through, but we do miss him. I also had the opportunity to honor Dr. Kevin Gratton who was chemistry Professor, he's chemistry Professor Emeritus and I replaced him when he retired after 33 years. He was first at the college in 1973 and it was a really special moment for his family. And I did wanna share with all of you, for those of you that couldn't be there, a couple of things, he wrote a book at the end of his time at Johnson County. As a full-timer, he had the Senior Scholar designation and he got some release time to work on a project for the institution just before he retired. His project was to write a history of the science division at the college from the beginning until the year that he retired. So it's a wealth of information. There were a couple of highlights that I shared, I wanted to share with you from his book. He talked about his leadership of the course that I teach primarily and he used to teach and lead and a couple of the underlying principles that he used to guide decision making were that the student is more important than the course. And also that all of us together are no more than each of us alone. I think those are really important principles and I also often, I've said this before here, but I use that mantra of what's best for the students when I can't decide what to do with a specific situation in my classes and that came from Kevin. So that was a real treat to get to be a part of and to honor the legacy that he left for those of us in chemistry that have come up after him. We are hosting, the Faculty Association is hosting a candidate forum and we have invited all six candidates for the Board of Trustee's election to this and they've all accepted. At this point it is September 3rd in the Hudson Auditorium. We're co-hosting this with the League of Women Voters and it'll be at 7:00 p.m. and it's going to be a very professional and academic experience. We really wanted to provide, we wanted this to be an academic event where our students could come and learn and we just wanted it to be open for everyone as an educational thing. Our own professor of communications studies, Dr. Terry Easley-Geraldo is going to be conducting this forum. So she'll be the moderator and there'll be a reception to follow. It's at 7:00 p.m., it'll be about 90 minutes. So that's those plans. I did wanna mention a couple more things. One thing is that the faculty got a very strange thing in a lot of our mail boxes today. It was postcard. It was inside an envelope with an address from a company in Lawrence. It doesn't say who it's from, but it was a very surprising thing that we have no idea where it came from. The Faculty Association had absolutely nothing to do with it. One of our faculty members, one of our officers called the company whose address is being used and they have no knowledge of this. So it was



very unusual and suspicious and I just wanted to go on record as saying we have no idea where that came from. First of all that wouldn't be our style. If we're gonna do something, we're going to say it directly, out loud. We're gonna own it. We're gonna put our name on it. It would be more professional and it just, to me, it was a bit mean-spirited under the current circumstances and I just wanna say that I dunno where it came from, but it was kind of a surprise to us. So I think if you know what it is, then you know what I'm talking about and it wasn't us. The other thing is we have a party tomorrow night and of course you're all invited to come. It's the usual place at the usual time and we're gonna have Kansas City Joe's Bar-B-Que and so if you don't know where the usual place and the usual time is just let me know and I'll share that with you. I guess that concludes my report.

- Dr. Harvey I have two comments. Number one I'm aware of the communication that you referenced. I appreciate you being forthright about that and we will look into that, but thank you very much for that acknowledgement. Secondly, I just wanted to say that when you mentioned you had a very collegial meeting this afternoon, I had the opportunity to attend the forum yesterday morning and hearing and seeing the response following that I thought everybody that participated in that did a terrific job. The students did a terrific job, but it was the buzz after in the lobby and the enthusiasm and it helps remind us that we're here for students and we have an outstanding faculty that make sure those students are successful. So thank you very much for your comments. Nancy?

- I wanted to ask a question. When we did the Wall of Honor yesterday and you were talking about the program that the gentleman did, Mr. Wilson, who wrote the book?

- [Melanie] No, it was Kevin Gratton and okay.

- So what is that? You said not many people take advantage of it, just quickly.

- Oh okay, so there's this section in our master agreement. It was actually negotiated and it's called Senior Scholar and we just haven't had a lot of takers on it and I think part of that, to be honest, has to do with KPERS and a lot of time when you're close to the end of your career you wanna get as many hours and as much pay as you can KPERS calculations, I mean that's just natural. But it is there and right now as it's written it's an opportunity for someone to have some reassigned time to work on a project that will benefit the institution. And it needs to be taken in, I believe, the two years before you retire, so that's the way it's written. And so we just haven't had a lot of takers, but that's always been there. So if someone knows they're gonna retire in two years, they could say, I have this project that I wanna do to leave behind for the school that will help the institution and they can get released from their teaching for part of it. I think we do have, do we have one this year?

- [Board Member] We do.

- Yeah, we do have one person this year that is taking advantage of that. But it is budgeted every time, but it's one of the least used benefits I think in some ways. But I think there's some reasons why, yeah.

- [Nancy] Thank you.

- Thanks Melanie, appreciate it very much. Have a good year. Interesting shirt you have on. Where'd you get it?

- [Melanie] I actually got it when we dedicated the .

- Yeah. Johnson County Research Triangle, Trustee Cross.

- Mr. Chair, our committee met in April. We'll meet again October 28th and I have nothing to report.

- Okay, thank you. KACCT Trustee Lawson.

- The next meeting is September 13th through the 14th in Neosho Community College and then the National ACCT will meet in San Francisco October 15th and 19th.

- Okay, thank you. Foundation Trustee Musil.

- Foundation has a lot of activities going on between now and November 9th. The first one is a Foundation member social at the Hugh Libby Technical Education Center on Thursday, August 22nd. Richard Fort, the Dean, will be providing tours of the facility after an opportunity for socializing and some welcoming remarks. So a great opportunity for the community to come in and see what we've built. The Foundation's Annual Scholarship Celebration Luncheon will be held on September 4th at twelve o'clock noon in the Regnier Center where we have the opportunity to pass the mic and hear from students who receive scholarship monies and it's my second favorite event on campus after the GED graduation. But if you can attend as a trustee, it's a great evidence of what the community does in scholarship fundraising and how much it means to our students. Foundation reported nearly 1,500 students received over 1.2 million dollars in Foundation private scholarships and so we always wanna publicly thank the generous donors in the community who provide that assistance and the people in financial aid who work every day to see that it's distributed as broadly as possible. And then finally, the

preparations continue for Some Enchanted Evening Gala, our largest scholarship fundraiser which will be Saturday, November 9th at the Overland Park Convention Center. Mike and Susan Lally are the chair-couple for this year's event. Frank Devocelle is being honored as Johnson Countian of the Year after his really building Olathe Health Systems, Olathe Medical Center almost from scratch and turning that into an amazing healthcare facility for the region. About 600,000 has been raised to date. Sponsorships and ticket sales are on sale and for the first time, the Foundation will be announcing special pricing options for faculty and staff soon so that there can be more participation. The Convention Center allows us to expand the number of people that can comfortably be in the facility so we hope we can get more people from the college into that event to help raise money for scholarships. And that's all I have Mr. Chairman.

- Thank you. Any questions of Trustee Musil? Next item is the Budget Public Hearing. It is time for our 2019-20 hearing. I will open that hearing up at this time. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak to our Board regarding our 2019, 2020 budget? Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak to the Board regarding the 2019, 2020 budget? Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak to the budget on our 2019, 2020 budget? Do any trustees have a question for either Rachel or Barbara? Any questions from Trustees? We will vote on the adoption of the budget during the management section of our committee reports and recommendations. Are there any other questions or comments? If not, I will close the budget hearing and move on. Committee reports and recommendations, management, Trustee Ingram.

- Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. The Management Committee met at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday, August 7th here in the boardroom. The information related to the Management meeting begins on page one and runs through page 27 of the Board packet. The Management Committee received several presentations. Barbara Larson, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services presented information on agreements with a number of outside agencies. These agreements can be found in the consent agenda on pages 59 and 62 of the Board packet. Rachel Lierz is Associate Vice President Financial Services, Chief Financial Officer, reviewed the semi-annual report of budget reallocations. This report can be found in the Board packet on pages 15 through 18. Jerry Zimmerman, the college's benefits manager presented an update on the voluntary employment retirement benefit, or VERB program. The college originally budgeted 5.8 million as a liability for this new benefit for the current fiscal year. Based on an updated assessment of eligible participants, we will now book 6.3 million dollars for the program in fiscal year 2019-20. This is the amount of the full liability, but actual costs will be considerably less and will be based on the number of individuals who choose to retire under the VERB program in the current year. Barbara Larson gave a brief overview of procurement services, bid processes and procedures in light of the discussion of last month's Board meeting regarding a particular award. I'd like to ask Barbara to review this with the full Board. If you would do so at this time Barbara.

- Yes, thank you Trustee Ingram. I wanted to follow up on the discussion from last month's Board meeting regarding a particular purchase. This was the contract renewal for Digital Fine Paper that renewal was awarded to Veritiv Corporation. The second highest bid for that was Midland Paper. And

for those listening to that discussion they may have been left with the impression that Midland Paper is based here in Johnson County. It's not. They do have an office in Johnson County. They're a privately held corporation that's actually based in Illinois, in Wheeling, Illinois. Veritiv Corporation also has a warehouse in Johnson County. Also based on last month's Board meeting, I asked procurement staff to follow up on whether we could find peer institutions or other regional institutions that had a social justice metric as part of their award criteria. And so far we have not been able to identify any. Not that they don't exist, but we have not been able to identify any. When we look at the Human Rights Campaign Corporate Equity Index, Veritiv was listed in the footnotes as having a low score because they did not respond to the Human Rights Campaign request to respond. So I'm reluctant to make a judgment on their human rights record based on the fact that they didn't complete the survey. Certainly if we were going to use that as a criteria, and again, I have a lot of respect for the Human Rights Campaign, however, that corporate index is largely based on fairly large corporations, on Fortune 500 corporations and other large corporations. We write over 3,000 purchase orders a year, many of which are not to Fortune 500 corporations. And finally I'll say, at this month's Management Committee, based on this discussion, Trustee Snider asked that we do further research into procurement practices as they relate to local vendor preferences. We do have a statement in our current competitive solicitation policy which states that preference may be given when quality and price are comparable to purchases offered for sale by vendors with offices or plants located in Johnson County, Kansas. And I certainly appreciate that this could be strengthened based on some objective criteria. So we would be looking at that and bringing something forward through the Management Committee in the future. Thank you

- [Nancy] Okay.

- [Angeliina] I have a question. Did you reach out to the Human Rights Campaign?

- I did not, specifically.

- [Angeliina] And so this company, Veritiv, they self-reported this to you?

- No, no. It's based on the footnotes in the document, says they did not respond to the survey. Thank you.

- You're not sure if the Human Rights Campaign Index is based only on the survey. Is that what you're saying?

- I'm saying based on the footnotes, they did not respond to the survey.

- [Angeliina] I'm not talking--

- [Jerry] Proceed.

- [Angeliina] Okay.

- Okay, Janelle Vogler, Associate Vice President for Business Services presented the single-source purchase report and a summary of awarded bids between 50,000 and 150,000 dollars. This summary can be found on page 19. I provided an overview of the process that the Board will use to select the executive recruiting and search firm for the presidential search. We will have more specific action regarding the search later in this report. Karen Martley, Vice President of Continuing Education and Organizational Development gave a presentation on the Employee Engagement Survey from spring of 2019. She provided more detail on the favorability results filtered by employee class, age and description. She also updated the Committee on the listening sessions that have occurred over the summer. Rex Hayes, Associate Vice President Campus Services and Facility Planning gave an update on the Oral Health On Wheels, or OHOW and motorcycle storage garage project. He also provided the Monthly Progress Report on capital infrastructure projects and this report is on page 25 of the packet. Next, he gave an update on the construction projects across campus and reviewed the report on the financial status of the Facilities Master Plan. That report is in your packet on page 27. The Management Committee has a number of recommendations to present this evening. Information for the first recommendation can be found on pages two through six of the Board packet. The recommendation pertains to a refunding opportunity of the series 2011 bonds. At our Management Committee meeting earlier this month, Bill Henderson and Matt Courtney, Piper Jaffray were in attendance and presented information on a proposal authorizing the sale of student commons and parking system refunding revenue bonds. They estimate the college will save approximately 125,000 dollars annually by refinancing the series 2011 bonds for a total net savings to the college of just under one million dollars between now and fiscal year 2028. We have representatives from Piper Jaffray here this evening as well as from Gilmore & Bell, the college's bond counsel if you would have questions for any of them.

- Any questions of our consultants? Any questions regarding this topic? Trustee Lawson.

- I know someone from the public asked me specifically to ask this question about this. Does this policy, what we're talking about right now with the bonds, does that conflict with the Kansas state statues that we have around bonds?

- [Jerry] Does it conflict with...

- And this is a refinancing bond that we already held.

- This is not new. We've done this in the past to save the college lots of dollars as the opportunity comes up to refinance. And so I really applaud the consultants for bringing it to our attention and staff. I mean 125,000 a year is good savings. Any other questions? Proceed.

- Okay if there are no further questions, I'd like to proceed with the recommendation at this time. It is the recommendation of the Management Committee that the Board of Trustees accept the recommendation of the college administration to adopt a resolution authorizing this offering for sale of student commons and parking system refunding revenue bonds in the approximate principal amount of 8,500,000 dollars as found on pages four through six in the Board packet and I will make that recommendation.

- [Man] Second.

- We have motion and a second. Any discussion? Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Angeliina] No.

- Motion carried, uh one no? Okay, I guess that's and David's not here so five to one, with one absent. Proceed.

- Okay, Barbara Larson presented the 2019, 2020 Management Committee Working Agenda found on pages eight and nine of your packet. There was an omission in the Working Agenda presented for action last month and this month's packet contains a corrected version. So we ask for your approval of the Working Agenda.

- [Man] So moved.

- We have a motion. Is there second?

- I haven't read the recommendation, I apologize.

- Oh okay.

- You said you didn't, I'm sorry.

- Go ahead.

- So we ask for your approval. It is, now it is the recommendation of the Management Committee that the Board of Trustees approve fiscal year 2019, 2020 Management Committee Working Agenda and I will make that motion.

- Second.

- We have a motion and a second for the calendar. Any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Angeliina] No.

- We have a six one vote.

- Okay, the next recommendation was for a transfer of funds. The Center for Sustainability has requested that 6,000 dollars from recycling proceeds be transferred to the JCCC Foundation. This disbursement brings the total distributed to the Foundation for scholarships since 2012 to

approximately 107,000 dollars. It is the recommendation of the Management Committee that the Board of Trustees authorize the transfer of 6,000 dollars from the Sustainability Initiative's funds to the JCCC Foundation to be used for student scholarships and I will make that motion.

- [Man] Second.

- We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. I would say that I think Dr. Antle reported at the meeting yesterday that that total now was about 300,000 dollars. That Sustainability has--

- [Jay] We go back to the beginning of recycling--

- It's four?

- [Jay] Yeah because it's up over 300.

- Yeah, thanks Jay.

- Good job.

- And thank you.

- Yes.

- Good job.



- Earlier we held the public hearing on fiscal year 2019-20 budget. This public hearing represents the culmination of budget process that transpires over many months, beginning with budget guidelines that were first presented to the Board of Trustees in December of last year. These budget guidelines provided a policy framework for building the fiscal year 2019-20 budget and they were considered and adopted by the Board at the December 13, 2018 meeting. Furthermore, the Board held a Comprehensive Budget Workshop in April of this year and adopted the management budget in May. It is the recommendation of the Management Committee that the Board of Trustees accept the fiscal year 2019-20 budget as published, which includes total property tax levied of 101,704,900 dollars for fiscal year 2020 as compared to 97,842,147 dollars for fiscal year 2019 and does hereby certify said budget to the County Clerk of Johnson County Kansas for collection in the manner prescribed by law and I will make that motion.

- [Man] Second.

- We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Trustee Musil.

- Well we've been through this a lot. We started December with our budget guidelines. In December we projected an increase in appraised value that would yield four million dollars in new dollars for the college. Johnson County's values grew more than that and would have yielded 5.6 million dollars. The budget that is presented, it includes a 1.6% rollback in the Mill Levy. 1.6% so that we still take four million in new dollars. Last year we did the exact same thing, we rolled the Mill Levy back. So we took the three million dollars we had budgeted instead of four million dollars. I think there's a tradition here of funding this college as it needs to be funded, including a history of a majority of this Board around this on the Board when we raised the Mill Levy 0.75 back in 2013. I won't try to beat this horse completely dead, but I look at the blue bar on the graph and see that since I've been on this board, property taxes as a percentage of revenue have gone from 55% to 66%. Every other source has been reduced. I've seen information out there suggesting that a rollback in the Mill Levy benefits businesses, specifically developers. When 2/3's of the property tax is paid for in Johnson County are paid for by residential folks, single-family homeowners and apartments pay 2/3's of the property taxes in Johnson County. I undertook an exercise because there's this notion that property tax rollbacks are somehow beneficial, more beneficial, to wealthy individuals or business owners. I bought a house in 1987 in Johnson County. It was 87,500 dollars. It's just west of the college, the college in Falun. In 2014 its appraised value was 170,000 dollars and this year it's gone up to 225,800 dollars, hardly Mission Hills or Southern Johnson County. So its property value has increased 32% in the last five years and its taxes to the college alone have increased 63 dollars a year for fiscal year 2020. I'm very willing to accept new dollars for new programs and to continue the programs we have and to compensate our faculty and our staff reasonably, which I believe we do. I'm also willing to accept more money, because I think we contribute to the growth of Johnson County. And I think I've said this every August since I've been on the Board. At the same time I think there has to be a recognition that folks out there are feeling property tax pressure not just from Johnson County Community College, but when your appraised value goes up 32% in five years and you add the county and you add your city and you add the water district or you add the

school district it affects people, particularly those on lower incomes or on fixed incomes. It is a regressive tax and I'm not willing to increase it over and above what we budgeted. So I hope the rest of the Board will go along with that, because if we don't roll it back and if you choose not to roll it back then you're asking for an additional 1.6 million dollars in property taxes to be charged. About one million of that would come from residential homeowners and apartment dwellers. Thank you.

- Any other comments or questions?

- Yes Mr. Chair.

- Trustee Cross.

- I think the Board and I thank the Chair for the opportunity to make the statement. You know it's telling that there's nobody here at the budget hearing. And either that means nobody knows what's going on here or they're somewhat happy with us. So there is to say that in my time, 30 years ago, I think my father came back to school here. In my time connected to this college many people are happy with this place and so the entertaining nature of our internal politics and issues right now are entertaining, though somewhat concerning. I think that this Board has largely welcomed discussion and input from every sector of this county. I've personally witnessed in six years on the Board and yes I was on this Board when, I think it was my first vote, or my first night here we voted to raise and we had to come back. It was gonna be one and became 0.75 later. So that was a courageous thing to do in what really was a conservative time in this state's history and I'm real proud of that and I thank the Board members who were here for doing that. Saturday we had a retreat in which we talked about the college promise and a program that we have launched and I think like many other of our peer institutions struggled to figure out how to implement. I do thank this Board for even discussing it. I thank this Board for considering it. I don't exactly want it to be 13th and 14th grade that we're funding, but I think that the initiative as instituted by the administration was a welcome one and not an unthoughtful one. So with that said, I think if we'd had more money, my preference would have been to simply keep the money we had to go toward student success, ensure more students could have success here. A friend and colleague said, what about the students who don't even know or can't even fill out FASFAs? And that was almost not me. It was not me. We were from a lower income family, but we knew to do that and that was a point of privilege certainly. So the need to address need-based students, I believe Trustee Musil said that repeatedly Saturday, that's near and dear to my heart and I appreciate his comments on that. I appreciate the recognition that it is indeed a regressive tax. I think any need of thoughtful discussion on taxes and the reason that President Lincoln first originated an income tax was frankly to get the money when people have it, rather than create a situation say in Wyandotte County where there's a high tax delinquency rate because of an impoverished citizenry. So we are certainly blessed here. I understand that the gentleman, Trustee Musil, you repeatedly state that we have higher revenues and that should not go into this, we'll have higher revenues this year because we're blessed to an embarrassment of riches in real estate frankly. Nevertheless, as I've said, my vote in disagreement

with you and demonstrating our lack of group think frankly is that there is a looming recession coming and I would rather not raise taxes in the middle of that recession. Nevertheless I do have confidence in this Board. Though reasonable minds may disagree, I simply would rather keep the mil, excuse me, and reinvest it in our students and our faculty and our administration frankly who in difficult and challenging times have done some amazing things. So I thank the Board for this discussion. I thank the Board for listening to my thoughts, I know Trustee Cook is anxious for me to be quiet, so I will. Thank you Mr. Cook.

- [Jerry] I'm just trying to figure out what I'm gonna do next.

- I'll put in words...

- Any other comments or questions? We have a motion and a second to adopt the 2019, 2020 budget as presented. All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Board Members] No.

- I hear that as a five for and two against. Okay.

- Yes sir.

- Canvas learning, thank you, Canvas Trustee Lindstrom.

- [David] I excused myself during the revenue bond vote. I would be in favor of that. I wasn't here for that vote, but would be a yes on that.

- Go back and reflect that. Let the record reflect that. Canvas Learning Management System, Trustee Ingram.

- There were three recommendations based on requests for proposals or RFPs and bids that Ms. Vogler reported. First was the RFP for the renewal of an annual contract for a Learning Management System. It is the recommendation of the Management Committee that the Board of Trustees accept the recommendation of the college administration to approve the renewal of the contract JCCC-1416 within structure for ongoing licensing of the Learning Management System for a current year amount of 181,466 dollars and an estimated amount of 362,932 dollars for the remaining optional renewals through 2022 for a total estimated amount of 544,398 dollars and I will make that motion.

- [Man] Second.

- We have a motion and a second. Any discussion or questions? Any discussion? All in favor say signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- Our next recommendation is for the General Executive Search and recruiting services. To be clear, this recommendation does not pertain to identifying a firm for the JCCC presidential search, but for other executive positions at the college on an as needed basis. It is the recommendation of the Management Committee that the Board of Trustees accept the recommendation of the college administration to approve the proposal for EFL Associates for as needed executive search and recruiting services for an FY20 base year and for optional renewal years through 2024 for the supplemental rates and I will make that motion.

- [Man] Second.

- Motion and a second. Any discussion? Trustee Musil.

- Question, is there a number of searches they will do? I mean I know we have an idea of how many positions would be open on an annual basis, but is it, it'll help on how many we have and they're comfortable with--

- [Woman] For instance, per time we use it tuition.

- [Gerald] Mr. Chair, if I may?

- Wait a minute, so it's 35,000 dollars a search?

- [Woman] Yes.

- Based on the bid.

- [Woman] Yes.

- [Gerald] Is that how high your retainers are?

- Trustee Cross.

- I'm kidding, I'm kidding. I didn't plan on yours. Does this lock us in on the presidential search? I'm not complaining, I'm just asking.

- [Greg] No, no.

- Okay.

- Does not.

- [Angeliina] Do we require organizations to align with our non-discrimination policy?

- Yes, as part of contractual language, yes.

- Any other questions? Again, this is not related to the Presidential Search and we'll deal with some of the other positions we have open as needed. We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Angeliina] No.

- Six one, motion carries. Vehicle storage.

- Next is a recommendation for construction of the vehicle storage garage. It is the recommendation of the Management Committee that the Board of Trustees accept the recommendation of the college administration to approve the low bid from Infinity Group in the amount of 538,223 dollars with an additional 10% contingency of 53,822 dollars to allow for possible unforeseen costs, for a total expenditure not to exceed of 592,045 dollars and I will make that motion.

- [Man] Second.

- We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- That concludes the recommendations forwarded from the Management Committee, however, as the Management Committee was charged with beginning the process to identify an executive search and recruiting services firm for the Presidential Search. I'd like to go through a bit of that timeline before I invite Janelle Vogler and Jim Fikert to come to the podium to take us through the next steps in narrowing of the firms that will be invited to make presentations to the Board of Trustees at a special meeting scheduled for Tuesday, August the 20th at 8:30 a.m. The timeline to date has been as follows: The college's Procurement Services Department issues are P20-006 to identify an executive recruiting

firm for the Presidential Search on July 23rd of this year. Procurement Services notified more than 170 firms of this opportunity. Interested firms had until this past Friday, August the ninth at 2:00 p.m. to submit proposals in response to the RFP. The college received 11 proposals deemed responsive by Procurement Services. The Evaluation Committee to review proposals was comprised of the seven Board of Trustees members. All Board members had until last evening at 5:00 p.m. to score these 11 proposals and turn their evaluations into Jim Fikert, Director of Procurement. Dr. Cook, at this time I'd like to invite Janelle Vogler and Jim Fikert to the podium to present the results of our evaluation and that concludes my report.

- Good evening everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to present on this. I'm Jim Fikert. I'm the Director of Procurement Services for Johnson County Community College. Janelle Vogler of course, Associate Vice President of Business Services. I just wanna touch base where we're at on the process for the executive search and recruiting services for the JCCC President RFP. First I would like to acknowledge and thank you. I offer a big thank you to the Board of Trustees and the members of the Evaluation Committee. I know this was a short timeline, bit of an aggressive timeline for reviewing all the proposals and the proposal responses that were sent in from the vendors. Thank you, I really really appreciate the effort on that. Just touching base, Nancy kinda commented to a little bit of the process, but this can kinda be broken down into two phases. We've largely completed phase one of this RFP evaluation process where we had sent out the invitation to bid. We've received proposal responses from the vendors. We've evaluated and tallied those scores to an aggregate level and now the next step kind of where this yellow arrow is kinda kicks off phase two in the RFP process okay. So what we're doing right now is we're going to talk about the top ranked firms and determine who to shortlist for interview in that special committee on Tuesday. And so procurement will conduct reference checks against those top-ranked firms and the Committee will continue forward with conducting the interviews with those top-ranked firms and hopefully at the end we will indeed make an award to the most successful candidate or to the, excuse me, vendor. So again, the next steps: Procurement will check the references. The Evaluation Committee conducts, the Evaluation Committee rather is available and can conduct additional research at their discretion. Some examples of that would include some internet research or other publicly available information. The vendor presentations will occur Tuesday right here in this room. We're allowing for 25 minutes for the presentation based on the discussion topics that you'll see here in just a second and then 25 minutes for individual question and answer from the Evaluation Committee members. Again, I'd like to ask a reminder not to have any outside communication with the vendors or the shortlisted firms at this time. If you have questions for them, please direct those through Procurement Services and myself, please. The results: The scoring tabulations. Ranking the firms based on their aggregate totals out of 500 points and this was for the five committee members that submitted evaluation responses and their matrices. It came down to kind of the top firms that you see here. Academic Search Incorporated on the left hand side came in the highest at 416 points. AGB Search, at 415 points. And so on and so on down the list. We've got an alternate kinda table on the right-hand side. If you kind of went based only on individuals choice rankings, kind of who they deemed number one, number two, number three, so on and so on, just individual committee members. Those are some lower point scores. I kind of think of this in terms of golf scores just to keep it simple, but lower the score the better. And so what you see though is exactly what we wanna see in a typical RFP process. The top three firms are still the top three firms based on individual rankings from committee members or based on the

total aggregate and what you see is a good clear cutoff of what we see and at this point we typically like to recommend for shortlist purposes the top two to three firms. And in this case I've kind of highlighted the top two firms because of the clear cutoff in points. I think it makes sense to kind of look at it in terms of those two firms that are up there, again, Academic Search Incorporated and AGB Search.

- And I might just jump in just to explain to you what you have in front of you and then we'll turn it back to Trustee Cook to lead a discussion among the Trustees. So you have a copy of the presentation. You also have a copy of all of the scores by rating criteria and by firm. The next sheet is what Jim referred to as the choice point rankings. So each individual Trustee who they ranked first, second and third. And then this is the one with all the green boxes on it, so it kinda gives you a picture. We colored green the one, two and three choices for each Trustee. So that gives you an idea per firm and that's summarized there. And then the very last page is all of the individual score sheets from each of the Trustees. So as Jim said, we typically look for that clean cutoff and this one worked out pretty well with the top two firms having kind of a cutoff and a drop to the next firm. But it is, I'm gonna turn it back to Trustee Cook to have that discussion with the rest of the Trustees.

- Okay, so I think this is kind of a first. At least since I've been on the board for all the Trustees to be involved on the procurement process at this point, but we wanted to make sure that all Trustees had a chance to have input into the selection of the firm. I guess at this point I would ask for any. It appears that's pretty clear as you've indicated Jim, the top three are both on the top three in both columns if we went to three. Comments or questions at this time? Trustee Snider.

- I would just note, I mean it looked to me while there are maybe some stylistic differences, it looks to me all firms were well-qualified and so it made the decision process somewhat difficult, especially for someone like me that doesn't have experience going through these processes. Frankly, I would be comfortable with a number of them and the two that came out on top I would support moving those forward.

- I would say that, thank you, I guess having been in the education business as a school superintendent I've had a chance to go through some of these processes and so I kinda looked at a couple of things. It seems to me that when you're a national company or even a local company and you do a bid process, you have a template. And I was pretty critical of some of the firms that forgot to change their template to Johnson County Community College and in some cases they referred to us as a university, not a community college. In a couple of cases they didn't identify who the lead consultant in the team was going to be, so I was pretty critical of that detail, thinking that if they didn't attend to that detail then what kind of detail would they tend to when they got to work with us. I obviously looked at the community college connection that these firms had, but beyond that I had also looked at repeat business. And many of them have been in business for some time and they have been called back by the community colleges in which they worked initially more than once. So that tells me that those colleges without calling all those references had confidence and faith in those companies to bring them back for



multiple times. Those are some of the things I looked at in terms of evaluating, but I agree Trustee Snider, they have a lot of similarities. I was also interested primarily in their recruitment ability and not just to respond to people that apply, but do they go out and aggressively recruit people that may not be interested in this position, but they would go after them and try and get them into the fold. So those are some of the basic things I kinda looked at. Trustee Snider.

- And I would just further note, I believe this is the order also that we received them in the packets, but to the extent someone took their book and read as they were in order these were the top three. So that certainly could have some influence on people. You tend to remember some of the first and last and other. We're juggling I think 11. Again, I support these, just noting.

- And I would agree with that, but I think I was tougher in the beginning, 'cause I didn't know really what I was into. Well until you kind of had your rhythm going, quite frankly, and you knew what you were looking at after the first couple, so I'm real pleased with that.

- [Jerry] Trustee Cross.

- [Gerald] I was thinking about grade normalization. I figure which law professor had talked about how they were more critical in the beginning and as you go through exams and you're reading through, you're like, oh yeah that's what they're talking about.

- Right.

- I think it's how I got through. But, no I was completely overwhelmed with the process. I thank everybody for their help in it. I thank everyone for their comments. Is it appropriate now, can I ask questions or you want me to be quiet. What do you want right now?

- [Jerry] You can ask questions.

- Well, I mean we just hired EFL. So I think it would make some sense to invite them. I don't wanna freeze the process by having a local player, but I am impressed that EFL had many many local, they're local, they had local graduates. They understand who we are. They deal with many of our partner institutions in the area. I suppose it's a pitch for them on some level to make it to Tuesday, although I have no reason to object to any of these other findings. So those are my thoughts.

- [Jerry] Trustee Musil.

- [Greg] I'm gonna make a couple comments.

- Oh and confidentiality. I agree with your comments.

- Right, I was disappointed that several of these that are in the top didn't mention the fact that the process needs to be confidential until we get to finalists. And I thought that was fundamental to recruiting, especially the people that they call passive people that are happy where they are, aren't looking for something, but we're gonna go find them. So I hope all these firms understand that that confidentiality, I hope this Board and the community understands that there has to be confidentiality until we get to finalists and we interview on campus. So that as far as process, I agree with Trustee Cross and that I was a little bit overwhelmed as well, so just... I wanna find a President for at least five to seven years, but the next time we do this I do think there's some early alphabet bias here and so maybe you mix 'em up. You guys are the procurement experts and I think the next time it would be helpful if the Board had a working session where we kind of agreed on what we were looking for for a search firm. 'Cause I think the things that Trustee Cook just mentioned were kind of the things I looked for; community college experience. Have you done anything in the Midwest? How much fraternity do you have? What's your DEI statement? But we didn't have any discussion about those as a Board and when we get to setting the position statement in their community town halls with all kinds of folks involved. I think the next time we had that in advance it would have made the process less overwhelming, because we would have had criteria. I mean the fee criteria means nothing to me if we're gonna invest in somebody for seven years. I don't care if it's 55,000 or 80,000. So having that as 20% of the value didn't strike me as much, and you'll see I put the same number on all of them. So I think those are future things. I wanna know from the Board and from you as procurement people, we have four hours set aside next Tuesday, if I remember right, that seems like plenty of time, more than enough time to interview two. Because it's hard to discern on paper what these people really have or are or you know, I would like to interview at least three and I don't know why we couldn't interview four in four hours. And then I know it could end up with a process like we do when we pick a trustee for a vacant position where there's a set number of questions and we all have to ask the same question so it's fair which drives me crazy because everybody responds differently. But is that how we're going to do those processes on Tuesday, that there'll be a set of questions that we have to ask and we will divvy them up. Or are we gonna have a little bit of free reign to, I mean within boundaries obviously, but to press these folks on, do you recruit as opposed to relying on your 77,000 person database? I mean all these people have huge databases. Well those 77,000, one of them at least broke it down to how many are community college, how many are Presidential or Chancellor levels and how many are an investment. I wanna know more about how many you think and the Board thinks we ought to interview, because I'm much more interested in seeing two people or three people that we get to hear from and question than going through this book.

- [Jim] I was kind of looking at it Trustee Musil, that we would be doing three, four, not just two.

- I'm up for either three or four and I just wanna see what the rest of the Board's--

- [Jim] I mean is an hour enough time? I would like to do four.

- [Woman] I'd like to do four.

- [Jerry] Well if they have 25 minute presentation and there are questions, I believe that'd be enough time. I'm gonna keep going.

- [Jim] Just because you're having this discussion topic I'll put this up here. Since we're talking about just questions and kinda of that a lot of time, kind of structured these procurement presentation topics as an idea to present, or excuse me, as an agenda rather for the firms so they can structure their presentation to the Evaluation Committee. That would kind of dictate the 25 minutes, but again you would have 50 minutes per vendor and then 25 minutes dedicated to question and answer for any one of the Evaluation Committee members.

- [Janelle] And to be clear these questions we're bringing to you tonight, I think we sent them via email, we want to know. We can ask different questions of these vendors on Tuesday, give them different topics to present.

- [Barbara] To answer Trustee Musil's question, these would be presented for them to address during their 25 minutes. The Board would have 25 minutes to ask other questions and it does not have to be the same question to every vendor. In other words, if they say something and you want to ask a follow up question during that portion and it's an appropriate question, absolutely.

- So Trustee Musil, so... Barbara, in response to that as they respond to these five questions, I would then ask to be thinking of a question and we'll take one question per Trustee at a time to go around that 25 minute period and focus in on your specific issues that you have for that particular firm . Trustee Lawson did you have a question?

- Okay, I'd like to invite the HR Perry & Associates. They had the most detailed timeline out of all the candidates that I saw. It was very specific. It was also mid-range priced just like the Academic Search and

they're President is a person of color as well as they're a diversity equity inclusion statement was, I think, had the most substance. And the amount of individuals that were selected from under-representative groups, progressive, so I think when we are putting commitments to DEI, I think it's important to include .

- Appreciate that. There were other firms that either were all female firms and or also had minorities on their team. I'm not sure they were all identified as being key consultants for this project, I know a couple of them were. Okay.

- My concern with EFL is I think their approach when I read that did not reflect as much academically as the other ones and the non-discrimination policy is not in line with ours.

- Okay. Other comments?

- [Gerald] The ACCT Program. Did we just not get a bid from them?

- They did not respond.

- [Jim] They did not respond.

- [Gerald] Are they mad at us?

- [Jim] We reached, totally reached out. We haven't heard back.

- And I spoke to Mr. Brown about that as well. Noah Brown's her Executive Director and he was gonna check on it but I never heard back from him. So I know they go the bid for the year, the RFP and they didn't respond. Can we agree on three or four? Is there any disagreement with three or four?

- I like four.

- I would think four's fine.

- Four? So hearing then, we'll focus on four. Can we agree that Academic Search and AGB, they're top on both of those lists by pretty good score? Can we agree that they should be two of the four?

- [Man] Yes.

- Okay, we have one viewpoint that we should have EFL. We've got another viewpoint we should have RH Perry. Try and be as equitable as we can as we go about selecting slot three and slot four. EFL, I guess I was disappointed in the community college connection that they have in terms of placements, nationally with President searches. And they're a good partner for us obviously with our other positions, but I guess unless I overlooked something, I thought their presidential searches at the community college level weren't as strong as some of the other companies.

- [Woman] Agree.

- And it is a local company so back to our point of are we giving local companies good opportunities. Trustee Musil?

- I had RH Perry as my third choice if I'm reading this right, it's what I remember. But rather than get into a lobbying effort with who we individually liked, there is a pretty clear break between four and five. I did not have Myers McRae ahead of RH Perry & Associates, but I would suggest that we take the first four on the list from points total.

- So you're suggesting Academic Career and Myers McRae, correct?

- I think that's consistent with the approach.

- It's consistent with our scoring as a team I guess.

- [Gerald] I like RH Perry.

- And who would you have them in place of?

- Oh I'd take, if you're asking me Mr. Chair, I'd take the top two, RH Perry and EFL.

- Well Academic Career and Executive Search, it's pretty strong as a third slot.

- [Gerald] But they're the third alphabetically.

- I see.

- [Gerald] I don't have any reason, I'm not . I'm not .

- Chair Cook I've got a question. Do we have any issues by interviewing folks by bouncing around without taking the top four, you know, bouncing around from one two and then down to five or six? Are there any issues with that that we've done the scoring? Is that arbitrary?

- No, the short answer is no. I mean you arrive at this decision as much as possible out of objectivity against the criteria in the RFP and that's a huge part of the public procurement process. But you did send RFPs so you certainly have the ability to interview anyone.

- I will say though to tag team to that, you can show by score it does put that objectivity in the process, but it doesn't mean that you couldn't. It's just typically how we do these types of RFPs in public procurement is we try to make an objective decision based on the scoring.

- Thank you, with that, I would support Trustee Cross's suggestion of bringing in RH Perry and EFL to round out the four. And I'll just say for EFL, one of the reasons I scored them higher is I noted they didn't have a strong experience recruiting college presidents, but they have an outstanding record of recruiting business executives.

- [Jerry] They do.

- And I'm not one that thinks that we have a mandate to bring in a academic that's floated around community colleges per se.

- I would entertain a motion that we select Academic Search Inc., AGB Search and I'm hearing a consensus for RH Perry and EFL.

- [Man] So moved.

- [Man] Second.

- Trustee Lawson.

- [Angeliina] Myers was number five for me. So I can see the first two Myers and RHP.

- Trustee Musil.

- I don't wanna be wed to this as I've already talked about how overwhelming it is, but whether we knew exactly what we were doing with the process we did a process that tried to be objective and the top four, the 12 point difference between four and five is not insignificant. It's a same 12 points between three and two. So I really am comfortable taking the top four there and respecting the fact that others on this board put Myers McRae and Academic Career and Executive Search ahead of RH Perry when I had RH Perry as my third choice. But I don't think there's enough distinction between or among applications to slice and dice too deeply. So I'll support the top four. I won't be upset if we drop down to five and six.

- Well my number one choice I'll reveal was Greenwood/Asher because I liked a lot about what they were about and they're seven.

- [Man] That's just .

- So I'm compromising on this.

- [Gerald] Are you serious?

- [Nancy] That was mine as well.

- We have a motion and a second on the floor for Academic Search, AGB, RH Perry and EFL I believe was the motion. So if you vote in favor of that, I mean if we have a majority on that, that's who they'll be. If you don't want those four, I would say then you'll vote no on that issue.

- Would it be appropriate, I don't think I've ever done this, to substitute the motion and ask for unanimity? Can we do that in the approval process? Like arrive at four and that everyone supports it?

- Well I really would like all four. I'd like for us to support all four.

- I'm working to reach a consensus here, so that I substitute a motion to say, I support Trustee Snider and I's motion, but then further ask the Board for a second that we--

- Did you make the motion?

- He made it.

- [Paul] He brought it up.

- Would you like--

- [Paul] That you'd entertain it. I said so moved.

- Would you like to withdraw your motion?

- [Paul] I would be happy to do that and just note that I have no objection to what Trustee Musil suggested.

- Would you withdraw your second?



- I would.

- So Counsel have I done that properly? That they've withdrawn the motion?

- [Counsel] Yes.

- [Angeliina] Can I make a motion then?

- Trustee Lawson.

- [Angeliina] Can I make a motion? That we vote on Academic Search, AGB Search, Myers McRae, RH Perry & Associates.

- Okay we have a motion for one, two, four and five. Is there a second?

- [Greg] I'm not gonna say it. We agreed on the first two.

- Okay let's--

- [Greg] Can we just--

- Let's do this if we can. Trustee Lawson if you would, we don't have a second on it. Would you make a motion for approving Academic Search and AGB Search so we get the first two on the Board?

- Okay, so I will rescind that motion and then--

- [Woman] It failed.

- [Jerry] It just failed. You don't have to rescind it.

- So then my motion would be to vote on Academic Search and AGB Search as just the two that we're working towards.

- Okay, do we have a second? All in favor of inviting those two in say aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? We have those two taken care of. Slots three and four.

- RH Perry.

- I think we, it appears that Myers McRae is on both, on all those lists. And so I would ask for a motion to approve Myers McRae.

- [Man] So moved.

- Is there a second?

- [Angeliina] Second.

- We have a motion and a second to include Myers McRae. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Greg] Nay.

- [Gerald] No.

- Lindstrom did you vote?

- [David] I did not.

- Let's call the vote again. All in favor of Myers McRae say aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Gerald] No.

- [Greg] I wanna change mine to aye, because I said I'd support the top four.

- So you leave me hanging out.

- So that is a six one vote.

- I have nothing against Myers McRae. I really--

- And Trustee Cross said that he would support whatever we decide so that's said.

- [Gerald] I'll support the vote of the Board.

- So we've got three: Academic Search, AGB Search and Myers McRae.

- [Man] Academic Search, Academic Search, Academic Search.

- We have a difference of opinion evidently between Academic Career and RH Perry.

- [Angeliina] I'd like to move to approve RH Perry.

- [Man] Second.

- Motion to second. Any discussion? Andy discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- [Gerald] Yes.

- Opposed? Motion carried. So I think the four Jim and Janelle are: Academic Search, AGB Search--

- You counted my vote, sorry, I'm in favor.

- Yeah, Myers McRae and RH Perry. And I would like to reinforce what Trustee Cross said that we have, what's that big word you used? Unanimity?

- [Gerald] It must be unanimous.

- That we unanimously support as a Board those four firms to be called in on next Tuesday. Thank you, it is a laborious process and for all of you snickering and laughing out in the public watching this group try and find four people, I agree with you, it's kind of a challenging thing to do. But thank you very much. So Trustee Ingram.

- [Nancy] That's my report.

- That concludes the Management Report. Okay thank you. And thank you Janelle and Jim. Appreciate it.

- [Jim] Thank you.

- [Janelle] Thank you.

- Next item is the Audit Committee Report and I have that here somewhere. The Audit Committee met on Thursday, August 8th. In your packet you see everybody that was present. We had an update on activities in audits. We did the bi-annual travel and expense review. Mr. McDade represented the results of the review noting that reimbursements were found to be reasonable, complete, accurate and substantially in compliance with policies. We had two nonconforming expense reimbursements which have been addressed and clarified. They weren't big issues, but taken care of. Proposed updates, Trustee use of college resource and reimbursement guidelines. Mr. McDade indicated that the guidelines are being updated to mirror the following JCC Board policies: Reimbursement of travel expenses policy, same day travel operating procedures, overnight travel operating procedures and appropriate expenditures on college funds operating procedure. We're cleaning up those policies so there's no misunderstanding or confusion. Those policies are going through our Policy Review Committee as all policies go through. Those policies will come back to this Board I think Justin, we were targeted October. It'll go through the Policy and Procedures Committee between now and September and then they'll come back to this Board for approval.

- [Gerald] Is Justin here? Mr. McDade here?

- Yes, uh-huh, Annual Trustee Expense Reimbursement Report, Mr. McDade presented the Trustee Expense Report for fiscal year 18, 19. Quarterly projects update, Mr. McDade highlighted projects planned for the upcoming quarter. These included the outsourced IS audit of hardware and software licenses and a review of the JCC-backed facility rental program. Ms. Warner shared a presentation which highlighted the vision behind the Business Continuity Initiative and provided a status update on the project which by the way was really well-done. The Business Continuity Initiative is if for some reason, natural or other, situation that causes the college to close what is our business continuity program to continue the operation of the college. And I want to assure the Board that I think Nancy and I both really feel good about what the college is doing in that whole initiative, a lot of work. Ms. Warner emphasized the importance of collaboration and teamwork in achieving the gains made thus far and the key role of these factors will continue to play in closing the gap which had been identified. Ethics Report line update between April one and June 12, reports were received via the JCCC Ethics Report Hotline. Four reports were received anonymously and as of August 1st, 2019 all have been reviewed and nine have been appropriately addressed and the other three are being taken care of. JCC Behavioral Intervention Team, the KOPS-WATCH student complaints. Mr. McDade and Dr. Weber presented a year-to-date and an annual statistical report of the KOPS-WATCH case data. Dr. Weber and Paul Kyle both provided insights on the data presented in the Student Complaints Portal Report. We do have one recommendation

tonight on our working agenda for the 2019, 2020 school year and it is the recommendation of the Audit Committee that the Board of Trustees approve the fiscal year 2019, 2020 Audit Committee working agenda shown subsequently in your Board packet and I'll make that motion.

- [Man] Second.

- I guess I probably shouldn't make the motion.

- I'll ask you to make the motion.

- So moved.

- So we have a motion and a second. The working calendar, all in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- Opposed?

- [Angeliina] No.

- Six one vote and that concludes the Audit Committee Report.

- Could I just--

- Sure.

- Add something to that, I know at the meeting the other day I had asked a question about the student processes and someone had asked me about it from the community and I wanted to reiterate that we have a formal complaint process. I do not doubt that complaint process at all and I just wanna make that publicly clear that I believe we are doing a very good job, that sometimes there are not even formal complaints that are made that are addressed by our staff. And I just want everyone to know that I think

we're doing a great job with that. The Audit Committee only meets quarterly, so I did wanna provide that info, thank you.

- Thank you very much.

- You're welcome.

- Human resources, Trustee Lawson.

- Thank you Mr. Chair, let me get to my calendar here. We met on August 2nd and we reviewed the Human Resource Committee Working Agenda for 2019 to 2020. The changes that were done: Every year they find a different group of people that they wanna do a salary study on and this year is gonna be the non-exempt positions. Then there's also, let me move this back, the Human Resource Technology Support Initiatives. They add and provide updates on the new applicant tracking system implementation. Becky I don't know if you wanna explain just a little bit about that.

- The Applicant Tracking System, the system we have now we've had for about seven years and so we went out for an RP and the Board approved as our new vendor. So this will be probably a year long implementation for us to actually get it updated and working. We'll be talking to . So our informational go from being introduced . And so we will probably get it up and running in spring, but we'll have both systems running side by side just to make sure it goes seamless. But this is the system that applicants, people who are applying for positions at the college, they will use it. Our supervisor will use it and then HR will use it.

- So it's the recommendation of the Human Resource Committee that the Board of Trustees approve the Human Resource Committee Working Agenda for 2019 to 2020 as shown in the board packet.

- [Man] Second.

- I have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Any discussion? All in favor say signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- And the next item that we looked at was the Social Media policy. Pulling up the agenda here, apologize. So the Social Media Policy seemed pretty standard. It crossed out and just changed a few words. The one question that I had was the change from JCC Personnel Policies to the College Policies and Procedures. I wanted to find out what those procedures were and I was informed by our college attorney that it was just a change in the language, but the policies still remain as if it was original. Then the other question I have is the students and employees that the Social Media Policy just reflects students and employees and that was the gist of the Social Media Policy.

- [Jerry] So there is--

- A recommendation there. It is the recommendation of the HR Committee that the Board of Trustees accept the recommendation of the college administration to approve the modification to the Social Media Policy 520.00 as show in the Board packets.

- [Man] Second.

- We have a motion and a second, any discussion? Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- And the rest of the Committee, we talked about different salary grades in our consent agenda, the different pay ranges from the levels going up. And talked about if any questions or concerns about staff versus full-time, the different terminologies used, how that would be seen in the Board packet. Then we went down and got a nice report for the Health Retirement HRA and then we also had some public members who wanted to find out some more questions about the Voluntary Employee Retirement Benefit called VERB and get some update on that. We did find out that there would be a small increase in the salary because there is a 3% increase in everyone's salary so that added 180,000 to the participants. The eligible participants that we had voted on back a few months ago was about 280. After reflecting on everything, there was about 15 extra eligible participants and that added 320,000 so their 295 eligible participants were 6.3 million and each participant is about 21,300. And I know you had some



questions in the Human Resource Committee, so wasn't sure if you wanted to mention anything about that.

- Well I think Trustee Ingram reported from the Management Committee that you looked at the VERB program, Voluntary Employee Retirement Benefit and we had initially reserved 5.8 million dollars for that and now we're reserving 6.3 million dollars. And I had some concerns about that increasing each year because we don't know how many become eligible and how many take it. But we know that if salaries increase that will increase the level and it simply is, I mean, we adopted it which I supported, it's something we need to keep an eye on because it freezes amount of our reserves that we can't use for anything else. But we've adopted it and we have to be cognizant of whatever the number is and Jerry and Becky got the number right so it is what it is.

- Okay, the last section was the overview of the Employee Engagement Survey, the group comparisons. It broke it down by three different categories, the overall favorability of class description and that was broken down by part-time, full-time, bargaining unit, 10-month bargaining unit, admin and then favorable by age, 25 to about 66 and tenure, you know, anybody working less than one year to 15 years and over. I know I had some concerns about this because I could, from looking at this, it felt like I could easily target who are the low favorable marks on here and I think that was something that is not exactly what research is supposed to do when we come back with some feedback form. So we talked about that and what was mentioned is the favorability score was basically determined on an overall versus, I mean overall was a net positive or negative. I think Dr. McCloud talked about that. There was a question about how was the measurement grouped and the explanation was: For example if there was eight questions out of 12 then that would be an overall positive favorability. So the concerns I have around that methodology is, for example, say this bottled water or popcorn or whatever I have on my desk here, if four of the questions that I have are about packaging and the packaging I like, but the one question that I have is terrible taste, that would be based on this methodology as a positive rating. So the weight on each measurement is not making sense as when a lot of the questions that we're looking at that I heard sounded, if there's a positive rating score of I like my co-workers, but a negative score on distrusting senior leadership, there's no weight, it's all seen as equal and that is then seen as positive. So there was concerns from me when I look at this data and then I also contacted Quantum to ask them just about their best practices. I did not ask them, we did not discuss the data from the college and I wanted to be able to understand how they conduct their business and their model. I learned that averaging this way can create some false interpretations of the data that companies are providing us and that data we received had such a strong data integrity that these additional breakdowns should not be necessary. Then listening to Melanie Harvey talk about the issues that are starting to come forward from the listening session it concerns me if these listening sessions are used as witch hunts for troublemakers, 'cause I can already identify who they are and I'm not understanding that. So those were some concerns that I had when we received this information and I continue to have some concerns about the follow through of this information.

- [Jerry] Any questions of Trustee Lawson? Trustee Musil.

- Well I might add a little different perspective on this. We have already had the detailed slicing and dicing of the Engagement Survey and that was reported to Human Resources Committee a month ago. There are about 3,000 ways you could look at this data and this was one way to look at it. It wasn't presented as a final answer. It wasn't presented as the only way to analyze the data. It was presented as one way to look at it. We have heard from the start of the Engagement Survey that the concern and the protections against identifying small groups of people so that you can identify somebody. And the groups that were shown there, people that have been here under a year, that's a number of people. People who've been here over 15 years is a large number of people and I know that Karen Martley is careful in that. I appreciate Melanie's statement that she heard from one person that thought that they had heard back from their supervisor, that's inappropriate and I'm sure will be dealt with. And there are plenty of ways for employees, not just faculty, who Melanie mentioned have some extra protections to report incidents where they believe their supervisor has come back and done something to them. If somebody could point to me anything that resembled a witch hunt on this campus in the eight years I've been here before, I would be surprised. You have to use the data in various ways to get to the goals that we all want and I have utmost faith in Karen and her team to do that. And if anybody has a concern that their supervisor is using that against them, I hope they will report it up through the proper channels, because if it gets to the President or this Board I know it will be taken care of swiftly.

- [Man] Karen, where are we now with regards to the listening sessions?

- [Karen] We completed our last listening sessions this week during professional development days. So now that we have information, we need to roll that information up and take a look at it and then determine next steps and set some priorities around that.

- [Man] And then are you gonna be putting together a report or how are you gonna report the roll up.

- It'll be a report back. I'm not sure what that's going to look like yet. I've said in the listening sessions I'm not the one that can make that decision by myself so we have to determine what that model's gonna look like and we'll work with on it.

- Okay, very good. Learning Quality Trustee Snider.

- Mr. Chair I wasn't finished. So one of the concerns I heard for this evaluation was how do we, where are the benchmarks, how do we know we're being successful in the process that we're rolling out. And what I kept hearing back was, well you take this survey again in two years, except Quantum, their best practices actually three months, six months, nine months and one year later where you engage

company leaders, local leaders, managers and teams in a very structured outline. So to just take another test or survey in two years is going to replicate a very similar voice. I know that's best practices that are out online, so I'm curious as to how we can utilize?

- [Karen] There are best practices for the survey and for Pulse surveys. I'm not sure which one you're talking about.

- It seems like Quantum has a pretty basic--

- [Karen] They do.

- Structure, timeline for action.

- [Karen] Pulse surveys that you can push out throughout the year as well too as a follow up.

- So are you saying you're not familiar with what I'm talking about?

- I'm familiar with the Pulse surveys and then the regular survey.

- [Angeliina] A timeline for action and breakdown by responsibility.

- [Man] Mr. Chair?

- [Angeliina] Are you familiar with that? The three month, six month, nine months. It sounds like--

- [Jerry] The Pulse survey.

- I think you're talking about the Pulse survey and the three, six and nine month.

- [Jerry] Trustee Cross.

- [Angeliina] It's usually a recommendation.

- I'll never forget Ms. Martley, I think it was my senior year at Lawrence High, I took some Shakespeare class, I do love Shakespeare, good Shakespeare. And my dad had always said to me when I was reading Shakespeare going through the early plays, like how did this guy come up with this? You know this is brilliant. My dad's like, well he's just trying to make money. He's trying to get people into the theater. He was trying to get people to watch it. I understand and appreciate Trustee Lawson's questions, but it seems to me that Quantum's in the business of selling stuff. I mean is it possible that they want you to have the survey more often so that you'll buy their service more often?

- Well I mean when you look at best practices, it also has to figure culture too. So when we look at trying to run a one-year cycle on employee engagement survey, one of the things we come up against are we have people that are out for three months, so it's hard to get full participation during that time. We have a pretty lengthy break during the holiday break as well, between semesters and a spring break. So when we start to factor all of those things in, by the time you're rolling out then you have really large gaps between getting that data and then handing that information back out. So that's one of the reasons we're on a two-year cycle.

- And it reminds me of, I think it was the first two or three years here, Dr. Sopcich used to talk about how there was initiative fatigue, we had initiative fatigue. I dunno.

- [Jerry] It's a good memory, initiative fatigue.

- It seems to me, in order to have more meaningful input in the process you stagger it out. I'm just a dumb lawyer. I have to boil it down.

- Well that's part of it and part of that was the recommendation when we work with the committee that did that initial implementation. How we would stagger that out with the length of time would be to roll that out. You could certainly do one once a year, but I'm not sure we would complete a full cycle, get all the training in and start to get the implementation and talk to everybody within one year. It would be a really quick turn in our culture.

- [Gerald] Thank you.

- I appreciate the detail of the discussion and I appreciate Trustees interested in some of that detail. But I would say again, that we have a talented staff. They deal with these kinds of things day in and day out. I think we as a Board know that there's an issue on communications whether it was through HLC or the Engagement Survey. I believe those issues are being addressed, will continue to be addressed and I have all the confidence in our staff to do what's right, whether we do a survey every three months or six months or two years. Trustee Musil.

- [Greg] I'm done.

- Okay, Trustee Snider, learning quality.

- [Angeliina] That concludes my report, thank you.

- Trustee Snider.

- Thank you Mr. Chairman. Your hard working Learning Quality Committee met on Monday, August 5th at 8:30 a.m. in the morning. Minutes of that meeting are in the packet. One of the highlights of the meeting was a Sabbatical presentation by Dawn Gale, Professor of Philosophy here. She was able to go to Israel and further her Jewish studies. That has been a lifelong dream of hers. Trustee Lindstrom was able to tie back the trip that you all took and I think it was meaningful for him as well so it was real interesting presentation and Sabbaticals in general I think are one of the reasons that faculty benefit here. That is one of the reasons we have high retention of faculty so hopefully we can continue that. I have three recommendations tonight, first two are slight policy updates. The first one ensures that policy numbers and references tie back to appropriate documents. So it is the recommendation of the Learning Quality Committee that the Board of Trustees accept the recommendation of the college administration to approve modification to the Students With Disabilities Policy 322.00 as shown subsequently in the Board packet and I make that motion.

- [Man] Second.

- We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed

- Recommendation deals with how the college determines academic standing. It is recommendation of Learning Quality Committee that the Board of Trustees accept the recommendation of the college administration to approve modification of the Academic Standing Policy 314.06 as shown in the Board packet and I will move that motion.

- Second.

- We have a motion and a second. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- Mr. Chairman my final recommendation deals with the academic calendar. It is the recommendation of the college administration and the Faculty Association Board of Trustees approve the 2021-22 academic calendar as shown in the Board packet and I will move that motion.

- We have a motion. And a second? Trustee Musil?

- [Greg] I know, when do we implement the 12-week semester versus 13 or whatever the numbers were?

- We're a year out and we're moving back from 16 to 15.

- [Greg] Okay, so we'll start fall of 20?

- Yes.

- [Greg] Okay.

- And this is the second iteration of planning for that calendar. So last year we approved it for that first information and they've worked out a couple more kinks. Do we vote, no.

- All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- [Board Member] Yes.

- Opposed? Motion carries.

- That concludes my report.

- Thank you Trustee Snider. President's recommendations, Treasurer's report, Trustee Musil.

- Mr.Chair the Board packet contains a preliminary unaudited Treasurer's report for fiscal year ended June 30th 219. We're on a fiscal year July one through June 30th. It does not include fiscal year end adjustments. Some items of note, page one in the general post-secondary technical education fund summary, total revenues increased by 3.5% in 19 over 18 primarily due to 5.1 million dollar increase in property tax revenues resulting from increased assessed valuation. The college's Mill Levy was reduced by 0.25 mils in fiscal year from 9.50 to 9.25. The general PTE Fund expenses were approximately 142 million, three million more than in the previous year as far as expenses primarily related to the capital expenditures on our Facilities Master Plan. Our unencumbered cash balance at the end of the year was 121.3 million, about almost five million dollars higher than the same time last year. And during June we received 42,255,792 dollars in property tax revenues from the county and all the expenditures of the Primary Operating Funds were within approved budgetary limits. So it's the recommendation of the college administration that the Board of Trustees approve the Treasurers Report for the month end of June 30, 2019 subject to audit and I so move.

- [Man] Second.

- Motion and a second. Any discussion? Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Monthly report to the Board, Dr. Sopcich.

- Thank you Dr. Cook. First of all the monthly report to the Board, there's some incredible things in there. I'd like for you though, on page 18 to note that over tonight we heard Beth Edmonds speak, Head of the Faculty Senate and she's featured on page 18 as someone who's invited to a two-day event at NSF, that's National Science Foundation Headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia to review the NSF S-STEM Track-2 Design Development Grant for single institutions that award grants up to one million dollars. This is Beth's third time that she's been a participant in this and has really led greater, I guess you could say engagement with the NSF for community colleges and this is fantastic. She represents our college extremely well at that level. Second, I'd like to recognize Karen Martley and her team and I see Farrell back there in row two, for an outstanding PDD week of professional development days. I mean it was excellent. The in-service was fantastic, a lot of good reviews on that. It's a lot of hard work. How many sessions? How many PDD sessions did you put together?

- [Woman] 80 something.

- 80 something. And so that's like about 80 individual presenters, plus probably those around us at this table were a part of that. Dr. Weber's presentation was so popular, went on for two hours, 60 minutes over the original time designation. So thank you for a wonderful PDD for this semester. It's a great way to start.

- [Greg] What does PDD stand for again.

- What?

- [Greg] What does PDD stand for again?

- It's Professional Development Days.

- [Greg] Oh okay. Thank you.



- I'd like to make the record clear that I did say that. I did do the acronym.

- [Jerry] Keep going.

- Tonight we're going to have a lightening round of one. There is much discussion obviously about the HLC and what we need to do over the upcoming months and I've asked Sheri Barrett. Sheri is our Director of Office of Assessment Evaluation and Institutional Outcomes. Sheri you're gonna give us a little overview of what we need to do over the upcoming year, correct?

- Correct.

- [David] But before you get started, how many years have you worked with HLC?

- You know I had to think about that because my first foray into work in higher education was at the University of Missouri, Kansas City, Kansas and in my very first year I did an accreditation report for a specialized accrediting body for the school business. So early on in my academic career I got involved in accreditation and I have been an active member of the Higher Learning Commission for 18 years now. I sit on a Board of a specialized accrediting agency where we make decisions about programs and I've been a Chair, a sight team reviewer, I'm getting ready for a visit in Ohio coming up in October. I just finished a portfolio. I have mentored organizations on behalf of the Higher Learning Commission. So I am an accreditation geek and proud of it. So I have a lot of experience in this realm.

- [David] And we're so lucky to have you here, working for JCCC. So Sheri, why don't you take us through this presentation.

- So I'm an academic at heart and I can't do any presentation without setting context and so as I look to what I wanna talk to the Board about tonight I had to look to the past, at the present and then to the future moving forward. I don't know how many, if I quizzed the group and quizzed the Board of Trustees specifically. I don't know if you could tell me when this campus gained its accreditation, there's a hint on the screen. 1975 we became a candidate in 1972 because its a long process. So a little bit about, a little bit about accreditation. I know you guys have missed me this last year when I wasn't here talking about it constantly, but it is both a process and a status. We go through the ongoing process everyday in many many ways. We go through a process of ongoing accreditation. We are constantly in the process of accreditation. We're constantly looking forward in our accreditation processes. It is also a status. An institution is accredited because of the processes they go through. The accredited status means that

students, the public, can have confidence in the kind of programs that we offer and the kind of institution that we are. JCCC is an accredited institution by the Higher Learning Commission. We have 10 years of accreditation at this point in time. This is my favorite slide and just for the record in case Greg Musil asks me, I have all the acronyms written down so that when--

- [Greg] I'm impressed.

- [Sheri] Okay . I just wanted to show this piece because accreditation is fairly complex and it is influenced by a large number of factors. There's things like NACIQI which is the National Advisory Committee for Institutional Quality and Integrity. It is the body that accredits the accrediting institutions and works with the Department of Education. PEAQ, PEAQ was a former crediting process that we had at the Higher Learning Commission that stood for Pure Evaluator Quality Assurance. We have CHEA, who is another organization that works in coordination with the Higher Learning Commission and CHEA's the council for higher education accreditation. Federal compliance, If I could draw a picture of Federal compliance, it would have started as a dot about 10 years ago and would now fill the entire slide in terms of the impact it has had on the accreditation processes. Assumed practices, those are things that we must adhere to. All institutions have a certain level that you must meet at the very base. Those are kinda like the assumed, well of course it's in the title. Assumed practices, it's the floor that we all build upon. NCA, some of you are old enough to remember when it was called the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges before it became the Higher Learning Commission. The Criterion for Accreditation, it is an ever-changing. We have this idea in our heads that the criterion is a fixed thing that just sits there. By Federal mandate every five years every accrediting body must go through the processes of reevaluating their criteria for accreditation. Beth referenced in her beginning thing that she looked at the 2020, because even the criterion by which we were accredited this last time, with is the 2018 will change in the fall of 2020 and we will have new criteria for accreditation. That's what I mean when I say it's always forward-looking, because it's always changing. Standard Pathway is fairly new. We were an AQIP school up until this past summer. AQIP was Academic Quality Improvement Program and it was a measure by which we as an institution beginning in the early 2000s were always looking at ways that we can improve ourselves around a series of practices which I'm gonna highlight briefly. So right now at this moment in time, because I checked the website this afternoon and they haven't changed yet we have the assumed practices that all schools must address. It covers everything from the Board of trustees. What is the role of the Board in terms of approving the budget? What is the role of the Board in adopting Board policy in hiring a new President? That's it. It's also adjusting things like, do we have the appropriate resources in place? Do we have the appropriate evaluation of faculty? The right faculty when things come out about faculty credentialing that came under the idea of assumed practice? Criteria for accreditation itself, I mentioned there are five of those that we'll look at that are in the process of changing even as we speak and the Federal compliance which is an ever-shifting sand upon which we try not to sink and that has to do with our ability to give Federal financial aid and has to do with practices related to those Federal financial aid. Isn't that the largest report we submit when we go through the accreditation process? It was over a 1,000 pages, light reading for your bedtime. So criteria for accreditation is very broad. It speaks to mission. Do we as an institution have a mission that is stated publicly? Do we adhere to that in our decision making processes? Do we understand ourselves as an

open-access community colleges? Do we set policy? Do we set procedures? Are we supportive of that mission? Criterion two has to do with ethics and integrity and responsible conduct. Again, it talks to things about the Board. Is the Board in their lane? Is the college in its lane? How do we act at purchasing, even things like how do we deal with vendors outside et cetera. Criterion three and four, I think this is really important to note, because for the Higher Learning Commission it's all about teaching and learning. Guess what? That's our primary mission. And so we talk about things like resources and support and evaluation and improvement. Those wonderful things like student learning outcomes that I'm very fond of. And then finally criterion five has to do with resources, planning and institutional effectiveness. These are broad categories, but what's within those broad categories do respond to things like the Higher Authorization Act that has to be voted on and responds to the Department of Education and pressures that they place upon the Higher Learning Commission. I mentioned before in 2009 the Higher Learning Commission got a visit from our favorite Inspector General of the the United States and there were a lot of things that came out of that based on the pressures from that particular agency. Also the Consumer Advocate Bureau. The Consumer Bureau has gotten involved in accreditation and what we tell our students and what we promise our students. Some of that was based on some of the debacle I'll call it, related to for-profit institutions. AQIP, I wanna talk just a minute about AQIP because I think sometimes we get a little in the weeds understanding what AQIP is. I know there's been references by folks on campus and sometimes occasionally in meetings here about AQIP and whether or not we're meeting those. They are not the criteria for accreditation, let me be plain about that. They are instead a series of categories that we could organize continuing improvement projects around and they morphed over time as well. When we first became an AQIP institution and filed our 2011 report we had nine categories and you see those nine listed there. In the meantime they shifted to six categories and this past summer it went away altogether. AQIP is no longer a pathway by which we can maintain our accreditation. No school's a pathway for AQIP. Instead it's open pathway and standard pathway. Open pathway, which is what we are right now. Our institutions that are in good standing and they're moving forward to their accreditation processes. So let's look for just half a second at the timeline for our recent accreditation history. I decided not to go back to 1975, I thought you might get a little restless, so I started in 2010 which was the last big submit change request that we put in as an institution and that was for us to offer distance education to join that online universe and we were approved for that. Next, in 2011 we submitted what was called a mid-term systems portfolio and the purpose for those mid-term portfolios is an AQIP institution was to give us suggestions on some different projects we might undertake as an AQIP institution to prepare us for the final submission of our eight-year portfolio which is the culminating portfolio. We did that in June of 2017. We submitted our eight-year Systems Portfolio and for the first time since we became an AQIP institution, again, because accreditation's always a moving target. We had a comprehensive site visit, because that was a new requirement for AQIP schools. So we had a wonderful team come. We loved them. There was seven of them. They came and spent three days with us as an institution and out of that we were re-accredited for 10 years with a interim report that we received staff analysis on in July of 2019 which brings us to now. So we received that staff analysis and they games us nine months to complete some steps. And really, if you look at the two reports, what the original feedback from the site team was and what we received as a staff analysis, it is a completion of the work that was begun. The work that Mickey and the Faculty Senate and Faculty Association undertook is being continued. They've asked us to, first of all they said, you need to capture this work, because they want us to report it out. So we're gonna keep track of all the work that's done this coming year and write about it. Second, they want us to create and review and approve institutional

policies. So we're looking at a cross functional team of faculty, of staff and administration to research what's standard practice, what's good practice, who are institutions that we think do this really well from a shared governance standpoint and recommend institutional structures in support of shared governance. We'll make that recommendation to the cabinet which would make that recommendation to the Board for those kinds of institutional documentations. The Faculty Association and Faculty Senate have been asked to provide documentation on their responsibilities to work together to determine, the faculty have to determine this, what is those responsibilities? What are those roles and how are they gonna play out? So that's the work that they're undertaking. And then finally, we have to reply to this by May 1st of 2020 and guess what? This is my favorite part, by the time we turn this May 1st document in I'll begin the next assurance argument, because it's an ever-moving, ever-forward process. So this next summer I'll start a next assurance argument which will be due in two years. So we're always moving forward. We're also always doing yearly reports to the Higher Learning Commission that involves institutional research around our fiscal responsibility, around our counts, around our numbers, those kinds of things. So wanted to give you a nice broad context for accreditation in general, how we as an institution participate in it and the very nature of it which is always forward, constantly forward, everywhere forward. That's a quote by the way, by an Abbott from the third century. So it's been about forward. So can I answer any questions?

- Sheri let me just start it out by saying that, and you heard tonight the Faculty Association, the Faculty Senate have been consistent in their request for shared governance. We've discussed it a little bit in collegial steering since I've been on the committee and prior to that. Are you confident that through the steps you've just outlined that between administration, Faculty Association, Faculty Senate that by May 1, actually submitted by then prior probably March or so we'll have an institutional piece as you call it that everybody will have input into the shared governance issues.

- I would say I am confident, but I'd include one more group that you didn't mention and that's in this group. We're gonna have AMS and staff, ALS staff represented, because institutional governance is not about any one group. It's about all the voices and so we have different branches of the college, they need to be involved in that institutional shared governance. One of the discussions that we've had with cabinet regarding this next step for us is the fact that currently we don't have a framework upon which to rest shared governance. We haven't ever adopted a framework upon which we could say this is the operational processes we're gonna go forward with. I think this committee with this cross functional with faculty voice, with staff voice and administrative voice I think it is without a doubt the mechanism by which we can reach that agreement. I think the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Association are entirely capable folks that can reach an understanding of their roles and responsibility and codify that as well.

- And if you would, go back to the criteria for accreditation if you would. So I'm going to distribute to you all this while we're talking about this. Our approved Board policies as it relates to duties and responsibilities of a Trustee and the Board. But as you look at this slide, I really appreciate criterion

three and four, teaching and learning and it's so easy for an institution of this size to get caught up in other issues that we sometimes forget the focus of what we're here for.

- [Sheri] Correct.

- And that's criterion three and criterion four, teaching and learning all driven by a strong mission and hopefully we are doing that with high integrity, ethical and responsible conduct. I was interested in your comment about this whole governance issue also involves Trustees and we as Trustees probably forget about what our responsibilities are. I asked Terry to put together a copy for use for a quick reminder, but I've pulled out of sequence a Code of Conduct Policy 114 and I think if you listen to Sheri talk about HLC expectations of a Trustee, it was select, support and promote the success of the President through the evaluation process and that whole selection process which we're about to encounter. Secondly, to adopt policy and most of those policies are driven by administration up to through our committee work to our Board. And then we have a fiduciary responsibility to ensure as we've adopted the budget that we know where the revenue is coming from and we have some idea of where we're spending the money. And I would add a fourth to that and I believe a fourth responsibility of a Trustee is to be a positive community ambassador for the college in the community. These are consistent with ACCT, with KACCT, with any kind of training that we have for Trustees on best practices, those four things. And I'd like to draw your attention to the Code of Conduct Policy 11401 which is the front cover of the handout I just gave you. And I'm gonna take some time to share some of these because I think all of us fall into a behavior sometimes of forgetting who we are and what we are as Trustees. Go down to bullet item number three, to work with fellow Board members in the spirit of harmony and cooperation in spite of differences of opinion. I thought Trustee Cross did a nice job tonight talking about will we have unanimity when we finish this process for a search firm we need to work together. That arises during vigorous debates of points of issue, civility and mutual caring for one another and for the employees of the college shall guide the conduct of Board members. And it goes on to say Board members shall promote mutual respect among one another and among all college employees and shall not use their position to embarrass, intimidate or threaten employees. Members of the Board of Trustees are leaders in the community and their conduct is important to the college and to the community. Next bullet point, to base personal decisions upon all available facts in each situation to vote their honest conviction in every case unswayed by partisan bias of any kind, therefore to abide by and uphold the final majority decision of the Board. We've had differences on votes tonight. That's fine, we have differing viewpoints on the issues. But what this really says is when we walk out of this room then we're going to support what that action the Board took and not create problems outside of this Board meeting. Next bullet item, to remember at all times that as an individual the Board member has no legal authority outside the meetings of the board. Therefore, the Board member must conduct relationships with the college employees, the local citizenry and the press on the basis of this fact and engage in no private action that will compromise the Board. And down to the last bullet item, not that the others aren't important to forward through the Board Chair or College President. Any requests for information about college employees and it goes onto the next page to bear in mind that the primary function of the Board is to establish effective policies for the college and to delegate authority for the administration of the educational program and the conduct of college business to the President and employees. And as Chair I

would remind again that any time we have a request for information at the college that we go through the President of the college or through myself as Chair. We've been spending a lot of time as staff dealing with lots of requests and I look around, I think we're all guilty. It's easy for me to forget about going to the President's office and going to see somebody about an activity that somebody has asked me about. I thought this was a good time Sheri to support what HLC says about Trustee governance to review our own policies that you have all approved. And so then the issue becomes, are we behaving accordingly? Any comments or questions of Sheri Barrett? Trustee Snider.

- Thank you. Sheri, appreciate all your expertise and help through these endeavors. My question is if there are any Board actions that will need to be taken as we go down this process?

- There probably will be. So what's happening right now on this current timeline is between, once the groups are pulled together, which that process is getting started, they'll be meeting through probably December and our goal will be to have a recommendation to cabinet. They would come up then through the appropriate Board processes for either, we're having some discussion with council either a board policy and/or Board endorsement of whatever that structure's gonna be. So the plan going forward so that you all are aware of all the steps that we're taking is that you'll see my shining face more often. I will be at probably every other board meeting to answer any questions or give you an update on the current processes and how they're going from the institutional policy standpoint. You know other people are dealing with the FAFS stuff and they'll, I'm sure, report out. My office is gonna be dealing with this institutional policy question.

- [Jerry] Thank you. Trustee Musil.

- I don't wanna suggest, matter of fact, you are not eligible for VERB, just to clarify. I dunno how long you plan to stay here, but I think it's such a valuable asset. Is there a mentee? Are we supporting somebody to continue to do this on behalf of the college? I think it's helpful to have somebody that goes to other schools and does the accreditation study. We talk about succession planning in many ways, seems like this is very important, because you've been so valuable at least to me explaining this as we go through it for the first time in decades that I really wanna make sure we give you support to have somebody that might step into your shoes 10 or 20 years from now.

- We have been encouraging faculty and folk. In fact I've got one I think I have on the hook right now that I'm gonna try and pull in to come to the annual meeting this next spring. And we've had a few folks that have applied for peer review status. It's not as easy as it sounds. They're looking for certain skillsets in any given call for a peer evaluators. I'm lucky I'm in a field of assessment and they always want assessment people. So we are encouraging folks to apply for those peer evaluator opportunities when they come along or trying to take faculty and staff with us to the Higher Learning Commission so we can begin to get them interested in those processes and applying and being part of this. I was very fortunate

when I came along into the process. I was fortunate with the field I was studying in that I was able to get on early on and I've had a great wonderful experience. I think I benefit. I do try and bring that benefit to the college with all the different structures I've seen with the different schools. I will joke and say that the schools that I have been to they're on probation or in trouble. Faculty governance and specifically actually institutional governance has been a recurring theme. I even had one school that was on probation due to some misconduct by Trustees and their President. So there's lots of ways, financial is also another one and assessment of student learning. So I've seen all these different activities and there's always a way back. The whole thing about accreditation, it's always about moving forward, building on your strengths, making sure that you meet these criterion and I believe in the folks we have here in the room are the people that can make this happen.

- Thanks Sheri. Dr. Sopcich.

- Sheri, you didn't it explicitly clear, because you referred to this responsibility falling to your office that you yourself will chair this institution-wide task force.

- [Sheri] I will. That's a yes.

- That's a ringing endorsement. That makes the enthusiasm is--

- The joke was I was at a Cabinet meeting to discuss something else and somebody threw me under the bus. But I, yes, I am gonna chair. I am okay. I am gonna Chair the group because--

- I am gonna Chair this group of cross functional folks that are gonna come together and talk about this. For one thing I think I have the experience to at least bring to it the expectations of the Higher Learning Committee. The Higher Learning Commission for this also looking at AGB and other national organizations that have set policy regarding shared governance and I think we can get there with the right people at the table, which is including everybody.

- And Sheri what's your first step gonna be?

- The first step, the first step that I took actually ties very nicely with Dr. Cook just did. I set a list of what I consider appropriate conduct for the task force. I want this to be collegial. I want this to be with a spirit of listening and responding to one another in a collegial manner with respect and honestly listening to

the ideas that come out and looking at best practice et cetera. So I set a code of conduct as it were for the task force that we'll talk about in our first meeting together.

- [Jerry] Trustee Cross.

- Yeah, I bought tickets to the KU at the K and told my kids like this is based on a code of conduct, like you have to be good in order to qualify. I think this is a tremendous opportunity. In my lifetime I remember both Presidents Reagan and Clinton always talking about how these situations and though we arrive here I think out of strife and difficulty are an interesting opportunity perhaps for one person's legacy at this table. Just to say it, I enjoy being the guy saying things. I thank you for your work on this Sheri and I than everybody here for their input and work. I think that in my observation I think everyone here is seeking in good faith to do their best to understand what goes on and appreciate you.

- [Sheri] Thank you.

- Well when I look at this criteria and then I remember the two students Shelly and Jemima at the session yesterday. This is why we have criteria like this. To ensure that folks like those two who have followed their dream and are becoming something different than they thought they could be and they have great futures ahead of them. So Sheri, thank you very much. Appreciate that.

- [David] Thank you Sheri. And lastly, Dr. Harvey, I'd like to thank you and your leadership team for the statement you made earlier tonight. And also I'd like to thank you for actually sharing your thoughts with me directly. It was very much appreciated. Look forward to more exchanges like that in the future, so thank you. And that closes the report.

- Old business, I think we have none. New business, we have none.

- [Angeliina] I just have a comment. I think it's great Beth was awarded that invitation and I hope that we work hard to make her feel respected by giving her a voice in the process.

- Yeah, good, thank you. Consent agenda is the next item on the agenda that's a timely deal with a number of routine items. Unless a Board member has an item to pull off the consent agenda, I would ask for a motion.



- Better pull this first and second grant?

- What item is that?

- A3, A3. First and second grant from US to the Department of Education Grants. Bulldoze if I may.

- So is it A3? You say that and I don't know what you're talking about. Page 56, one and two I think.

- Oh yes!

- Okay we'll pull A3 from the consent agenda. Any other items to be pulled from the consent agenda? I will entertain a--

- [Angeliina] HR addendum.

- Which number?

- [Angeliina] Ah which number was that?

- B what?

- [Board Members] C.

- C, can I pull C? Okay we're pulling C from the agenda and we're pulling A3 from the agenda. I'll entertain a motion to approve the consent agenda. I move to propose exceptions. Okay, do we have a second?

- [Angeliina] Second.

- [Gerald] Second. We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Item A3 Trustee Cross.

- Yes, I'm just looking at the grants. I have no objections. Just wanted to ask for more information regarding the Adult Education Workforce and Opportunity Grant, ACT Grant and then number two the Carl Perkins Program. Just a brief synopsis of what we're doing there. Could I ask for that?

- [Jerry] So the question is? Take one and I'll take the second one.

- What are they? And they seem exciting and I just wanted to highlight them frankly.

- [Jerry] Sharon go first.

- The first one is the AO-K program. You've probably heard us talk about the where we have joint, we have Adult Education students in the credit classes together. They're co-led and they have coaches that work with them as well too and they learn a job skill along with getting their GED at the same time.

- Is this for, who is it for may I ask? Is it for any specific person or demographic? Or is it just--

- Anyone who would be working on their GED.

- You know I said I come out of a trailer park, it's hard to learn to talk. That was probably one of the most difficult things. So I didn't know if it was for, it's for all of our students?

- [Sharon] Yes.

- It's not simply for maybe people who have ESL?

- [Sharon] No, no.

- Okay.

- [Sharon] And we started with the specific tracks like the CNA. Now we've gotten into railroad. We've done some IT, welding, CT program. So they've broadened that scope of different career paths they can take.

- So and I'm parroting this back if I may. Just to give our students basic English language competencies so that they can survive in a workplace. Is that fair?

- Well they could be taking ESL proficiency, but they're also taking their GED along with and getting the credit at the same time.

- And then number two?

- Yeah the second one is the Carl Perkins Grant. Carl Perkins was reauthorized through the Federal government last spring and so we begun to pick up funds for that. Carl Perkins actually focuses on career and technical education. It allows us to garner extra funds through that grant which we use for extended training for our faculty, new equipment and newer and more progressive technical field as well as being able to pay for some exploratories for new programs that touch anything within the career and technical field such as what we're kind of working on right now and bringing career and technical students from high school ranks who are just now they've completed all of the work that they can at the high school. And so we're trying to bring them in a year early to let them start down the path towards the AA degree in their technical field since there's no more skillset training that they can get at the high school. Some of that is being supported by Carl Perkins dollars and so we used that in a variety of ways. Every year it gets reauthorized every two years, which changes some of the reporting parameters, but the funding has been there and been consistent for about the last 20 years.

- I appreciate all that and I wanted to highlight it as a way of saying that we're not just a feeder school for KU. That's a part of our broad mission here. I'm a KU graduate, I'm sensitive to that and I'm very proud of our mission. Like we're sending kids to K State too. But we have this broad fundamental mission that we do here. All of our stakeholders should be thanked for the support they have.

- [Jerry] Trustee Cross moves item A3 is there a second?

- Second.

- Any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. Item C Trustee Lawson.

- [Gerald] Trustee Ingram informs me she also went to K State.

- [Jerry] Yeah. You're out of order.

- I just had a question about the retirement. So our President, Dr. Sopcich is noted as retirement. Is that the official filing? Or is it resignation?

- [Woman] It's a retirement.

- The official filing is retirement? Okay, was there a letter updating the information that we received?

- [Woman] Generally when someone retires they send in a resignation, but if they build up a retirement and they with a retirement or the retirement, we'll designate as retiree resignation.

- [Jerry] Trustee Lawson moves item C, is there a second?

- [Man] Second.

- [Jerry] Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [Gerald] Yes.

- [Board Members] Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carries. We have no executive session. I would move for adjournment. Motion to adjourn. Motion and a second? All in favor signify by saying aye.

- [All] Aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.