

LANSING COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
June 20, 2016

**Regular Meeting**  
Adopted Meeting Minutes

## **Public Hearing - Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:06 p.m.

## **Roll Call**

Present: Abood, Azima, Canja, Hidalgo, Meyer, Proctor, Smith  
Absent: None

## **Pledge of Allegiance**

Trustee Proctor led the Pledge of Allegiance.

## **Public Hearing on Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Proposal**

Trustee Proctor made the following statement:

The Board of Trustees published formal notice on June 13 through 18, 2016 of this public hearing on the budget for the 2016-2017 fiscal year, for which the College proposes to levy 3.8072 mills. The millage may be reduced by any required Headlee Rollback. This millage amount is referenced in the FY 2017 budget and approving this budget by the Board of Trustees will meet the truth in budgeting statute for levy of the proposed mills.

The Chair thanked everyone for their interest and opened the floor to Public Comment.

## **Public Comments**

There were no Public Comments.

## **Public Hearing Adjournment**

IT WAS MOVED by Trustee Meyer and supported by Trustee Smith that the public hearing on the budget for the 2016-2017 fiscal year be adjourned.

Ayes: Abood, Azima, Canja, Hidalgo, Meyer, Proctor, Smith  
Nays: None  
Absent: None

The motion carried.

The public hearing adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

## Call to Order

The regular meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

## Roll Call

Present: Abood, Azima, Canja, Hidalgo, Meyer, Proctor, Smith

Absent: None

## Resolution and Special Recognitions

The Board of Trustees presented the following resolution honoring Lory Murphy:

*The **Board of Trustees** of Lansing Community College resolves as follows:*

**WHEREAS**, *Lori Murphy has had a long and distinguished career at Lansing Community College,*

**WHEREAS**, *she has supported the greater Lansing community through her involvement in such organizations as the Holt Public School Board; serving three terms from 2004-2016, and the Holt Public Schools Baseball Booster Board from 2003-2007; and*

**WHEREAS**, *she brought her talents to Lansing Community College in 1980, serving the college for 36 years. She began working in the Math Lab and was later assigned Lead Support of the newly joined Science, Math and Computer Science Service Center. In 1997, Murphy accepted a new role as Assistant to the Dean of Liberal Studies, now Arts & Sciences, and served Dr. Gary Knippenberg and the division for 11 years. In 2008, Murphy began serving in her current role as Administrative Assistant to President Brent Knight; and,*

**WHEREAS**, *through her roles at Lansing Community College, she has provided unequalled counsel and support for campus-wide projects, including the Build Forward initiative—a project involving significant renovation of key buildings and critical learning spaces on campus. Murphy has assisted in the implementation of divisional and college-wide goals, working with administrators, faculty, students, and the general public in a cooperative, service-oriented manner. She has received multiple awards, including the LCC Employee Recognition Award for her outstanding service to the College and its students, and the LCC Distinguished Staff Award for outstanding professional work, achievement, service, and dedication to the College and Community; and*

**WHEREAS**, *through her service, she has enhanced the lives of an untold number of students at Lansing Community College; and*

**WHEREAS**, her employment at Lansing Community College comes to a close; so

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board of Trustees, in recognition of her service, dedication, and her sincere commitment to Lansing Community College, on behalf of the students, faculty, staff, and a grateful community, recognize and thank Lori Murphy for all that she has given to this college.

**AND BE IT THUS RECORDED THIS 20<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2016.**

## Approval of Minutes

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Smith and supported by Trustee Canja that the minutes of the May 16, 2016 Regular Board of Trustees meeting and the May 23, 2016 Special Board of Trustees meeting be adopted.

*(Trustee Azima stated that Ms. Towns felt her Public Comments at the May 23, 2016 Special Board of Trustees meeting weren't reflected correctly. He stated that she submitted something in writing and asked if that could be inserted instead. A copy of that written statement was not given to the Executive Assistant to insert.)*

Trustee Proctor stated that comments are summarized and not verbatim.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Abood, Azima, Canja, Hidalgo, Meyer, Proctor, Smith

Nays: None

Absent: None

The motion carried.

## Additions/Deletions to the Agenda

The following additions/deletions were made to the agenda:

- Dr. Sharpe stated there was a substitution to the revised Resident Tuition Policy.
- Dr. Prystowsky asked for a video on Operation 100% be shown to provide an update to the Board.
- Trustee Smith asked that the revised college policy on Resident Tuition be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion.
- Trustee Proctor asked that revisions to Governance Policy, BRP 403 Monitoring President's Performance, be added to the agenda under Policy Development for consideration.

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Azima and supported by Trustee Meyer that the amended meeting agenda be approved.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Hidalgo, Abood, Canja, Proctor, Meyer, Azima, Smith

Nays: None

Absent: None

The motion carried.

## Limited Public Comment Regarding Agenda Items

Cruz Villarreal: Mr. Villarreal, President of the PTCTU addressed the Board regarding the labor contract negotiations and ratification of the Health Care Agreement with the College Labor Coalition. His comments are summarized as follows:

I have been an insurance veteran for 40 years, so I understand the nature of insurance and that premiums continue going up. Employees can't afford higher health insurance premiums, and the only way to address the issue is to make it possible for individuals to have enough compensation to afford increased premiums in a zero interest economy and avoid shopping for the cheaper insurance product. If the college cannot provide sufficient compensation so employees can afford health insurance, the college's bottom line of providing 100% student success will be adversely affected.

Gezelle Oliver: Ms. Oliver addressed the Board regarding the ratification of Health Care Agreement with the College Labor Coalition. Her comments are summarized as follows:

Last week employees expressed whether they supported a change of their health care provider. Some supported that change and some did not. Employees were not given an adequate amount of time to make an informed choice about their health care insurance since the new plans offered by the college differ from the plan the employees currently have. The union side of the healthcare taskforce was brought to the table and informed of the health insurance option in an untimely manner that precluded our members from having sufficient time to review and make an informed decision. The Board has done nothing to help the employees, but, in moving forward, I hope the Board will make appropriate choices that shows LCC's employees they are valued and that they matter to this institution. I encourage the Board members to approve all contracts before them tonight to help offset the cost that some employees have had to absorb.

Sally Pierce: Ms. Pierce's, President of LCC MAHE, addressed the Board regarding the ratification of Health Care Agreement with the College Labor Coalition. Her comments are summarized as follows:

At the May 23 Board of Trustees meeting, I falsely stated that the WHIM had declared bankruptcy. That statement was corrected the next day, and was told that at the end of WHIM's first year, the eight participating institutions voluntarily put in \$1.8 million to help support the pool. I request that the Board consider the hardship the healthcare hard

cap is creating for the people the Union represents. The choice by the college's team to provide a separate health insurance option for non-bargaining unit members and separating them from the entire healthcare taskforce has affected our ability to represent our members well. Our members have questions about how the drug formulary will be implemented and they are convinced the WHIM plan is a lesser healthcare plan. Our members have missed the July billing date for MESSA, so they can't change carriers even if they wanted to before August. Today MAHE had a tie vote on healthcare; we are running a revote that we expect to be completed by a week from Tuesday. I request that the Board make its employees a priority and change your financial commitment to union employees. I request that the Board do regarding health insurance and the collective bargaining agreements and that the Board make a conscious effort to support the employees who serve LCC students.

Sally Pierce read note from a full-time member who could not attend the meeting to address the Board regarding the ratification of the Health Care Agreement with College Labor Coalition. The employee indicated she was upset about having to again pay a deductible which she had already met for the year. She had a surgery planned for the summer that is unfortunately after July 1, which means she is not sure if the new insurance will cover it. The offer of difference insurance choices came with such short notice to make a decision that it can only be regarded as unfair. She wished she had until December to plan and make choices. She didn't think people were well informed about the new policies and are very nervous about them. She found it interesting that employees are supposed to always have a syllabus ready ahead of time, but are rarely given adequate notice by the administration.

James Luke: Mr. Luke, professor of economics and senator at large on the Academic Senate, addressed the Board regarding the ratification of the Health Care Agreement with the College Labor Coalition and the FY 2017 Budget Proposal. His comments are summarized as follows:

Many people are scared to talk to the Board and the Administration. Regarding the budget and the healthcare agreement, there wasn't input from the faculty or Academic Senate. Per the collective bargaining agreement between the College and the Union and the charter of the Academic Senate, both of which were agreed to and signed by the Board, the Union and the Academic are supposed to have shared governance in the college. There are departments and department managers that have no clue what the proposed budget will be. The budget and healthcare agreements were put together in secrecy and do not have the input from the most important body; the faculty. Regarding healthcare, I have never seen a process where decisions had to be made in 72 hours with vague scanned sheets provided as information about the plans. This was how the healthcare agreement came down to us. The college must take its time, have shared governance and participation. I understand the budget must be approved, but we need cooperation on the healthcare agreement.

Ed Bryant: Mr. Bryant addressed the Board regarding the ratification of Health Care Agreement with the College Labor Coalition and the FY 2017 Budget Proposal. His comments are summarized as follows:

Decisions had to be made at the 11th hour, actually, at the 11 hour and 45 minutes. The faculty haven't had an opportunity to weigh in on some of the more important decisions that the college has embarked on. It is a real concern because faculty directly serve, support and educate the students at the college. To shut faculty out or create an environment where they aren't able to participate disfranchises faculty and also disenfranchises the students because faculty are their direct voice.

## Action Items – Consent Agenda

The following items were presented under the consent agenda:

- A. Authorization of New Jobs Training Addendum #3 – General Motors  
Lansing Regional Stamping East
- B. College Policy
  - 1. ~~Residence Tuition~~ *(REVISED) Removed*
- C. Invitation for Bid
  - 1. Rubbish Removal and Recycling Services
- D. Lease Agreement between Lansing Community College (LCC) and  
Accident Fund Holdings, Inc.
- E. Lease Agreement between Lansing Community College (LCC) and City of  
Lansing
- F. Lease Agreement between Lansing Community College (LCC) and Eaton  
Regional Education Service Agency (ERESA)
- G. No Bids Justification
  - 1. The College Board
  - 2. Various Book Publishers
- H. Request for Proposals
  - 1. BCI Qualified Supplier Instructor Pool
  - 2. Managed Print Services
  - 3. West Campus Conference Rooms and Auditorium AV Upgrade
- I. Sublease between Lansing Community College and Capital Area Michigan  
Works!

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Hidalgo and supported by Trustee Meyer that the Consent Agenda, removing the revised Residence Tuition Policy, be approved.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Abood, Azima, Canja, Hidalgo, Meyer, Proctor, Smith

Nays: None

Absent: None

The motion carried.

### **Action Item – Resident Tuition Policy Revision**

Trustee Smith stated that she had concerns with the following language in (III. B.) of the policy:

III. Eligibility for Paying In-District Tuition

A student is eligible for In-District tuition if:

*B. The student has not lived at any other location since establishing residency within the district, except for temporary periods of absence for less than four months (e.g., for travel, temporary employment, etc.); and*

Trustee Smith stated that when an individual moves to a different area they can sign up to vote in 30 days, and there is no question from the federal government. She stated the policy should allow students to obtain in-district residency status within 30 days of moving into the district rather than having to reside in the district for 120 days. Such a policy aligns with obtaining their right to vote within 30 days of changing residency.

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Meyer and supported by Trustee Hidalgo that the revised Residence Tuition Policy be approved.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Abood, Azima, Canja, Hidalgo, Meyer, Proctor

Nays: Smith

Absent: None

The motion carried.

### **Action Item – Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Proposal**

Dr. Knight stated that the budget has been widely discussed and all involved understand what has been presented and the rationale. He stated that the Board should be able to make an informed decision.

Dr. Prystowsky stated that the budget is geared in many ways to supporting Operation 100%. He showed a video that provided some context for the allocation of the money requested in the budget proposal.

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Proctor and supported by Trustee Hidalgo that the FY 2017 Budget Proposal be approved.

Trustee Meyer asked what budget proposal was being presented tonight, and suggested that the resolution be considered first.

Trustee Proctor stated that the motion before the Board is for approving the FY 2017 Budget Proposal submitted by the Administration, which includes an \$11 increase in student tuition.

Trustee Meyer stated that he would like to include a Student Success Commitment resolution, but is not in favor of an \$11 increase in student tuition.

Trustee Canja stated that she would not vote in favor of the motion. She stated that if there is support to defeat the motion, she will proceed with another motion and move the approval of the Student Success Commitment resolution.

Trustee Smith commented as follows:

I will also vote against the motion of an \$11 increase in student tuition. The college has had a tuition increase for the past few years and I understand we have tried to keep tuition affordable in light of necessary projects like Operation 100%. I can agree to an \$8 tuition increase because the Board adopted Operation 100%, but didn't fully fund it last year. The college says it's trying to help students, but, at the same time, it is increasing student tuition to do so. The college must be judicious in doing so and I believe that an \$11 increase is too far out of the realm and overly burdens students. I am willing to go to \$8.

Trustee Azima commented as follows:

Before discussing the number of dollars, first I would like to see a statement of principle first that the Board agrees with the Student Success Commitment Resolution. As a matter of principle, the college must operate efficiently and effectively. I do not want to underfund the current or proposed initiative for student success. I am opened to thoughts and ideas from my colleagues about alternative ways of funding the proposed budget. I would like to know where the money is coming from and how much is from tuition and how much from other sources the college might have.

Trustee Canja commented as follows:

During the budget process the Board was originally presented with a \$7 increase that included roughly \$1 million in contingency fund and initiatives to support Operation 100% that was all built into the \$7 we needed to move forward. Following the development of the budget, there was discussion on what it would take to move the needle on student success and do it quickly. There was discussion about what the college's best approach to making a significant radical difference in a short period of time. The question became what made the difference where at-risk students succeeded. After looking at all of the approaches, we learned it was human interaction that made the difference. The college needs success coaches, more tutors and tutoring available when the student needs it. In my nine years at the college I have been absolutely committed to low tuition and affordability, but I would go for a large increase in tuition if there was something I thought would make a difference. This initiative would make the difference. In answer to Alex's question of "where will the money come from";

the college has the contingency funds and fund balance currently at 15%, when the Board Bylaws states it only has to be at 10%. There is also money in reserves for 505 N. Capitol. There is money available to launch this initiative and I expect the budget to be different in the next fiscal year. To pass an increase now that the college can't really spend until later is not the way to go because it's on the backs of students. It isn't responsible to ask for the money that may not be needed in the future. Tuition increases can appropriately be viewed as tax increases, for the money comes from the public.

Trustee Smith commented as follows:

The student success model is not something that is new to the institution. In the past few years there has been a shift in community colleges to not only have access for students, but to get them to completion. My concern is that an \$11 increase is a 12% increase in tuition to our students. This tells me that if the college has been working toward student success, it has not put the money where its mouth is to implement it in a way that has succeeded enough. The college's partnership with the Bill and Melinda Gates Grant Foundation gives me a ray of hope. Having more touch points for LCC's students to navigate in a more successful way may be new to LCC, but not to other community colleges. I understand there has to be a tuition increase, but I am not in support of the motion of on the floor of an \$11 increase in tuition.

Trustee Hidalgo commented as follows:

The Board asked the administration to put forth a budget for us to approve. The administration told the Board they needed a maintenance dollar of \$7 a credit hour and \$4 a credit for Operation 100%. The Board has failed in the past years to give the administration what they asked for and each year the Board has underfunded the budget as to what the administration said was needed. Because of this, employees have taken the biggest hit and many have not had raises in several years, while having to pay more toward their healthcare. In addition, when employees leave, the college doesn't fill positions, thereby causing the remaining employees to have to do more. The college is asking for the students to pay for Operation 100%, which I believe is a better use of their tuition dollars. I have compromised in the past few years to pass a budget, but this year I will give the administration what it asks for because it is the right thing to do for the students and employees. There is a price for being too low, and I can't vote for anything less at this time. LCC is a college like no other, but it can't continue to stay there being the lowest tuition in the state. I ask my colleagues to consider that when you vote tonight.

Trustee Proctor commented as follows:

I have served on the Board for 13 years, and when I became a trustee, LCC's tuition rates were approximately in the middle of the 28 community colleges in the state. LCC has been on the downward glide path to make it affordable and accessible and is now tied at the bottom at \$88 per credit hour. Even with an \$11 increase in tuition, there will only be five other community colleges in Michigan with a slightly lower rate. We spend a lot of time talking about access, but not enough about getting students through to completion. We, trustees and college personnel have been told for over two years that 50% of the students who come to LCC don't finished. The college has been engaged in

this journey of trying to change that paradigm. Such a change requires an investment in acquiring additional resources. I hardly believe that \$99 a credit hour will be that burdensome when compared to the tuition rate charged by other community colleges in Michigan. These are not uncharted waters for LCC; other institutions have taken up this mantle to try to improve student success. There are institutions the college can learn from, and I believe the President, Provost and the Senior VP for Finance and Administration are determined to make this a successful effort and I urge my colleagues to take up that challenge. We're committed to doing that now. We've spent some money on other things that did not move the needle with regard to student success.

Trustee Azima commented as follows:

Oddly enough I agree with all sides of the issues here. Dr. Prystowsky outlined earlier the major differences of serving LCC's students and there is no question for him that this is a more holistic approach. I believe the college is on the right path and needs to be funded adequately. I would like to hear from the President and the Vice President of the Administration whether the alternatives proposed in the Student Success Commitment resolution are viable. I am interested in keeping the tuition low, but I don't want to be the lowest in the state either. What is the real amount we need and can we get it from different places? I agree with Chair Proctor that \$99 dollars is really not that big of a deal in the long run. If the college has other resources to minimize the impact of this on its students, I am willing to explore those, and I want to hear from the administration on where they might stand on that.

Trustee Abood commented as follows:

I listened to Trustee Canja and I am 100% on the opposite side because I remember things slightly differently. The issue in the meetings wasn't about student success, but about the persistent issue and the fact LCC is losing 50% of its students every year. The administration felt that getting the coaches or advisors would increase this, but they couldn't do it right away. The board was told it would take five years, which I think is unacceptable. If the Board gives the college the money, there should be an immediate impact. I don't see the difference between having whatever amount of touches the college wants now or five years from now because the students coming next fall won't be here. I asked to see 1,000 students more and I have questions about the plan. If someone told me to try this new golf ball out and that five years from now I'll be playing good with it, I would expect to see an immediate impact. If the college hires these coaches in the next six months, the college should see an impact the next month if they're doing their job. There isn't data to say that students are failing out because the college doesn't have these coaches. Where Trustee Canja and I differ is that I believe in the people here and they think it will work. If they ask for an \$11 increase in tuition I'll give them that, but the next month I want to see results. I do not want to be stuck with these people they hire on the payroll if the Board is told this really didn't really work. If the Board gives the college the money they need and the college hires these people, the college must be held accountable. The college's first tutor is the professor; they are here and want to help, but have to be paid. The college can't expect people to go four years and not get an increase in pay. Everyone knows my position and that I believe employees deserve a pay raise every year. It's the college's obligation to give them a raise and if it doesn't it fails.

Dr. Knight commented as follows:

I never made the statement of seeing results in five years and couldn't agree more. That would be ridiculous to wait five years.

*Trustee Abood interjected that he did not attribute the statement to President Knight.*

If my son enrolled at LCC or anywhere he would get a math tutor right out of the gate, whether he wanted one or not. I would want my son to win no matter what, and he would have a tutor. End of story. In addition, I would make sure he and the tutor show up every time, and I wouldn't wait until he got into trouble. I think tutors are imperative. I'm in LCC's tutoring center frequently and it's full during times you would expect it to be full. Everybody starts the semester with all A's, and it takes a little while for students to figure out they're not getting all A's. I want more space for tutoring and tutoring services any which way that works. I am not sure tutoring is needed 24 hours, but I like 18 hours. I would like tutoring in whatever way fits each individual student and a plan for each student on how they'd best learn the material. I want success rather than getting behind and trying to catch up. I am convinced that if you have highly effective coaches you will see prompt results, and I would couple the coaches with the tutors. I don't want to lose one more student. My conscience bothers me in my job under any notion that the college would write off any number of students for any length of time. If one person fails, it means they could struggle for the remainder of their life; struggle for themselves and struggle for their family. An \$11 increase in tuition would fully fund this initiative and the college would still be under the average tuition level. College policy states a 10% fund balance is required, which is \$12.5 million. The college has approximately an \$18 million fund balance. While some Trustees propose 20%, and others propose 15%. It's all a matter of opinion. The Higher Learning Commission would like the college to have a growing fund balance. I have often said that if you attend LCC and you're not successful, there is no great virtue in that. This conversation really comes down to the percent of increase individuals are comfortable with. The seven Trustees understand and read the media and are mindful of comments and the Michigan Legislature, so the Board must gage and make its best decision based on all the issues coming together. Each Trustee knows the issues and was elected to exercise their best judgements knowing all that they might know, and it's up to the Board to decide what's best for all concerned. This is a difficult decision, and I would be glad to answer questions candidly and openly.

Trustee Proctor stated he didn't know if the President addressed the questions. He asked how long will it take to ramp up?

Dr. Knight responded as follows:

If the Trustees are looking for me to say this better work and we better see results, I can handle that pressure. I think this would be appropriate because I have to make this happen no matter what, and I will do everything I can do. This will become my project, and I will shepherd it on a continuing basis. I need every coach and tutor to be excellent and effective, and I want them all to be good. As to how long will it take, even under a fast expedited process you will not get through the hiring process, nor should you instantly. It might be a couple of months, and then they (the new hires) would have

to start work and get acclimated. In any job I've had it's taken me a couple of months to really understand a culture and be good at it. It would take a couple of months to hire people and a couple of months before they understand how to be good and I don't think I can or should shorten that. If the college were fully functional and expert on July 1 of a given year, I could promise you'll see improvement of note for that fall semester in terms of student success. If we get there at Thanksgiving, I'm confident the college can demonstrate its improvement and the Board will feel very comfortable with the college's progress. We can't make the fall semester today and I won't say something I can't deliver. That is my candid assessment of how fast, and I assure the Board I'm determined and so are my colleagues.

Trustee Azima thanked Dr. Knight for his explanation and stated that it needed to be made as effectively as Dr. Knight did. Trustee Azima further stated:

Dr. Knight you only partially answered my questions and my question still remains. I am not as optimistic about two months, and I think the college will probably take six months. The \$4 from the \$11 increase isn't for an entire year because the college will not have someone on board for at least three to six months. How would that modify the numbers?

Dr. Knight stated because the college hasn't done this before he couldn't produce an answer of validity.

Trustee Azima stated that if it's half a year, we are looking at \$2 not \$4, and, therefore, talking about a \$9 increase, not \$11. He said it makes a big difference in terms of the Board's decision.

Dr. Knight stated that he doesn't want to just say a number and goes back to saying the college as an educated informed Board and each can factor in the choices and make their own assessment as well as he.

Trustee Azima stated there should be a foundation as to where the numbers are coming from.

Dr. Knight said that he would like to be reliable and valid on his numbers. He stated that he doesn't know the market place for coaches and tutors, but can promise to be expert in their efforts.

Trustee Azima said he has confidence in that and in the staff. He stated that the second part of my question related to Dr. Knight's response to the alternatives in the resolution about moving some money around to achieve the funding with a lower increase in tuition.

Dr. Knight responded as follows:

I could go through the resolution word by word and line by line. We are trying to change the culture and that is not easy, nor should it be taken for granted. If I were a success coach, I would know where my students will be the most successful because I want to be the best success coach. How long does it take for someone to figure out how to do

their best coaching? I am not certain. With regards to the budget and the monies, we would spend and when; I'm not certain of that. The college has various accounts of money we could use in a circumstance like this. The Board must be mindful in spending one-time money because it doesn't refill, and the Board must comprehend where that would lead the college in future years and decisions the Board would have to make. There are a lot of other factors regarding how the college would end up at the end of a fiscal year that the college really can't foresee. I have never been an advocate for deficit spending for operations. We are looking into 12 months, but a budget is always an estimate of how the year would unfold. I think this Board understands all of this and can factor all and make the best decision for the college.

Trustee Azima thanked Dr. Knight.

Trustee Canja commented as follows:

I thank Dr. Knight and I don't wish to cross examine him, but I'd would like to share some thoughts. As Dr. Knight alluded to, to get really excellent people and get through the hiring process, will not happen overnight and would likely go on for about six months. If \$4 was the money pegged for the new student success initiative, of which I'm supportive, half of that is \$1 million dollars, given that each \$1 increase in tuition generates approximately \$450,000. The \$7 increase could include the \$1 million contingency fund that the college has used before to offset tuition. A tsunami could hit the college and it might need the contingency fund for unforeseen things. There is \$1 million dollars and an additional \$6 million sitting in the fund balance. It is possible to use some of that. There is also \$2 million sitting in the 505 N. Capitol fund. The President called me and discussed with me that he would be comfortable with an \$8 tuition increase because the additional money was available in other fund sources and could be used if the Board approved his ability to access those additional funds. It would be no problem in moving forward and beginning this very important initiative. Even though it's a onetime use of that money, the next fiscal year may paint a different picture. Although I was not supportive of going beyond the \$7 originally asked for, I'm okay with an \$8 increase in the interest in finding a common ground. That \$8 increase would give them an additional million, and the college would have the money in 505, the contingency and the fund balance. The Board would give Dr. Knight the authority to use it as he saw fit to make sure this initiative gets off the ground. I appreciate that he is committed to its success and I have no difficulty in believing that he'll see it through, and I take him at his word that \$8 would do it.

Trustee Meyer commented as follows:

Initially when the first presentation came, it was \$7 and \$4. I talked to Trustee Proctor and said I would look at this as an investment. If you wanted to make the investment and see a return on that in one year, the college system can't do that because it's not like a reactive organization where the consumer stops buying the soap and you have to do a different formula for the soap. This is not the way the system works. It's a long cycle time. What the Board is talking about is extracting more money from its taxpayers, but we know we are not going to raise property taxes. Instead, the money comes from student tuition. The population LCC has coming into the school are not students from privileged lives marching off to the Wolverines or off to the Spartans. The

college is taking young men and women who want to do better and are trying to achieve, but they don't come from wealth. One could say that the student is entitled to student loans, but I'm not sure that advancement moves on debt. Student debt burden is overwhelming to me. I'm worried that if the college puts too much money into that system, it will be absorbed by other things. We can't speed things too fast. I would like to see a moderate \$8 burden to the student rather than an \$11 one.

Trustee Smith commented as follows:

I trust the administration, and I believe in the concept the college is working towards. I believe the heart of the President is to make it happen with all that is within him as well as the rest of the college staff. The thing I wrestle with, which I've heard the Board's Chair state, is these are one time dollars that the college would use. The college is using one time dollars with the Bill and Melinda Gates program. The reason they're willing to allow the college to be a part of this strategic partnership is because the college, as an institution, had already done work down the line to prove that it could ramp up. Using dollars to ramp up simply means you need the money because you are ramping up. Once you get there, you don't need those dollars, because you only needed those dollars in the beginning process. My other concern about going to the \$11 is that the assumption is when the \$7 increase was presented to this Board, it was an assumption it would be accepted. In one of the two day sessions I asked the question of what would happen if the college didn't get a \$7 increase. I asked if there was a \$6 plan for the departments or a \$5 plan for their departments? The response I got was "yes." That response lets me know there is still room and the administration must look at it in a holistic manner, as there is a mix of solutions for the Board to consider. The college can't say it values students and unfairly burden them with an enormous tuition increase. The students coming to LCC aren't always coming here because they don't have the option of Michigan State. Often they come to Lansing Community College because they don't want to have to pay what they're paying at Michigan State. At a high school graduation I attended, several of the graduates were coming to LCC by choice. LCC is not last choice; in many cases its first choice because of the quality of education it provides and the affordable tuition. My expectation isn't that the college will remain the lowest in the state, and it's not what the board is asking for. \$4 was for maintenance and the extra \$4 was the plus. There was an assumption that the Board would have been willing to consider. I appreciated Andrew asking about data on how much of a success the college can have. The Board needs to be realistic, otherwise we set ourselves and the community up for failure. When you don't end up with an expected result and the result that was promised, you're in a worst place. That burdens me to see that with this additional \$4 increase, there is nothing to do with ratifying union contracts. It burdens me when the college is not able to give increases or steps. I wish I could have 80/20 in healthcare. I have had to make hard choices in my personal life. We are not saying we don't want what's best or that we are not willing to fully fund the success of the initiative before us if we rollback the \$11.

Dr. Prystowsky commented as follows:

I want to clarify the five-year statement, since I was the one who made it. I was referring to the results at Georgia State. Georgia State originated this concept along with a couple of other colleges and they had quite a few mistakes they made along the

way that they have fixed. It wasn't surprising to me that their increases in student success spiked and stayed on an upward trajectory. It will not take the college five years. I will not pretend that we don't understand where to begin on this because we are learning from Georgia State. Higher Ed is not known for being phenomenally fast in anything. Sometimes our president says, "We are out in front; we're the lead snail." The college's biggest concern, in terms of student success, is to make sure the student who comes to LCC has an education plan and the student who wants to move from semester 1 to semester 2 on track and on time does so. We will not know whether or not a success coach's case load has succeeded for those students until they see those results. We can't shorten the semester to give the Board results. We are talking all the time about intervening measures we can look at before it gets to the end of a semester to see where we can intervene on things. It will not take five years or a month, but I can assure you of this, we will get on it right away. The college will not get to an increase of student success by status quo, and, therefore, we are not going to take six months to hire people. The analogy might be that we are trying to create special forces units. I and others will be very involved and will make sure we stay on top of this initiative. I can't guarantee tremendous gains in the first year, because we have no point of reference to go by. We have never done this. I agree with Trustees who say other schools are doing this, but it's not as many as they think. We hired Rob Johnstone as our consultant. He has his finger on the pulse of every major thing going on in community colleges around the country. When he saw what we were rolling out, he told us that of all the schools he works with on this type of initiative most of them, on a scale of 1-10, are around a 2 or 3. We were at an 8 or 9. He told us we have a lot of heavy lifting, but you're doing the right thing. Our work has been so impressive to him and Davis Jenkins and others who are involved in such initiatives that they changed how they viewed the priorities in moving forward. They told us to get your structure first and worry about the quality adjustments later. We told them we disagreed with that order. In response to our suggestions about the order of proceeding, they have changed their thinking and approach. They acknowledge us at national meetings. He stated that Operation 100% is bold and the college is on the right track. The Board has a heavy burden because it isn't just a vote for a certain dollar amount, but the sending of a strong message with your vote. This message can go a long way to inspiring the employees here and the ones they will bring in, to do the right thing and get a much greater return on student success. I've spent my career, close to 35 years, doing this work and can't think of an initiative that is as significant and has such widespread impact as Operation 100%. This initiative is the most exciting and rewarding initiative I've ever undertaken in my career. If the college gets it right, we will be on the national map in a major way. I quote a line from James Murphy's *Flawless Execution*, in which he related talking to a basketball player who said, "We gave up a lot of points on the way to that win." The college may make mistakes, but we will win and we will bring a ring to LCC. We need the Boards vote, help and heart behind this initiative. I thank the Board for the message and the support.

Trustee Proctor commented as follows:

As I look at these rates for community college tuition in 2015 – 2016, and this is in response to some of the arguments presented that LCC is in an economically depressed area, and its students can't afford it, I submit that Jackson Community

College is in a more depressed area than the greater Lansing Community College area. Mott Community College is in a more depressed area than Lansing Community College. Jackson Community College's 2015 – 2016 rate were \$125 per credit hour, and Mott Community College's rate for the same period was \$126 per credit hour. LCC is proposing to go to a \$99 a credit hour, which is not close to either of them, and they are proposing increases in their rates for the upcoming academic year. It appears that Jackson will be at \$135 and Mott at \$130. I want my colleagues to consider that. This is an investment. I didn't say the college was using one time dollars, because I never use that terminology.

Trustee Meyer further commented:

Jackson has never won a millage election, and there are different communities, different things taking place and different values. It isn't just the dollar amount, but the value proposition. I think LCC has a value proposition. I believe that excess money in the system will not go to the purpose the college wants, which is student success.

Trustee Smith called for a vote.

Trustee Proctor stated that the motion on the floor has nothing to do with the Student Success Commitment Resolution. He asked for a roll call vote moved by him and supported by Trustee Hidalgo that the FY 2017 Budget Proposal be approved.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Azima, Hidalgo, Proctor, Abood

Nays: Meyer, Smith, Canja

Absent: None

The motion carried.

Trustee Canja moved the adoption of the following Student Success Resolution:

*Whereas, the Board of Trustees of Lansing Community College is committed to assuring affordable and accessible tuition and out of the 28 community colleges in Michigan, LCC is now tied for the lowest in-district tuition; and*

*Whereas, the Trustees of Lansing Community College are committed to maintaining support of the College's successful academic programs and activities; and*

*Whereas, the Trustees of Lansing Community College are committed to achieving radically enhanced student success through full support and implementation of operation 100%; and*

*Whereas, the Trustees of Lansing Community College are committed to achieving radically enhanced student success through substantially increased employment and/or utilization of qualified success coaches, case managers, professional tutoring services and other necessary personnel; and*

*Whereas, these commitments are of the highest priorities and will require additional funds in order to invest in the activities and staff and resources necessary to meaningfully increase student success;*

*NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:*

- 1. The President is charged with the responsibility and authority to take all steps necessary to ensure rapid and meaningful increases in measurements of student success.*
- 2. Notwithstanding Executive Limitations to the contrary, the President may utilize the contingency, the general fund balance and the 505 reserve to support these initiatives as necessary.*
- 3. The President shall inform the Board regarding action taken and outcomes at least every 60 days.*

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Canja and supported by Trustee Meyer that the resolution as read be adopted.

Trustee Azima asked if # 2 could be restated. He asked if it still included moving money and stated the since the Board approved an \$11 increase in tuition this was no longer needed.

Trustee Canja agreed with Trustee Azima amendment.

Trustee Meyer accepted the amendment.

Trustee Proctor asked if there was unanimous consent to delete #2. He asked for a vote to amend the resolution by deleting #2. He stated the NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED would read:

- 1. The President is charged with the responsibility and authority to take all steps necessary to ensure rapid and meaningful increases in measurements of student success.*
- 2. The President shall inform the Board regarding action taken and outcomes at least every 60 days.*

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Canja, Proctor, Abood, Smith, Hidalgo, Azima, Meyer

Nays: None

Absent: None

The motion carried.

The Board recessed from 8:20 p.m. - 8:31 p.m.

## Monthly Monitoring Report

The following Monitoring Reports were presented:

1. Monthly Financial Statements

## Policy Development

Trustee Proctor stated that the revised Governance Polices were brought before the Board at the February 22, 2016 Board meeting as a first read. He stated that one of the Trustees asked for more time to review. He asked if the following Governance Policy revision could be considered at tonight's meeting.

**POLICY TYPE: BOARD-PRESIDENT RELATIONSHIP**

**BPR-402**

**POLICY TITLE: MONITORING PRESIDENT'S PERFORMANCE**

---

- I. As the Board's main official link to the operating organization, the President's performance will be considered to be synonymous with organizational performance as a whole.

Consequently, the President's job contributions will primarily be evaluated as to performance in two areas:

1. Organizational accomplishment of the provisions of Board policies on *Ends* and budget policies and parameters;
2. Organizational operation within the boundaries of prudence and ethics established in Board policies on *Executive Limitations*.

~~Additionally, the Board will evaluate the performance of the President on overall effectiveness of communication with the Board, and multi-year achievement of goals set by the Board.~~

- II. Monitoring the President's performance is synonymous with monitoring organizational performance against Board policies on *Ends* and on *Executive Limitations*. Any evaluation of the President's performance, formal or informal, may be derived from these monitoring data.

1. The purpose of monitoring is simply to determine the degree to which Board policies are being fulfilled.
2. A given policy may be monitored in one or more of three ways:
  - A. Internal report: Disclosure of compliance information to the Board from the President.

- B. External report: Discovery of compliance information by a disinterested, external auditor, inspector or judge who is selected by and reports directly to the Board. Such reports must assess executive performance only against policies of the Board, not those of the external party unless the Board has previously indicated that party's opinion to be the standard.
  - C. Direct Board inspection: Discovery of compliance information by a Board member, a committee or the Board as a whole. This is a Board inspection of documents, activities or circumstances directed by the Board which allows a "prudent person" test of policy compliance.
3. Upon the choice of the Board, any policy can be monitored by any method at any time. For regular monitoring, however, each *Ends* and *Executive Limitations* policy will be classified by the Board according to frequency and method.
  4. Each year the Board will have a formal evaluation of the President. ~~Evaluations shall consider overall achievements of the president on multi-year initiatives, budgetary performance and effectiveness of communication with the Board as well as any annually established performance goals set by the Board for the President.~~ **The president's yearly evaluation shall be based on the president's performance during the fiscal year starting July 1 and ending June 30.**

Trustee Proctor stated that the policy changes the period over which Dr. Knight's performance will be evaluated from a calendar year period to a fiscal year period starting July 1 and ending June 30. He stated this would be consistent with the college's fiscal year, and that one of the significant components of his performance is how he manages the budget.

Trustee Canja asked on what calendar timeline the Board would do his performance to make this happen.

Trustee Proctor stated that he was presenting the policy as a first read tonight to be taken up at another meeting.

## Linkage Planning/Implementation

### Community Linkage – President's Report

President Knight presented the June 2016 President's report to the Board. A copy of this report is on the LCC website.

[http://www.lcc.edu/trustees/presidents\\_reports](http://www.lcc.edu/trustees/presidents_reports)

## **Committee Reports – Audit Committee Update**

Trustee Meyer gave the following Audit Committee Update:

1. Rehmann Robson presented the proposed Internal Audit Services for FY17
2. Plante Moran presented the Audit Committee with four proposed areas of focus for the FY 2017 internal audit. The Audit committee approved the audit of Athletics, Facilities and Travel Expense and Reimbursement
3. Plant Moran present a review of the Student Financial Aid

## **Committee Reports – Foundation Board Update**

Trustee Abood stated that a written report was provided in the packet.

## **Unfinished Business**

There was no Unfinished Business.

## **Public Comment**

Sally Pierce stated that the person whose email she read during Limited Public Comment Regarding an Agenda Item was Janice Elmore, a full time professor in psychology.

## **Closed Session**

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Meyer and supported by Trustee Smith that the Board go into Closed Session for the purpose of discussing Ratification of Administrative Association/AFT Wage Reopener Agreement, Ratification of Educational Support Personnel (ESP) Contract and Ratification of Health Care Agreement with College Labor Coalition.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Smith, Abood, Azima, Proctor, Canja, Meyer, Hidalgo

Nays: None

Absent: None

The motion carried.

The Board entered into closed session at 8:38 p.m.

The Board returned to open session at 9:22 p.m.

Present: Abood, Azima, Hidalgo, Meyer, Proctor, Smith

Absent: Canja

## Action Item

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Meyer and supported by Trustee Smith that the Ratification of the Administrative Association/AFT Wage Reopener, Ratification of the Educational Support Personnel (ESP) Contract and Ratification of the Health Care Agreement with College Labor Coalition be approved.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Abood, Azima, Smith, Meyer, Hidalgo, Proctor

Nays: None

Absent: Canja

The motion carried.

## Board Evaluation of Meeting

Trustee Meyer stated that he thought the Board did a great job on the tough decision they had to make tonight.

Trustee Azima stated that the discussion was very valuable and that the public needed to hear it.

## Adjournment

IT WAS MOVED by Trustee Meyer and supported by Trustee Proctor that the meeting be adjourned.

Ayes: Abood, Azima, Hidalgo, Meyer, Proctor, Smith

Nays: None

Absent: Canja

The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

Submitted,



Executive Assistant to the Board

Benita Duncan