

MINUTES
EVALUATION AND POLICIES COMMITTEE MEETING
OF McHENRY COUNTY COLLEGE

A meeting of the Evaluation and Policies Committee of the Board of Trustees of McHenry County College was held on Monday, December 9, 2013 in the Board Room, Room A217, in Building A on the Campus. Chair Kisser called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. When Mr. Jenner called the roll, the following committee members were present:

Mr. Jenner
Ms. Liddell
Ms. Kisser

Also present were Ms. Walsh and Mr. Parrish. Dr. Smith was present. Attorney Nanci Rogers was present as legal counsel.

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as revised; item #11, Discussion of the Timeline for Preparing and Circulating the Evaluation Forms for the President and the Board in 2014, was moved between items #8 and #9..

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Evaluation and Policies Committee meeting, November 11, 2013 were accepted as revised. One correction was made.

OPEN FOR RECOGNITION OF VISITORS AND PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Gus Philpott addressed the Evaluation and Policies Committee to inform them that he felt there was no need for a Concealed Carry Weapon policy.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Dr. Smith had no report.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF SUSTAINABILITY POLICY

Discussion centered on the policy language, specifically the wording, "to the greatest extent feasible." Debate followed on whether "the College is committed to" or "to the greatest extent feasible" would be more appropriate. Ms. Walsh stated her preference to retain "to the greatest extent feasible" in the policy

language, noting that sustainability is an issue that must be considered with every College purchase. In further discussion, the phrase “when all relevant variables (or factors) are considered” was introduced. Several suggestions were made during discussion with the phrase, “will be considered in all purchasing decisions” added to the language. This policy is under advisement and will be discussed at the next committee meeting.

DISCUSSION OF CREATION OF CONCEALED CARRY WEAPON POLICY

The Internal Committee drafted a proposed policy using suggestions from the College attorney contained in two memos. Extensive discussion followed on this policy and a straw poll was taken to determine opinions on whether a weapons policy was needed – Mr. Jenner felt no policy was needed, Ms. Walsh was undecided, Ms. Kisser and Ms. Liddell felt a policy was needed, and Mr. Parrish stated that he does not know enough about the issue. Director Clesceri provided his perspective; he noted this was a firearms policy which is needed for those who have no concealed carry permit. He stated that spelling out what can and cannot be done alleviates concerns later. Mr. Clesceri stated that whatever the Board decides to put in place, his department will comply with it. Another straw poll was taken on whether the reporting of “clear and present danger” would be a policy or procedure; Mr. Jenner and Mr. Parrish felt a procedure would be appropriate and Ms. Walsh, Ms. Kisser and Ms. Liddell felt a policy would be appropriate.

Extensive discussion followed on the proposed policy, reviewing language paragraph by paragraph, to determine what was needed, touching on signage, reporting, discipline, safe harbor parking lot, and vehicles leased by the College. Ms. Kisser asked for a straw poll to determine whether Trustees felt a policy or a procedure was needed. Mr. Jenner and Mr. Parrish stated a procedure would be appropriate; Ms. Walsh, Ms. Kisser and Ms. Liddell stated a policy would be appropriate.

Another straw poll was taken on whether a policy was needed for designation of a “safe harbor” parking lot; Mr. Jenner and Mr. Parrish said no, Ms. Walsh, Ms. Liddell and Ms. Kisser said yes.

Another straw poll was taken on whether a policy was needed regarding College vehicles; Ms. Liddell, Mr. Jenner and Ms. Kisser said no, Mr. Parrish said he would not object to it, and Ms. Walsh felt it was needed.

A follow-up straw poll was taken on whether reporting of clear and present danger would be mentioned in the policy. Mr. Parrish did not object if it applies to state policy, but did object to a campus policy. Ms.

Liddell felt this statement would be in procedures. Ms. Walsh felt it should be in the policy, and would be mentioned in procedures as well. Mr. Jenner felt a procedure was fine.

Ms. Kisser followed up on the question of college vehicles: Ms. Walsh felt there should be a policy; Mr. Jenner had no comment; Ms. Liddell wants the language kept in; Mr. Parrish wanted a policy rather than a procedure and stated he still objected.

The draft was approved, with a semicolon removed and replaced with a comma, to send to the December 19, 2013 Board of Trustees meeting for a first reading.

TIMELINE FOR PREPARING AND CIRCULATING THE EVALUATION FORMS FOR THE PRESIDENT AND THE BOARD IN 2014

All reviewed the timeline provided. It was noted that Dr. Smith must have her self-evaluation to the Board by March 1, with a Board evaluation of the President done by May 1. A date change was made: April 26 will be changed to April 24, the date of the Board meeting.

Ms. Kisser sought feedback on the Board evaluation forms and noted that June 26 would be the soonest date the Board could conduct its self-evaluation.

A break was taken at 8:57 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 9:04 p.m.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF DEVELOPMENT OF NEW POLICY ON ISSUING DEBT

Ms. Kisser turned the discussion over to Mr. Jenner. Ms. Walsh asked whether there is currently a policy and Mr. Jenner replied that the new verbiage could apply to the current policy. He noted that the philosophy behind this policy is not to issue significant debt without voter approval. Mr. Jenner reviewed concerns raised at the last meeting. To the concern that the College's bond rating might be downgraded Mr. Jenner noted that District 26 received an upgrade, adding that District 26 had a more restrictive policy than is being recommended here. To the concern that this policy would hamstring the College regarding emergencies, Mr. Jenner noted that such emergencies could be "bootstrapped" until the Board approves expenditures. Mr. Jenner noted ways the College could incur debt: 1) alternative revenue bonds, 2) levy

funds without voter approval, for which Attorney Rogers clarified that this may mean the “working cash fund,” established in the Community College Act. She noted that a referendum would be required to provide for buildings and equipment. Mr. Jenner continued with 3) bonds for wages of teachers, 4) refunding bonds or debt certificates. Mr. Jenner summarized that the District 26 policy could be construed as somewhat constrictive. To avoid the concerns expressed, Mr. Jenner recommends policy language that the College not issue bonds where the voters would have to do a back door referendum to put them on the ballot, and that the College would not levy into the Working Cash Fund without asking the voters. Mr. Tenuta clarified that to levy into the Working Cash Fund, the College must ask the taxpayers.

Attorney Rogers noted that the College started out with the Working Cash Fund, and once it is in place, there cannot be an additional levy for it without a referendum, adding that this process is different than the School Code. Mr. Jenner asked whether there was a fund the College could levy without voter approval; Ms. Rogers and Mr. Tenuta replied that refunding bonds and debt certificates could be done without voter approval. Mr. Jenner stated that his proposal would be to install a policy that says although it is not required, the College would go to the voters for these types of alternative revenue bonds.

Ms. Kissler asked Mr. Jenner whether he would like to draft a policy, noting that the College would not want to adopt District 26’s policy, which was not written for a College, and would mean a lot of rewrite.

Ms. Kissler stated that the sample policy from District 113 provided in the packet contains good, solid language about defining debt and responsibility for managing debt.

Ms. Liddell stated that she saw the value in having a policy to help the county citizens know what is going on, and added that community colleges must get acceptance at the state level before building. She stated her opinion that the College has already tied its hands enough and does not know if there is a need to do any more. She stated that the Board knows already that expansion would require a referendum, and stated she was not sure if the Board is creating something that doesn’t create enough good will to be beneficial to the community. Ms. Walsh asked whether the purpose of this policy was to eliminate alternative revenue bonds; could the language be specific in stating they would not be used? Ms. Walsh stated that such bonds are paid from revenue that is being projected; if projections don’t come through,

the taxpayers are required. Discussion followed on several projects; Mr. Jenner noted Toyota Park in Bridgeview, where property taxes tripled and revenue did not come in.

Dr. Smith stated that community colleges in the state were asked whether they had ever issued alternative revenue bonds and subsequently had to go to the taxpayers in order to make a payment; all except one college said they had not. Mr. Tenuta noted that the one community college that had issued alternative revenue bonds did not go to the taxpayers and covered part of the bond payment with tuition.

Dr. Smith stated she did not think McHenry County College had ever issued alternative revenue bonds and Ms. Walsh added that to her knowledge, the College has not. Mr. Parrish spoke about bringing an idea several years ago, after which the law changed.

Ms. Kisser stated that Mr. Jenner needs to put together policy language and bring it to the Board. He can capture what is appropriate for a community college, and the Evaluation and Policies Committee can decide whether to add to that language. She asked that all review the sample debt management policy from the other high school, District 113, she provided to the committee. Mr. Jenner noted that he would not be present at the January meeting, and he would craft something for the January packet to be circulated in advance.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF REVIEW PROCESS FOR MCC VENDORS

There was no discussion; this item will be discussed at a future meeting of the Evaluation and Policies Committee.

CONTINUE REVIEW OF SECTION 2, BOARD POLICY MANUAL, POLICIES 2.1.4.1 THROUGH 2.4.5

The rolling review will continue at the January meeting.

SUMMARY COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Walsh thanked the committee for the discussion on sustainability. Mr. Jenner noted he would be absent for the January committee meetings. Mr. Parrish complimented Ms. Kisser on the way the Evaluation and Policies Committee functions and complements the Board.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Future agenda items include a continuation of discussion on College vendors, continued review of Section 2 of the Board Policy Manual, and continued discussion on issuing debt.

CLOSED SESSION

No Closed Session was held.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, Chair Kisser adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Patricia Kriegermeier, Recording Secretary