

**Delta College**  
**Board of Trustees Special Meeting**  
**Delta College Main Campus**  
**Board Room**  
**Thursday, February 1, 2018**  
**4:00 pm**

<b>Board Present</b>	M. Benecke, A. Buckley, D. Middleton, M. Morrissey, M. Nash, M. Rowley
<b>Board Absent</b>	R. Emrich, K. Lawrence-Webster, E. Selby
<b>Others Present</b>	T. Boudrot, N. Bovid, T. Brown, P. Clark, R. Curley, R. Curry, S. DuFresne, L. Dull, J. Goodnow, K. Houston, A. Howell, D. Lutz, D. Roebuck, D. Sabourin, L. Smith, A. Ursuy
<b>Press Present</b>	J. Hall, WSGW
<b>Call to Order</b>	Board Vice Chair, D. Middleton, called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm.
<b>Approval of Agenda</b>	Board Vice Chair, D. Middleton, called for the approval of the agenda. M. Rowley made a motion to approve the agenda with support from M. Nash. The motion passed unanimously.
<b>Public Comment</b>	D. Middleton called for public comment, hearing none the meeting proceeded.
<b>Welcome, Ground Rules, Getting to Know One Another</b>	<p>D. Middleton turned the meeting over to the facilitator, former Delta College Trustee, Kimberly Houston. K. Houston thanked everyone for all their help in pulling the packet of information together for this meeting.</p> <p>K. Houston shared with the Board the outcomes for the meeting which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Increased engagement, trust and ownership among the Delta College Board members.</li><li>• Increased clarity of the trustees’ role, responsibility and advocacy for Delta College.</li><li>• Increased understanding of Delta College’s priorities which focus on enrollment and retention.</li></ul> <p>The ground rules for the meeting included the following: stay engaged and participate; all voices need to be heard; ask for clarification; provide your insight; and keep an open mind.</p> <p>K. Houston then began a discussion on building trust with these questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How do we build trust as a Board?</li><li>• How do we treat one another as board member?</li><li>• How do we hold ourselves and one another accountable in our roles as trustees?</li><li>• How do we lead effectively as a governing board?</li></ul> <p>She then asked Board members to present their 60 second “elevator speech” introducing themselves to the Board as part of their pre-work for this meeting.</p>

The Board shared ideas for future actions and/or insights in regards to trust. This included listening without judgment; taking input without assuming motive; wanting to be trusted; asking clarifying questions; not being overly sensitive; getting to know each other better; and respecting the process – being courteous to the hierarchy of the administration. Board members expressed no issues with trust. The focus was on building new relationships with the majority of the Board being relatively new.

Board members also gave a 60 second “elevator speech” introducing Delta College to a community member.

**Trustees’ Role,  
Responsibilities and  
Advocacy**

K. Houston started the discussion on trustees’ role, responsibility and advocacy with these questions.

- What are our responsibilities individually and collectively as Delta College trustees?
- How do I stay informed, engaged and act as a positive advocate for Delta College?
- How will I be involved in providing direction and guidance on the strategic initiatives identified in the College’s strategic plan?
- How will we measure our effectiveness as a Board in the strategic governance of Delta College?

Board members shared their experiences. M. Rowley noted that the oath of office included upholding the law but didn’t include much more. He has had an awesome experience and noted that he will be running for another term. D. Middleton shared her observation in that she doesn’t hear from the community as much as she had anticipated. She considers her role to be a representative of the community. She feels a responsibility to reflect their concerns. M. Benecke noted a possible additional role is to engage with the community proactively. Meeting agendas are so structured that it doesn’t always leave room for exploration and discussion with Dr. Goodnow on her concerns and thoughts about Delta College.

M. Nash noted the benefit in having a legislative luncheon. He supports doing this again especially when we are on a down slide with projects, keeping up with our relationships. There was some discussion on governing boards (Delta College) versus policy board. It was noted that different isn’t always bad. Delta College is a large institution that has staff to complete the strategic priorities unlike some smaller organizations where some of this responsibility falls on their Board members.

D. Middleton shared her experiences with the Michigan Community College Association (MCCA) and the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT). Both have been very beneficial as there are others to learn from. It has been very powerful and helpful. There are opportunities for learning and working with other trustees as they have a different culture and a different way of doing things.

K. Houston asked the Board members for strengths and weaknesses. M. Benecke noted that she’s still learning. M. Nash noted that it’s been a progression. D. Middleton noted that it has met her expectation. She also noted the respect she has for the faculty and

staff who know what they are doing but said she has the ability to ask questions when needed.

J. Goodnow shared with the Board her expectations for Board members in having an active role in advocacy. She encouraged Board members to share their “elevator speeches” while out in the community. She noted examples of recent Board member’s activities and involvement. She also noted that there shouldn’t be any surprises between the Trustees and the President. There should be mutual respect and any questions or concerns should come to the President first.

J. Goodnow noted she has plans to meet with Board members, one-on-one, to better know them, finding out what areas they would like to be more involved in and how they would like to receive information from the President.

**Dinner Served**

The Board took a short break for dinner.

**Strategic Priorities:  
Focus on Enrollment  
and Student Retention**

D. Lutz, Vice President of Business and Finance, began by sharing with the Board a chart that was included in their packet and updated since being included in the Budget Book with credit hour projections for fiscal year 2017-2018 of 171,678 and 2018-2019 of 165,600. This is a decline in enrollment of 34% and almost 86,000 credit hours. D. Lutz shared this information from a strategic planning stand point.

She then shared with the Board the comparison chart that the auditors reported on in November in regards to our expenditures compared to our peer group. The report given in November now includes the 2017 Activities Classification Structure (ACS) information that has been recently released allowing us to compare our 2017 numbers with the group’s 2017 numbers. Delta spent 53% on instruction compared to 46% within the group. Although the difference in percentages don’t seem large, the actual dollar amount is. The difference in the cost of instruction equates to Delta College spending \$4.7 million more, \$2 million less in student services, \$1.3 million less on institutional administration and \$1.4 million less on plant operations. D. Lutz noted that this is not something new in that the College’s philosophy for many years has been that we spend more on full-time instruction.

D. Lutz then shared with the Board information on class capacities to encourage discussion and digging in to how we report this information as it’s used as a benchmarking tool. She also noted that there is some disagreement and lack of clarity whether all colleges report this information consistently. She shared the duplicated headcount, sections delivered, and class size per section for the fiscal year 2016-2017 for the colleges within the ACS Group 3. Delta College’s class size is significantly lower at 14.77 compared to the average of the others within the group at 18.68.

If Delta sections ran at an average of 18.68 we would need 899 less sections. Our average cost per section is \$8,221. This would save \$7.3 million annually or almost \$1.9 million for each additional +1 to class size. She also shared costs based on instruction and instructional support per fiscal year equated student (FYES). Delta College is \$752 above the average of the others in the group. This equates to almost \$4.5 million.

D. Lutz also shared information on full-time and part-time faculty ratios among other Michigan community colleges for Fall of 2015. Delta has a student FTE to full-time faculty ratio of 26.08, making us the fourth lowest. The mode is close to 40 and the average is at 52.4. We have nearly double the number of full-time faculty that our peers have. If Delta did decide to target the average it would be a cost savings of \$11.3 million and the mode would be \$7.8 million. However, making this change will take decades and isn't something that can happen in just a few years.

Finally, D. Lutz showed budgeted general fund personnel from 2000-01 when enrollment was last at 175,000. There has been a decrease of 57 full-time positions which include a decrease of 3 faculty; 31 from the administrative and professional staff and support staff; and 23 in maintenance.

R. Curry, Vice President of Instruction and Learning Services, presented on retention strategies. She shared with the Board some recent ACS Data. Based on AY 2016-2017 data, independent study classes account for almost 9% of 4,018 sections scheduled. Cross-listed classes account for almost 3%. When both of these groups are removed, our average class size is 16.94, which is comparable with both Henry Ford and Mott. Strategies to reduce independent studies are being reviewed by the academic area.

R. Curry gave an update on Guided Pathways which map the courses that need to be taken for each semester until completion for students. During the academic year 2016-2017 all occupational and career programs were completed. Work is continuing on guided pathways for transfer to four-year institutions. Fifty-two pathways have been completed including the top 5 transfer programs to the top 5 transfer schools which include Central Michigan University, Saginaw Valley State University, Ferris State University, Northwood University and Wayne State University.

In regards to class scheduling a committee has been formed including Enrollment Management in Student Education Services, Academic Deans, Division Chairs and the Academic Finance Manager. They are working to identify scheduling needs for fall and winter semester and making adjustments to better meet student demands. Over the past 3 years there has been a decrease of 9% in sections as student enrollment has declined. Section review is ongoing and will continue based on students need. The goal is to develop course schedules using Student Planner and Guided Pathways in order to continuously improve a student-centered schedule.

Faculty are currently working on an Achieving the Dream (AtD) Project in identifying faculty whose students consistently do well in gateway courses. These courses include: ENG 111W – English Composition; MTH 119 – Intermediate Algebra; BIO 111W – Principles of Biology; ART 151W – Art History and Appreciation; PSY 101W – General Psychology; CHM 111 – General Chemistry; POL 104W – American Politics; COM 112W – Foundations of Oral Communication and HIS 111W – Survey of Western Civilization. The faculty identified would then be interviewed for best practices and share them through the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence with other faculty.

R. Curley, Dean of Enrollment Management, shared with the Board some of the challenges and goals in regards to enrollment and retention. He began by showing the College's

dashboard which shows current vs. projected credit hours for Fall 2015 through Winter 2018. He shared the most recent fall-to-fall retention rate for 2016-2017 being 52%. The challenges include a divide between the number of new applications and the number that actually enrolled being only around 42%. Students are also transferring early without graduating. The majority of our students, 64%, are part-time and have an average credit load of 9.1 as of last fall. The high school graduating classes are declining and will continue to do so for quite some time.

Goals include a pre-orientation onboarding; the new student orientation which also includes a parent orientation; and an intrusive academic advising case management plan. The pre-orientation includes working more closely with students in high school helping them through the steps for applying for college and any next steps. Guided pathways has been fully implemented. The Customer Relationship Management Tool (CRM) is fully operational on the admission side and work continues on the retention side. There will also be a faculty portal. Finally, the push of "Fifteen to Finish" is encouraging students to take at least 15 credits a semester in order to finish their degree in two years. The retention rate of those taking higher credit loads is much higher.

M. Rowley asked about information on our graduates. It was noted that more effort is being made to get this information as only approximately 30% return the graduate follow-up surveys each year. D. Middleton noted that Delta College has one academic advisor for every 800 students while Jackson Community College has a 1 to 400 ratio. She asked about any results Jackson could share that would help Delta College. R. Curley noted that Delta's intrusive academic advising is modeled after Jackson. He also mentioned the recent awarding of a TRIO Grant that allows for five VISTA workers to help in this area. They will not be able to advise students but can help out in other ways.

M. Benecke asked how we balance the budget when revenues continue to decrease and our expenses stay the same or increase. D. Lutz noted that the cost saving changes we make each year are listed in the budget book. The easiest time to reduce cost is when there are vacancies. The College has not taken the philosophy of across the college cuts. J. Goondow also noted efforts in additional revenue efforts which include dual enrollment and new program development.

M. Nash asked if there is a way to measure the quality of education at Delta College against others. R. Curley noted in a recent student survey, students indicated that there was a high level of satisfaction with their instruction at Delta College. J. Goodnow noted the idea of a possible pilot program in finding strategies for effective teaching. M. Nash also asked about the number of programs Delta College offers compared to their peer group and also reviewing our high cost programs. J. Goodnow also noted the need for a more robust program review that goes above and beyond the state requirements.

A. Buckley asked about our membership with the League for Innovation and what role technology plays in the classroom as well as a comparison to other colleges who are not members. J. Goodnow noted her recent request for a chief technologist. The person in this position will help with some of our technology challenges as well as maximize what we already have.

**Board of Trustees Next Steps**

K. Houston asked Board members to think in regards to enrollment and retention one year to 18 months from now what the priorities should be. Board members indicated the following: hold true to a commitment with the students in not always cutting small classes; 2 year class schedules; speed of college; remember that one size doesn't fit everyone; staying involved as a board member and knowing what's going on; reviewing what we have; more on-line classes; game plan for what to do when the numbers keep dropping and incremental changes aren't enough; strategy for academic advisors; ask for the Board's help; have a play book - stick to it and review and evaluate along the way; having a plan for how we react; and partnerships with the community.

**Retreat Feedback/ Trustee Comments**

K. Houston asked the Board members to share their positives that came from this meeting and any changes they would make.

The positives included an eye opening experience to better understand their level of responsibility; having the College continue to innovate; the opportunity to talk about tough issues at an in depth level; allowing for great discussion that doesn't always happen at the regular meeting; the opportunity to better know the Board members; and a well prepared meeting with great information.

Changes included having less data as it takes a long time to process as well as having full Board participation.

Wishes for the Board included: staying relevant; champion in diversity; rank high nationally; better apply board member's strengths; be the face of the college; hear more from the community; capitalize on the difference in background and skills among board members; more participation from the Board; know what Board members can do to help; 100% participation by Board.

Highest hopes included: innovation; to think differently; culture of innovation; staying relevant; getting ahead of the average; nobody provides free community college; balance expenses and stay in the top among other community colleges in the nation.

J. Goodnow thanked K. Houston for a great job in facilitating this evening's meeting. There was a high level of engagement and a focus on priorities that will help J. Goodnow better focus on her goals. She also thanked the Vice Presidents and R. Curley for their participation as well as A. Ursuy and T. Brown for their work.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, Board Vice Chair, D. Middleton adjourned the meeting at 8:03 pm.

---

Talisa Brown, Assistant Board Secretary