

MINUTES

COCHISE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, September 8, 2015
Sierra Vista Campus
6:00 p.m.

1. GENERAL FUNCTIONS

1.01 Call to Order

Mr. DiPeso called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Board Members Present:

Mr. David DiPeso
Mr. Dennis Nelson
Mrs. Jane Strain
Mr. Tim Quinn
Mr. Danny Ortega

1.02 Pledge of Allegiance

1.03 Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as published.

1.04 Citizen's Interim

There were no requests to address the Board.

1.05 Standing Reports

1.05.1 Representative to the Arizona Association of District Governing Boards (AADGB)

An Arizona Association of District Governing Boards report was not presented as the AADGB has not met since the last report was provided at the Cochise County Community College District Governing Board meeting held on August 11, 2015. The next meeting of the AADGB is scheduled for November 12, 2015.

1.06.2 Representative to the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT)

Mrs. Strain shared the ACCT New Vision Statement. She stated that she and some other individuals had volunteered to be on a task force, and have worked for about a year to redo the vision statement. The vision statement was approved at the ACCT Board Retreat held in Washington, DC and will be placed on the website, as well as on ACCT documents. She also provided Board members with the detailed program for the ACCT Leadership Congress being held October 14-17, 2015 in San Diego. It's an interesting document in terms of showing the activity taking place at the national level, including symposiums, break-out sessions, different types of

populations attending, and various caucuses. Dr. Rottweiler stated the college will be providing a presentation on loan default and the improvements we have had in that area, and added that the Board's participation would be greatly appreciated. Mr. Quinn requested that a copy of the briefing be sent to him and Mr. Ortega, since they will not be attending the congress.

1.06.3 Senate

Wendy Davis, Vice President for Human Resources, stated the Senate met in August and elected officers; Kathy Carrillo was elected president and Mary King Power will be secretary and incoming president for next year. The committee ratified an administrative policy on the assignment of credit hours. The next Senate meeting is scheduled to be held later this month.

1.06.4 Student Government Association (SGA)

Mason Rust, President of the SGA, introduced himself and stated he is studying building construction technology. He then introduced SGA Vice President Lakaysha Barnes, and she stated she is studying Nursing; Jose Cardona, the SGA Secretary, introduced himself and stated he is studying Art Education; SGA Treasurer Cody Bosley introduced himself and stated he is studying business administration; and Veronica Hill, the SGA Social Events Coordinator, introduced herself and stated she is studying General Studies.

Mr. Rust then shared the upcoming events the SGA is working on. They included:

- World Suicide Prevention Day on September 10th
- Constitution Day on September 17th
- Hosting Week-long Voter Registration (September 21-25, 2015)
- Giant Game Day on September 29th
- Volunteer Event at the County Fair

To encourage a greater relationship between the Cochise College Governing Board and the Student Government Association, Mr. Rust invited the Board to attend a lunch with the SGA at the Student Union, Sierra Vista Campus, on September 25th at 11:30 a.m. He also provided Board members with a printed invitation.

1.06.5 College President

Dr. Rottweiler reminded the two new Board members that a Senate report and an SGA report (the Sierra Vista SGA on the Sierra Vista and the Douglas SGA on the Douglas campus) will be provided at most Governing Board meetings. This is an opportunity to learn about various activities taking place at the college.

Dr. Rottweiler informed the Board he will be traveling to Phoenix in the morning, where he will participate on the Expenditure Limitation Study Committee – he has been asked to provide a presentation and to brief both the House and Senate members who are on the committee. Expenditure Limitation is rules in the state of Arizona that date back to 1980. They don't control revenue, they control expenditures, and what you are authorized to expend. It's based upon a formula that was established in 1980 that uses FTSE rates, student enrollment rates, and a calculation of GDP. Six of the ten community college districts are currently facing

some fairly significant expenditure limitation concerns – they may have the resources, but under the current rules, they are unable to expend those resources. Currently, Cochise College is not one of those. The reason we are not one of those is because we've had significant increases in our enrollment. Dr. Rottweiler has been asked to represent the system and provide some of the concerns. The main point of his presentation will be 1980 vs. today. He then reviewed the differences between today and 1980 in the area of expenditures. Our students have changed, our programs have changed, and technology has changed. In 1980, the college had three typewriter labs, and state-of-the art IBM Selectric typewriters were being used – today, every classroom and location on our campuses are wired (WiFi), and expectations of bandwidth are there. That is an increase in costs that wasn't there previously. In Aviation, we were using steam gauge flight panels; today we're using glass panels. In Nursing, in 1980 there was no such thing as a Sim-Man, nor was there electronic charting. There have been fundamental shifts as technology has dramatically increased. Things are fundamentally different than in 1980; therefore, we are seeing some cost issues playing out. Dr. Rottweiler stated he will keep the Board updated as we move through those areas.

Dr. Rottweiler stated that, while in Phoenix, he will also be attending an AC4 meeting, and he will have the opportunity to work with his colleagues from around the state as they lay out a legislative agenda. He provided the Board with a letter that was sent to the governor, which included a formal budget request, and directed their attention to areas which he felt the Board needed to be aware of.

Dr. Rottweiler shared that in 2007, the community college system was funded at about \$170M; this request is for \$48.4M. We have seen a 70% decrease in overall funding. What does that mean for Cochise College? This request going to the governor follows the statutory authorities and has us receiving \$10.5M; that is about \$121,700 less than we received this year. This is based upon a decrease in our FTSE - over the last five years we've lost about a quarter of our FTSE. Much of that (95%) has been a decrease in our MOS program as the Army has drawn down, as well as sequestration. The largest contributor is actually the prison, where the decrease in offerings is based upon the contract we have with the state of Arizona. Those two areas, while somewhat outside of our control, are clearly part of the overall funding mechanism. For the state, the \$48.4M is about \$787,000 less than what was received for the eight districts. Dr. Rottweiler pointed out additional charts, including assessed valuation, were also turned into the governor along with the letter. He stated this is a starting point – clearly it would be wonderful if we could get it fully funded. We'll see where that goes as we move through the legislative process. Early indications are that there is not a desire or motivation to defund the community colleges any more than they already have; however, depending what comes out of the lawsuit related to K-12 and the state of Arizona, everything could be thrown back open. If a court comes back and rules that the state owes \$1.3B, and it needs to be paid in any given year, they will be looking for resources anywhere they can find them. He will watch that closely and keep the Board updated.

On Thursday, September 10th, the ten community college districts will be meeting with Governor Ducey. Dr. Rottweiler stated that he has been asked, as one of three college CEOs, to address the governor with a presentation – his presentation will focus on workforce training, specifically our partnership with Fort Huachuca and defense contractors, and some of the unique things happening in the state related to

workforce development. He is trying to tie into the governor's heavy emphasis on jobs and workforce training.

Regarding master facilities, Dr. Rottweiler stated we are continuing with our construction plans. As the Board has been previously briefed, we expect to hold a special meeting on November 20th to establish a guaranteed maximum price. The work is moving along fine, and we are getting much closer to our \$14M budget. He added the Board will see an item on the agenda regarding a reimbursement resolution; this is an opportunity for us to establish a resolution that will allow the Board to make decisions in the coming months related to how they want to fund the Downtown Center.

In his general comments, Dr. Rottweiler stated the Board had been provided three 2015 Outcomes Reports for the Arizona Community Colleges - an overall systems report, a data report, and a Cochise College report. He stated he wasn't going to review the reports; he just wanted to provide the Board with a copy of them. Dr. Fick will touch on parts of the reports during his presentation later in the evening, as well as during upcoming Board meetings.

Dr. Rottweiler informed the Board that he received notice that a new team member will be visiting us as part of the site visit, as one of the assigned team members had to withdraw – Dr. Elizabeth Stich from West Shore Community College will now be participating. He provided and reviewed with the Board, a draft schedule for the visit, along with a peer reviewer professional data report for each reviewer. Dr. Rottweiler stated he will keep the Board up-to-date. He may request that a couple Board members participate in a welcome dinner.

Dr. Rottweiler shared that there has been some exciting news out of the Small Business Development Center (SBDC). Mark Schmitt, Director of the SBDC, continues to do amazing things, including bringing in lots of additional resources in areas such as international business and forming partnerships with businesses in Mexico to encourage international trade. Dr. Rottweiler made the Board aware of a press release related to some work being done in the northern part of the county around the USDA renewable energy and energy efficiency projects. Bob Mucci is leading this out of the Willcox Center, and the Board may hear some exciting things related to this in the coming weeks.

Dr. Rottweiler informed the Board that there are some unique things occurring in Nursing, and he asked Jennifer Lakosil, Dean of Nursing and Allied Health, to talk about this. He and Dr. Fick had the opportunity to recognize the Nursing department last week for some amazing things they've done around student completion, specifically around retention and maintaining high pass rates on the NCLEX. Ms. Lakosil stated that in 2014, they saw a decline in their retention rates. They instituted a comprehensive plan for retention and did very well. She was also pleased to share that the NCLEX pass rates are above the national norm, which is currently coming in at around 85% - we're at 89%, with one person remaining to take it. They also have a 100% job placement. In summary, Ms. Lakosil was happy to report that Nursing is doing very well with retention – up 20%, very good job placement rates, and the NCLEX pass rates are excellent. Mr. Quinn requested Ms. Lakosil explain how she measures retention. She responded by saying they have two ways – the Arizona State Board of Nursing and the ACEN Accreditation.

In the area of community happenings, Dr. Rottweiler informed the Board that he and Denise Hoyos, Director of External Affairs, met with the Mexican Consul last month. He has allocated some resources, and it appears, if all goes well, there will be about a \$20,000 match for scholarships for students of Mexican descent. This is pending all approval processes in January. The students can be Mexican nationals or they can be a grandchild of a Mexican national. A selection committee will select the scholarships coming in.

Dr. Rottweiler stated he sat in with Pat Call on a Friday radio broadcast, and they spent the entire hour discussing a wide variety of opportunities. He said it was a great opportunity to talk about the college and the things that are happening here. That afternoon, at the invitation of the Douglas mayor, Dr. Rottweiler participated in the Stakeholders Luncheon for the Douglas Port of Entry. They have some exciting things happening there, and he hopes the college can be a part of those initiatives. Dr. Rottweiler stated he met with Mr. Jeffrey Jennings, Deputy to the Commanding General at Fort Huachuca, who replaced Mr. Jerry Proctor. They had a wonderful opportunity to discuss the things happening at Cochise College; it was nice to hear Army officials talk about the benefits of Cochise College and the unique things we do. There is a heavy push to talk about the Army University; however, our local leaders say that's not nearly as important to them because what's happening at Cochise College is better than the things that are being discussed there.

Dr. Rottweiler stated he met with county elections officials. There is a whole new technology in place, and between the University of Arizona-Sierra Vista and Cochise College, we're going to try to get some students to participate as poll workers as well as 'poll ambassadors' to help people transition through the new technology.

Dr. Rottweiler stated he and Frank Dykstra, Executive Director of Facilities and Planning, visited with the University of Arizona-South Foundation regarding some joint master facilities planning as they look at the next stages at their campus in relationship to Cochise College.

Mr. Quinn stated that Army University is not necessarily a university; they are just changing titles to be more consistent with education.

Mrs. Strain requested information regarding the impact of expenditure limitation. Dr. Rottweiler stated real property is outside expenditure limitations – you can buy as much real property as you want. However, if you buy equipment, it counts against the expenditure limitation, and the cost of that equipment has gone up exponentially. This last year the Board approved purchasing some real property at approximately a half million dollars, but they also purchased aircraft at \$1.6M and a simulator at \$400,000 – that would count against the expenditure limitation. In comparison, in 1980 we were buying typewriters; today we buy a computer for every desk. E-mail came to Cochise College in 1993; in 1980 when those expenditure limitations were set, there was no such thing as e-mail, at least not for a place like Cochise College. Regarding GPS – the military was using GPS, but commercial airlines weren't. Now, we have to purchase that technology in order to train students so they can be productive in the workforce. Mrs. Strain inquired if there will be any blowback for us waiting so long, are we going to be punished for not bringing this forward sooner. Dr. Rottweiler stated he didn't believe there would be a timing aspect, but clearly there will be blowback. ATRA is also on the committee, who believe the best way to curb taxes is to curb expenditures. When we talk about all the dilemmas we have, their

response is, if we've seen a decrease in students, then just decrease expenditures. They don't have an understanding that to ramp up programs is not something that is done overnight. When you're basing it exclusively on a table that shows here's how much you have, here's how much you can spend, our goal is to try to put a face to the issue. Dr. Rottweiler then provided information around investors wanting to do public/private partnerships and how they can't because it counts within the expenditure limitation. If you brought in \$10M to build up revenue to do high tech training under workforce development, you may not be able to spend those resources. Mr. Nelson asked if a constitutional amendment in 1980 brought this about. Dr. Rottweiler replied, yes, to which Mr. Nelson inquired what can be done at the legislative level to rectify it. Dr. Rottweiler stated legislatively, they must establish a formula, and the details of that formula are left to statutory rule. One of his arguments will be, if you want to impact the future, you have to say not all credits are the same – to educate a student in a college transfer costs us about \$3,000; to educate a student in Nursing costs about \$10,000; and to educate a student in Aviation costs about \$50,000. Mr. Ortega inquired if there is anything they can do as a Board, to which Dr. Rottweiler replied, "At this point, no".

1.06.6 Monthly Financial Report – August 2015

The Financial Report for August 2015 was presented and accepted as submitted.

2. INFORMATION ITEMS

2.01 Communications

- Dr. Clyne Namuo, Department Chair, CIS, received a letter of appreciation from Ossie Thomas, IT Director, Regionalcare Hospital Partners and Dr. Dean French, CEO, Canyon Vista Medical Center, for the team he assembled to provide IT assistance during the relocation of the Sierra Vista Regional Health Center to the new Canyon Vista Medical Center.
- Dr. Rottweiler received a note from Congresswoman Martha McSally, congratulating Cochise College for being approved to participate in the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements, and thanking him for his continued leadership and dedication to higher education in the community.

2.02 Recognition of Mr. Dan Guilmette

Dr. Rottweiler stated Mr. Guilmette is being recognized this evening by the Air Force Association and the office of Congresswoman McSally. Mr. Ross Lampert, Cochise Chapter CyberPatriot Coordinator and Air Force Association Southwest Region president, stated Mr. Guilmette is being recognized for the first of two times (they will recognize him again in two months) by the Air Force Association for his work in the CyberPatriot Program (the official name is the National Youth Cyber Education Program). The K-6 level teaches students how to be safe online, and the middle and high school levels teach students how to get into networks and fix them after they have been hacked. Mr. Guilmette has been doing some amazing work in teaching the students here, how to be effective at doing that with multiple different operating systems and different problems that are placed in front of them. Mr. Lampert stated the award being presented to Mr. Guilmette this evening dates back to the 2013-2014 school year. He will be presented another award for the 2014-2015 school year at a later date. Mr. Lampert stated the award this evening recognizes Mr. Guilmette for the work he did during the 2013-2014 school year, at which time they had six teams competing.

Since then, they have grown to 36 teams competing in the state of Arizona this year; 17 of those 36 teams are from this area, and they have not yet finished registering teams. We are leading the way in Arizona, and a lot of the credit goes not only to Mr. Guilmette, but to Dr. Rottweiler and the Governing Board; without their support this could not have happened. Mr. Lampert then presented Mr. Guilmette with the Air Force Association Medal of Merit.

On behalf of Congresswoman Martha McSally, Ms. Cynthia Giesecke presented Mr. Guilmette a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition. The award read, "Thank you for the numerous hours of tutoring and mentorship provided to the younger generation of our community. His efforts and support of the CyberPatriot Program also teaches students outside of the programs smart cyber security practices that they can apply in their lives. Cyber security is a vital skill that the youth of this community will, do doubt, find crucial in their working and personal lives as they grow. In recognition of outstanding and invaluable service to the community, Martha McSally, U.S. Representative, Arizona 2nd Congressional District."

Dr. Rottweiler then provided background information on how the CyberPatriot Program began on the Sierra Vista campus, and he recognized Mr. Guilmette for his hard work. He stated that one of the things that is a benefit and a competitive advantage of Cochise County and Cochise College is that we're able to access expertise such as retired COL Guilmette and his experience in the army and apply that in cyber security. He added that we are proud of the things that have taken place in this area and the outstanding work that is happening amongst our faculty.

Mr. Guilmette then acknowledged his wife for her support, and added that this doesn't happen without the coaches and mentors from all the schools, as well as the Cochise College AFCEA Chapter.

2.03 Aviation Business Plan

Dr. Verlyn Fick, Vice President for Instruction/Provost, and Belinda Burnett, Director of Aviation Programs, provided the Board with the Cochise College Aviation Professional Pilot Program Business Plan 2015. Dr. Fick stated they wouldn't touch on every page of the plan, but would try to highlight a few areas, and then have a discussion at the end. Basically, this document touches heavily on the professional flight portion of the department. There is Part 61 and Part 141 of the federal regulations; Cochise College has a Part 141 program where everything has to go through FAA approval. This differs from Part 61 in that anyone who has an instructor's credential with the FAA can take anyone up and basically provide them with pilot training. We certainly take it several notches above what you can get from the average entrepreneur.

Ms. Burnett stated the document addresses current changes that have been taking place in the airline industry in the training model and philosophy of pilots, and radical upsets in terms of what qualifications are required for pilots to operate, both as captain and first officer, in any passenger-carrying airline. These changes affect not only major airlines (United, Delta, American, etc.), but have also reached down into the regional airlines that, historically, students/individuals have been able to gain employment at roughly about a 500-hour level of experience. In 2013, the FAA made some significant rule changes as a result of the Colgan Air crash. The rule changes said that both the captain and the first officer have to now hold what is referred to as an airline transport pilot (ATP) certificate. For our students, this translates to a difference of about 300-500 hours of experience into 1500 hours of experience. This has not only delayed the opportunity for students to enter into the job

market, it has increased the requirements for those people to actually be able to start working in that environment.

Within the airline industry, over the next 15 years, two thirds of the currently employed airline pilots will reach the mandatory retirement age of 65. As a result of those rule changes, higher certification requirements, and at the same time facing unprecedented retirements in the airline industry, the industry is facing some significant changes and challenges in terms of being able to staff. This is not even addressing global growth or new equipment. This has impacted how schools and universities train pilots and what the requirements are to be able to get students from the actual training environment to the workforce for employment environment. Mr. Nelson inquired if the total hours required are actual flight hours or are simulator/training hours included. Ms. Burnett stated it is total hours – it is a combination of actual aircraft hours and simulator hours. Dr. Fick added that, one of the advantages of the simulator hours is it's cheaper to provide and students can fly during inclement weather.

Dr. Rottweiler directed the Board's attention to page 7 of the plan, where he pointed out the new FAA rules/requirements. Military pilots can qualify with 750 hours, graduates holding a Bachelor's degree with an aviation major with 1000 hours total time as a pilot, graduates holding an Associate's degree with an aviation major with 1250 hours, and pilots who are at least 21 years of age with 1500 hours. For the first time there is an incentive for pilots to actually complete their Associate's degree. We are working very closely with our sister schools to see if we can get a Bachelor's completion program at the same time they're building their hours. He stated another part that the Board needs to be aware of is the Letter of Authority (LOA), the requirement that comes from the FAA that says we have the authority to be one the schools that can grant a degree in an aviation field, making it 1250 hours in our case, or 1000 hours for a university. Ms. Burnett stated there is an application process that needs to be completed, along with an approval process, through the FAA. It takes about six months for the approval process to move through the FAA to be granted an LOA to issue what is now referred to as a restricted ATP - the restricted element being the reduced hours. Prior to these rule changes, in order to obtain an ATP an individual had to have logged the 1500 hours. Even though they made the rule changes that required the ATP, the FAA said they recognize the fact that they are putting an undue burden on the industry, so they were going to make some concessions for that by funneling and focusing individuals through academic institutions. In summary, this means that anyone who has the desire to have an airline career will have to go through colleges/universities to receive their training in order to be able to take advantage of the reduced hours. Otherwise, it's going to cost them more to get there and, when it comes to their competition, they're not going to be nearly as qualified because the airlines will choose the person with the degree.

Mrs. Strain inquired how long it took the FAA to formulate the change. Ms. Burnett stated that individuals were given a one-year to either acquire the hours or get the ATP or go back and do specialized training. These rules went into effect in July 2013; in July 2014 it went into effect across the board - no grandfathering of any of these individuals. Dr. Rottweiler added that schools that have this LOA are not as prevalent as one might think. Ms. Burnett stated that, in Arizona, the schools holding an LOA are Arizona State University (ASU), Embry Riddle, and Cochise College. Dr. Fick stated that there is one college in California that offers a Bachelor's degree that has the LOA, there are two Associate's degree institutions in Colorado, in Texas there are two Bachelor's and one Associate's degree, and there are two Bachelor's and one Associate's degree in Utah – there are none in Mexico. Ms. Burnett stated we can take our students through their flight training, get their Associate's, and then continue their Bachelor's degree through the articulation agreements and qualify for the 1000 hour mark vs. the 1250 hour mark. The student's choice is, do they

have the money to go to school to finish the Bachelor's degree or do they have the money to acquire the extra 250 hours, and how does that balance play out in the equation for them? Dr. Rottweiler stated he and Dr. Fick met with Dr. Maria Hesse from ASU to see if we could get an onsite Bachelor's completion program. If we could do that for our students who have transitioned to become our flight instructors while they're building hours, they could be completing their Bachelor's degree at the same time they're building hours, and they could, in theory 'double dip', so dropping their maximum required hours while at the same time they are building hours. He believes that is doable. We have positioned ourselves right, the question is, can we execute the plan and the initiative?

Ms. Burnett stated when the proposed rule-making came before the FAA, community colleges were cut out of the equation. They were only focusing on 4-year institutions that had flight training programs. Fortunately, through an organization called University Aviation Association, which Cochise College is a member, they advocated significantly on behalf of community colleges indicating that the universities were only able to provide a little less than half of the required pilot training that was forecast to be needed. It had to include community colleges in the equation or there was absolutely no way that the colleges and universities would be able to even come near meeting the gap. Ms. Burnett directed the Board's attention to page 9 of the handout where they would find some of the statistics in the forecast indicating there is a need for nearly 19,000 pilots to be trained annually just to start to meet the outflow demand. Currently, given the staffing ratio of what colleges and universities are producing, at full capacity we'll only be able to produce approximately 12,000 pilots. There is about a 7,000 pilot gap already there in terms of capacity. Mr. Ortega inquired how discussions are going with ASU. Dr. Fick stated discussions have just begun. Dr. Rottweiler stated we've always had a completion program, but it meant students had to go to Tempe. We've requested them look at, perhaps through a joint hire, having someone on our site that can provide the training and then supplement it with online education. We have most of the resources they would need; therefore, through a partnership they could complete that degree on our site while they're working for us as a flight instructor. Dr. Fick then directed the Board's attention to page 11 where graphs displayed the number of retirements expected each year through 2029.

Mr. Nelson asked how flexible we are at expanding our program if we get more students; are we looking at 50 or 100 students? Can we expand as the demand grows? Dr. Fick stated we currently have some room for expansion without needing to add a lot of additional pieces. We've put together some rough ratios – if we add a certain number of additional students, what will be the limiting factors. We've discussed, depending on the associate faculty availability, that full time faculty might be the first limitation because, like in the nursing world, there's only so many people who can be tied into the clinical instructor ratio that's limited to provide oversight and support. In flight, a full time instructor can only handle a maximum of six students throughout a full year's program. Mr. Nelson then inquired if recruitment of instructors may be a problem. Dr. Fick stated that Ms. Burnett and her crew have been working hard at courting the regional airlines. One of the things we're finding is, as the pilots get short, the 'big boys' steal from the 'little boys' and it works its way down. Now, all the regional airlines are the ones having to figure out how to solve the pilot shortage. He directed the Board to page 14 where they would see a list of the airlines with whom the regional airlines, cargo carriers, and corporate aircraft trainers have a partnership. We already have arrangements with these entities, and Ms. Burnett provided the Board with a few MOUs that we have. She stated the regionals really are bearing the burden, more so than anyone else, because the major airlines are losing the pilots; the average age of a major airline pilot today is 53 years old – the average age of the regional airline pilot is between 28 and 32. Most people will not remain at a regional airline long enough to retire.

They will get recruited up to a major airline. The regional airlines are seeking out colleges and universities to create this flow-through program. There was a period of time in aviation where most pilots skipped the instructor avenue, they'd go out and seek different types of employment, such as charter, pipeline patrol, sightseeing tours, etc., that an individual could do to build hours, because not everyone is cut out to be a flight instructor nor do they want to be. There were a large number of people who did not become flight instructors over a period of about seven years. This has also created some of this gap problem because now our instructor pool has decreased significantly. Our instructor pool is aging out just like the pilot pool. Currently, the average age of the flight instructor in the U.S. is 58 years old. We believe that any expansion or growth that we want to incorporate into our program will come as a direct result of these partnerships because these students need to build hours. So, what is the easiest and fastest way for them to build hours? Become a flight instructor. They build the hours, they get paid, and we have a pipeline to ship them down the road to do the next step they want to do. Dr. Fick pointed out that, at the bottom of page 11, the Board would see some of the things different regional airlines are offering as part the pipeline relationship. This would include signing bonuses, paid training, guaranteed flight hours per month, being upgraded to captain in a shorter period of time, and getting a higher rate of pay. Mr. DiPeso stated that most of the airlines used to hire retired air force pilots. What's happened there? Ms. Burnett stated that the military has moved to an unmanned world, fairly significantly. Also, there are fewer manned pilots being trained by the military. Obviously, the overall downsizing of the military has also impacted the number of pilots that are coming out to be able to be employed in the airline industry. All of this has impacted what the airline actually has as far as a resource to pull from.

Mr. Nelson inquired what the regionals are doing to recruit students. Are they just relying on the colleges to do this, aside from offering the incentives they have? Ms. Burnett explained they initially went out and recalled furloughed pilots, pilots they had put on the bench during downtimes. However, they have discovered that recalling a lot of those has financially cost them significantly - when they bring them back into the mix, the cost of getting that person back up to speed, they have to quickly decide how much money they are going to invest. Every one of the regional airlines has gone after every college and university to create some type of pathway or pipeline program because they have said if they can get three from Cochise, five from ASU, and six from Embry Riddle, they know that within six months they will get those three, in ten months they'll get that three. Therefore, they can plan what they need to do in terms of upgrading their pilots to captains and have a much better plan for what's coming in. Mr. Nelson said that, in reviewing the handout, 85% of our students come from within the state. Ms. Burnett stated that is correct. Currently, about 85% of our students come from within the state of Arizona, typically the Phoenix/Tucson area. With the recruiter position, we are going to actively go after high school students (our demographic at that point is the recent high school graduate). There are several schools within the state of Arizona that are referred to as aviation magnet schools. We go into the high schools and say we have the pathway for them to have a seamless flow all the way up to the major airline – this is just what you have to do. Those are the connections we have to make with the recruiter.

Mr. Nelson then asked if the regionals will be hiring pilots that are 22 and 23 years old. Dr. Rottweiler and Ms. Burnett both stated, yes. Dr. Rottweiler stated he believes the regionals are going to have to change their hiring practices if they are going to meet the shortage. Currently, they're betting on students willing to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars to get the training so they can go to work for them for \$28,000 a year. The international carriers have changed the model completely. They grab the student out of high school and say they'll provide all the training, and then the student owes them 'x' number of years at the

end. That has not been the historic model in the U.S., but he feels they will have to move to that because, even as affordable as our program is, it will cost the student approximately \$70,000. Ms. Burnett stated that one of the reasons the foreign airlines have done what they've done is general aviation training does not exist in other countries like it does in the United States. There are numerous conversations taking place in University Aviation Association that says we're going to have to change this. There's going to have to be an investment of maybe a 'one-third, one-third, one-third' model that says the student invests one-third in the process, the airline invests one-third in a scholarship type of activity, and then we get other partners in industry to say they'll invest 'x' amount of dollars in scholarships to just fill the gap and meet the requirements. We can't continue to do what we've done and meet the demand. Mrs. Strain inquired if there is a positive aspect in seeking out our returning veterans to become students. Ms. Burnett said it is, but it isn't. Some of it will have to do with their age, whether or not they want to go to work for \$20,000 - \$25,000 a year, and the VA has significantly changed the rules around the funding they provide for flight training; the purse strings have literally almost closed completely for what the VA will actually pay for in terms of flight training. They are going back to an old model that basically says the student has to invest up-front and they'll reimburse the veteran. Again, when it comes down to affordability, they probably don't have those resources.

Dr. Fick stated a number of the challenges have already been discussed. In terms of programs, we have two versions of the professional pilot programs. One of those takes the student through private pilot and the instrument rating through commercial training. The other takes the student down the flight instructor route or multi-engine rating. With the new simulator, we are looking at jet transition training. We'll need to make some curriculum adjustments because we'd like to incorporate that, to a reasonable degree, into our training programs; however, we're also looking at the idea of doing some ten-day sessions where they would go through CRJ-related training to get them up to speed. We have a new program we're just kicking off in the aircraft dispatcher area. Dr. Fick stated this is sometimes a good model for some folks that may have issues down the road with regard to actually being able to fly but they can remain in the airline industry. The unmanned systems are a whole other discussion.

Dr. Fick shared that one of the things they looked at was what type of competitive advantages we have, and one of the big ones we push is our cost – we're 40% of the cost of what the university is charging. This might be something we have to tighten up, because we'll be talking about what kinds of revenue and expenses we have, and we'll want to make sure there's more of a balance between revenue and expenses. One of the other things that make our program more efficient is the fact we're out in the middle of the country. Once you get off the ground you can pretty much start training instead of having to fly for a while to get to the point where you can start training. We're more efficient for the student just in the fact that they don't have to take a plane ride to get to where they're going to actually be able to do their lessons. These are just a few examples of the advantages – he pointed out that additional advantages could be found on page 16.

Dr. Fick stated he attempted to provide an overview of the finances on page 24. In looking at the typical revenue for the last couple of years, the fees for renting an instructor, renting an plane, fuel, etc., adds up to a cost of \$420,000. The tuition has been approximately \$40,000. Therefore, our revenue has been around \$460,000. Operating costs include full-time faculty and a few associate faculty. Their salary and benefits has been in the \$580,000 range, insurance is a little under \$100,000, Fuel/Parts comes in at \$170,000, and staff, including the director, recruiters, mechanics, etc., is another \$420,000. So, actual operating costs are \$1,270,000. We have also purchased a number of new planes and simulators;

they are key because we're shifting our model away from a plane intensive model to the ones that will be able to use the simulators. This will give us more advantages in terms of when we can train, how much we can train, and the cost of the training. To do all of that, we put together a potential replacement cycle and estimated how much it would cost. Over time, we would probably have to average \$450,000, per year, to save enough money to replace equipment. We could also extend some time frames. Dr. Fick asked Ms. Burnett how many years we've been using some planes. Ms. Burnett stated she has been here 30 years, and some of the planes have been around since then. Dr. Fick stated that, at this point, none of the replacement timeframes were based on a 30-year plus system. Part of this is also being up to speed with technologies. Some of the planes we're able to bring in are going to be much more fuel efficient, and they will have glass panels. If we want to stay competitive, we need to be able to offer those kinds of opportunities.

At the top of page 25, Dr. Fick pointed out some areas he would like to address to help improve the program in general, and to hopefully improve the balance of revenue and expenses, as well. The first was to review price structures, comparing our costs to the cost for the student to those of the university – if we're at about 40% of what a university is doing, odds are we can make some adjustments and still maintain a significant competitive advantage in terms of price.

Ms. Burnett stated the second area is international students. One of the things Cochise College has not been involved in historically is the training of foreign pilot students in groups or cohorts. Many flight schools across the country have foreign airline contracts. They have sought contracts with Air Asia or Chinese airlines, or whatever the case may be - that model that has come to the U.S. to do training and has sort of filled the gap for flight schools. Cochise has never done that, but we're working with some of the partnerships we have with our pathways to initially start being an overflow provider; we've recently signed an MOU with Spartan School of Aeronautics out of Oklahoma that has several foreign contracts. They have contacted us and are interested in us being overflow providers. That is an advantage. Plus, we just signed an MOU with Aerostar Training Services, which actively goes out and seeks out training cohorts of foreign students in groups to get them through the process. We believe Cochise College is in a perfect position to be able to do that because we have on-campus housing, transportation for the students to and from class – all of those types of things that other schools have to figure out. It's just a matter of getting the right mix that we can manage and maintain and keep a balance, because a lot of flight schools have abandoned their traditional market looking only for the dollar of the international students. When the dollars dry up, there's no more domestic market for them because they've already abandoned that.

Ms. Burnett stated this goes hand-in-hand with the third area, marketing. We have to be competitive, we have to go out and recruit for these students. We need to understand that these students are millennials, and they are going to engage at a different level. We have to understand what attracts them to this type of industry. What is it we have to do to get them on campus? She shared that, after 30 years of being in this program, when we get a student on campus and we interact with that prospective student, we have a 90-95% closure rate of getting that student to sign up. It's a matter of working ways to actually get them on campus to see what we offer and where we offer it.

The fourth area is completion. Dr. Fick stated that currently we have two completion issues that we need to explore. The reason behind 75% of the students not being successful and not completing is because they run into money issues. Even though we are a relatively inexpensive program, they still manage to run out of money long before they're finishing

their program. We need to look at 1) are there other ways to help support the students financially, 2) are there things we need to shuffle around, and 3) the fees can be as low as \$5,000 or \$7,000 for one of our terms, and the fees for another term could be as high as \$25,000. Perhaps there are things we have to do to level out the amount of fees the students have to pay in any given term, as well. The other piece is performance – a lot of students just don't seem to get it done. One of the things discussed was setting milestones. Ms. Burnett stated that some of those incentives we see from the regional airlines are part of that plan because they're saying the student has to complete within a certain timeline, and they have to maintain a specific GPA to be part of these pathway programs. Depending on which pathway a student might choose, there's going to be greater motivations to get moving and get through the process than there might have been for previous students. Historically, aviation has been a 'train at your own pace' mindset for individuals, and it's a matter of shifting that mindset on the behalf of the consumer/student that there is a process we need to get through.

This ties in with the fifth area – the fixed price guarantee. There are industry providers, particularly Red Hawk and Red Bird flight simulation, from which we have acquired several pieces of our equipment. They have fashioned a very successful fixed price model, which says they will guarantee a private pilot or instrument or commercial certificate for this price based upon the following breakout - 'the minimum hours in the airplane, but unlimited or extensive use of the flight training devices'. Again, the flight training devices being so much more efficient and effective in terms of costs for operating that the student can do the practice, do the remedial training, and perfect it before they actually take it to the airplane. If we can come up with a fixed price structure that builds into the system some profitability or some net revenue for us to be able to do what we need to do, but yet still gets the student completed in a price point that is comfortable for them, then Ms. Burnett thinks we will see some increased activities there.

Dr. Fick stated the sixth area is consideration of additional start times. Currently, students can start a program twice in a year. Often we get interested students, and they can't wait for six months for things to kick in. Therefore, we're going to look into a redesign of the overall curriculum, looking to see if we might have a chance to have four start times instead of two.

Ms. Burnett stated that lastly on the list we have the CRJ project or the FTD, and again, the need for next level training for the students. We've already addressed the fact that these individuals need to be viable candidates when they show up at the regional airline. The regional airline is a business, they can't invest unlimited resources in getting a potential candidate up to speed on that particular aircraft. By having the CRJ simulator and having the jet transition program for our graduates, and for open product availability for consumers, people can come to us, get that type of training, and get those skills and proficiencies they need to make them more successful when they show up at the regional airline.

Dr. Fick stated he'd like to report back to the Board on a regular basis to update them on how we're trying to improve the program and trying to meet some of the other goals.

Mrs. Strain inquired if one of the reports would specifically include the unmanned aerial systems. Dr. Rottweiler stated that we took a little gamble that the FAA would make some decisions, and we believe that in order to fly a UAS would require, at a minimum, a private pilot's license and most likely an instrument rating. To-date, the FAA has not made a decision. Currently, many of our UAS students are learning how to fly an airplane before they'll learn how to fly a UAS. Ms. Burnett stated that historically in aviation, the FAA has mandated the rule and everyone has to get in lock-step with whatever the rule is.

Unmanned has been almost completely opposite of that in that, 'we're just going to let the industry figure it out and then you'll tell us what you need'. That's been the problem, industry hasn't really figured out some guidelines, and there are people doing things they shouldn't be doing, like illegally landing on the White House lawn. It's taken us nearly 18-months to get a COA to operate our unmanned system legally within our airspace at the college simply because we apply for it and the FAA says 'we're going to backburner that'. But, we now have it. Dr. Rottweiler stated we've positioned ourselves right where we need to be. The question, as it always is, can we get students to come to Cochise County to receive the training? We're on the border, and the border has negative connotations. It's not easy to get people on the Douglas campus. The state of Arizona has not done a good job of marketing itself as a place where people want to come – rather it be the border or our funding for education.

Mr. Quinn inquired if the calculation of \$70,000 for an Associate's degree and flight training takes into consideration that the FAA requires a minimum number of flight hours in an airplane and we're moving our model to match that. Ms. Belinda stated yes, the FAA has not changed the minimum hours in an airplane in over 45 years. Mr. Quinn stated that, having just seen this, with a nursing shortage, an elementary school teaching shortage, and a pilot shortage, it would be helpful to him to know what the basic cost for credit is for us to graduate a pilot in order to compare that to going after a student who wants to be a pilot vs. going after a student that wants to be a nurse, vs. going after an elementary school teacher – what is the cost to Cochise College to pay for fuel, simulator flight hours, etc., vs. going after and trying to attract the student who wants to be a nurse and what's the cost of that.

2.04 Provost's Report

Dr. Fick provided the Board with a chart showing the Enrollment Report for Fall 2015. He stated the bottom line is, there's not a whole lot there because things have held fairly steady. A few areas have gone up, and a few areas have gone down, but, in general, things are pretty much where they have been. The columns marked Headcount (duplicated) showed the Douglas campus had 921 in 2014 and 887 in 2015, a change of 3.7%. The FTSE columns (number of credits) shows 619.4 in 2014 and 582.4 in 2015, a change of 6%. The final columns showed Class Enrollments, which is what we track as we do our registration (a student might be taking 15 credits, but they might be taking five classes – so enrollment just means they're in a particular section, and they might have five enrollments for that term). Class enrollments showed 2,900 in 2014 and 2,759 in 2015, a 4.9% change. The enrollments are broken up by locations, including Virtual Campus, Cochise County District, and Santa Cruz. Santa Cruz is still experiencing a growth spurt due to having a relatively new facility, and adding more staff and additional regular full-time faculty. Dr. Fick stated that, in general, across the country, most of what he is reading still shows community colleges as being in a slight decline. He then pointed out the unduplicated headcount (a student only gets counted once). This chart shows a slight increase in the total number of students we are serving, which he broke out into part-time and full-time. Dr. Rottweiler stated this chart is a snapshot of what he calls traditional students – classes that started in August and will end in December, which is less than a third of our total enrollment. Our short term classes – those that start at eight weeks, our MOS, some of prison our classes, as well as dual credit classes, will not even appear in this report.

Dr. Fick stated it was decided last Spring to suggest that, if a student hasn't signed up for class by the first day of class, they really shouldn't be in the class. Studies have shown that a student who doesn't start the first day, doesn't perform as well; therefore, student success is impacted. He stated that students who wake up on that Monday, the first week of

classes, and decide they should go to college haven't applied, haven't registered, and haven't started the financial aid process. He wanted to see if we could help them by having a few select courses that start a couple weeks in. Normally, we have a 16-week semester; however, we went to some 14-week classes, choosing four to six classes on the Douglas campus and four to six classes on the Sierra Vista campus, just for those late-comers to see how we could best serve them. As a result, we had about 250 credits worth of coursework that were signed up for over those two locations. We will have some discussions around how to tweak that and continue that for another round or two just to see if we can help the students. Dr. Fick stated he believes this was especially beneficial on the Douglas campus, as some of the athletes don't get into town until the absolute last minute, and as a result, they aren't registered for classes. This allowed some of them to get into classes they needed.

Dr. Fick then provided the Board with a four page document entitled Fall 2015 Declared Majors. He stated he clustered programs into a page of majors, where on each page a different column was highlighted for each major - they included FTSE, total students in a major, how many of those students were full-time, and the percentage of the total number of students that were full-time. One of the challenges currently being discussed is around some of our biggest majors (general studies, general requirements, undeclared, etc.) – are these people intentionally taking a very undefined path, or do we need to put some things in place that might cause them to try to make some decisions earlier in their college career. If they don't make those decisions, they run into more problems later on. Even if they make a decision and they change it, at least they know more making the second decision than they did the first time.

Dr. Fick provided another handout, Measuring Up at Cochise College – Numbers That Guide Us, that he described as a systematic start to looking at key metrics for the institution. He emphasized that the Board not get caught up in the details, but to think about it from a systems perspective. The columns included the tier (things the Board might be most interested in from a big picture perspective), category (various categories – completion, retention, and access, etc.), specific measures (FTSE enrollment, graduation rates, Fall-Fall retention), current number (numbers shown in green are going in the right direction, numbers going in the wrong direction were shown in red, and numbers in yellow stayed the same or there were no numbers to be compared – Dr. Fick stated these colors will change as numbers change), target (showed no numbers, as we need to have discussions in this area), year or cohort (what kind of data this is), and audience or driver (these are things we are reporting to the state group of community colleges). This is a system we are starting to develop and could become an information item on the Governing Board meeting agenda each month, very much like the Financial Report. Mr. Quinn inquired if classroom experience is captured where we measure if the student was satisfied with the teaching and training – where is it that we get the student's feedback on the instructor? Dr. Fick stated that information is not specifically listed in this handout. That is another set of pieces that he wants to work in there. We do have a survey in which each student has the opportunity at the end of every class to answer questions. Mr. Quinn then inquired if we're looking at thresholds or trends that indicate we either want to measure that or not. Dr. Rottweiler stated we're looking at what the Board tells us they want to look at. We do an annual survey, CCSSE, where students will classify how they feel about their experience at the college. Collectively, our hope is that this becomes a good measure; we are striving to be data driven in a lot of the things we do. Mrs. Strain added that there are mountains of research out there on this. Dr. Rottweiler stated this is exactly what we need to be doing. Mrs. Strain stated this will be exciting for the trustees in terms of student success and the national agenda on completion because there is so much about this that the trustees just

don't know. This is new; community colleges have never worked this way. Mr. Quinn asked for clarification on the expectations regarding what the administration is most interested in. He stated that a greater explanation of what the measure is would be helpful to him. Mrs. Strain added that additional information can be found regarding the Volunteer Framework for Accountability (VFA) on the internet. Dr. Fick stated Cochise College is one of the few institutions in Arizona that is working with the FAA.

2.05 Santa Cruz County Provisional Community College District Update

Dr. Rottweiler provided background information on the partnership with Santa Cruz County Provisional Community College District (SCCPCCD). SCCPCCD has a provisional Board, they are basically a taxing district and they are able to bring in resources; however, they are not eligible (by current state statute) to be their own community college. Therefore, they must form an agreement or an IGA with an existing college. We are that entity for Santa Cruz County; Eastern Arizona College in Graham County does the same for Gila County. These unique provisional colleges exist only in Arizona and nowhere else in the U.S. We've been in partnership with them for three years under the provisional, and prior to that it was through an IGA with the Board of Supervisors. We recently received notice that their Board would be having a public meeting with the purpose of meeting Dr. Lee Lambert, Chancellor of Pima Community College. Other than the notice, we were not briefed on the contents of the meeting. Mr. George Self, Dean of Extended Learning, who oversees SCCPCCD, attended the meeting and will provide the Board with a report of that meeting.

Mr. Self stated he received notice of the meeting on Wednesday, September 2, 2015 at about 10 a.m.; the meeting was scheduled for Thursday, September 3, 2015 at 10 a.m. While this did provide a 24 hour notice (per state statute), the president of the Board must have had this meeting planned for months, as Dr. Lambert and their state representative were both present. The meeting began at 10 a.m., and in attendance were three of their Board members, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Lucero (Arizona Minerals), two accreditation consultants under contract to the district, State Representation Velasquez, and several other people. It was an informational meeting with one agenda item – workforce training for a proposed new mine. First, an accreditation consult reported to Dr. Lambert about all their efforts to become accredited; he mentioned there is a long history between Pima College and Santa Cruz County. (He failed to mention that most of that history was in the court.) He also stated that a strategic planning session was scheduled for their Board, and part of that plan was to look at “both Pima College and Cochise College” to see how they would fit into the strategic plan. Mr. Lucero then presented a lengthy report regarding the open pit mine that has been proposed for just south of Patagonia. This was an investors presentation – long on promise and short on specifics. Areas such as legal and environmental clearances were not mentioned; however, he did promise that, despite a lack of investors and governmental clearance, the mine would be up and running within two years. Dr. Varona, president of the SCCPCCD Board, revealed that he was in negotiations with Pima College to provide workforce training for an estimated 350 mine workers. Specifically, he mentioned they would need welders, equipment operators, construction crews, as well as various management and support staff. Mr. Self stated that the impression he was left with was that they were already in negotiations and that a draft contract would be ready for their Board to sign at their meeting next week. He added that, while he believes that the process they used is a violation of state procurement law, a greater concern to him is that they have clearly violated their intergovernmental agreement with Cochise College. Specifically, that agreement states, “In the event that SCCPCCD desires to offer more classes than are contemplated by this agreement, it shall notify COCHISE, and the parties will negotiate in good faith for supplementing the class offerings.” This notification did not occur; in fact, they

seem to have gone out of their way to avoid that notification because the first public meeting where they discussed this contract was only announced 24-hours prior to the start of that meeting. At worst, the secretive nature of this entire process, to him, is a breach of faith and makes him question their commitment to Cochise College.

Mr. Self stated tonight's agenda item was for information only, and he doesn't expect any sort of action. However, he will attend the SCCPCCD Board meeting next week to see what sort of contract they are signing with Pima College. He believes we need to be prepared to take some sort of action, depending on whatever their next step is. Mr. Self shared that he feels Cochise College has been 'stabbed in the back'; SCCPCCD is negotiating with another college to teach classes that we can teach and should be teaching, which, to him, is inexcusable.

Mr. DiPeso inquired if this was the mine in Sonoita. Mr. Self informed Mr. DiPeso that this is not the one in Sonoita, but a new mine south of Patagonia. He has difficulty believing that the citizens of Patagonia are just going to let them open up a mine; however, Mr. Lucero believes it will happen within two years. Mr. Nelson inquired if Mr. Self was able to learn why they would go to Pima rather than talk to us. Mr. Self replied that the reason was because 'they have such a long, productive history with Pima College'. Cochise College has been their educational provider since 2003, more than ten years. He added that Ms. Velasquez stated publically in the meeting that she felt like it was time to mend fences with Pima College. Mr. Nelson stated it seems like it was more Santa Cruz reaching out to Pima than Pima reaching out to Santa Cruz. Mr. Self agreed, adding that he doesn't think Pima had any clue as to what was going on, and he doesn't believe that four out of the five Board members knew what was going on. Dr. Rottweiler stated he reached out to one of their Board members, and he was not aware of this. He was utterly embarrassed, and said it's not good business. He believes they did violate the IGA; however, when he shared that with the Board Chair, the Board Chair took it to their legal counsel who said they are more than welcome to negotiate with multiple community colleges for services. Dr. Rottweiler's response was that he doesn't care who they negotiate with, he's just not going to be played against each other. He contacted the chancellor of Pima and shared his concerns with him, and the chancellor was concerned as well. Dr. Rottweiler stated this is a difficult area; we like to provide the services to the students – they are important to us, but working with this provisional Board is getting more difficult all the time. Mr. DiPeso stated it would be his recommendation to not even start a class like that until they at least have some permitting in place. Dr. Rottweiler stated that a year and a half ago he and Dr. Fick met with Mr. Lucero and Dr. Varona and had the program lined up. Now, he's not sure what's going on, to all of a sudden switch plans. However, he knows this has a couple of their Board members concerned because they have reached out to him. Mr. Self stated that the Pima College welding staff has been in Nogales evaluating locations for them to teach welding classes. This has gone beyond just talking about maybe offering a couple of classes there.

2.06 Governing Board Retreat

Dr. Rottweiler stated the Board had requested to hold a retreat in September or October; however, he needs the Board to set some dates, and he will work around the Board member schedules. Ms. Mountjoy stated the responses she has received from Board members suggest that October 3rd would be the most convenient date for Board members to attend a retreat. All members confirmed that date would work for them. The amount of time to be allowed would depend upon the agenda. It was suggested to hold the retreat on the Douglas campus, since there is an event taking place earlier that morning in Douglas. Dr.

Rottweiler stated the retreat will be scheduled accordingly. Dr. Rottweiler requested the Board send him items they would like on the agenda.

3. NEW BUSINESS

3.01 Consent Agenda *

The following items were approved:

- 3.01.1 * Classified; Appointment (*Sarah Nikkari, Facility Services Technician III, Sierra Vista Campus*)
- 3.01.2 * Classified; Appointment (*Nathan Routhieaux, Facility Services Technician III, Sierra Vista Campus*)
- 3.01.3 * Administrative Support; Appointment (*Gabriela Amavizca, Director, TRiO SSS, Douglas Campus*)
- 3.01.4 * Administrative Support; Appointment (*Ana Arvizu, Testing Services Specialist, Douglas Campus*)
- 3.01.5 * Administrative Support; Appointment (*Gabriel Galindo, Director, Santa Cruz Center, Nogales*)
- 3.01.6 * Faculty; Appointment (*Lori Nichols, Instructor, Nursing, District-wide, based in Sierra Vista*)
- 3.01.7 * Administrative Support; Resignation (*Yvonne Gauch, Academic/Career Advisor, Sierra Vista Campus*)
- 3.01.8 * Administrative Support; Resignation (*Debra Soto, Business Analyst, Sierra Vista Campus*)
- 3.01.9 * Faculty; Resignation (*Eric Mapp, Instructor, Business, Sierra Vista Campus*)
- 3.01.10 * Faculty; Resignation (*Tierra Stimson, Instructor, Psychology, Sierra Vista Campus*)
- 3.01.11 * Faculty; Retirement (*Jeffrey Sturges, Instructor, English, Sierra Vista Campus*)
- 3.01.12 * Administrative Support; Change of Start Date (*Martin Haverty, Workforce Development and Training Coordinator, District-wide*)
- 3.01.13 * Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Douglas to Continue to Operate Transit Services to the Douglas Campus
- 3.01.14 * Curriculum Changes
- 3.01.15 * Acceptance of Minutes for August 11, 2015 – Regular Meeting

Mr. Nelson moved and Mr. Ortega seconded a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. There was no further discussion by the Board. The Board unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Dykstra introduced Sarah Nikkari and Nathan Routhieaux, and Polly Gosa, Director of Nursing, introduced Lori Nichols.

3.02 Resolution to Reimburse the Downtown Center Renovation Project from Tax-Exempt Bonds Proceeds

Dr. Rottweiler stated this is a reimbursement resolution that allows the Board some time as the Downtown Center work continues. It's about a \$14M project, and they have the resources in their fund balance; it would utilize approximately 75% of that. This resolution starts a clock that allows the Board flexibility to determine if, at some point, they would like to issue revenue bonds, which they could reimburse the college/fund balance, for the resources that have been paid out. He recommended the resolution to the Board for

approval. If the Board chooses to fund completely out of fund balance, the agreement means nothing. This would be a topic for the retreat as to what level they would like to potentially issue debt service for the remodel/repurpose of the Downtown Center. Mr. Nelson inquired if the college currently has outstanding revenue bonds. Dr. Rottweiler replied yes, we do. Mrs. Strain inquired about the reference to the 'clock'. Dr. Rottweiler explained that by having this resolution established, as we start paying the bills for the remodel, within 60 days of payment we can issue bonds to reimburse the college for those expenses. Mr. DiPeso stated he thinks it's a good idea; he feels uncomfortable using 70% of our fund balance. Mr. Ortega moved and Mr. Quinn seconded a motion to approve the reimbursement resolution. There was no further discussion by the Board. The Board unanimously approved. MOTION CARRIED.

3.03 ACCT Board Committee – Continuation of Representation/Membership

Dr. Rottweiler stated it's a requirement of ACCT to have the Board support Mrs. Strain's ongoing participation not only on their Board of Directors, but on their committee(s) as well. He recommended her ACCT Board committee continuation for approval. Mr. Quinn moved and Mr. Nelson seconded a motion to approve Mrs. Strain's representation/membership on an ACCT Board Committee. There was no further discussion by the Board. Four of the five Board members approved - Mrs. Strain abstained from voting. MOTION CARRIED.

4. COMMENTS FROM GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. DiPeso turned the floor over to Governing Board members for comments.

- Mrs. Strain stated she attended the Paramedic Program recognition on September 4th. It was wonderful! It was an amazing event, and it was a great experience. She hopes to attend more of those recognitions.
- Mrs. Strain shared a clipping of a lady's death notice that included she has a grandson who is in the Aviation program at Cochise College. Mrs. Strain thought it was amazing that this lady would be so proud of her grandson as to include that in her obituary.
- Mrs. Strain shared ACCT publications that are available to Board members.
- Mr. Quinn thanked Ms. Mountjoy for her support in getting information to the Board in a timely manner.
- Mr. Ortega stated he is proud to be a part of the team.
- Mr. Nelson stated he was unable to address the State Board of Education at their last meeting, as he had planned, due to a scheduling conflict. It is his intention to attend their next meeting scheduled for September 28th.
- Mr. Nelson stated he appreciated the business plan of the Aviation department. It was very helpful to him. He didn't realize the disparity between income and revenues going out.
- Mr. DiPeso commented on Nogales – he stated it has taken HudBay, previously Rosemont, eight years, and they still have not been granted a permit to open a copper mine in Sonoita. It took ten years to obtain a permit to open a new mine in Safford. He has doubts that a permit will be granted in just two year for Nogales.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DiPeso adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Cochise College Regular Governing Board meeting
Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Respectfully Submitted:

Loretta Mountjoy, Executive Assistant to the President

Mrs. Jane Strain, Secretary of the Governing Board