

**San Jacinto College District Board Workshop
October 1, 2018
District Administration Building, Suite 201**

MINUTES

	Board Workshop Attendees:	Board Members: Erica Davis Rouse, Marie Flickinger, Dan Mims, John Moon, Jr., Keith Sinor, Dr. Ruede Wheeler, Larry Wilson Chancellor: Brenda Hellyer Other: Chris Duke, Lynwood Dunseith, Arturo Michel - via conference call (Thompson & Horton), Joy Pasini, Ann Pearson, Mandi Reiland, Steve Trncak, Laurel Williamson, Teri Zamora
	Agenda Item:	Discussion/Information
I.	Call the Meeting to Order	Board Chair, Marie Flickinger, called the workshop to order at 4:32 p.m.
II.	Roll Call of Board Members	Marie Flickinger, Erica Davis Rouse, Dan Mims, John Moon, Jr., Keith Sinor, Dr. Ruede Wheeler, Larry Wilson
III.	Adjournment to closed or executive session pursuant to Texas Government Code Section 551.074 and 551.071 of the Texas Open Meetings Act, for the following purposes: Personnel Matters and Legal Matters	Adjourned to closed session at 4:34 p.m. a. Legal Matters – For the purpose of a private consultation with the Board’s attorney on any or all subjects or matters authorized by the law. Arturo Michel -via conference call (Thompson & Horton), Mandi Reiland, Steve Trncak, and Teri Zamora b. Personnel Matters - For the purpose of considering the appointment, employment, evaluation, reassignment, duties, discipline or dismissal of a public officer or employee or to hear complaints or charges against a public officer or employee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chancellor Evaluation – Only Board members present to conduct Chancellor Evaluation. Brenda Hellyer rejoined session upon Board’s request. • Other Personnel Matters – Brenda Hellyer and Mandi Reiland present for this item.

IV.	Reconvene in Open Meeting	Reconvened in open meeting at 5:35 p.m.
V.	Discuss Property Tax Rate Proposed Action	<p>Teri Zamora reviewed the proposed action for the 2018-2019 property tax rate. This presentation was reviewed with the Board Finance Committee on August 28, 2018. The College’s total tax valuations increased to \$54.82 billion from \$52.44 billion last year, or 4.65 percent. She explained the following two statutory constraints. The effective property tax rate calculation produces an overall tax rate that would provide the same total taxes as last year when comparing the properties taxed in both years. Tax rates in excess of the effective tax rate require two hearings. The rollback property tax rate calculation produces a Maintenance and Operation (M&O) rate, plus the necessary debt tax rate, per \$100 of valuation. This calculated rate would provide about the same amount of M&O tax revenue from the previous year, plus an eight percent increase. Tax rates in excess of the rollback tax rate require taxpayer vote.</p> <p>She explained that a small portion of the tax base is residential, and despite concerns about the impact of Hurricane Harvey, results positively exceeded expectations. The 4.65 percent growth in the tax base results in a proposed rate decrease from previous calculations. The proposed tax rate of \$0.179329 per \$100 of valuation is a 1.9 percent decrease from the prior rate.</p> <p>Dan Mims asked to confirm the anticipated tax rate increase that we told taxpayers when the 2015 Bond was proposed. Teri answered that we told them that there would be no more than an increase of 3 cents on the debt service.</p> <p>Keith Sinor asked what Teri anticipated for next year on the debt rate. She explained that she foresees an increase. These estimates are based on conservative numbers.</p> <p>Teri stated that this tax rate of \$0.179329 will get the College very close to the budget for 2018-2019.</p> <p>In the Board meeting, Brenda Hellyer will state that the proposed tax rate is a decline from the prior year.</p>
VI.	Review Proposed Timeline for	Teri Zamora reviewed the proposed timeline for Generation Park development. Teri explained that at this

	<p>Generation Park Development</p>	<p>Board meeting, the Board will be voting on a selection of a construction manager at risk (CMR) procurement process for Generation Park. The selection process for architects will be open to the Board approved pool of architects.</p> <p>Erica Davis Rouse asked why we cannot open it up to architects that are not in the current pool. Teri explained that having a pre-screened and Board approved pool will allow a timelier process. Opening this up to additional architects would create delays in the development process.</p> <p>Brenda Hellyer explained that the first step is to select the architect and begin the design process. After the CMR is chosen, they will begin working with the architect on the construction process and timeline for the development. This timeline is based on anticipation of opening Fall 2020.</p> <p>Teri explained that preliminary work on facility needs and usage has been completed by Facility Programming.</p> <p>Brenda explained that Erica has previously expressed concerns regarding the perception that the College has a limited approved pool for architects for larger and small projects. Brenda would like for Teri to reach out to the architectural firm that Erica has been in communication with. Marie Flickinger added that the last solicitation processes included a wider range of architects than previously.</p> <p>Brenda asked if the Board is comfortable with the timelines as presented. Members did not have any issues with the proposed plans. Brenda stated that she would be bringing back any changes or additional information regarding Generation Park.</p> <p>The group briefly discussed the classroom spaces. Brenda explained that after an architect is selected and the design process is underway, she will provide the Board with additional information on the building itself.</p>
<p>VII.</p>	<p>Update on Quality Enhancement Plan</p>	<p>Brenda explained that the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is part of the work for the SACSCOC Reaffirmation.</p>

		<p>Laurel Williamson introduced the QEP team that will be presenting today. Those present were Chris Duke, Ann Pearson, Joy Pasini, and Woody Dunseith. Woody and Joy are co-chairs of the QEP Steering Committee.</p> <p>Woody reviewed the process for a QEP topic selection. The focus group began its work in fall 2016. The first round includes a review of general education outcomes assessment reports. The second round is to refine a topic list, and the third round ranked topics and formed advocacy groups. This process is classroom based and led by faculty. The suggested topics were presented at College Community Week in Spring 2017 and were voted on by faculty with 65 percent selecting critical thinking.</p> <p>Woody reviewed the College’s definition of critical thinking. He also provided examples through videos to demonstrate critical thinking in the fire protections field.</p> <p>Woody explained that the goal is that the QEP will engage the College community in a strategic effort to enhance development of critical thinking skills among students. He also reviewed the student learning objectives (SLOs), critical thinking framework, analytical thinking tools, and assessment.</p> <p>Dr. Ruede Wheeler stated that he thinks this will be difficult for the faculty and especially for students to implement. Woody explained that we are on the right track in our planned application of the QEP. Teaching the process of critical thinking and applying it directly to specific areas, such as philosophy, nursing, and firefighting, will make the process easier to implement.</p> <p>Keith Sinor asked if faculty in each area are developing the critical thinking processes. Woody explained that this is faculty based, and that each department by campus is developing the processes first. The information will be taken to the advisory committees to build alignment with the employers. The goal is to have the student enter the workforce with critical thinking skills.</p> <p>Dr. Wheeler asked about participation. Woody stated that it would be ideal to have all faculty members participate, but it will be voluntary. The goal is to have as much participation from faculty as possible to ensure that more</p>
--	--	--

		<p>students are reached. The vote indicated tremendous support for this topic, so the participation should be representative.</p> <p>Erica asked how we are encouraging the faculty to participate. She agrees that critical thinking is a good QEP topic that will be applicable and interesting to students. Laurel explained that the general education assessment outcomes will help guide interest in the QEP. Chris Duke added that over the last 6-7 years of review on critical thinking, we have had approximately 60-70 faculty members that are taking the current critical thinking rubric and applying it to samples of student work from across the core curriculum. This QEP process is building on a broad base of current faculty involvement.</p> <p>Brenda explained that this will be presented to the SACSCOC on-site committee at the end of October. Then for the next 5-year report, we will provide an update on the implementation of the QEP.</p> <p>Laurel stated that there was heavy faculty involvement and engagement, and we do not see us having any difficulty getting faculty to voluntarily participate.</p> <p>A QEP reference sheet was distributed to the Board for their reference.</p> <p>Brenda thanked the group for their work and leadership on this project.</p>
VIII.	Review Proposed Changes to Board Bylaws	<p>Brenda reviewed the recommended changes to the Board bylaws. They were noted in track changes and include clarification that the Trustees are included in the Conflict of Interest Policy and Procedures.</p> <p>Members did not have issues with these changes. This item will be voted in this Board meeting.</p>
IX.	Review of Calendar	<p>Brenda reviewed the calendar with the Board.</p> <p>Members discussed the Association of Community College Trustees Leadership Congress and determined that John Moon, Jr. and Keith Sinor would be the voting delegates.</p>

X.	General Discussion of Meeting Items	<p>Brenda asked if there were any items from the meeting agenda that the members would like to review.</p> <p>Brenda explained the changes in the Payroll policy and procedures that are going to the Board for vote at this meeting. The December payroll change will be delayed until 2019.</p>
XI.	Adjournment	<p>Workshop adjourned at 6:38 p.m.</p>