

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**  
**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**RETREAT NOTES**  
**SEPTEMBER 16-17, 2014**

**Present:** Chair Thomas Renier, Trustees Ann Anaya, Margaret Anderson Kelliher, Duane Benson, Kelly Charpentier-Berg, Alexander Cirillo, John Cowles, Dawn Erlandson, Robert Hoffman, Philip Krinkie, Maleah Otterson, Elise Ristau, Louise Sundin, Michael Vekich, Erma Vizenor, and Chancellor Steven Rosenstone

---

---

**Board of Trustees Retreat**

The retreat was held at Fitger's Inn, Duluth, Minnesota.

**Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Thomas Renier convened the retreat at 1:15 PM on September 16, 2014. He welcomed new trustees Kelly Charpentier-Berg, John Cowles, Robert Hoffman, Maleah Otterson, and Erma Vizenor. He also congratulated Trustee Louise Sundin on her reappointment. Chair Renier asked all trustees to introduce themselves and he introduced staff members.

Chair Renier reviewed the retreat schedule.

**Trusteeship**

Chair Renier introduced Facilitator Kathryn Keeley, of the Keeley Group. Ms. Keeley led a discussion on working together as a board.

**FY2016-FY2017 Biennial Legislative Request**

Chair Renier called upon Vice Chancellor Laura King to introduce a discussion on the FY2016-2017 Biennial Legislative Request. Vice Chancellor King introduced presidents who sit on the Leadership Council executive committee: Ron Anderson, Century College; Larry Anderson, Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College; Richard Hanson, Bemidji State University and Northwest Technical College; and Earl Potter, St. Cloud State University.

Vice Chancellor King opened with the objective of today's discussion, namely to engage the board in formulating the system's FY2016-FY2017 legislative biennial budget strategy. The Board of Trustees' formal request to the legislature is for two years of state operating funds for Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.

The suggested goals of the biennial request are to:

- Develop a proposal that serves our students and communities across the state
- Protects access and affordability
- Improves student success
- Advances academic excellence
- Meets community and workforce needs
- Forges a proposal that builds a strong coalition of support among students, faculty, staff, and community partners

The summary of the preliminary legislative request is in two elements: \$72M to cover a portion of annual 2% salary + 1% fringe benefit cost increase (total of 3% total annual compensation increase) plus \$70M to cover a portion of annual 2% salary increase + 1% fringe benefit increase + inflation on operating costs, which equals \$142M. This will reduce the student share from 56% to 53% by 2017 – on track to 50% by 2019.

Vice Chancellor King reviewed the recommended approach and strategies for managing risk. She discussed the concerns and consequences of not securing the \$72M for the tuition buy-down and the \$70M needed to cover compensation and inflationary costs.

Consultation: Twenty-four colleges and universities forwarded ideas from campus discussions. All bargaining units and student associations were consulted multiple times; written feedback was received from Minnesota Association of Professional Employees (MAPE), American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), and the Inter Faculty Organization (IFO.)

President Hanson stated that there is and will be continued consultation – this is our story. Our request and our impact is our people. President Lundblad stated the importance of disseminating the strategic messages with a summary of the legislative request and the math behind the request. President Potter stated that the request for the \$142M has strong legislative support and moves the state back to historic levels covering a tuition freeze. Also, it sends a strong message that failure to go with the \$142M will cause implications to our employees. He continued that there are cuts every year on the campuses. An alternative scenario of \$72m and a 3% tuition increase will break faith with the public. President Anderson stated that the scenarios offer pros and cons and risks. There are cuts at the campuses due to falling enrollments. There continues to be a great deal of discussion on the campuses.

### **Board Discussion**

Trustee Cirillo inquired if there is an estimate of the amount from enrollment shortfalls. Vice Chancellor King replied that the information will be available in October. Chancellor Rosenstone stated that a driver of the decline in enrollment is related to a decline in high school enrollment.

Trustee Hoffman inquired about the budget details on the last slide of the presentation. Vice Chancellor King stated that each year, the campuses go through their budget to identify what resources to move from one activity to another activity. She added that it is expected that we reallocate as necessary.

Chair Renier introduced and invited the student association and bargaining unit leaders to join the conversation.

- Kayley Schoonmaker, president, Minnesota State College Student Association, remarked that the two-year colleges are a good price but are about one-third percent higher than others across the country. Students are graduating with huge debt. MSCSA fully supports a request for a tuition freeze.
- Laura Duscher, vice chair, Minnesota State University Student Association, added that MSUSA also supports a request to freeze tuition.

- Jim Grabowska, president, Inter Faculty Organization, stated that the IFO supports MnSCU's request. He continued that the state has a commitment to education and it is important to tell the story that we have to tell and to make it compelling.
- Kevin Lindstrom, president, Minnesota State College Faculty, remarked that MSCF also supports the request and added that it is important to be united with the request.
- June Clark, MnSCU Policy Committee, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, stated that AFSCME also supports a tuition freeze and is ready to work with MnSCU.
- Adam Klepetar, president, Minnesota State University Association of Administrative and Service Faculty, stated that MSUAASF supports the request and will join in to support MnSCU.
- Jerry Jeffries, Representative, Minnesota Association of Professional Employees, offered the support of MAPE for the request. He commented that there are concerns regarding bargaining.

Chair Renier thanked each representative, noting that he was struck by their unity and full support. Mr. Grabowska added: "We are all in."

Chancellor Rosenstone stated that it is important to be ready for the risk of not getting the full \$142M. He reviewed the risks on slide 28 remarking on how it will impact programs, faculty advisors, and support staff. Chair Renier added that there will be further discussion in the next few months. Chancellor Rosenstone concluded that once the board takes its position, the next steps are: a strategy, and how the board wants the consultation to look. He added that he continues meeting regularly with legislative leadership. Chair Renier concluded the discussion.

### **Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)**

Chair Renier stated that this is the third conversation the board has had on ERM. He commented on slides 10 and 11, which show how MnSCU compares very well with other systems nationally. Chair Renier stated that Chancellor Rosenstone has suggested three goals on slide two of the presentation.

- Review, provide feedback and oversight of the enterprise risk management strategy.
- Review, provide feedback and oversight of the identification, assessment, and management of the top strategic and operational risks.
- Discuss board strategies for effective oversight of enterprise risk management.

Chair Renier stated that the board would not go through each slide. Part of this discussion will include work done over the summer on assessing the financial resiliency of our colleges and universities.

Chair Renier invited Chancellor Rosenstone to give a brief background on ERM and the risks confronting the system. Presidents Earl Potter and Richard Hanson also were invited to join in the conversation. Chancellor Rosenstone referred to slide five regarding who is responsible for risk management. The assessment and management of risk is everyone's responsibility. The board oversees the entire ERM effort. The chancellor is responsible for the system as a whole; he does not delegate this responsibility.

The presidents lead the campuses at their level. The system-level is led by the ERM team (chancellor, vice chancellors, director of internal audit, general counsel, chief of staff, associate vice chancellor for facilities, government relations, and communications officers).

Chancellor Rosenstone referred to slide six on risks – strategic and operational. He commented that it is good when people point out something they see that may not be right. He gave the example of an employee who sees a policy that is not the same across the system, and he commended the employee for bringing attention to the inconsistency of the policy.

Chancellor Rosenstone called upon Presidents Potter and Hanson to comment on ERM on the campuses. President Potter noted that the first step is to make sure you have a team thinking strategically to evaluate the risks with the tools to access the risks. Analytical tools are in place to take apart and develop strategies to address risks and threats. Examples of risks include enrollments; operational risks regarding safety and security; and enterprise risks in an unsafe neighborhood that's not safe for students. President Potter remarked that the university pays the salaries of two police officers to ensure safety for students. The university also has an investigative team for crimes against students.

President Hanson commented that even though Bemidji State University is further out, it has some of the same dynamics as President Potter's experiences at St. Cloud State. President Hanson stated that he assigns risks in four categories: responsibilities of senior vice presidents; strategic risk; recruiting talent; and a financial category of having reliable, predictable data. He commented on some of the risks at the university. There are risks such as sexual assault crimes, technology risks from data hacking, as well as the risk of locational disadvantages.

Chancellor Rosenstone stated that the goal is not to eliminate all risks as there needs to be some risk in order to be creative. Chancellor Rosenstone added that the system is performing very well in terms of ERM compared with similar higher education systems nationally. The State University of New York (SUNY) just had their first conversation on ERM.

Chancellor Rosenstone reviewed the questions on slide 12 regarding the board's assessment and oversight. Chair Renier commented that a session for every risk is impossible. He inquired as to how deep the board should go to assess specific risks. Chancellor Rosenstone stated that his position is that it remains a board responsibility. The board also may take a deeper dive into operational risks such as IT by Finance or Audit as a closed meeting to not reveal or take on more risks. The board may decide to keep the strategic risks to an annual conversation, but not less than annually.

Chancellor Rosenstone reviewed the top strategic risks on slide 15.

- Growth among first-time college students
- Increased competition from public and private higher education providers
- 5000 fewer graduates than last year
- Growing need for space on campuses which could hit a wall with the legislature
- Threats to longterm financial sustainability
- New technologies
- Changes in careers – not just technical capabilities;

- Increased regulatory and public accountability expectation
- Low public/marketplace awareness
- Fear of change which blocks progress.

Chair Renier thanked Chancellor Rosenstone for the good overview. Trustee Vekich stated that there are more than the expected risks related to IT and Finance. He suggested a risk statement or guiding principles for board use with eyes wide open to know how to measure the risks. Trustee Anaya referred to the increased scrutiny and suggested a code of conduct and implementation procedure be in place to be certain that employees and students are acting accordingly.

Chancellor Rosenstone asked if the board felt that anything was missing or needed to be added to slide 15, adding that the top risks should not be compartmentalized. He does not see the risks as narrowly as just this top ten viewed in isolation. Trustee Krinkie inquired about student safety on the list. Chancellor Rosenstone responded that the top risks are systemwide with a shared systemwide solution – campus plans need to be managed at the campus level and are seen on their plans. Trustee Krinkie inquired about the records of the campuses. General Counsel Gail Olson replied that there is a federal campus security act which requires the campus to report, and there is a system group of campus security officers.

Trustee Benson remarked that this is a very well done presentation. He wondered, from the perspective of the presidents and the board, how to define a new funding model. Chancellor Rosenstone stated that they may need to have a broader conversation on that topic.

Trustee Jay Cowles remarked on the significant list of risks from operational risks to systemwide management, and the process for the risk management of a potential loss of forty percent of the workforce in the next five years. He continued that there ought to be a systemwide approach on that issue. Chancellor Rosenstone responded that the operational risks are at the systemwide level. Trustee Dawn Erlandson commented that some other changing dynamics are the changes in affordability and family income.

Chancellor Rosenstone asked the trustees to share with him what they see as big things in the environment and to keep on talking even when there is no agenda item. Chancellor Rosenstone commented on an alignment to keep students on track in high schools to start college earlier. He added that every student needs to have a plan in alignment with their passions and capabilities.

Chancellor Rosenstone noted that another risk is an aging faculty, which has led to conversations around the nation. Part of the student success team reviewed the evidence and found what was working.

Trustee Erma Vizenor inquired if the tribal partnership relationship could be added to slide 16. Chancellor Rosenstone noted the omission and said it would be added. Trustee Anaya inquired if there is an outreach to the Red Lake Reservation community and President Hanson replied that there is.

Chair Renier asked the board if they felt they are getting to the right questions and which question will be followed up in the committees. Trustee Vekich responded that some questions should focus on strategy and which committee it will go to. Chair Renier stated that it is thoughtful and productive work to spend an hour study session to ensure a deeper discussion at a committee. Chancellor Rosenstone suggested consulting with the individual members of the board.

Trustee Vekich asked what happens if enrollments continue to drop and if tuition is capped by the legislature and the governor? What more can the institutions stand? Vice Chancellor King replied that at the request of the trustees and the chancellor, they developed a stress test tool. Chair Renier inquired how a tool would be used given that there are some significant differences in the sizes of campuses. Vice Chancellor King responded that it is to be used productively with comparable data between institutions. Trustee Cirillo inquired if it will tell presidents what options are available. Vice Chancellor King replied that there are two parts in the tool: enrollment and financial resiliency. Chancellor Rosenstone returned to the issue of agendas and suggested that the finance committee review a 20/20 tool.

Chair Renier concluded the discussion.

### **Contract Oversight**

Chair Renier reported that this past July, Chancellor Rosenstone asked Presidents Dick Hanson and Phil Davis, the Leadership Council liaisons to the board's Finance and Facilities committee, and Vice Chancellor Laura King, to provide consultation and advice concerning the board's contract oversight role with the expectation that any recommendations for change would be brought to the full board this fall. The three were asked to consult with Finance and Facilities Committee Chair Mike Vekich and Vice Chair Dawn Erlandson.

The chancellor's charge to them set out the following goals:

1. Review current board policy and practice concerning contract approval levels.
2. Review the current reporting and monitoring methods.
3. Provide available national best practice insights concerning board governance standards and practices.
4. Recommend any changes to policy or reporting practices in order to assure the board has appropriate oversight and due diligence.

Chair Renier called upon Trustee Vekich to report on the results of the discussion. Trustee Vekich reported that the discussion group convened to examine board policy 5.14, Procurement and Contracts. The group examined the current assurance framework in policy and procedure and what the board currently approves; the delegation between the board and chancellor; the systemwide contract activity for the past year; and a review of board policies and practices for eight other higher education systems. The general conclusions were that the current \$3M board approval level for professional technical and other service contracts and procurements is higher than typically found; the construction contract program is working well and additional periodic board reporting would improve oversight and awareness.

Trustee Vekich continued that proposed changes in the policy include decreasing the threshold for board approval of certain contracts and procurements from \$3M to \$1M. (Note that this would not apply to contracts associated with projects otherwise approved by the board in the capital program per Board Policy 6.5); leaving in place the \$3M threshold for interagency agreements with other governmental units like Minnesota Management and Budget (MMB) and the Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED), etc.; and adding a bi-annual reporting requirement for all contracts subject to this policy and over \$1M. This report would likewise exclude the construction related contracts since those are reported in the biannual capital improvement report. The effect of this change will be an increase in the number of Finance agenda items.

Trustee Krinkie commented that construction project contracts can lead to nuances in the process of who gets selected. It is important to pay attention to large projects. Vice Chancellor King replied that there are currently over \$300 million in projects out there. Trustee Sundin stated that she supports the changes in the cut-off amounts. She added that the board did not have the opportunity to discuss a contract that should have been brought before them. Trustee Vekich noted that the new dollar numbers should help and that it is a different day with different leadership on the board. Trustee Erlandson noted that dollar amounts can trigger a test to not be caught off guard.

Chair Renier concluded the discussion by reporting that the proposed policy will be heard as a first reading in October. Chancellor Rosenstone thanked Trustees Vekich, Erlandson, and the group for their work as the board considers the proposed policy.

### **Charting the Future (Update on Implementation)**

Chair Renier recalled the beginnings of *Charting the Future* and how it has evolved to this date. At the board's retreat in 2012, the board carefully looked at the challenges facing higher education, challenges which could weaken educational quality and the ability to deliver on the Strategic Framework and Board Policy 3.36. Discussion unfolded around nine policy briefs. As a result of that discussion, two months later in November 2012, Chancellor Rosenstone created three workgroups charged with formulating recommendations for how best to meet those challenges:

- Education of the future;
- Workforce of the future; and
- System of the future

The workgroups were comprised of 46 students, faculty, staff, and trustees. The board reviewed the initial draft recommendations in June 2013. After five months of reflection, discussion, and debate – including 108 feedback sessions in which 5,400 students, faculty, and staff participated – the initial draft was revised and the board unanimously adopted the *Charting the Future* recommendations last November. In January of this year, the chancellor shared the implementation strategy and five months later, four of the eight implementation teams kicked off. Another four teams begin their work this month.

The board received an update on implementation at their June meeting. One hundred forty-six people are serving on implementation teams, with 86% of the team members coming from our campuses across Minnesota. The highlight of the June update was hearing from students, faculty, and staff from across our colleges and universities who are serving on the teams. They had begun their work not long before that. They let us know that they understand how important *Charting the Future* is to Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.

From the beginning, the board realized that *Charting the Future* was going to be anything but easy. Despite the challenges, they recognized that *Charting the Future* is the roadmap to providing an extraordinary education to our students, and to deliver on our Strategic Framework for the people of Minnesota.

Chair Renier remarked that in his ten years on the board, he has never seen a more engaging, comprehensive, consultative, and thorough effort to identify strategies to meet the challenges facing our colleges and universities. Chair Renier called upon Chancellor Rosenstone.

Chancellor Rosenstone recalled that last January, he shared with the board a plan for implementing the *Charting the Future* recommendations which the board unanimously adopted last November. The board requested that implementation updates occur in board study sessions so that the full board could monitor the progress, provide oversight, and offer counsel.

Chancellor Rosenstone noted that this was the second such session; the first occurred last June. Implementation is on track and this update includes the progress the implementation teams have made since June, as well as suggestions that have been offered for ensuring the integrity of the process.

Chancellor Rosenstone stated that he remains energized by the enthusiasm of our colleagues, their commitment to working together, to thinking creatively about new ways that our colleges and universities can collaborate to better serve our students and ensure their success.

Chancellor Rosenstone introduced Ms. Jaime Simonsen, system director tasked with coordinating our *Charting the Future* implementation efforts. In 2012, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities joined with DEED and the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce to conduct 55 employer listening sessions around the state to better understand the workforce needs of Minnesota. Ms. Simonsen managed that effort. Most recently, she helped support the Itasca Project Workforce Alignment effort and helped launch the pilot studies that nine of our colleges and three of our universities participated in to test new tools to help us better align our academic programs with workforce needs. Prior to joining the system office, Ms. Simonsen worked at North Hennepin Community College in a variety of roles focused on growing programs and enhancing services to meet the needs of adult learners and businesses in the area.

Ms. Simonsen thanked the board for the opportunity to join in the presentation to share an update on the implementation teams. She thanked the team conveners for their leadership and recognized the Organizational Capability team. She explained that the campus-led teams have students, faculty, staff, and subject matter experts from colleges and universities across the state, and they are deeply committed to our students and doing what is right for the communities.



Throughout the summer, Student Success, Diversity, Comprehensive Workplace Solutions, and System Incentives and Rewards implementation teams actively met.

- Teams have looked at research from around the country; brought in experts from our colleges and universities and community leaders.
- Teams have asked questions (e.g., What do they believe will make a difference? What do our students, faculty, and staff need? What do our colleges and universities need to continue to offer the best education possible?).
- Teams are currently developing and gathering initial ideas on which they want feedback from students, faculty, and staff when they attend the gallery walks that will be held across the state. (See below for a description of gallery walks.)

Engagement activities have continued and there is a great deal of excitement about what has been the participation up to this point:

- Over 75 ideas/suggestions/questions have been sent to the MyIdeas email address.
- Over 12,000 visitors have visited the *Charting the Future* blog, where team meeting agendas and synthesis are being posted.
- Discussions with MSCSA and MSUSA were held over the summer to get their ideas about better ways to connect with students, get their ideas, and get their stories.
- MSUAASF invited Ms. Simonson and others to their summer board meeting. They gave some great feedback that was then passed on to the implementation teams.
- Over 350 MAPE members participated in more than 25 events at campuses around the state, which resulted in some great recommendations that were passed along to the implementation teams.

The four teams launching this fall (and holding their first team meetings by September 19) are:

- Academic Planning and Collaboration
- Competency Certification and Credit for Prior Learning
- Information Technology Systems
- Education Technology implementation

Ms. Simonson identified the conveners of the teams:

- Phil Davis, associate vice chancellor and managing director of the Campus Service Cooperative: convener of the Systems Incentives and Rewards team.
- Scott Olson, president of Winona State University: convener of the Diversity team. (Unfortunately he was not available to participate. Winona State serves over 1000 students at their Rochester campus, in addition to the students they serve in Winona.)
- Leon Rodrigues, chief diversity officer for MnSCU and a member of the Diversity team.
- Connie Gores, president of Southwest Minnesota State University: convener of the Student Success team. (President Gores joined in the meeting by phone.)
- President Sue Collins of the Northeast Higher Education District: convener of the Comprehensive Workplace Solutions team. President Collins was unable to attend.)

- Ramon Padilla, vice chancellor for information technology and chief information officer: convener of the Information Technology Systems team.
- Richard Hanson, president of Bemidji State University and Northwest Technical College: convener of the Academic Planning and Collaboration team.
- Ron Anderson, president of Century College: convener of the Education Technology team.
- Annette Parker, president of South Central College: convener of the Competency Certification and Credit for Prior Learning team.

The conveners present at the retreat each gave brief updates on their groups.

Ms. Simonsen stated that at the June meeting, they touched briefly on an ambitious plan to bring the work of the spring implementation teams to all of the colleges and universities via gallery walks. The teams are going to hold gallery walks on 37 campuses in four weeks between October 16th and November 21<sup>st</sup>.

Gallery walks are the spring implementation teams' opportunity to share what they have been discussing for the past few months – their initial ideas. They are an opportunity to test ideas with students, faculty, and staff at all of our colleges and universities. Feedback will be shared not only with implementation teams but also with the campus communities and online. The gallery walks are part of the commitment that this effort deeply engages students, faculty, and staff from across the state. All voices must be heard and all ideas, even the ones that might end up on the cutting room floor, must be shared. This level of engagement is unprecedented in the nearly 20-year history of MnSCU. The board will have an opportunity to view the gallery walk at their meeting in November.

Chancellor Rosenstone stated that every team member's views are being taken into consideration. Implementation teams' strategies and initiatives have not been inappropriately influenced by others. Dissent is not being ignored in the effort to prioritize initiatives. Transparency is in the process by which implementation team agendas are set, priorities decided upon, and differences in opinion are being tracked, and there is clear coordination among the implementation teams. Chancellor Rosenstone added that they continue to address logistics issues that arise around scheduling meetings, reimbursements, etc.

Chancellor Rosenstone emphasized that whatever emerges is the best thinking to success from the teams. It is their implementation, not ours. They have the power to set their own agendas and consult with any constituent, and this is not a secret plan shaped by McKinsey. Chancellor Rosenstone continued that McKinsey has had no role in charting the work of the teams, and the board can see every document. Chancellor Rosenstone stated that the risks if we do nothing are huge and these challenges have never been met on a scale of this magnitude.

Chancellor Rosenstone commented that change is difficult and sometimes messy. He quoted Trustee Benson who wrote in an op-ed in December 2011, "Everyone supports change in the abstract. It's only when we start getting specific that people start getting nervous." Chancellor Rosenstone added that this process welcomes everyone's best ideas.

Trustee Vekich asked what the barriers are, and what resources are needed. Chancellor Rosenstone replied that some recommendations will cost money, i.e., using system balances to reimburse students to be engaged, or if a pilot or analysis is needed.

Trustee Vekich asked if anyone has doubt in moving forward. Chair Renier commented that if the excitement and commitment of the teams is clear, and all the while team members continue doing their regular full time work. Chair Renier stated that he sees no reason to pull in any reins. Trustee Hoffman stated that he agrees it is a great plan. He asked where the coordination will occur, more to the steering committee, one big committee, or separate autonomous groups and then the coordination of the groups. Ms. Simonsen stated that the fall teams will be in sync with the spring teams, with a pause to wait and see what comes next from the other implementation teams. While they have complete autonomy, they don't have control over policy; the board does, with a formal consultative process.

Chair Renier concluded the discussion.

### **Building Momentum**

Chair Renier reviewed the board calendar and the draft document of the committees, topics, and schedules.

Chair Renier led a brief discussion on the advantages of scheduling concurrent vs. consecutive committee meetings. He suggested that the board have a conversation about the structure of meetings. He concluded the discussion, adding that he will take under advisement the possibility of concurrent meetings and he will discuss it with trustees as well.

Chair Renier stated the importance of social time for team building and special recognitions. He added that a breakfast or dinner event may be added on occasion as schedules allow.

Chair Renier commented that trustees should feel welcome to schedule a campus visit. He added that no approval is needed for trustees to visit a campus but they should work with the board staff to schedule their visit. He mentioned that it is important to respect the campus' time and to be considerate of the campus' calendars if an event is taking place. He also encouraged trustees to attend and participate in national conferences of the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB).

Chair Renier reported that the Chancellor Performance Review Committee (Trustees Anaya, Cirillo, Erlandson, and Renier) will meet throughout the year. The board will return to Fitger's for their retreat next September 15-16, 2015. He recognized and thanked board staff Patty McCann, Inge Chapin, and Vicki Tschida for their work on the retreat.

The retreat concluded at 2:15 PM.

---

Patty McCann, Executive Assistant to the Board