

Session #921

A retreat of the Mt. Hood Community College District Board of Education was held August 26th, 2016, in the library of the Bruning Center.

Present: Susie Jones (Chair), Jim Zordich (Vice Chair), Teena Ainslie, Kenney Polson, Sonny Yellott, Michael Calcagno

Staff Present: Carrie Toth, Debra Derr

Jones called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m.

BOARD GOALS

Derr gave an overview of the prior year's board goals, including the possible goals from last year. From the list, the board had prioritized three goals. The first goal was to help pass the GO Bond; she noted that there was a great effort and connections were made. The second goal was to undertake a comprehensive policy review and explore Carver policy governance. OSBA completed a review, and Toth and Derr are undertaking a full review of policies. We will continue to go through to update the policies we currently have. The Carver piece was presented to the board at the summer retreat; some preliminary conversations have taken place, but no next steps have been taken yet. Third, the board had a goal of coming together for an active role with the legislature. Though the board did not come together with a joint effort, this was a short session, and board members did participate when Derr asked. The engagement has been minimal, but we are going into a full session that could potentially impact community college education – there are many unknowns. Derr noted that she will be more active with OCCA, and she hopes that the board will interact with local legislators.

Derr noted that Calcagno asked about SMART goal setting. The framework helps to set realistic goals in a manageable timeframe. She pointed out that some specificity was missing from last year's goals, and she provided handouts on the SMART goal-setting method and the Strategic Plan. The board members took a few minutes to review their longlist of goals from last year.

Derr asked what goals the board viewed as still relevant. Jones still believes we need to address a GO Bond, even if it doesn't happen this year – it is still a high priority. She would also like to move to Carver Policy Governance, stating that it will help eliminate inconsistencies and friction. She sees advocacy as important, but doesn't believe it should be a board goal. She has a modified third goal (innovation): "The Board will engage internal and external stakeholders to develop a district-wide strategic plan that addresses the district's values and needs for the next 20 years, and beyond (what will our population be? What will transportation be? How will students access education? What partnerships can be created to maximize innovation and efficiency?)."

Ainslie would like the board to get the attention of the community, and it has to be positive and bring visibility. Ainslie would also like us to continue pursuing the Carver policy governance model, and to keep the GO Bond as a goal, especially in the areas that voted against the bond. She also wants to make sure the board goals are financially possible.

Yellott recognized that the GO Bond is a necessity, but the board must also consider the social climate we are in. He believes that the board should not take action on the bond until after the November elections. He does not believe that the Carver model needs to be a board goal, but he supports the goal of legislative advocacy. Derr responded that the role of the board would be to get involved and meet our local legislators, and to work with the OCCA board to advocate for certain bills. She will

provide regular legislative updates and reach out to individual board members. Yellott noted that he supports the goal of working with the business community.

Zordich noted that he has been researching the policy governance history in the board minutes, and discovered that the Carver model has been in discussion for almost 20 years. He supports fully implementing the model. He also supports the GO Bond, and he hopes we do not lose the community connections we have made. As part of that, he would like to see a comprehensive Marketing plan, and a focus on affordability.

Polson supports what has been discussed; his three priorities include seeking exposure and involvement in the community, increased digital access to meetings (including videotape), and board reports to constituents. He would still like to see us pursue video meetings to show transparency and get us out into the community. Derr noted that this could be a strategy as part of our visibility. Polson agreed with the focus on affordability. If we could easily share with the community some of what is shared with the board, we could build our relationship. He still sees the bond as the overarching goal and believes the board needs to start soon.

Calcagno agrees that a GO bond must be a focus. The board will develop a new GO bond by the end of 2016 and will successfully pass the initiative in 2017, reformulating the package with a focus on stewardship of physical and financial resources of MHCC and state-of-the-art learning environments. His questions include: what are the most important and essential funding projects needed for the acute challenges faced in the immediate future? What are near-term charges leadership can make to signal responsiveness to no-voters, skeptics, and college detractors? What is the right steering group, regionally, to achieve successful passage of the bond? Calcagno believes the amount of the bond ask must be reduced to signal responsiveness to voters and views seismic/safety issues as a top priority. He supports the idea of a community vision; his proposed goal focuses on more immediate needs.

Derr stated that the board agrees that the GO Bond is a top priority and their first goal, and that district-wide communication, visibility, and outreach are key. The board would need to know by December what they plan to do, and come up with a realistic timeline. Secondly, she heard that the College has a strategic plan for five years, but the board would like to think longer-term, with a more visionary and comprehensive strategic plan. She also heard interest in Carver governance, but that the board does not yet fully understand what that is - if the board still wants to pursue the Carver model, it will still be a long-term goal, as it will still take significant time. Jones noted that it will require significant reading, but that it involves a strong link between the board and community. Building relevance to our stakeholders. Finally, the board would like to increase community visibility.

Calcagno would like to seek expert advice as to when the bond will go out again. The board agreed.

Yellott asked if it is possible to structure the bond in a way that is more palatable to the public and be held accountable, especially showing our successful students who become part of the community.

PRESIDENT'S GOALS

Derr presented a draft of her goals for the 2016-2017 academic year. She worked closely with Sergey Shepelov to formulate her goals, moving to a different model this year. As the College reformats its participatory governance model, some modifications might be made. The board will take action on the President's goals at the September meeting. She noted that one of her goals is tied to morale; we cannot just focus on our external stakeholders, but we must keep our own employees in mind. A second climate survey was recently completed, and it showed that we did not make significant

progress. The College needs improvements in participatory governance and transparency in how decisions are made. Communication has been a consistent issue, and we have to address process improvement and information Derr hopes to balance her internal focus with her external focus. She will continue to maintain some of our key relationships, but she hopes to shift the majority of her focus to internal matters. Jones asked Derr to give assignments to the board if there are relationships she would like to maintain.

Yellott asked about the third goal. Along with the vocational and STEM classes, is there a core class directed to entrepreneurship? Derr responded that, yes, there is a program through our Business department, and through our Small Business Development Center. Yellott asked if it is a core requirement; Derr responded that no, it is not currently, but we do have programs with a small-business or entrepreneur component, just not every program. She noted that our SBDC is first in the state of Oregon, and it was ranked last two years ago, by the state SBDC. Derr stated that the College will report to the board with our placement rates so that it can see in our CTE areas where students become employed.

Calcagno said that it would be helpful to know what some of the metrics mean, and what percentage will we aim for? How many department unit levels are there, for example? Derr responded that this will be presented to the board in September. He would also like to know what Derr needs from the board for support, in terms of policy revision, implementation, etc. Derr responded that the board has already provided support in adopting policies, such as our Diversity and Equity policy. Schedule of reports to the board that tie back to the goals that we have set. He asked for a mid-point check in on the goals, to see what is being missed or what has been accomplished. Ainslie noted that teamwork will be key.

BOARD SELF-ASSESSMENT

Jones presented the survey results from the ACCT GISS survey. Board members will review the survey results prior to the next meeting. Derr commented that the accreditors will ask if the board had assessed itself, and what it did about the results. She advised the board to see how the results align to the board goals - Toth and Derr will work on this.

BOARD MEETING TIMES, CALENDAR

The issue of meeting times was brought forward by Tamie Arnold. Polson asked about the possibility of additional workshops. Calcagno notes that if we moved to a committee structure, we might reduce some conversation. Could we create more concise workshops to begin at 6:15? Derr responded that we could do a better job of getting information out more quickly, with the board bringing questions forward. Follow-up questions could be answered after the workshop. If the topic is big enough, a second workshop session could be held on the fourth Wednesday of the month. The standing times will move to 6:15 - 6:45, but board members must come prepared.

BOARD ASSIGNMENTS

OCCA - Susie Jones

OSBA - Susie Jones

ACCT - Kenney Polson

Foundation - Jim Zordich

Head Start - Head Start

Teaching Awards - Jim Zordich/Tamie Arnold

Outstanding Support Staff Awards – Jim Zordich/Tamie Arnold, Teena Ainslie
External: OCCA committee. These can teleconference.

OCCA is looking for members for the Howard Cherry Awards, specifically. Ainslie would be interested. Jones will review the committees and let Derr know by the end of next week.

GISS REPORT

Calcagno presented a summary document on the GISS Conference in June. The institute focused on Student Success. He noted that the lens with which we look at student success must include equity and diversity; how do we define student success? He would like to see quarterly staff reports with disaggregated data. What is the college doing as a whole to address specific issues and communities? He would like also to see a closer look at our consent agenda – what is required, and what is extra work? What would be more useful information? Could we see quarterly metrics? Jones would like to see a Board library.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The board convened an Executive Session in accordance with ORS 192.660(2)(i) to review and evaluation the employment-related performance of the Chief Executive Officer of any public body. The session began at 12:35 p.m. Ended at 12:48 p.m.

PRESIDENT'S EVALUATION/COMPENSATION

Zordich motioned to approve the requested 3% increase to the President's salary. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

APPLIED TECHNOLOGY CENTER

Charles George, Facilities Director, and Deb France of Oh Planning, presented a vision for the Applied Technology Center. They provided a refresher on the Master Plan. As discussed in the bond ask, the current Applied Technologies center is out-of-date, with significant structural issues, as well as simply not fitting our current program needs. Options include an entirely new building, or a partial salvage of the current building.

Jones asked if anything proposed for the new building could be kept in the remaining building – could it be salvaged, or partially salvaged? Becker responded that the proposed plan and associated costs do not include renovation. Derr noted that it is at the point where there are concerns about roof damage, ADA issues, entryways, and other impediments. Calcagno noted that it would also hinder the Master Plan. Could some programs remain where they are, leaving room for other programming or needs? Derr responded that they will look at the cost of converting the current space to what it needs to be.

OREGON SOLUTIONS

Calcagno introduced a concept of a live/learn center for MHCC for high-barrier students at MHCC. He had put together a brief last year on an Upward Mobility Center. He introduced Steve Greenwood, Executive Director of Oregon Solutions, which was essentially created by the legislature. They seek to build consensus among different jurisdictions and help make projects happen.

Greenwood noted that Oregon Solutions just completed a project with several different agencies to develop a transportation system out into the Gorge to reduce some of the strain in that area. They

help others collaborate and create results. They have done over 100 projects so far. The idea Calcagno presented is the kind of project they might become involved in, as it involves multiple agencies. They would provide a free assessment to meet with parties and to make recommendations. The governor would then designate it as an Oregon Solutions project and appoint a high-level convener. There would be a cost associated. They are sometimes able to match resources up to 50%.

Calcagno said that there are two steps to the project: the no-cost assessment, and the project facilitation. He asked that in one of our upcoming meetings to bring forward a resolution allowing Oregon Solutions to explore the project. Greenwood estimated that the assessment would take approximately 2 months, if not shorter. The board would decide next steps as a unit. He noted that he is aware of the limited capacity of staff and college resources, so he is looking for ways to pull in resources and be innovative. How can we leverage state, federal, and local resources into relevant projects? His goal with the UMC project is to lower barriers.

FIRST READING - COMMITTEES

Jones read through the proposed board policy on committees. The proposal will be up for approval at the September meeting.

FORMATION OF COMMITTEES

Now that the board has set goals, Jones addressed the idea of board committees. Calcagno clarified that these are smaller teams from the larger board, but they have no decision-making ability. They gather information and bring recommendations to the full board. Jones suggested that the bond, district-wide strategic planning, Carver policy governance, and visibility – the four board goals – could serve as committees. The committees would set their own schedules outside of the monthly meeting, at the discretion of its members, and could include staff or community members. Jones would like to lead the Carver policy committee, with possibly Toth and Polson as members. Derr strongly recommended a staff member be part of each committees, and that they have achievable goals and timelines.

Calcagno would like to participate on the bond committee, either as a member or as chair. Zordich is considering the bond committee, but he would like to investigate the timeline and our bond asks. He sees some urgency in seismic issues. He will co-chair the bond committee with Calcagno. Jones and Derr would be interested in the vision goal. Derr noted that we are in year 2 of our 5-year plan, and we need to start down our next cycle of strategic planning. She hopes that the board will be involved in that process. Calcagno asked if the board goal can complement our existing plan or lead into the new plan. Derr responded that is an important question – how does the board view its role? Jones envisions Sergey Shepelov helping with the strategic vision. Derr stated that there are questions not necessarily addressed yet by the Strategic Plan – what do we do in Sandy? Cascade Locks? What is our role in Maywood, or the west side of our district? Calcagno suggested renaming the committee to Regional Partnerships or Visibility. Jones noted that the group could meet sporadically at first. Polson asked about our involvement with Cascade Locks. Derr responded that our primary partnerships are through the Port and the City, as well as through our SBDC. Jones would be interested in taking it on and checking in with Arnold and her interest.

Bond: Al Sigala, Jim Zordich, Michael Calcagno

Policy: Susie Jones, Carrie Toth, Kenney Polson

District-wide Visioning: Susie Jones, Debra Derr, Sergey Shepelov, Tamie Arnold (possible)

If Arnold is interested in a visibility committee, Ainslie will participate.

Derr encouraged the committees to set goals before the next meeting. Jones responded that the chairs should touch base with their committee members, set goals, and seek potential members. Mission, make-up, and meeting schedule of each committee will be reported in September. Derr pointed out that meetings can be held over the phone. Derr will continue work with legislative advocacy.

ADJOURNMENT

Zordich moved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:33 p.m.

Clerk

Board Chair

Minutes recorded by Carrie Toth, Executive Assistant to the Board of Education.