Welcome and Introductions – Tim Johnson, Board Chair, welcomed participants to the Board retreat. A quorum of the Board was present including Pat Ashley, Ron Fox, Shawn Hogan, Tim Johnson, Claudia Sullivan, Kevin Talbert and Dean Wendle. Due notice was given.

Administration/Staff: Cathy Kemper-Pelle, Kori Ebenhack, Kirk Gibson, Curtis Sommerfeld, Greg McKown and Denise Nelson. Laurie Roe joined the meeting late morning.

Guests: Gregg Sanders, Hennebery Eddy Architects, Inc. and Lois Schlegel, Facilitator

2. Orientation – Lois Schlegel reviewed the agenda (see file) and goals of the retreat. She also reviewed facility information, ground rules and provided an opportunity for participants to add or remove items to/from the agenda.

Tim Johnson requested extending the lunch time to one-hour and there was no opposition to this request. President Kemper-Pelle will shorten her presentation to accommodate the minor revision to the schedule.

Ms. Schlegel advised the group if items come up for which we do not have time to discuss today, she will place the subject on a list for future reference. She referred to this list as the "parking lot."

3. Presentation – Table Rock Campus (TRC) Master Plan Architect

Ms. Schlegel introduced Gregg Sanders, Hennebery Eddy Architects. Mr. Sanders provided a PowerPoint presentation (see file) and distributed the TRC Master Plan document (see file). The visual presentation was provided concurrently with review of the Plan document, specifically, pages 5, 11, 13-15, 17-26 (charts/graphs), 29, 38, 59, 69, 71, 77, 83, 85, 89 and 92. The Plan document is a guide for all recommended campus improvements through 2030. Current funding allocations do not support completion of all recommendations illustrated in the Plan; therefore, the Plan calls for phased implementation by the College as funding becomes available. The Health Professions building is recommended for the first phase.

Mr. Sanders provided an overview of the steps taken to develop the TRC Master Plan (see file for complete list):

 RCC Programs Considered – Arts and Letters, Health Professions, Career Technical Education, Student Services and College Services

- Planning Process Project Charter, Vision and Goals, Programming Workshops, Site Analysis, Documentation
- Role of Decision Makers Stakeholder Representatives, Steering Committee and RCC Board of Education

Findings and Analysis (see file for complete list, charts and graphs):

- Site Zoning & Access Site: General industrial zone; Zoning: Limited to commercial
 or business schools; Access: Full access from Pacific Avenue and limited access from
 Table Rock Rd.
- Site Parking Parking: Code does not specifically identify College University or Business School, Schools (K-12): Min. 1:25 seats/classroom; maximum 2 spaces per classrooms; RCC to set parking requirement based on current and projected uses
- Landscape and Setback Parking lot landscaping required; On-site storm water detention likely required; No floor area ration (FAR) limitations; Very limited setback or other requirements
- What can we do?
 - a. Continue to provide Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Health Professions programs
 - b. General education classes only if required by CTE and Health Professions
- What can't we do?
 - a. Full service campus
 - b. Comprehensive pedestrian traffic changes

When providing an overview of the 2030 Master Plan Program Summary, Mr. Sanders discussed creating a front door to the campus, a campus commons, program priorities and areas with potential for shared use across several program groups (see file for further detail and multiple diagrams).

It was noted the TRC Master Plan will be presented for action at the October 17 Board meeting. Board members were concerned about the entrance and exit points at TRC and requested to discuss this subject in further detail at today's retreat. Ms. Schlegel provided the options of a) continuing to discuss this today or b) schedule a work session prior to the October 17 Board meeting. Board members agreed to amend the retreat agenda by postponing the tuition discussion and redirecting the time allotment to further discuss the TRC Master Plan.

Ron Fox reported he received a question from someone asking why RCC is making substantial investments in Table Rock Campus when the campus is far away from everything. He posed the question to the Board for further discussion on this topic.

Kevin Talbert responded, as a member of the TRC Steering Committee, he has participated in a number of discussions related to the location of the Health Professions building and the Board has subsequently discussed this as well. A considerable amount of input has been received regarding how the building will fit with traffic patterns and how this will work for students. Substantial discussion has occurred on many levels regarding Table Rock Campus. He believes the best location (TRC) has been selected. Ron Fox agreed TRC is the best location.

General discussion occurred regarding the traffic patterns at TRC.

Shawn Hogan agreed TRC is a good location and commented universities such as the University of Washington and Oregon State University have taken what is traditionally a thoroughfare and created a zone that brings everything together.

Dean Wendle fully supports the right turn off Table Rock Road. This will create a front door for the campus. Pat Ashley agreed with Mr. Wendle.

Ms. Schlegel confirmed the Board has reached consensus regarding placement of Health Professions at TRC and the Table Rock Road traffic pattern. Board members agreed without opposition.

Tim Johnson called for a break from 10:20 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

Ms. Schlegel proposed the following time adjustments to the retreat agenda:

10:30 to 11:15 a.m. – Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) Process and Bond Project Update.

11:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. – Strategic Plan Update

12:15 to 1:15 p.m. Lunch

1:15 to 2:00 p.m. Entrepreneur Fund

Board members agreed to the agenda adjustment.

4. Presentation – CM/GC Process and Bond Project Update – Greg McKown

A. CM/GC Presentation – Greg McKown, Construction Project Manager, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Contract Manager/General Contractor CM/GC) Process (see file for complete presentation). The following is an overview of the presentation:

- Review of acronyms and terminology
- Project delivery methods and definitions of Design-Bid-Build; Design Build and CM/GC
- Timeline comparisons of the aforementioned delivery methods
- Contractor and owner risk comparison of the delivery methods
- Project team comparisons of the delivery methods
- Known issues with Design-Bid-Build
 - a. Low bid may not result in the lowest total cost
 - b. Constructability challenges
 - c. Risk allocation
 - d. Adversarial relationships
 - e. Higher level of inspection/testing by the owner
- Design-Build Advantages
 - a. Single point of responsibility to the owner
 - b. Design and construction under one contract Integration
 - c. Allows construction to start before design is complete
 - d. Based on fixed price or Guaranteed Maximum Price
- Design-Build Drawbacks
 - a. Design Builder controls the design, which ultimately controls the quality and cost
- CM/GC Overview

A three-part project team

- a. The owner
- b. Owner contracted architect
- c. A two-phase contract with a general contractor
- CM/GC Advantages
 - a. Owner control of design
 - b. Contractor part of design
 - c. Self-perform work
 - d. Fixed fees
 - e. Technical expertise for GMP
 - f. Decreased project time and increased cost savings
- Review CM/GC Time (see file for chart)
- Review of Core Project Management
 - a. Architectural firm
 - b. CM/GC
 - c. Greg McKown, Construction Project Manager

- d. Curtis Sommerfeld, Vice President of College Services
- e. Jodie Fulton, Contract and Procurement Manager

Mr. McKown mentioned Board members and the President are welcome to attend project management meetings. These meetings are held weekly on Wednesdays at TRC, room 206, (contact Denise Nelson if planning to attend.)

The Board requested to continue to receive the monthly written report and brief updates at regular Board meetings and also make quarterly tours available and Board members will attend if available. Curtis Sommerfeld mentioned staff will ensure a construction website camera will be installed and images linked to the College website.

- **B. Bond Project Updates** Greg McKown continued with a PowerPoint presentation and provided the following update (see file for complete presentation):
 - High Technology Center Project Highlights
 - a. Project out for bidding October 1 November 1
 - b. November 21 construction contract to Board
 - c. November 29 scheduled construction start
 - d. July 9, 2018 scheduled project completion/opening
 - High Technology Center Project Challenges
 - a. Private use of bond funds under EDA covenant limiting budget
 - b. EDA contractor review required before awarding contract
 - c. Drainage ditch permit
 - Health Professions Project Highlights
 - a. Master planning completed
 - b. Architect fee negotiation ends 10/5/17, 2:00 p.m.
 - c. October 17, Architect and CM/GC contract before the Board
 - d. October 25, Project kick-off meeting
 - Health Professions Project Challenges
 - a. Increased cost of construction
 - Science Building Remodel Project Highlights
 - a. \$6 million match grant award
 - Science Building Remodel Project Challenges
 - a. Renovations could trigger fire code requirement
 - Redwood Campus Water Connection Project Highlights
 - a. Phase 1 complete site conditions and college options
 - b. September 14, ZCS Engineering presented project finding to Bond Oversight Committee (BOC)
 - c. September 28, Meeting with City of Grants Pass

- Redwood Campus Water Connection Project Challenges
 - a. Future waterline in City of Grants Pass master plan necessary for college project
 - Board members and the President agreed the waterline challenges
 with the City of Grants Pass have the potential to become a
 significant issue. The BOC and/or full Board will discuss this
 further at their next meeting. Curtis and Cathy will work on
 developing deadlines. Dean Wendle recommended the College
 schedule a work session with the City and provide a presentation
 regarding this.
- RCC/Fire District 3 (FD3) Classroom Project Highlights
 - a. FD3 developed design/build request for proposal
 - b. Project out for bidding October 7 November 8
 - c. Contract to FD3 Board at their November meeting
- RCC/Fire District 3 (FD3) Classroom Project Challenges
 - a. Low project budget

Board members thanked Greg McKown and Gregg Sanders for their presentations. Mr. McKown and Mr. Sanders left the meeting at this time.

Lois Schlegel coordinated another adjustment to the agenda by changing the start-time of the lunch break from 12:15 p.m. to 11:30 a.m. Board members agreed to this change.

At 11:30 a.m., Tim Johnson called for a one-hour lunch break. Laurie Roe, Director, Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning, joined the meeting at this time.

Tim Johnson reconvened the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

President Kemper reported a preview of the Innovation Hub (Maker Space) was provided yesterday at the Small Business Development Center in Grants Pass. Board members Dean Wendle and Claudia Sullivan attended. Mr. Wendle commented the space is set-up very nicely and reflects our partnership with the City of Grants Pass to show the potential of what a Maker Space could provide to the community.

Board members were invited to attend the Innovation Hub Open House at the Small Business Development Center, Grants Pass, October 6, 5:00 to 8:00 p.m.

5. Strategic Plan Update

President Kemper-Pelle reported she recently saw a marketing form at Asante to be completed by their customers when recognizing an employee who demonstrates "living

Asante's values." Cathy has talked with RCC's Human Resources (H.R.) office about creating this type of form at the College. H.R. staff is putting this together in hard copy form and also online.

A. Status of Strategic Plan Objectives – A copy of the 2017-2020 Strategic Plan was distributed to Board members for review prior to the retreat (see file). The College Executive Team is in the process of developing area plans for the wildly important goals and objectives. In the past we have had an electronic portal for this but heard it was hard to use. Staff is currently working on simplifying a new process to get area plans submitted. Administration is also in the process of updating the College Effectiveness Council (CEC) membership. This group is instrumental with coordinating documentation for accreditation. Cathy reported she will be attending accreditation evaluator training in November so she has a clear sense of what RCC's accrediting body looks for as she is used to the southern association which is very different.

Ron Fox asked to receive a copy of the Strategic Plan metrics. President Kemper-Pelle will distribute this information to the Board with the October 17 meeting material.

B. Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) Data - Laurie Roe

Ms. Roe reported the State of Oregon belongs to VFA and all community colleges submit data to VFA. Laurie provided background information regarding the history of VFA.

The VFA's Public Outcomes Report for the 2016/17 RCC reporting cycle was distributed to Board members for review prior to the retreat. Ms. Roe advised, whenever the report indicates "credit" this means "semester credit."

Laurie explained the following items in the report and the related charts (see file):

- Cohorts examined in the report
- Six-year outcomes page
- Developmental math
- Developmental English and reading

The last page of the report highlights the two-year progress measures at the public level.

Updates of this report will be provided to the Board on an annual basis.

Board members thanked Ms. Roe for being flexible with her presentation time and for providing a presentation.

C. Format to Receive Monthly Update – Strategic Plan Wildly Important Goals

The Board requested to receive quarterly progress reports on the objectives.

6. Entrepreneurial Fund

- A. Review Application and Decision Process Used This Year Board members received the entrepreneurial funding proposal process flow chart, preliminary entrepreneurial funding proposal authorization form, project application form, and proposal scoring rubric for review prior to the meeting (see file). President Kemper-Pelle reviewed the process and forms in detail. She acknowledged the excellent work of Lisa Stanton, Chief Financial Officer, for developing the process and forms. Board members were pleased with this as developed.
- **B.** Review Outcomes of the Process President Kemper-Pelle reported two proposals were received. One proposal, Latino Outreach and Recruitment Project, received funding. Board members received a copy of this proposal for review prior to the meeting (see file). Cathy believes it is possible additional proposals were not submitted because the process required the applicant spend time with the Small Business Development Center thus the amount of time required to complete the proposal may have deterred applicants. Vice President Ebenhack added the Latino Outreach and Recruitment Project has the potential to generate full-time students for the College. If entrepreneur funding successfully helps to increase the number of full-time students, this position could be added to the general fund.
 - Dr. Talbert commented the forms and process look terrific. He is pleased with the project funded.
 - Claudia Sullivan was impressed with the process and outcome.
 - Dean Wendle commented this was nicely done.

C. Discuss Thoughts, Ideas and Recommendations Regarding the Entrepreneurial Fund/Process, Current and Future

- a. Achieving the Dream Board members received background information about Achieving the Dream (ATD) for review prior to the meeting (see file). In addition, President Kemper-Pelle provided a budget estimate handout at the meeting (see file). The following are highlights of discussion on this topic:
 - President Kemper-Pelle reported the largest piece of ATD has to do with data. Also, part of their mission is helping colleges build capacity. The success of this for colleges depends on the institution's ability to confront its

- weaknesses. This is about looking at data and leveraging data to focus in on the key things you need to change to receive the biggest impact.
- Tim Johnson asked for Cathy's thoughts on the institutions which failed with the ATD model. Cathy advised, one institution that failed did not have board support. Another institution had so many projects going on they had no focus and suffered from initiative fatigue.
- Dean Wendle mentioned, at one time, Clackamas Community College was an ATD college and they did well with this. Cathy reported there are 6 community colleges in Oregon still involved with ATD.
- Cathy indicated a three-year membership is \$75,000 per year. Most institutions get this expense grant-funded somehow. The important things ATD provides are the leadership coach and data coach.
- ATD colleges must travel to and participate in their annual conference.
- Pat Ashley would like an opportunity to discuss this further to think about ATD in depth.
- Claudia Sullivan is concerned if this is the right time to become an ATD college considering we will be migrating from Rogue Net to another system.
 In addition, an accreditation cycle is forthcoming. Instead, she likes the idea of using entrepreneurial funds for new college programs
- Shawn Hogan agreed with Claudia. We could fund new programs with this
 amount of money. He questioned, with accreditation coming up, what is the
 capacity of the team to take-on another initiative? President Kemper-Pelle
 reported the upcoming accreditation is a self-study.
- Kirk Gibson offered his thoughts with developing pathways, managing bond projects and enterprise resource planning (replacing Rogue Net) capacity is the issue. The College reduced function by about \$1.7 million last year and is operating very lean.
- Ron Fox commented ATD looks like a good initiative but a big initiative for the institution at this time.
- Dean and Pat believe it would be best for Board members to take the time to review the information thoroughly and revisit this at some point.
- Kevin agreed with Dean and Pat. In addition, due to the annual budget, he is not ready to make a decision on this.
- **D. Next Steps** Board members will take time to read through the material and revisit this topic at a later date.

Tim Johnson called for a ten-minute break from 2:10 to 2:20 p.m.

7. Student Tuition

A. Explore what can be done to avoid a possible increase in tuition next year

<u>Challenges:</u> The following is a list of challenges resulting from general discussion:

- Difficulty in forecasting tuition over time
- Increase in the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) liability
- Uncertain funding from the State
- Limited ways for the Board to balance the budget
- Two consecutive terms recently when enrollment has decreased

<u>Possible Opportunities</u>: The following is a list of thoughts and ideas resulting from general discussion:

- Increase funding from grants (actively seek more grant funding)
- Increase productivity
- Increase enrollment
- Increase enrollment with class scheduling efficiencies Are we offering classes when the students need them? Are we offering enough night classes?
- Consider reducing tuition for classes during non-peak days/times
- Focus on recruiting and retention increasing retention is important to reducing costs
- Continue to grow and strengthen pathways
- Dual enrollment model, as an example, at TRC
- Offer high schools reduced tuition costs if they come to RCC campuses before 10:00 a.m. (as an example)
- More efficient use of space will reduce costs
- a. Open Educational Resources (OERs) This will continue to be an area where the College commits to reducing costs for students.
- 8. Recap and Review Parking Lot Board members thanked Denise Nelson for coordinating the meeting and for her assistance with putting the meeting material together. They also thanked Lois Schlegel for her excellent work preparing for and facilitating the retreat.

The following is a list of items brought up at the retreat for which the Board did not have time to discuss but would like to address at a later date:

Parking Lot

- 1. Scheduling external business presentations
- 2. Discussion about zoning issues/Jackson County definition of "industrial"
- 3. Revisit pending items and Board member's areas of interest
- 4. Negotiation with City of Grants Pass about water line pumping station
- 5. Achieving the Dream
- 6. Other ideas for entrepreneur fund what is the purpose of the fund?
- 7. Revenue and cost discussion
- 8. Data on maker space
- 9. Future of work/education
- 10. Dash board? Retention check-in, strategic plan metrics, data
- 11. Communication with high schools and universities
- 9. Board Roundtable Tim Johnson asked Board members to comment on the retreat.
 - Dean Wendle Good discussion of topics and mentioned he appreciated the wellorganized meeting material in binders.
 - Pat Ashley Enjoyed the discussion and interaction. She would like to see housekeeping details addressed quickly at monthly Board meetings in order to have more time to learn. In her view, the Board can make better decisions when they receive an opportunity for this kind of discussion.
 - Ron Fox Enjoys serving on the Board with this group. Everyone works very well
 together and consequently, the Board can cover a variety of topics while
 accomplishing a great deal.
 - Claudia Sullivan Impressed with the Voluntary Framework of Accountability. It is nice to see the numbers have improved compared to the past. She also appreciated taking the time to discuss the TRC Master Plan.
 - Kevin Talbert The retreat provided good discussions on a variety of topics. He specifically enjoyed the discussions around construction, Achieving the Dream and the entrepreneurial fund. He appreciated having the Vice Presidents in attendance.
 - Shawn Hogan Appreciated the TRC Master Plan and CM/GC Process and Bond Project presentations.

Tim Johnson adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.