



ACTION

MT. HOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

DATE: *September 16, 2020*

ITEM TITLE: 4.1a

CONTACT PERSON: *Laurie Popp, Executive Assistant to the Board of Education*

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 30, 2020

Session 1011

A meeting of the Mt. Hood Community College District Board of Education was held on July 30, 2020, with a Board Retreat at 2:00 pm, held in the Board Room* at Mt. Hood Community College, 26000 SE Stark Street, Gresham, Oregon, and via Zoom. *Board members only in the board room due to COVID-19 social distancing requirements.

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Members present: Diane Noriega, board chair, Annette Mattson, board vice chair, Jim Zordich, Diane McKeel, Kenney Polson, Andrew Speer (via Zoom), LaVerne Lewis (via Zoom)

Additional Attendees: Dr. Lisa Skari, president, Jennifer DeMent, chief operations officer, Al Sigala, executive director of Development and District Communications, Traci Simmons, director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Noriega welcomed everyone and called the board retreat to order at 2:07 p.m. Dr. Skari provided an icebreaker activity for discussion.

2.0 DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION (DEI)

2.1 Discuss DEI topic and create action steps

The board discussed diversity, equity and inclusion, and leadership, and the need to define leadership and create a broad equity lens. In applying an equity lens across campus, would it be broad enough for use by various departments across campus? Mattson shared it should be broad enough to be used for policy, but concrete enough to be used for day-to-day operations. They discussed clarifying the board's role and the president's role, and reviewing the college mission. Does the college mission accurately and strongly reflect this work? The current Mt. Hood Community College (MHCC) mission is *Transforming Lives / Building Communities*. The board discussed reviewing the college mission this year with a suggestion to add time to the



board training / work sessions for this work. Dr. Skari suggested getting some examples from other community colleges to review various mission statements.

2.2 Outcomes: Action steps prioritized

Questions raised regarding the outcomes:

- Who is the accountability held to? Is it the board?
- How is it tracked?
- What data do we ask for?
- How do we measure that we are following through on this?
- What is the problem?
- Are we solving the same problem?
- Do we have a unified agreement on what problem we are trying to solve?

There was discussion about the priorities, and the first priority was for a policy review of the mission. This includes campus stakeholders being involved in the process to provide input, followed by a recommendation for adoption by the board. The prioritized action steps are:

- Create an equity lens statement
- Work with the Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, and the Diversity Council
- Review the mission statement
- Ask Human Resources for a policy review

Dr. Skari shared that accreditation is moving to new standards, and the first data will be reported in September. This will include how MHCC compares to other schools and how we are doing. Mattson referred to the Reimagine Oregon Project that the State of Oregon is working on, and will forward a link with more information to Dr. Skari to send to board members.

3.0 BOARD OPERATIONS

3.1 Discuss how the board uses time in our work sessions and board meetings

Noriega and Mattson shared their previous experience with board meetings and work sessions, and provided insight on how the work sessions came about. It worked well when there was a specific project, such as KMHD or academic revitalization. There was discussion about having the work sessions be more focused and to use the time for an in-depth board briefing on agenda items for the regular board meeting. This would provide an opportunity to discuss, provide guidance, recommendations, and ask questions on topics so information could be provided at the regular board meeting. There was a suggestion to use the work sessions to discuss progress on board goals, and to have a continuing agenda item about the DEI work.

4.0 BOARD GOALS

4.1 Review the board goals section of our self-evaluation

Board members reviewed the board goals for 2019-2020, and discussed possible updates for the 2020-2021 board goals.

- Goal 1: *The board will build relationships for the college* – no change

- Goal 2: *The board will advocate at the local level* – suggestion to reference the community engagement spreadsheet for 2020-2021 to track community engagement activity.
- Goal 3: *The board will advocate at the state level* – suggestion to reference the community engagement spreadsheet for 2020-2021 to track community engagement activity.
- Goal 4: *The board will advocate at the national level* – suggestion to reference the community engagement spreadsheet for 2020-2021 to keep the community engagement activity separate.
- Goal 5: *The board supports teaching, learning and working environments that are safe and welcoming* – question on how does the board measure this goal?
- Goal 6: *The board will implement policies to increase access* – the board will review policies for access to determine if there are any barriers, and identify any policies that need work to support students.
- Goal 7: *The board will implement policies that support student moving to successful completion* – suggestion to develop language on implementing policies that are inclusive and equitable for the success of all students.
- Goal 8: *The board will ensure relevant and responsive education and training* – this refers to training for the college and Dr. Skari will look into recent changes around accreditation. Dr. Skari shared that Traci Simmons is working with the campus on DEI training.
- Goal 9: *The board will guarantee MHCC's financial health and sustainability* – the board approved a balanced budget for the past year.
- Goal 10: *The board will advocate and support college efforts to serve the community through access to learning opportunities* – there was a question about what a good policy would look like that would not disadvantage students. Dr. Skari will look at some examples of student-centered policies. The COVID-19 pandemic has exposed the digital divide and not all students have access to the internet or a computer. How deep is the digital divide with our students? There was a suggestion to make the goal more focused.

Dr. Skari will send the college policy development process to board members. Noriega will create a draft of the updated board goals for 2020-2021 based on the discussion today and will send it to board members for review.

5.0 FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

5.1 Financial health of the institution and sustainability

Dr. Skari responded to questions about funding for the college and stated it appears the Community College Support Fund will not be reduced this year, however in the next biennial budget, the state will be addressing an estimated \$4 billion budget shortfall.

Jennifer DeMent provided an overview and update of the state budget process so far:

- The Governor asked all state agencies for an 8.5% across the board cut.

- The Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) ran the figures through the funding formula, which showed it would be equivalent to \$5.6 million in reductions for MHCC this fiscal year.
- The Ways & Means Committee put together a proposal in July to get through this fiscal year, which calls for \$354 million in expenditure reductions, and \$843 million in other resource adjustment options.
- A key component in the proposal is tapping into \$400 million in reserves from the Educational Stability Fund, which would largely keep K-12 and higher education whole through this current fiscal year.
- The proposal still needs to be approved by the legislature.
- There are some reductions in the proposal that will impact the college and our students, such as a reduction to the GED wrap-around grant that the college was awarded.
- There was a significant change to the Oregon Promise, which affects new Oregon Promise recipients qualifying for the Oregon Promise funding beginning fall term. We have a number of students transitioning from high schools that will not be eligible for Oregon Promise.
- A copy of the HECC document, *State Budget: What Do We Know?* is attached to the minutes.

DeMent responded to several questions during the discussion:

- What is our current contingency fund reserve percentage? It is estimated to be about 11.5 % after last years' expenditures.
- What percentage is one month of salary & benefits? It is 3.5% to get through one month.
- Does the fund balance include the CARES Funds we received? No it does not include the CARES funding, but it does include the back-filling of refunded online fees.

Dr. Skari responded to a question about enrollment numbers and stated they are up approximately 3% to 4% for this summer, and our application numbers are up from last year. There will be more information available about fall term registration by mid-August.

Discussed when looking at additional revenue sources, it is important to be clear on what the funds are for (e.g. a new building, lab upgrades, or funding the gap for staff or services), especially when going for a bond. Several questions were raised: What does it look like going forward to explore additional revenue sources so we do not have to continue raising tuition? What entrepreneurial options can the college explore? How do we move into areas that do not have expensive start-up costs? There was a suggestion to review the Facilities Master Plan, and do a facilities overhaul.

There was a discussion about the Community Impact Survey, with a request to see the full report. Dr. Skari stated the Community Impact Survey was comprised of an online survey and in-person focus groups, with responses from business and community leaders. She shared



there were challenges in getting a good sample size for the online survey. A presentation of the Community Impact Survey is scheduled for the board meeting on August 19.

6.0 BOND 101

6.1 Discuss capital bond project/capital campaign

Al Sigala provided an overview of a capital bond campaign, and described the process and timing to prepare for a bond in a May or November election. He discussed the three-year bond campaign process and the timing of key steps during each phase. He stated the community approval rate should be at 60% or higher for a successful bond, and shared the importance of a good PR and communications campaign to be one of the first things started. Things to consider for the timing of a bond campaign:

- A national election, which draws a bigger voter turnout
- Have it in May (fewer items on the ballot)
- Look at competing districts (who else is going out for a bond?)
- A bond campaign depends on PAC monies raised. The PAC should be established at least a year in advance of the bond to provide time for fundraising and campaigning.
- Measures that fail to reach 60% support typically fail (survey results)

Effective communication during a bond campaign to explain why the bond is important and having items the community sees as key initiatives are important for success. Sigala responded to questions about participation in previous bond campaigns, and shared that student leaders and some board members participated in bond activities. He highlighted the importance of having board members actively involved and collaborating in the bond campaign to build community support, and making sure the college staff and faculty are aware of and support the bond initiative. Board members shared comments of lessons learned from past bond efforts and important elements to consider when planning for a future bond campaign. Sigala has the analysis of the voter turnout for the last election and will share that with the board. Social media was discussed as a way to engage with the community, and board member engagement with community groups can be tracked on the community engagement spreadsheet.

7.0 POLICY DISCUSSION

7.1 What are our core values that drive decision-making, policy, etc.?

This topic will be moved to a future board work session for discussion.

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

The board retreat was adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Clerk

Board Chair

Minutes recorded by Laurie Popp, Executive Assistant to the Board of Education.

The Ways and Means Co-Chairs have published a state budget rebalance plan for the second special session of 2020. The plan outlines the principles and approach used by the Ways and Means Co-Chairs to balance the state budget. Across both general and lottery funds, a \$1.2 billion budget problem is identified. The plan calls for \$353.6 million in expenditure reductions with \$842.8 million in other resource adjustment options.

The proposed rebalance plan will not be enacted unless it is adopted by the full Legislature and signed by the Governor, likely in an upcoming (but yet undeclared) special session.

The adjustment options include spending \$400.0 million from the Education Stability Fund and \$213.3 million in PERS adjustments among others. Postsecondary education is largely, but not entirely, protected from cuts with more detail provided below.

The following programs have been prioritized for preservation in the proposal:

- CCSF
- PUSF
- Sports lottery funding
- State support for OHSU
- Oregon Opportunity Grant

Other elements of the proposal include:

- For new students, the Oregon Promise program would be limited to EFCs of \$18,000 or less which is a reduction of \$3.6 million in general funds
- Funds for Oregon GED® Program Wraparound Grants are reduced by \$350,000
- Lottery funds to support the Outdoor School Program are reduced by \$2.3 million
- OSU Agricultural Experiment Station, Extension Service, and the Forest Research Laboratory programs are reduced by 5%
- Public university state programs are reduced by 5% except for the Engineering Technology Sustaining Funds (ETSF)
- HECC's agency operations budget is cut by \$1.3M, or 5.1%, in general funds

The co-chairs expressed the following guiding principles for rebalancing the budget:

- Address immediate problems first, considering equity and focusing on those populations the most affected by COVID-19
- Prevent creating or exacerbating barriers for underserved populations

- A prudent use of reserves and judicious bonding while evaluating programs for efficacy in order to capture savings that do not affect critical needs
- Implement reductions based on values rather than an “across the board” approach
- Minimize reductions leading to a loss of federal matching funds
- Consider the long-term impact of reductions