



Meeting Minutes January 26 – 27, 2021

	Page
Board of Trustees	1
Academic and Student Affairs Committee	11
Audit Committee	16
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee	21
Facilities Committee	35
Finance Committee	38
Outreach and Engagement Committee	45

**Click on committee name to jump to that section.*



Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes
January 27, 2021

Present: Chair Jay Cowles, Vice Chair Roger Moe, Trustees Asani Ajogun, Ahmitara Alwal, Alex Cirillo, Dawn Erlandson, Javier Morillo, April Nishimura, Oballa Oballa, Rudy Rodriguez, Kathy Sheran, George Soule, Cheryl Tefer, Michael Vekich, and Chancellor Devinder Malhotra.

Absent: Trustee Jerry Janezich

Call to Order

Chair Jay Cowles called the meeting to order at 11:45 am. He welcomed all trustees, presenters, participants, and the audience listening to the live stream.

Representatives of the bargaining units and student associations were requested to submit their written testimony in advance of the meeting. All testimony was distributed to trustees for their review yesterday evening and has also been posted to the Board website.

Chair Cowles conducted a roll call of the trustees who were participating by Zoom.

Chancellor Devinder Malhotra Remarks

Chair Cowles, Vice Chair Moe, and members of the board,

It has been almost one year ago today that we last came together and convened for an in-person board meeting.

2020 is certain to forever hold strong in our memories and in our country's history. Twenty-twenty was marked by a global pandemic, economic crisis since the Great Depression, a national and local reckoning on racial justice and disparities and political turmoil. COVID-19 has brought tremendous loss, grief, pain, and acute hardship.

Yet, through the uncertainty, challenges, and crises, we also experienced tremendous innovation and technological advancements previously unimaginable – including in higher education. Our experiences have exponentially expanded what it means to transform.

While the violent occupation of the U.S. Capitol on January 6th left us deeply shaken. We must continue to aspire “to form a more perfect Union” – as set forth in our Constitution.

Last week we witnessed a hallmark of our democracy in the peaceful transition of power. As we look ahead, we all have a responsibility to help strengthen our nation's civic resilience. It is a charge we must all take seriously.

While I have a number of important topics to touch on today, I lead with extending my deepest gratitude to you, and to our campus and system leadership, faculty, staff, students, and the entire Minnesota State community.

In particular, thank you, Chair Cowles and trustees for your leadership and guidance. The enormous scale and overwhelming speed of events created extraordinary demands. Chair Cowles, you and I have talked more this past year than we both could have ever anticipated. That communication, the commitment by the board, and the stability you all provide is vital. Minnesota State truly is a resilient organization.

Legislative Session

Yesterday, Governor Walz announced his priorities for the 2022-2023 biennium budget.

I want to thank Trustee Moe as chair of the Finance Committee and Vice Chancellor of Finance Bill Maki and his team for their thoughtful work in putting together Minnesota State's budget proposal, which is focused on meeting the pressing needs of our students and colleges and universities during these challenging times.

The preparation of the Minnesota State budget was done in consultation with our student, faculty, and staff organizations. Their partnerships are deeply appreciated.

The budget proposal centers on two main priorities. The first area is the core level of funding needed to stabilize our colleges and universities. The second priority area focuses on equity and affordability.

We greatly appreciate the time that the Governor, Lt. Governor, Commissioners Schowalter and Olson took in listening to and considering our proposal. It was made clear during our conversations that Equity 2030 aligns with the Governor's priorities.

I also appreciate Chair Cowles and Vice Chair Moe for their help in providing valuable legislative testimony before the Minnesota House and Senate. This afternoon, Presidents Charlier, Atewologun, Wacker, and Olson will join in testifying before the House. I am grateful for their participation and sharing the campus perspective.

As Vice Chancellor Maki shared yesterday, both federal stimulus bills have provided much needed funding to our students and our campuses. I am grateful for the engagement and support of the Minnesota congressional delegation. We stay engaged with our federal delegation on the third stimulus bill that is being debated now.

I also want to thank all the presidents and their teams throughout our 37 colleges and universities for engaging in our Virtual Minnesota State Days at the Capitol. Each college and university has their own special day to share their stories using social media and engaging directly with their local legislators. Their advocacy is a vital part of how

Minnesota State tells its multifaceted story and helps legislators see the value we bring to every corner of the state.

Executive Searches

Now, turning to our five presidential searches that are currently underway, I am pleased to share that Minnesota State University, Mankato and St. Paul College have completed their first round of interviews. We'll be meeting with the finalists in the next couple of weeks, and I look forward to bringing forth my recommendations for these two presidential roles to the board at the March meeting.

At the same time, our presidential searches for Northland Community and Technical College, the Northeast Higher Education District, and Minnesota State College Southeast are following closely behind.

I extend my appreciation to Presidents Wacker, Atewologun, Brimhall, Mulford, and Parker for their leadership as chairs of the search advisory committees and the students, faculty, staff, and community members serving on these committees.

We have also launched our search for the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion position, partnering with AGB Search. My thanks to President Pierce who has agreed to serve as the chair of the search advisory committee and President Blackhurst for agreeing to serve.

Finally, over the next couple of weeks, we will move forward with the Vice Chancellor of Information Technology search. We are partnering with an executive search firm that focuses specifically on IT leadership recruitment in higher education. It is coincidentally and aptly named, Next Generation Partners. My appreciation to President Olson for chairing this search advisory committee with the support of President Millender who will also serve on the committee.

NextGen Update

Members of the board, as we are on the topic of IT, it is a good segue to NextGen.

Following the Board's approval in November to enter into a contract with Workday, I am pleased to share I signed the contract on December 23rd, and the NextGen implementation has moved into high gear.

The Minnesota State NextGen Project team has begun to meet with their counterparts from Workday, which includes Workday's implementation team from Deloitte.

With Finance and Human Resources moving through implementation first, one of the first critical steps is to expand the Minnesota State team to include functional area

project leads, coordinators, and subject matter experts from across our colleges and universities and the system office.

NextGen will play a critical role in our ability to increase the success of our students at every step on their higher education journey, and I look forward to sharing future NextGen key updates and progress with the board.

Mental Health Summit

Last October, Minnesota State partnered with the University of Minnesota to host a first-ever statewide Mental Health Summit to discuss strategies and address the needs of our students.

Subsequently, University of Minnesota President Gabel is launching the President's Initiative on Student Mental Health taskforce. I am pleased that Dr. Paul Shepherd, who serves as the System Director for Student Development and Success, will represent Minnesota State on the task force. Dr. Shepherd was a critical partner that made the Mental Health Summit a reality.

There are great opportunities for the state's two public systems of higher education to partner to increase the services and support available to students and I look forward to continuing our joint work in this area.

Through the summit and subsequent discussions, we have identified concrete steps that Minnesota State must take if we are to increase our capacity to serve students. I have charged Sr. Vice Chancellor Anderson and his team to complete:

- a needs assessment and gaps analysis around mental health services – what is currently offered and what else can be done, and
- increasing the resources and training for faculty and staff to give them the tools to help support our students.

Given the urgency in addressing the challenges and pressing concerns regarding student mental health, I am creating a chancellor's fellow position to abet in this critical work. It is my intention to open the opportunity for the chancellor fellowship by mid-February.

Equity 2030 – Conclusion

Chair Cowles and members of the board, in sum, while the coronavirus has significantly impacted higher education, we continue to successfully proceed in moving forward with fundamental organizational operations and our strategic priorities.

The creativity and ingenuity of our faculty and staff, in partnership with the Minnesota Department of Health, has enabled us to successfully finish the semester while protecting health and safety and helping our students achieve their educational goals.

Case in point: our colleges and universities served over 163,000 students this fall semester. And, in the midst of the pandemic, between spring and summer semesters, our students earned over 26,000 degrees, certificates, and diplomas.

At the same time, the pandemic has exposed our frailties, laying bare deeply rooted systemic and persistent inequities – in society and our institutions, including in higher education.

That is why achieving Equity 2030 is paramount. The crisis has propelled our sense of urgency and unites us in purpose.

Only by closing the educational equity gaps will students – of all backgrounds and socioeconomic status – have the opportunity to gain social mobility and economic security.

And, only by closing the educational gaps will Minnesota be equipped with the skilled workforce it needs for our state’s economic recovery and long-term vitality.

Once again, Chair Cowles and members of the board, this has been a time like no other. But it has brought out – and continues to bring out –the best in the Minnesota State community.

Chair’s Report, Jay Cowles

We started off this month’s meeting with a joint meeting with the Minnesota State Leadership Council. Our time together was facilitated by EAB, a best practices firm that uses research, technology, and consulting to address challenges within the education industry. The session focused on the future of higher education in the shadow of COVID. The presentation, along with small discussion groups made up of trustees, presidents, and members of the Chancellor’s cabinet, provided stimulating and meaningful discussion of what the future may look like and how our system can best position itself for the future. I will be working with committee chairs to ask them to take the month of February to reflect on yesterday morning’s discussion and think about potential committee topics for the upcoming year that will allow the board to continue consideration of these areas.

I also would like to report out on a discussion at the January 6th Executive Committee meeting regarding a proposed inclusive board leadership plan. A summary of this plan can be found in the meeting minutes, which are included in this month’s board materials. This plan was developed as a follow-up to the Board training held last July and came out of conversations with the Chancellor and Trustee Rodriguez who chairs the board’s Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee. System Diversity Officer Andriel

Dees also assisted in the development of this plan. I'm thankful to all involved for their thoughtful efforts. During the January 6th meeting, Trustee Rodriguez walked us through the particulars of this plan which is based in the interests of supporting Minnesota State in delivering on the Equity 2030 plan and focusing on board development activities that allow trustees to lead by example. The objectives for trustee learning through this plan include building self-awareness about different dimensions of diversity; demonstrating leadership commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion; embedding inclusive leadership in trustee decision-making; and helping trustees become allies for underrepresented population. I look forward to continuing to work with Trustee Rodriguez and others in the coming months as we plan specific opportunities related to this work, much of it self-directed in order to allow trustees to approach this learning in a manner that best meets their needs. As mentioned during the Executive Committee meeting, trustees should feel free to reach out to Trustee Rodriguez with feedback... this plan is for and by the board in order to become a better leadership body so input from trustees is important. I look forward to hearing from Trustee Rodriguez on next steps in the coming weeks.

And lastly, I would like to express my appreciation for the support of Minnesota State that Governor Walz and Lieutenant Governor Flanagan have demonstrated in their recently released biennial budget recommendation. If enacted, this proposal will support students in continuing their educational journeys and will help stabilize the financial positions of our colleges and universities. I also want to echo Chancellor Malhotra's appreciation for the efforts of Finance Committee Chair and Board Vice Chair Moe and Vice Chancellor of Finance Bill Maki and his team in developing Minnesota State's budget proposal as well as the partnerships with our student, faculty, and staff organizations that supported these efforts.

Consent Agenda

Chair Cowles asked if anyone wanted to remove an item from the Consent Agenda. No items were removed.

Following a motion from Trustee Cirillo and a second from Trustee Rodriguez, a roll call vote was conducted, and motion passed unanimously. The Consent Agenda was adopted.

Consent Agenda

- 1. Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, November 18, 2020**
- 2. Minutes of the Committee of the Whole Meeting, November 18, 2020**
- 3. Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, January 6, 2021**
- 4. Contracts Exceeding \$1 Million:**
 - a. Contract for Flight Training Program Facilities and Services – Rochester Community and Technical College**

- b. **Contract for Printer/Copier Multi-Function Devices – Rochester Community and Technical College**
 - c. **Contract for Office 365 Management Tool – System Office**
 - d. **Student Affairs Renovation - Minneapolis Community and Technical College**
 - e. **Comstock Memorial Union Roof Replacement - Minnesota State University Moorhead**
5. **Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 2.1 Campus Student Associations (Second Reading)**
 6. **Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.1 Student Rights and Responsibilities (Second Reading)**
 7. **Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.6 Student Conduct (Second Reading)**
 8. **Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.7 Statewide Student Association (Single Reading, Technical Change Only)**
 9. **Mission, Vision, and Name Change related to Northeast Higher Education District (NHED) Consolidation**

Board Standing Committee Reports

Academic and Student Affairs Committee, Cheryl Tefer, Chair

Committee Chair Tefer reported that the committee met on January 26th and voted by unanimous consent to recommend that the board adopt proposed changes to the following board policies: Board Policy 2.1 Campus Student Associations, Board Policy 3.1 Student Rights and Responsibilities, Board Policy 3.6 Student Conduct, and Board Policy 3.7 Statewide Student Associations. Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson gave a first reading and described proposed changes to Board Policy 2.9 Academic Standing and Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress and Board Policy 3.29 College and University transcripts. The committee heard a presentation from Interim President Michael Raich related to the Northeast Higher Education District's (NHED) proposed new mission statement, vision statement and name change for board approval as next steps in merging NHED's five independently accredited institutions. The committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Board of Trustees adopt these changes.

Audit Committee, George Soule, Chair

Committee Chair Soule reported that the committee received an update on the results of the Comprehensive Workforce Solutions (CWS) project review. The committee also received an update from Executive Director of Internal Auditing Eric Wion on the internal audit plan for the 2020-2021 year.

Chair Cowles noted that he and the Chancellor have begun conversations for bringing the CWS conversation back to the board in the future.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee, Rudy Rodriguez, Chair

Committee Chair Rodriguez reported that they received an update regarding Equity by Design from Interim System Diversity Officer Andriel Dees followed by a Strategic Equity Update from Interim Assistant System Diversity Officer Priyank Shah and Project Director for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Tarrence Robertson. Dr. Wendy Marson from Inver Hills Community College/Dakota County Technical College and Dr. Henry Morris from Minnesota State University, Mankato also joined the committee to share their campus perspectives. Trustee Rodriguez noted that a key follow-up was a desire from trustees to see more metrics behind diversity and inclusion and that he and Interim System Diversity Officer Dees commit to sharing an update on this at the next board meeting. Lastly, Trustee Rodriguez thanked the Chancellor, Chair Cowles, and Trustee Soule for contributing to the board inclusive leadership learning plan that Chair Cowles noted in his remarks and encouraged trustees to reach out to him with feedback on what they would like to see in this plan.

Facilities Committee, Roger Moe, Vice Chair

Vice Chair Moe reported that the committee received an update on the 2020-2021 legislative capital budget request from Associate Vice Chancellor Brian Yolitz who shared that the request for \$188M includes \$103M for HEAPR projects and \$84M for 2 different projects. There were also two contracts exceeding \$1M that were approved on the consent agenda.

Finance Committee, Roger Moe, Chair

Committee Chair Moe reported that Vice Chancellor Bill Maki gave an update on the general workflow of NextGen and audit topics. There were five contracts exceeding \$1M which were all approved in the consent agenda. There was discussion related to the Federal Higher Education Funding update and a breakdown of the \$187M that Minnesota State will potentially receive. Lastly, the committee received an update on College and University Financial Performance.

Chair Cowles noted that the federal funding is one-time funding and not to be used for ongoing expenses or compensation. It is to provide an opportunity to deal with short term revenue and expense issues caused by the current pandemic.

Human Resources Committee, Michael Vekich, Chair

Committee Chair Vekich reported that the Human Resources Committee met in closed session. An informative report of the current state of the bargaining units' negotiations was provided by Vice Chancellor Eric Davis and Senior System Director for Labor Relations Chris Dale.

Outreach and Engagement Committee, Dawn Erlandson, Chair

Committee Chair Erlandson reported that the committee heard from Pine Technical and Community College and Metropolitan State University on their current partnerships to support student food insecurity. They talked about a holistic approach to meeting students' non-academic needs so they can connect with community partners to help them find food, heating assistance, housing, healthcare, and other resources that will be available after they leave our campuses.

Student Associations | Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Bargaining Units

Student associations and bargaining units were invited to submit written testimony in lieu of the opportunity to address the Board in person. The testimony was distributed to trustees for their review in advance and has also been posted to the Board website under the meeting materials link. Written testimony for student associations was submitted by Lead MN President Priscilla Mayowa and Students United Vice Chair Emma Zellmer.

Written testimony was submitted by the following bargaining units: AFSCME, Jennifer Erwin, President; Inter Faculty Organization, Brent Jeffers, President; and Minnesota State College Faculty, Matt Williams, President.

Chair Cowles added that the structure and management of board meetings has been an ongoing topic and that he and the Chancellor share a desire to ensure the consultative process is robust. He noted that in addition to the testimony received as part of the board meeting, there are regular meetings between campus presidents and representatives of student associations and bargaining units as well as conversations with the Chancellor on a statewide basis with the leaders of student associations and bargaining units. Chair Cowles noted that as trustees review testimony, they are thinking of future agenda items and conversations for committee meetings in order to be responsive to what we are hearing.

Trustee Reports

Trustee Erlandson reminded everyone that there is an upcoming virtual ACCT National Legislative Summit February 8-10. Trustee Erlandson also noted that there are three trustee groups that meet regularly: African American Trustees, Latinx Trustees, and Asian Pacific Islander Native American Trustees. Links can be sent if interested.

Trustee Erlandson noted that she had a meeting with the CEO of ACCT and the current Board Chair and the CEO of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). The purpose of the meeting was to talk about collaboration between the two organizations in particular the onboarding of new trustees.

Chair Cowles thanked Trustee Erlandson for her work at ACCT in the past and for representing Minnesota State very well.

Trustee Oballa wanted to thank Metropolitan State University and Pine Technical and Community College on their presentation and research regarding food insecurity and noted it is especially important to be mindful during this pandemic.

Trustee Oballa commented that student associations and bargaining units used to be able to present their testimony in person and receive feedback directly and the current practice of written testimony only feels different. He asked when we would go back to allowing them to testify in person. He noted that yesterday's discussions with presidents was good but stressed that it is important to have interactions with students as part of these opportunities in order to learn from their perspectives.

Chair Cowles responded that this matter is under consideration and there are dynamics involved that will need to be considered including time and the nature of the virtual meeting environment. Chair Cowles also noted again that there is ongoing consultation occurring throughout the system and presuming written testimony is the same that it would be in person, the message is still received. He also noted that he understands that if trustees have follow-up questions or comments. Lastly, Chair Cowles noted that yesterday's discussion related to re-inventing higher education was designed for presidents and trustees and that he will work with the Chancellor to consider how those discussions could continue with more stakeholders.

Chancellor Malhotra noted that he will work with Chair Cowles to determine how future joint meetings can be accessible to student associations and bargaining units while we are still needing to meet remotely due to the pandemic.

Trustee Oballa thanked Chair Cowles and Chancellor Malhotra for their thoughts and noted that as a former student association leader, he is aware of the critical importance of opportunities for student perspectives to be part of leadership discussions.

Trustee Soule shared that the Minnesota State Taskforce on Law Enforcement Education Reform has concluded hearing from resources and is now focused on preparing to present their thoughts to the board at its March meeting.

Chair Cowles noted that there will be training for the trustees on the executive search process directly after this meeting. There will also be a zoom social at 5pm today.

The next Board meeting is scheduled for March 16-17, 2021

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:39 pm.

**Minnesota State Board of Trustees
Academic and Student Affairs Committee
January 27, 2021
McCormick Room
30 7th Street East
St. Paul, MN**

Academic and Student Affairs Committee members present via Remote connection: Cheryl Tefer Chair; Alex Cirillo Vice Chair; Asani Ajogun, Dawn Erlandson, Javier Morillo, Oballa Oballa, and Rudy Rodriquez

Academic and Student Affairs Committee members absent:

Other board members present via Remote connection: Ahmitara Alwal, Jay Cowles; Roger Moe, April Nishimura, Kathleen Sheran George Soule, Michael Vekich, and Chancellor Devinder Malhotra.

Committee Chair Tefer called the meeting to order at 11:06 am.

1. Minutes of November 17, 2020

Chair Tefer called for approval of the minutes from November 17, 2020. Trustee Erlandson moved to approve the minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Trustee Rodriquez. In lieu of a voiced vote, Chair Tefer executed roll call of ASA Committee members:

Trustee Ajogun - Aye
Trustee Cirillo - Aye
Trustee Erlandson - Aye
Trustee Morillo - Aye
Trustee Oballa - Aye
Trustee Rodriquez – Aye
Trustee Tefer - Aye

The minutes were approved as written.

Chair Tefer stated that in the interest of time, the three (3) policies requiring approval (Agenda items 2-5) would be grouped together for one motion and roll call vote.

2. Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 2.1 Campus Student Associations (2nd Reading)

Chair Tefer stated this is a second reading of Board Policy 2.1 Campus Student Associations. No comments or changes have been made since the first reading of the policy. No questions or discussions were brought forth by committee members.

3. Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.1 Student Rights and Responsibilities (2nd Reading)

Chair Tefer stated this is a second reading of Board Policy 3.1 Student Rights and Responsibilities. No comments or changes have been made since the first reading of the policy. No questions or discussions were brought forth by committee members.

4. Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.6 Student Conduct (2nd Reading)

Chair Tefer stated this is a second reading of Board Policy 3.6 Student Conduct. No comments or changes have been made since the first reading of the policy. No questions or discussions were brought forth by committee members.

A motion to approve all three policies as written was made by Trustee Cirillo and seconded by Trustee Ajogun. In lieu of a voiced vote, Chair Tefer executed roll call of ASA Committee members:

Trustee Ajogun - Aye
Trustee Cirillo - Aye
Trustee Erlandson - Aye
Trustee Morillo - Aye
Trustee Oballa - Aye
Trustee Rodriguez – Aye
Trustee Tefer - Aye

Board Policies 2.1, 3.1 and 3.6 were approved as submitted.

5. Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.7 Statewide Student Associations (Single Reading, Technical Change Only)

Chair Tefer stated that Board Policy 3.7 was reviewed as part of the five year review cycle. This policy has only one technical change. The single edit replaced the word “board” with “Board of Trustees” in Part 3 of the policy. The change was made so the policy would be in compliance with the writing standards applied to all board policies. Chari Tefer asked for questions or comments, of which there were none.

A motion to approve the edit was made by Trustee Erlandson and seconded by Trustee Rodriguez. In lieu of a voiced vote, Chair Tefer executed roll call of ASA Committee members:

Trustee Ajogun - Aye
Trustee Cirillo - Aye
Trustee Erlandson - Aye
Trustee Morillo - Aye
Trustee Oballa - Aye
Trustee Rodriguez – Aye
Trustee Tefer - Aye

Board policy 3.7 was approved as presented.

6. Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 2.9 Academic Standing and Financial Aid
Satisfactory Academic Progress (1st Reading)

Chair Tefer stated that Board Policy 2.9 was reviewed as part of the five year review cycle. She then asked Sr. Vice Chancellor Ron Anderson to review the changes that are proposed. Sr. Vice Chancellor Anderson stated that the definition of academic amnesty/renewal was added to the policy. Also, language was added in Part 3 to clarify that academic amnesty does not apply to financial aid eligibility. No action is required since this is the first reading of the policy

7. Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 3.29 College and University Transcripts (1st Reading)

Chair Tefer stated that Board Policy 3.29 was reviewed as part of the five year review cycle. She then asked Sr. Vice Chancellor Anderson to review the proposed changes. Sr. Vice Chancellor Anderson stated that the only change replaced "Integrated Statewide Record System" with "student information system" to remove language specific to former systems and give clarity to new IT systems. Several technical edits were also made to this policy. No action is required since this is the first reading of the policy.

8. Mission, Vision and Name Change related to NHED Consolidation

Chair Tefer introduced Michael Raich, Interim President of the Northeast Higher Education District, to address this agenda item. Interim President Raich spoke about the history and current structure of the Northeast Higher Education District (NHED). NHED was formed in 1999 and is currently composed of five independently-accredited colleges on six campuses. The colleges are: Hibbing Community College, Itasca Community College, Mesabi Range College, Rainy River Community College and Vermillion Community College (with campuses in Vermillion and Ely). The colleges have a shared president and several shared services but still operate independently in several aspects including enrollment management, academic programming, budgets, athletic programs and data bases. The intended merger of the 5 colleges would be an operational merger, meaning there would be one accredited college on six campuses. The new model would begin in the Fall Semester of 2022.

President Raich went on to review the reasons and realities for the change, including:

- Student Demographics;
- Significant and sustained enrollment decline;
- Fewer employees;
- Shared services barriers such as multiple databases and bargaining units; and
- Student barriers such as access to programs and services.

He then reviewed the opportunities that would result from the merger. Highlighted were: flexible and seamless learning experiences for students, a comprehensive enrollment management plan, expanded campus academic programming, advanced regional industry and educational partnerships with being one accredited institution, mission-centric investments, and focused roles for employees.

President Raich stated just as important as what will change, are the things that will not change with a merger. He stated that each campus has individual connections with within their community and this would not change. Each campus would retain their own identity and things that make them unique, such as their campus foundations, niche programming, face-to-face academic programming and athletic programs that will remain as competing.

He reviewed the process that led to the decision for the merger, which began with District-wide Strategic Planning in 2016. Planning and listening sessions occurred over the next several years and in January 2020 the intent to merge the 5 accredited colleges into one accredited college was approved by the Board of Trustees.

President Raich stated that since January, 2020 several steps have been taken to arrive at recommendations that are being brought forth at today's meeting. He further stated that work to combine the institutions into one-accredited institution has begun with the Higher Learning Commission. Academic instructional and non-instructional work has been reviewed with the unions and an Academic Affairs and Standards Council Group. This work is focusing to avoid duplication and ensure continuity after the merger. IT systems, partnerships and stakeholder relationships have been and are being reviewed. President Raich stated that VisionNE was developed as a framework to guide the efforts needed to merge the five colleges. Vision NE has included convening a VisionNE Advisory Council of students, community members, faculty and staff, who provide the critical link between the colleges' leaders and the various constituents associated with NHED's colleges.

President Raich stated that per Board Policies, the action to be taken at the meeting is to approve the mission and name of the one merged institution. He commented that the vision is provided as an action item even though Board policy does not require Board approval. President Raich stated that the employees, community stakeholders, and students gathered to provide input on the mission, vision, and naming elements for the merged college. Development teams then used that input to create drafts, which were reviewed by students, employees, leadership, community stakeholders, and system office staff.

President Raich read the following final proposal for the Name, Mission and Vision of the merged institution:

Proposed Name: Minnesota North College

Mission: Minnesota North College prepares lifelong learners and engaged citizens through inclusive, transformative experiences reflecting the character and natural environment of the region.

Vision: Minnesota North College will be the premier provider of life-changing education and the catalyst for regional prosperity.

President Raich stated that upon approval of the name, mission and vision; the branding and marketing process would begin. Continued operational planning would take place and be brought before the Board of Trustees for final approval. Application for final approval by the Higher Learning Commission would then be submitted. Finally, the new operational model would be launched in September 2022.

Chair Tefer opened the floor for comments or questions.

Trustee Rodriguez thanked President Raich for the presentation and pointed out his agreement with the mission. He stated that he was looking forward to the communication that would start to emerge as part of the branding and marketing process and stated it was important to have the campus names associated with the overall name of the one accredited institution.

Chair Tefer stated that the process showed there was competent leadership to date. She also agreed that given the proximity of the campuses, the word “North” is needed in the name.

Hearing no additional comments, Chair Tefer read the motion before the committee:

“Upon the recommendation of the Chancellor, the Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the name, mission, and vision of the new single college that will be formed upon the future merger of Hibbing Community College, Itasca Community College, Mesabi Range College, Rainy River Community College, and Vermilion Community College.”

Trustee Erlandson moved to accept the motion, which was seconded by Trustee Rodriguez. In lieu of a voiced vote, Chair Tefer executed roll call of ASA Committee members:

Trustee Ajogun - Aye
Trustee Cirillo - Aye
Trustee Erlandson - Aye
Trustee Morillo - Aye
Trustee Oballa - Aye
Trustee Rodriguez – Aye
Trustee Tefer - Aye

Chair Tefer stated that the recommendation will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Chair Tefer adjourned the meeting at 11:40 am.

Meeting minutes prepared by Rhonda Ruiter 2/4/21.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
January 26, 2021**

Consistent with the federal and state guidance on the Covid-19 pandemic, Chair Cowles has determined that in-person meetings will not be held for the foreseeable future. As a result, members of the public were not permitted to attend meetings due to the current pandemic. The board provided access for the public to monitor meetings via live audio-streaming of the proceedings.

Committee Members Present by Remote Access: Trustees George Soule, April Nishimura, and Michael Vekich.

Committee Members Absent: Asani Ajogun and Jerry Janezich.

Other Trustees Present by Remote Access: Trustees Alex Cirillo, Jay Cowles, Dawn Erlandson, Roger Moe, Rudy Rodriguez, Kathy Sheran, and Cheryl Tefer.

Committee Chair Soule called the virtual meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

1. Minutes of November 17, 2020

The minutes of the November 17, 2020 audit committee were approved as published.

2. Project Results – Comprehensive Workforce Solutions Project Review

Mr. Eric Wion, Executive Director for the Office of Internal Auditing, introduced Ms. Christine Smith from Baker Tilly, Senior Vice Chancellor Ron Anderson, and Ms. Mary Rothchild, Senior System Director of Workforce Development.

Mr. Wion reminded members that the Comprehensive Workforce Solutions (CWS) report was distributed to them in early December. He provided background that led to the regional CWS model implementation in 2017. Different ideas and models had been discussed and since the decision to move to the regional model, the merits and specific details of the model have continued to be debated and relitigated. He added however, that Minnesota State and CWS is a tremendous resource and engine for workforce development in Minnesota. There are tremendous examples across the system of innovative work, and there are great opportunities to leverage the power of the collective system to do more. He stated that the report identifies some key barriers and challenges and recommendations for CWS.

Finally, Mr. Wion pointed out the references to enterprise risks in the summary sheet in the audit committee materials in the board packet. He stated that this was part of some pilot work done in collaboration with the Enterprise Risk Steering Committee to clearly identify for trustees when a board topic is relevant to a major enterprise risk or opportunity.

Ms. Smith provided an overview of CWS, including project objectives, overall conclusion, challenges encountered in the new regional model for CWS, and key recommendations.

Ms. Smith stated that Comprehensive Workforce Solutions is part of a broader continuum of programs offered by Minnesota State that directly impact workforce development in the state of Minnesota to ensure an available, skilled, and qualified workforce throughout the State.

Ms. Smith reviewed the project objectives and conclusions. She stated that Minnesota State has not cemented their competitive position in the marketplace with regards to CWS, nor have the regions come together around a cohesive strategy. The model should be driven by an enterprise-wide sector-based strategy, executed by the regional structures, with universal agreement and commitment to the expected synergies, program growth, expectations, and fiscal outcomes.

Ms. Smith stated that based on the assessment, they believed that CWS does offer the opportunity to mitigate some of the current high risks that are faced by Minnesota State. CWS promotes a pathway from noncredit to credit and baccalaureate programs, which could impact positive enrollment for nontraditional students and the ability to grow that enrollment at a time when traditional student enrollment is expected to decline because of changes in demographics. CWS could also assist in terms of financial sustainability as it provides institutions the opportunity to carry out their mission and values in a fiscally sustainable method. The model that was designed assumed that these programs would be self-sufficient. CWS has the ability to be a value-added partner that is meeting the demands of the marketplace by providing in-demand workforce development skills and competencies that allow for successful entry or re-entry into the workforce, which is especially important during periods that follow unemployment such as what is being experienced right now. This gives CWS a specific link to the equity 2030 framework in that it enhances educational access and promotes student's success.

Ms. Smith outlined regional implementation realities and challenges. She stated that the differing perspectives across leaders on how this collaborative model could or should work is still a distractor from being able to go forward with the model as intended. There is still debate happening about what the model should look like and what the tactical approach should be, versus conversation about developing a common strategy, approach, and tactics to support that approach, so that Minnesota State can be seen as a strategic partner as it relates to workforce development.

Ms. Smith reviewed the four key recommendations – statewide sector strategy, clear role of the regional model, accountability framework, and finally, synergies across programs.

Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson thanked internal audit for their work on the advisory project and he thanked the numerous presidents and CWS leaders and staff who provided input and shared their perspectives and their experiences of the work over the last three years.

Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson provided leadership's response to the report. He stated that the findings were generally consistent with leadership perspective and experience.

Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson acknowledged there had been a lack of universal acceptance and support for the model. There is more discussion and listening to do moving forward to ensure the multiple perspectives are heard and considered as future direction is clarified and the right path is laid out.

Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson agreed that implementation has been challenged by leadership turnover due to significant numbers of retirements and other departures. In some instances, this has caused the conversations to begin again as new individuals' step into the work.

Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson also recognized that the operational focus over the last three years had gotten in the way of more strategic development and strategic positioning. He stated their efforts would be refocusing attention on strategy development as the next phase of this work begins.

Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson stated that internal structures created challenges in collaboration. Financial and human resources structures have been built around individual institutions and is often difficult to bridge across institutions. He noted that one of the positive takeaways from this work has been learning about the kinds of collaboration and sharing that need to happen across institutions, which can be applied to the transition to the new ERP system. Systems can be set up from the beginning in a way that allows for that bridging across institutions as opposed to the narrowly focused singular institution that has been the tradition of higher education.

Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson added that it is important to acknowledge that campus resources and capacity are limited. Collaboration and partnership and enterprise work takes more time and more effort than independent work. Resources across all campuses are stressed, and attention is pulled to numerous competing directions. Part of the work ahead is to ensure there is clarity on those priorities and expectations.

Finally, Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson highlighted some of the important lessons that have been learned about enterprise and cross institutional work that go beyond CWS. Collaboration and enterprise level work is a challenge in many ways because it challenges existing structures and the status quo. It requires deeper levels of trust and a willingness to focus on collective benefits that may have differential impacts at the individual campus level. He stated that the collective work is based on relationships, and there needs to be continued focus on developing and deepening those working relationships at all levels across institutions. He stated that there has been some really good progress made over the last three years, there is a good foundation to build upon that did not exist prior to this work. Clarity of direction and acceptance of the direction will be critical, not only to this effort but to any of the enterprise level efforts. He stated that they will focus on learning

from those regions and those program areas that have been successful and scale them up to build those approaches in ways that are appropriate to the local and regional workforce and economic development needs of our communities.

Ms. Rothchild discussed the next steps for CWS. The first step will be to reaffirm the direction which will include building on successes, retaining and strengthening regional structures, adopting a sector approach to develop regional growth strategies, align sector approaches with Centers of Excellence, and increase the focus on noncredit to credit articulation and aligned planning. Additional steps include establishing ongoing operational and oversight structures and broadening key performance metrics. And finally, finding common ground, among our campuses, within the regions, and among our leaders in continuing education and customized training around what is expected of them, and what kind of accountability framework there will be for revenue and expenses.

Trustee Tefer asked if the list of occupations that require ongoing licensure was used to build continuing education and customized training opportunities. Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson said that it was one of the things that is brought into the data review to determine the educational needs in communities and in multiple industries within each of the regions to ensure that they are being addressed. Trustee Tefer talked about looking at ways to broaden our borders using customized training and online platforms. Ms. Smith added that Minnesota State has several experts in their field that do things no one else does, and part of the strategy is to figure out how to position that to the system's advantage.

Trustee Erlandson asked about whether there were any national benchmarks or models that Minnesota State should be looking to for success and comparison. Ms. Smith stated that there were not any national benchmarks, but they were able to look at best practices in Georgia, Texas, and California. She offered to share more about those examples. Trustee Erlandson expressed frustration with barriers identified when regional models are developed. She talked about wanting to have a conversation at the board level about how to meet the needs of the students to be successful in their future, and how to be successful in meeting the needs of our workforce development, and of our industry so that we keep them in Minnesota.

3. Internal Auditing Update

Mr. Wion stated that we are halfway through the fiscal year 2021 audit plan. He stated good progress had been made on the plan, all but one project had been started and several had been completed.

Mr. Wion pointed out that the external auditors, CliftonLarsonAllen, had reported in November that they were waiting for guidance from the federal government in terms of the audit requirements for the CARES funding in order to finalize the student financial aid audit. Since then, the audit requirements have been released by the federal government and CliftonLarsonAllen is in the process of determining their testing strategy for that work. The

federal government typically requires the single audit report to be submitted by the end of March, however, they have extended the deadline to the end of June this year. CliftonLarsonAllen anticipates they will have their work completed by April and will return to the audit committee to present the results.

Mr. Wion stated that given the demands of other projects, he did not anticipate they would be able to complete the Academic Program Management Review advisory project that they had planned to work on with Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson. He proposed including that project in the pool of projects being considered for the fiscal year 2022 audit plan.

Finally, Mr. Wion reminded members that the Office of Internal Auditing is required by internal auditing standards to undergo a Quality Assessment Review every five years. An independent external assessor was contracted, and that work has just been finalized. He was very happy to report that the draft report indicates the overall conclusion is the Office of Internal Auditing generally conforms with internal auditing standards, which is the best rating that could be achieved. He stated that the report will be reviewed, and he will draft a written response, and Mr. Wion will bring the final report to a future audit committee meeting for discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Darla Constable

Minnesota State Board of Trustees
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee
Meeting Minutes
Virtual
January 26, 2021

DEI Committee members present by remote access: Rudy Rodriguez, Chair; George Soule, Vice Chair; Trustees: Ahmitara Alwal, Javier Morillo, April Nishimura, Oballa Oballa, and Cheryl Tefer; President Liaisons: President Anne Blackhurst and President Jeffrey Boyd

Guest Presenters:

Priyank Shah, Interim Assistant Diversity Officer

Tarrence Robertson, Project Director for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Wendy Marson, Director of Institutional Research of Dakota County Technical College & Inver Hills Community College

Henry Morris, Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion of Minnesota State University-Mankato

Committee Chair Rodriguez called the meeting to order and took roll call at **10:47 AM**.

Chair Rodriguez: Today, we have updates on strategic equity and Equity by Design. With that, I will turn it over to the Interim System Diversity Officer, Andriel Dees, to lead our discussion.

Andriel: Thank you Trustee Rodriguez and good morning everyone. I want to be respectful of time, I do want to acknowledge just for your information, a strategic equity update. This is kind of a look back at the past year at 2020, from the standpoint of the division, we're excited about where we are and where we're going, continuing the good work that was started by my predecessor, Dr. Clyde Pickett and Assistant Diversity Officer, Dr. Josefina Landrieu. We were saddened to see them go but excited to continue the good work and the foundation of moving and advancing equity and inclusion at a system and campus levels. One of the key things that is very poignant, given our recent conversation around looking at higher education post pandemic is that we are very much aligned in terms of making sure that we're being intentional with addressing the needs of our students at both the community and state levels. One of the things that I think continues to be a theme for us is looking at tools that will shape and move the dial for moving us through the process of our moonshot goal of Equity 2030. Again, I won't belabor any discussion point around the strategic equity update but I will open for any questions in case anyone had any questions or concerns.

Hearing none. With members of my team, Dr. Priyank Shah, Interim Assistant Diversity Officer and Tarrence Robertson, who is our Project Director, very much a vital voice in this work as we move forward. We are also excited to have our campus representatives,

Dr. Wendy Marson from Dakota County Technical College and Inver Hills Community College and Dr. Henry Morris from Minnesota State University Mankato to discuss and walk through an update regarding Equity by Design.

We just want to set the stage around why we are here today. What are the key pieces and why are we even pursuing Equity by Design. When we started really working around understanding what Equity 2030 was about and what was needed to get us through the long arc of a 10 year goal of going to a zero sum gap. One of the key things that we wanted to provide to our campuses were opportunities and tools to think differently from a system perspective down to the very granular perspective about what are we doing at our institutions that can really change the dial to be more student focused. We have the abstract perspective of being student focus but not hitting the targets that we want to hit when it comes to addressing the equity concerns within our higher education structures. Quite frankly the last two decades, there's been a movement in higher education towards developing an equity based educational environment. With the need to move into being more intentional and conscientious in unpacking what our systems can do and where we are actually creating the barriers for our students. To that end, Minnesota State's guiding principle of Equity 2030 and our state priority is really geared toward addressing and moving our system's policies and practices towards a place that will let lead us to zero sum gaps between our students. This goal is not really just based on change management organizational principles but a strong social imperative and a responsibility Minnesota State leads to calling the attention to inequality. The events that occurred here in Minneapolis, where people are calling it a place of ground zero. It was a national call to drawing attention to the inequalities of all of our systems but more importantly, narrowing in on the area of higher education. Overall, we want to ensure that all of our stakeholders are receiving that guidance and approach towards meeting and advancing equity and inclusion throughout our campuses.

Priyank: Equity by Design is strategy and framework for examining disparities in the outcomes and experiences of our stakeholders, namely students and employees. In broad terms, Equity by Design, or EbD for short, seeks to elucidate disparities through the disaggregation of data by social or demographic characteristics. For example, disaggregating data to look at differences in graduation rates between racial groups. Differences in graduation rates, let's say, between white and Latinx students or black students, are identified as equity gaps.

The EbD framework calls for closely analyzing equity gaps in order to understand how and why the disparate outcomes take shape. Of particular importance, is the need for viewing equity gaps through an equity minded lens, which ask us to think about how our institutions shape or exacerbate the disparate outcomes of our students. This methodology intently calls for a shift from a student deficit approach, where the lack of

success is attributed to the student's background or lack of academic preparation to an institutional approach, where the role of our institution is meaningfully considered. That is to say we aim to understand the equity gaps through deliberate examination of how our institutions and system's structures, practices, policies, and pedagogy shape disparate outcomes. The student's experiences and assets certainly matter for the disparities we observe, however, EbD emphasizes the role of the institution. This approach is effectively calling for the shift from the mindset of college ready students to that of student ready colleges.

Equity minded inquiry the framework aims to identify opportunities for improvement. Improvement in how we engage, support and teach our students in a more equitable manner. It is important to understand this work has a long arc and can certainly be complex. This methodology can be adapted and applied across a wide range of facets of Minnesota State's enterprise. In the current iteration of our EbD work, the focus is on racial disparities and core success outcomes with an eye towards classroom factors that shape equity gaps. In broad stroke, this diagram provides a visual representation of the key phases of EbD and illustrates how the methodology works. It is important to note that within AND between each of the phases, there are a multitude of additional steps and nuance that need to be considered and navigated. We begin with Phase A, where there is an existing recognition or growing awareness disparate outcomes for stakeholders and a desire to improve outcomes. Initiating EbD moves us on to phase B, where relevant data points are disaggregated by key group characteristics such as race, Native American identity, gender, or Pell eligibility. The disaggregation of data is key step for revealing disparate patterns in the outcomes of stakeholders.

As we move into Phases C and D, we consider the role of our institutions in shaping and contributing disparities, looking at institutional factors and dynamics both inside and outside of the classroom. The C and D phases require undertaking equity minded inquiry, which is often complex and not always linear, back and forth movement between the two can be expected and is often warranted. Phase E signifies the introduction of changes that are highlighted through the deliberate use of equity minded inquiry. The changes aim to improve outcomes and mitigate equity gaps between groups. As changes are made, there is a need for assessing the impact and efficacy of the interventions, which brings us back to phase B. And the cycle continues. Having provided an overview of EbD, Tarrence will now share some important highlights of our work over the past year.

Tarrence: Over the course of the last year, our system has made significant progress toward institutionalizing equity-minded inquiry across Minnesota State. As we solidified our strategy last spring to bring this work forward to all of our institutions, we were well positioned to launch this methodology and framework system wide in June 2020.

Since that time, we have facilitated six training seminars, published a corresponding toolkit, provided numerous consultations with several different campuses, and adjusted our approach to best meet the needs of our stakeholders. Moving into 2021, we are continuing to provide ongoing opportunities for training, cross-campus collaboration, and further engagement throughout the evolution of Equity by Design.

To highlight a couple of our major milestones over the course of this last year. In February 2020, we convened a large working group comprised of a variety of stakeholder groups including faculty, students, partners from IR/IE, campus equity practitioners, and other stakeholders from Academic and Student Affairs from both the system office and different campuses. As this work evolves, our workgroup continues to meet regularly and really has been instrumental in helping shape and inform the strategy of how we advance Equity by Design.

I previously noted the publication of the Equity by Design toolkit, as well as the ongoing training opportunities for our campuses undertaking this work. As campus needs continue to evolve, we are working diligently to ensure that our resources meet the needs of our campuses throughout this challenging endeavor. I would be remiss if I didn't mention that the key to our success of our strategy has truly been the collaboration with so many different partners.

Over the last year, we've developed a course success database in conjunction with our colleagues from IR & IT. We continue working closely with Ed Innovations and our Faculty Equity Inclusion Coordinators to expand faculty professional development opportunities within the Network for Educational Development (NED). We are also the expertise from our colleagues across various colleges and universities who have been engaging in this work and providing valuable insights, best practices, and illuminating different approaches in their processes. Finally to note, our communication and outreach. We recognize that the complexity of this work requires us to be proactive in our communication and outreach strategies. We are sustaining our engagement with members of IR community, our CDOs, Faculty, Deans, and many others to continue learning about their needs, challenges, and opportunities as this work evolves.

Priyank: As we roll out and lead the EbD work and trainings, we are being mindful of the differing circumstances and contexts of our Minnesota state colleges and universities. This in large part entails engaging the EbD campus teams to understand their needs, challenges, as well as their strengths and opportunities. The first two bullet points highlight our active work with our partners and teams to adapt our strategies, trainings, and timelines to best support their needs and success.

The third bullet point about continued development of tools and resources is an extension of the first two items. Having already provided resources such as the "EbD

Tool Kit,” we are continuing our work with our partners to develop, design, and deliver tools that support the work across the system. For example, a number of our campus partners have shared the need for conversation and group facilitation guides, which can help team members engage their campus colleagues in EbD related discussions. We are currently working with our system office partners, Equity Inclusion Coordinators, and faculty colleagues to develop these tools. The great advantage we have as a system is the presence of great work occurring and unfolding across our campuses. For example, work tied to culturally responsive pedagogy, professional development opportunities out of Academic and Student Affairs Education & Innovations team. As well as campus level led strategies, trainings, and tools for how to engage faculty and staff colleagues in meaningful equity work.

Tarrence: Just to touch on the last three points, I’ve alluded to the ongoing partnerships throughout this work and that continues to be one of the major opportunities that we have. As this work evolves to use the methodology of Equity by Design to assess and mitigate some of the outside of the classroom disparity factors, we are leveraging and enhancing our connections with our key stakeholders to align our efforts, training, and resources to assist our campuses in their pursuit of Equity 2030.

As we continue our engagement with campuses we are trying to be extremely mindful of assessing where they are and what realistic progress looks like from campus to campus. We are continuously assessing our trajectory and our goals over the next 3 to 5 years to ensure our campuses are in the best position to carry this work forward.

Finally, with regard to supporting Equity 2030 – Equity by Design is a methodology and an approach to critically examine the institutions role in causing disparities. While the current iteration is primarily focused on the in-classroom factors which give rise to inequity, this methodology can be applied to examine and mitigate disparities across the enterprise to support achieving and aligning our efforts in the pursuit of Equity 2030.

Andriel: Well, thank you so much Tarrence and Priyank for your insights on the workings of Equity 2030. Before we get into campus perspectives though, I did want to open up the floor to the committee to ask any questions that you may have with respect to what you're seeing in terms of the work that we're producing with Equity by Design.

Trustee Soule: For the various steps of Equity by Design, where are we in the process? What progress have we made in going down that list of things that have to be done in order to achieve our goal?

Priyank: In looking at the slide, this broad methodology truly represents the broad strokes of the work. Given that many of our institutions and our campus teams are at different starting points, where some are have already been undertaking this work, such

as DCTC and Inver Hills as our colleague, Wendy Marson will be sharing in a few moments. There are other institutions that are engaged in this work but are trying to adapt and map the EbD methodology onto their existing work. Overall, most of our EbD campus teams are somewhere between Phase C and D. Where they're engaging their faculty colleagues and Deans to determine where they want to focus their energies. Then start with disaggregating course or subject level data to identify and move into that equity minded inquiry phase. Phase D is really an exciting space right now given that there's a lot of engagement with our faculty and our administrative partners in developing those cultural responsive pedagogy curriculum opportunities to understand what is it about how we teach and engage students inside the classroom that can lead to disparate outcomes. There are certainly those colleagues that have been undertaking this work for more than two or three years. They are in that change place where they are actively bringing in change to their classroom in terms of how they engage students, how they teach and what the curriculum entails to advance success. So the short answer is, most campuses are between Phases C and D.

Trustee Soule: So we have looked at the data?

Priyank: Our campuses are either looking at the data or at a slice of the data. The real challenge with looking at the data in broad stroke is it's hard to engage all of our faculty colleagues and our leadership in looking across all subjects. We're really advocating for EbD to fit the campus context and the campus need. So if a campus decides to look at math, English or social sciences, that's really in their purview. In terms of subject, I'd venture to say, over half of our teams are focusing on math and/or English as a starting point. With a fair number also starting with some of the STEM courses around biology and chemistry as starting points. Our hope is for as this work progresses, that these growing eccentric and concentric circles of expansion. That if this year, we started with one subject or a set of courses that, as this work moves forward, it'll expand to encompass another set of subjects and courses in a manner that's manageable and feasible for our campuses.

Andriel: Thank you, Dr. Shah and one thing I will note, if we can probably move back to the slide that talks about campus perspectives. You'll be able to get a more practical perspective about how the methodology is put into action and so from that standpoint. We're excited to have Dr. Wendy Marson is the Director of Institutional Research at Inver Hills Community College and Dakota County Technical College. What she brings to the table is a lot of really good and deep experience with a lot of passion to this work, having graduated as a first generation non-traditional student. She really brought to the table the ability to work with a very similar methodology while she was at the University of Wisconsin Stout. Wendy, I can attest to, also having worked at the Wisconsin system, looking at that opportunity to really engage and understand around the success factors,

particularly for students of color. With that, I will turn it over to Wendy to do a deeper dive into what's going on at Inver Hills and Dakota Tech.

Wendy: Okay, thank you so much for that introduction. It is an honor to be here speaking to you today about our work. Since Michael Birchard, who could not be here today, encouraged me a year ago to become part of the system office group around Equity by Design. I've come to believe that this work will be the most important work that I will do at Minnesota State because of its potential for meaningful and lasting change.

Being an institutional research has always meant seeking out large numbers because they mean that we can be confident in generalizing about our results and making decisions. We're comfortable with the suppression of small cell sizes because we're uneasy with small numbers and their volatility. Equity by Design by its very nature of disaggregating data to very small numbers, has been frankly a challenge for me and for others in institutional research. While I have now reframed my narrative around this work in small numbers through all my Equity by Design work at both colleges. I've been transparent with others about my discomfort and apprehension with small numbers, and I have acknowledged the faculty and staff that this is now a new approach. I have also shared with them what I have learned about this level of disaggregation, which is how large numbers may will obscure what's happening with our students of color. And that by teasing out new information through this lens of equity, much has revealed this faith in large numbers has perhaps enabled us to resist change.

The next challenge has been in bringing difficult information forward and having conversations about it in environments where people feel safe. In these conversations, stay student centered versus slipping back into a familiar student deficit model is crucial. Chancellor Malhotra, when you introduced Equity 2030 to us in 2019, you told us that blaming others, including our own students for our equity gaps was not acceptable. We have taken that to heart in our work. Indeed, while we can acknowledge that our students of color often have difficult circumstances that we cannot influence. That should make us more compassionate, more willing to identify and change what we can control. Basically our own policies, practices, and pedagogies that create barriers for our most vulnerable students.

We have faced this challenge at my colleges by taking a wider view of Equity by Design. We are able to do this because DCTC, while formerly doing this work since 2017, was conducting it informally before that at a grassroots level, led by Harold Torrance. DCTC now has two cohorts of faculty and an expanded core team. Well Inver, new to Equity by Design in 2020, under the bold and unflinching leadership of Dr. Tia Robinson-Cooper, created a large cross disciplinary team of 12 to lead the work. She has been steadfast in her promise that we will meet inequity head on. And we will refuse to tiptoe

around the issues. Additionally, I have the privilege of leading a remarkable team of analysts, who have risen to the challenge of preparing information for this project in new ways. Finally, we all stand on the shoulders of those at both colleges who have long been advocates for this work and who now join us as equity champions. To be successful, sustainable and inclusive, this work has to first acknowledge what already exists to support and enlarge it.

This wider view has shown us that our gaps begin even before students reach the classroom. We convert students of color at a lower rate than white students so there is a need to examine our practices and identify barriers. When students of color enter our colleges, we have also found that an increasingly high percentage make up our developmental course enrollments. In some cases, our students of color are lost at an alarming rate when they begin at the lowest developmental level, indicating that our existing work with multiple measures needs to focus there.

The next barrier is the gateway courses which are necessary for degree progression and our equity gaps in those courses, which only widen when we further disaggregate by course delivery method. This work has emerged through IR's work with Martin Springboard, Director of Teaching and Learning, who has created a pilot to collaborate with faculty and redesigning courses to address these delivery gaps. We're also examining classroom policies and practices which may be creating barriers to success. Engaging faculty from multiple disciplines to discuss classroom policies and how inconsistencies in those applications of policies between courses may be negatively impacting our students. We all share in our commitment to our students and we all need to own our own part in identifying and closing the gaps, not assuming that someone else should fix it. And I've already seen that Equity by Design, by taking success data down to the subject level and lower, encourages faculty to invest personally and making a difference. I've already had multiple requests from faculty to look not only at their departmental gaps but their own individual gaps to see what how their students are doing.

Inver's mission includes the phrase the power and promise of education. These seats that we counted Equity by Design to measure gaps were all filled by human beings by our students who place their trust in us to deliver that transformative experience at both colleges. In nine short years, we will be measured on how we met this challenge, while acknowledging the enormity of the task and knowing we will meet resistance. We will persist and we will prevail. I'd like to close with what will guide the work going forward from the amazing Amanda Gorman, "We lift our gaze is not what stands between us but what stands before us." Thank you.

Andriel: Thank you Dr. Marson, what an excellent presentation. Kudos to Inver Hills and Dakota County Technical College for really digging into the data and setting a really good

strong mindset for understanding what these gaps mean. Then moving towards changing our framework so that we are addressing how to deal with these gaps. So thank you very much. Real quick, I do want to be respectful of time but are there any questions from any of the trustees at this time.

Trustee Morillo: Could she help me understand the relationship to the data and its impact? Like their relationship to that and curriculum content or what does Minnesota State look like after we've implemented fully of this versus what it looks like now? After we recognize what the disparities are and we enter the fantastic work of disaggregating data but what does it then mean for the experience of students, a change in curriculum and for us?

Andriel: What we all think is what does it look like and what is the utopian effect of all of this work, where do we go? And really what it comes down to is, no matter what a student comes in with, we're looking at moving from a deficit mindset to really being an asset mind. That our students are coming in with assets that we can take and mold and move forward to get them to where they need to go. So that requires us to really take a strong look at the delivery, curriculum of the classroom but also the co-curricular components, the policies the practices. This is why it's such a huge large undertaking because it really basically almost turning our system topsy-turvy. Hopefully at the end of the day, the utopian effect is that any student that comes into any of our campuses has the ability to be nurtured, to move forward and to get to where they need to. Ultimately, where they need to get to should be either in from an entrepreneurial state, if they're willing and interested in creating their own space for business opportunities and/or a job in the workforce. And if we have not met that that structure, then we need to go back because we would have failed that student by leaving them with a diploma in hand but debt and an inability to really make a difference with their lives.

Trustee Rodriguez: Andriel, wondering if you could comment for the members today, just a little bit of our discussions about the scorecard that you're working on. I think Trustee Soule and Trustee Morillo were hinting at. Like where we are with the metrics and maybe give an update of when you expect to share an example of the revised scorecard with this group.

Andriel: We are really excited to present to the Board of Trustees at the next board meeting with a full discussion and presentation on the equity scorecard. To that end, when we're talking about measurements, we will be able to create and sustain a perspective at the system as well as the campus level of how we are doing, how we're making progress and what ultimately will hopefully look like at 2030. A system that is truly in the business of addressing the needs of all the students, regardless of how they come into our space.

Chancellor Malhotra: Going back to the question which Trustee Morillo raised is an important one: what would it look like as a result of all this? How would we look? How would our teaching and learning look different? Afterwards as compared to before. A theme that emerged in an earlier presentation this morning, was that in order for students to be successful, we have to personalize and customize the educational experience. So the phase B and C would give us the information from the aggregated data at the student level which will help us understand as to what kind of holistic support structures, both in and outside the classroom, students would need in order to successfully navigate the educational journey. So that robustness is really ultimately what would be reflected once all these changes are embedded and institutionalized.

Andriel: Dr. Marson, this was very informative and really good to look at the college what's happening at the college level. We'd like to take you now into what's happening at the university level and to that end, we have we're excited to have Dr. Henry Morris who serves as the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion at Minnesota State University Mankato. Dr. Morris has been has served in a variety of senior level administrative positions for over 29 years in Mankato and we look to him as one of the key people that helps us to understand how we can really do well for all of our students but particularly our students of color and any students that are marginalized. From that standpoint, I wanted to just acknowledge the depth of knowledge that Dr. Morris brings to the conversation and with that I will turn it over to him.

Henry: Thank you for that great introduction. At Mankato, we started our Equity by Design using data to help us inform our decisions in 2017. It really was crystallized with the chance in Minnesota Stat's Equity 2030, to help us really crystallize and gave us a little extra push to move a little faster than we may have been moving in the past. As I like to say, every year we don't fix the problem, thousands of students are negatively affected.

First thing we discovered after looking at the data was the equity gap was really three challenges impacting our students keeping them from being successful. Those three challenges are academic, financial, and environmental that created the equity gap. So you can have a student with a 4.0, loves the university but can't afford to be there. Or you could have somebody who loves the university, has money to be there but is not doing well academically. There other variations of those combinations is what keeps our students from being successful. There is not one thing that's making that happen. We actually found that we were losing more students for financial challenges. Academic being a strong second and environmental being the third. Even though, environmental is third, it is probably one of the hardest things to change. A lot of that is mindset, both by the students and the university.

One of the things, environmentally we found and this was important. It wasn't something we were glad to look at but as we like to say, don't take the data personally. Let's look at it and fix it. We found when we looked at data that a black male from Minnesota State Mankato was three times more likely to have a disciplinary hold on their transcript than any other group on campus. Certainly as a university, it is something we need to look at, we are and we have. The other thing because of the three areas that required that we share the data across the university and departments. Again, looking at the student as a whole person, it isn't just an academic person, isn't just a financial person or environmental. All of those things need to work holistically for us to have the best opportunity to have our students be successful. And that's why we like to say it takes a university to close the opportunity gap.

We have to not be afraid of what the data tells us. Earlier I talked about how a black male is three times more likely to have a disciplinary hold on them than other groups. It required conversations with res life, student affairs and others of why that was happening and what we needed to do different. It wasn't huge numbers but it was part of the problem. The other thing when we looked at the data to help people understand the data and initiate one of our initiatives called, Strive for Five. It was that we broke that percentage down to numbers. We found that if we could just save 44 more students, keep them at the institution moving toward their goals, we would have no opportunity gap. And that's where the Strive for Five initiative came for each division/college to help students move toward their goals of graduation and success.

As I said earlier, we can't be afraid of the data because that's what stops us. You can't take it personally when the data is telling us something that we think is directed at us. You need to move away from us, from the people center to student center, it isn't your problem and it is actually a student's challenge that's keeping them from being successful. We have lots of examples of those data points that are causing problems. On the academics, we know the high failing classes and the high gap classes. We know our policies and procedures that stand in the way of students being successful. How they made it easier for us but did not make it easier for students to be successful. Financial challenges, again, when we looked at all the data, there was no data set that included just students of color. Just as students were color were indeed disproportional to their rate after university. So actually a lot of changes we have made were good for our overall student enrollment situation, because we haven't yet created a solution that did not impact all our students.

In return, then creates a bigger problem because as the bigger number gets bigger, we have to move twice as fast to close the gap. And we know that we initiated some things to close that gap quicker as we know there is no data set that will fix this or if we just fix that one data set, all our problems we got will be over. Not true, so there is no easy fix. Third thing we discovered because of the multiple challenges facing our students that

we had to share the information about the student between departments and divisions. So as soon as the student sat and talked to somebody, that person should be empowered to help them fix their problem. Not send the student to four other offices, all trying to silo information. We need to be bold about sharing information. That's the only way we will close this gap and be involved in looking at new ways of doing it. The definition of insanity is to keep doing the same thing over and over and think you're going to have a new outcome. And that's one of the things higher ed has a habit of doing. You just need to fine tune something, break it down and totally start over again.

Minnesota State has two things going for it, a very robust IR area and a very robust diversity inclusion area. One of the things about data that I had said is you can't take it personally. While I know it takes a university to close the gap, there are other people, departments and areas that involved with doing that. I still think as a person, professional and as a person of color, it is my personal responsibility to be part of the solution. But again, we can't do it by ourselves. I like to say, I don't know, a student that left the university because of what we do in diversity and inclusion. I can name more of why they stay because of what we do but we still need to be part of the solution. We need to change what we do so we move from a primary programming area to a very student centered division.

We have the saying that go along with that, one student at a time, one semester at a time. How can we help the student finish the current semester? Can you continue to be eligible for the next semester and continued progressing toward graduation? So every time we meet with a student, that's what we say: How do we keep Johnny or Jane in school this semester? What do we need to make that happen? What do we need to do to make them stay eligible for the next semester and the next lesson? So when they look up, they're walking across the stage at graduation, whether that is a two year, four year or certificate.

We did what we did with the data and Dr. Davenport has been real supportive of this. He created a division of student success that's data driven to help the overall university. Again, we looked at these problems, they weren't just student of color problems, they were all of our student problems. And we needed to figure that out and student success has the overall arching responsibility for looking at student success across the university. We look individually, diversity inclusion specifically as students of color. And I think that's important that there is somebody looking at the problem with the authority to fix the problem. It hasn't been an easy journey as we heard about, people like to take things personal, when it's not. We have lots of initiatives that we have done since we started the journey. To pre-COVID, we cut the opportunity gap in half around 5%. We were moving toward to hope to finish it in about year 2025 to have no gap. Then the pandemic came up and it affected people of color across the nation disproportionately again. And obviously, in higher ed, we've seen that number that was going down, went

back up. But we now know why and who along with the things that we can fix. So we're trying to make sure that that blip is not a new trend.

I want to thank the system office, Chancellor and Trustees for making Equity 2030 a priority because I think it has given new life to it on campuses. And I want to say, you cannot fix the problem without data. You don't know what you're fixing if you don't know what the data is telling you. We can't be afraid of sharing the data and thinking it is somehow directed at you, it is not, it is for student success. Thank you.

Andriel: Thank you, Dr. Morris. I just want to extend also a big thank you to our leaders at these institutions, Dr. Michael Berndt and Dr. Richard Davenport for their continued support of this work. As we wrap up this morning, we just wanted to acknowledge the final slide that there are some significant next steps that we are looking to take. We will not go in those details today, just to be cognizant of time, but suffice to say we'll be happy to come back and give you an update. Probably incorporating the work of the scorecard, that we'll be talking about next month as well as seeing where we are in terms of engaging and thriving as a system but also at the campus level on the work of Equity by Design. With that, I'll turn it over to Trustee Rodriguez and thank you again for your time this morning.

Chair Rodriguez: Trying to keep us on track, I know that Trustee Tefer had a question.

Trustee Tefer: This is just a general kind of comment and I probably get to be a broken record because it seems like I've talked about this too, maybe a lot. When you're talking about looking at teaching methodologies, I think about evaluation. It was the thing that in my experience, when there were issues with students, it turned out that when I conceptualize Equity by Design, I have a particular population and students in my mind. They are students who are English language learners. I found throughout my many years of teaching that some of the most talented students in my classroom could absolutely not succeed on these crazy time tests that people continue to put in front of them. These students constantly read in their language, they translate in their head and then they go back to the material. I learned this without anybody telling me. It's just on the face surface when you meet these students. Some of the best students in a classroom, not succeeding in a competitive discipline, for example nursing since that's the one I know best, is a total tragedy. It is ignorance, who swear to you that even a post nursing student needs to take a timed test because the licensure exams are timed. In the back of the heads of the academics of the faculty often are their pass rates and they're concerned about that. They don't seem to mind that these students aren't there anymore. And, again, maybe I am talking old school because a number of years, there may have been many light years of difference. I just think that whenever anybody is talking especially to faculty and the mindfulness of the whole operation of everything. Learning the engagement of a student and methodologies in the classroom ought to be

competent and to reflect the students for whom they are with and teaching. On the other hand, please just make sure that that extra piece is always in there too. Ultimately, it can be buried in the shuffle of it.

Trustee Rodriguez: Thank you Trustee Tefer. We'll move quickly to Trustee Soule as you had a question about metrics.

Trustee Soule: Yes, I just wondered about when Wendy and Henry discuss the data at their schools. I'm wondering if the trustees can see that data. And do we have system wide or by school data on equity gaps and whether we can get updated on those? Not right now but at some point.

Priyank: Thank you trustees so we can certainly follow up and coordinate efforts with Chancellor Malhotra and Kari share that information. So give us the opportunity to follow up with you and we will certainly bring that information back to you.

Trustee Rodriguez: I wanted thank Interim Diversity Officer Dees, Priyank, Tarrence, Dr. Marson and Dr. Morris for your presentations. The key takeaways for me is that we heard a lot of interesting feedback and we've had this discussion as a committee, about seeing the metrics and the disaggregated data by diversity dimension. We look forward to those discussions and then the follow up from Trustee Soule on the metrics that were discussed today. I want to recognize Dr. Morris' comment about how we all need to continue to learn and not take these comments as personal but where we have opportunities to learn. I totally agree with that and I also really resonated with his comments about focusing in on the data that shows where the gaps or the opportunities are. That the numbers are just numbers and it's an opportunity for us to get better so thanks to everybody. Lastly, I would like someone to make a motion to approve our November meeting minutes for the committee so would someone from the committee like to pass that motion.

Trustee Soule: So moved.

Trustee Alwal: Second.

Trustee Rodriguez: All those in favor say aye.

DEI Committee members: Aye.

Trustee Rodriguez: Our November meeting minutes are approved.

The meeting adjourned at 11:44 AM
Ka Her, Recorder

**Facilities Committee
Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2021**

A meeting of the Facilities Committee of the Board of Trustees was held on January 26, 2021.

Committee members present: Roger Moe, Vice Chair; Alex Cirillo, and Kathy Sheran

Committee members absent: Jerry Janezich, and Oballa Oballa

Other board members present: Jay Cowles, Ahmitara Alwal, Asani Ajogun, Dawn Erlandson, Javier Morillo, April Nishimura, Rudy Rodriguez, George Soule, Cheryl Tefer, and Michael Vekich

Staff present: Devinder Malhotra, Chancellor; Bill Maki, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Facilities; Brian Yolitz, Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities

The meeting materials for this meeting are available [here](#), starting on page 21. An audio recording of the meeting is available at [here](#).

Committee Vice Chair Moe called the meeting to order at 11:55 a.m.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Meeting Minutes for November 17, 2020

Committee Vice Chair Moe asked if there are any changes or amendments to the minutes then asked for a motion to approve. Trustee Sheran made the motion and Trustee Cirillo provided a second.

A roll call vote was conducted and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 2: Contract Exceeding \$1 Million: Minneapolis Community and Technical College, Student Affairs Renovation

Committee Vice Chair Moe invited Associate Vice Chancellor Yolitz along with President Sharon Pierce, Vice President of Finance and Operations Chris Rau, and Facilities Director Roger Broz

from Minneapolis Community and Technical College to present **Contract Exceeding \$1 Million: Minneapolis Community and Technical College, Student Affairs Renovation**, as detailed in the meeting materials. The meeting materials for this item begin on page 25.

Committee Vice Chair Moe asked committee members to consider the following recommended committee motion:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute a construction contract not to exceed \$2.9 million for Phases 3 and 4 of the student affairs renovation on the T-Building at Minneapolis Community and Technical College.

Trustee Cirillo made the motion and Trustee Sheran seconded. A roll call vote was conducted. The vote was as follows:

Trustee Cirillo	Yes
Trustee Janezich	Absent
Trustee Moe	Yes
Trustee Oballa	Absent
Trustee Sheran	Yes

The committee voted to approve the recommended motion.

Agenda Item 3: Contract Exceeding \$1 Million: Comstock Memorial Union Roof Replacement, Minnesota State University Moorhead

Committee Vice Chair Moe invited Associate Vice Chancellor Yolitz along with Vice President of Finance and Administration Jean Hollaar and Facilities Director Brenda Norris from Minnesota State University Moorhead to present **Contract Exceeding \$1 Million: Comstock Memorial Union Roof Replacement, Minnesota State University Moorhead**, as detailed in the meeting materials.

The meeting materials for this item begin on page 28.

Committee Vice Chair Moe asked committee members to consider the following recommended committee motion:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute a construction contract not to exceed \$1.3 million for replacing the roofing at Areas B1, B2 and B3 of the Comstock Memorial Union.

Trustee Cirillo made the motion and Trustee Sheran seconded. A roll call vote was conducted. The vote was as follows:

Trustee Cirillo	Yes
-----------------	-----

Trustee Janezich	Absent
Trustee Moe	Yes
Trustee Oballa	Absent
Trustee Sheran	Yes

The committee voted to approve the recommended motion.

Adjournment

The committee vice chair adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

**Minnesota State Board of Trustees
Finance Committee Meeting Minutes
January 26, 2021
McCormick Room
30 7th Street East
St. Paul, MN**

Finance Committee members present: Roger Moe, Chair; April Nishimura, Vice Chair; Trustees Ahmitara Alwal, Kathy Sheran, George Soule, Michael Vekich, and Chancellor Devinder Malhotra.

Other board members present: Jay Cowles, Chair; Trustees Asani Ajogun, Alex Cirillo, Dawn Erlandson, Javier Morillo, Oballa Oballa, Rudy Rodriguez, and Cheryl Tefer.

Cabinet Members Present: Vice Chancellor Bill Maki

President Liaisons Present: President Joe Mulford, Pine Technical and Community College and President Scott Olson, Winona State University.

This meeting was hosted online via Zoom. Committee Chair Moe called the virtual meeting to order at 12:30pm and a roll-call was taken.

Chair Moe provided a brief outline of the agenda for the meeting.

1. Approval of the Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

Committee Chair Moe noted that there was a change to the minutes to include those trustees that had inadvertently been left off of the version published in the packet. A revised version of the minutes with the noted changes has since been provided to the Board Secretary and will replace those in the final published proceedings. With that, Chair Moe called for a motion to approve the Finance Committee Meeting minutes from November 18, 2020. Trustee Vekich made the motion, Vice Chair Nishimura seconded. A roll-call vote was taken, The minutes were approved as amended.

The Chair recognized Vice Chancellor Bill Maki.

Vice Chancellor Maki thanked the Chair and recognized Chancellor Malhotra to make a statement.

Chancellor Devinder Malhotra wanted to share good news on the Governor's budget proposal which recommends \$61 million (out of the \$75 million in our biennial budget request) for campus stabilization and operating dollars, \$2.5 million (out of the \$45 million in the affordability and equity portion of our request) to deal with mental health issues for students. In addition, the governor's budget included for the Office of Higher Education \$35 million for workforce stabilization grants to support dislocated workers and those making \$50K or less.

The chancellor thanked the bargaining unit and student association leadership, the government relations team, and Vice Chancellor Maki for their advocacy and leadership which have helped lead to this result.

Vice Chancellor Maki was recognized again and gave updates on the following topics:

- *The NextGen contract was signed on December 23, 2020. Implementation work with Deloitte and Workday has begun.*
- *Finance Division had our annual virtual conference in early December with a focus on:*
 - *NextGen implementation*
 - *An EAB presentation on financial operations*
 - *Results of a financial modeling survey and discussion*

2. Contracts Exceeding \$1 Million:

a. Contract for Flight Training Program Facilities and Services – Rochester Community and Technical College

Vice Chancellor Maki provided a summary of the proposed contract. Committee Chair Moe called for questions.

There being no questions, Committee Chair Moe asked for a motion to adopt the following:

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE MOTION:

The Finance Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees authorize the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute an agreement for up to three years for the period July 1, 2021-June 30, 2024 for an amount not to exceed \$5.5 million. The board directs the chancellor or his designee to execute all necessary documents.

RECOMMENDED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MOTION:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute an agreement for up to three years for the period July 1, 2021-June 30, 2024 for an amount not to exceed \$5.5 million. The board directs the chancellor or his designee to execute all necessary documents.

Trustee Soule moved to approve the motion. Trustee Nishimura seconded. A roll-call vote was taken. The motion was adopted with five in favor (Chair Moe, Vice Chair Nishimura, Trustees Alwal, Sheran, and Soule) and one opposed (Trustee Vekich).

b. Contract for Printer/Copier Multi-Function Devices – Rochester Community and Technical College

Vice Chancellor Maki provided a summary of the proposed contract. Committee Chair Moe called for questions.

There being no questions, Committee Chair Moe then asked for a motion to adopt the following:

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE MOTION:

The Finance Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees authorize the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute a new agreement with Metro Sales, Inc. through the Omnia Partners Cooperative Purchasing Program for a term through June 2024 for a cumulative total amount from March 2016 through June 2024 of up to \$1.3 million. The board directs the chancellor or his designee to execute all necessary documents.

RECOMMENDED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MOTION:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute a new agreement with Metro Sales, Inc. through the Omnia Partners Cooperative Purchasing Program for a term through June 2024 for a cumulative total amount from March 2016 through June 2024 of up to \$1.3 million. The board directs the chancellor or his designee to execute all necessary documents.

Trustee Soule moved to approve the motion. Trustee Vekich seconded. A roll-call vote was taken. The motion was adopted with six in favor (Chair Moe, Vice Chair Nishimura, Trustees Alwal, Sheran, Soule, and Vekich).

c. Contract for Office 365 Management Tool – System Office

Vice Chancellor Maki provided a summary of the proposed contract. Committee Chair Moe called for questions.

Trustee Soule asked if the program had any relationship with NextGen or would be replaced by NextGen. Vice Chancellor Maki stated that he did not believe there was any connection to NextGen but would defer to Interim Vice Chancellor Ross Berndt for a definitive answer. Vice Chancellor Berndt confirmed that this software has no relationship to NextGen.

Trustee Alwal asked if this would help students logging in or if user names would change as a result of this software update. Vice Chancellor Berndt responded that the issues noted are campus related issues and while this software will not directly help those issues it will help campus IT staff the insight into the tenant to help relieve these problems sooner.

Another feature of this change will enable faculty and staff to move their phones into the Office365 tenant.

There being no further questions, Committee Chair Moe then asked for a motion to adopt the following:

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE MOTION:

The Finance Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees authorize the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute an agreement on behalf of the system for a term up to five (5) years to not exceed \$1,700,000. The board directs the chancellor or his designee to execute all necessary documents.

RECOMMENDED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MOTION:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute an agreement on behalf of the system for a term up to five (5) years to not exceed \$1,700,000. The board directs the chancellor or his designee to execute all necessary documents.

Vice Chair Nishimura moved to approve the motion. Trustee Sheran seconded. A roll-call vote was taken. The motion was adopted with six in favor (Chair Moe, Vice Chair Nishimura, Trustees Alwal, Sheran, Soule, and Vekich).

Vice Chancellor Maki yielded to Associate Vice Chancellor Brian Yolitz to provide a summary of the next two proposed contracts. Associate Vice Chancellor Yolitz noted that both contracts had already been reviewed and approved in the Facilities Committee which met prior.

d. Student Affairs Renovation – Minneapolis Community and Technical College

A brief summary was provided by Associate Vice Chancellor Yolitz. Committee Chair Moe called for questions.

There being no questions, Committee Chair Moe then asked for a motion to adopt the following:

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE MOTION:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute a construction contract not to exceed \$2.9 million for Phases 3 and 4 of the student affairs renovation on the T-Building at Minneapolis Community and Technical College.

RECOMMENDED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MOTION:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute a construction contract not to exceed \$2.9 million for Phases 3 and 4 of the student affairs renovation on the T-Building at Minneapolis Community and Technical College.

Trustee Sheran moved to approve the motion. Trustee Vekich seconded. A roll-call vote was taken. The motion was adopted with six in favor (Chair Moe, Vice Chair Nishimura, Trustees Alwal, Sheran, Soule, and Vekich).

e. Comstock Memorial Union Roof Replacement – Minnesota State University, Moorhead

Associate Vice Chancellor Brian Yolitz provided a summary of the proposed contract. Committee Chair Moe called for questions.

There being no questions, Committee Chair Moe then asked for a motion to adopt the following:

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE MOTION:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute a construction contract not to exceed \$1.3 million for replacing the roofing at Areas B1, B2 and B3 of the Comstock Memorial Union.

RECOMMENDED BOARD OF TRUSTEES MOTION:

The Board of Trustees authorizes the chancellor or the chancellor's designee to execute construction contract not to exceed \$1.3 million for replacing the roofing at Areas B1, B2 and B3 of the Comstock Memorial Union.

Vice Chair Nishimura moved to approve the motion. Trustee Vekich seconded. A roll-call vote was taken. The motion was adopted with six in favor (Chair Moe, Vice Chair Nishimura, Trustees Alwal, Sheran, Soule, and Vekich).

Trustee Vekich suggested a procedural change for the committee to consider with respect to contracts like those for the flight training program at Rochester Community and Technical College. Recommended for inclusion going forward would be the following items which were not included in the board packet this time:

- *A fiscal note for a program or investment*
- *A Risk/Reward analysis*
- *Market analysis that indicates an ongoing need*

- *Recognition of competition between programs and how this would be addressed during the consultation process.*

These are recommended from a good governance standpoint. This applies specifically to items that require additional scrutiny before approval by the committee.

Committee Chair Moe thanked Trustee Vekich and agreed that these are good suggestions.

3. Federal Higher Education Funding Update

Vice Chancellor Maki provided an informational overview of the higher education funding programs: The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES) and the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA).

Vice Chancellor Maki read a question submitted by Trustee Erlandson: "Related to exceptional financial need, how do we figure that out? A previously middle-class family could have lost their business due to COVID and would not have qualified for PELL grants for example". The vice chancellor responded that this was a very good point and is something that we are working through. We have heard through our schools that there are many students in economic distress due to the pandemic that may not be PELL eligible, but their needs need to be addressed in some way. This is part of the process that is being worked out right now.

Upon conclusion of the presentation, Chair Moe asked for questions and comments from the Board.

Chair Moe called attention to the final slide and the wisdom of making sure we have solid principles and transparency in the expenditure of these funds. This is good guidance for all.

4. College and University Financial Performance Update

Vice Chancellor Maki was joined by Denise Kirkeby, System Director for Financial Reporting and Steve Ernest, System Director for Financial Planning & Analysis. Together, they provided a comprehensive informational overview of the annual update on the college and university financial health indicators.

Trustee Sheran asked the vice chancellor to define one of the acronyms used. Vice Chancellor Maki stated that GASB stands for Government Accounting Standards Board.

Trustee Sheran asked for a clarification of when GASB is included or not included. Vice Chancellor Maki responded that GASB is not included per board procedure. There are two components, GASB-68 and GASB-75 which are the pension components and these are pulled out when calculating the numbers used to determine the health indicators.

Trustee Rodriguez asked how our enrollment decline compares to national trends or those of other Minnesota institutions. The vice chancellor answered that more specific information would be forthcoming, but in general, because of the demographic component and what we are experiencing, the trend line we are in is similar to what's happening nationally. Also, as we learned earlier from EAB and Senior Vice Chancellor Anderson, what we have seen more recently in this pandemic environment, has been consistent with what other institutions have been experiencing.

Trustee Sheran asked what the system's response would be if enrollment is more than eight percent in decline for a college or university. The vice chancellor responded that the system asks for an enrollment management plan response; what will enrollment look like and what is being done to try and stem the problem. Each of these colleges and universities have or will provide a summary of the strategies they are looking at in order to address their enrollment issues. For example, one institution has a plan to convert concurrent enrollment students to enrolled students upon their high-school graduation. Other examples include being more proactive in following up more directly with prospective students and using new CRM strategies.

Upon conclusion of the presentation, Chair Moe asked for additional questions and comments from the committee. There being no questions from other members, Chair Moe asked if there will be another federal response to the pandemic and if it will include some additional focus on higher education. Vice Chancellor Maki stated that based on what we have learned so far from President Biden's proposal, we would expect that there would be more funding coming to higher education if there is a Stimulus 3 package and it would be an amount that is closer to the amount of money from the CRRSAA funding than the CARES funding.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55pm.

Respectfully submitted: Don Haney, Recorder

**Outreach and Engagement Committee
Meeting Minutes
January 27, 2021**

A meeting of the Outreach and Engagement Committee of the Board of Trustees was held on Jan. 27, 2021.

Committee members present: Dawn Erlandson, Chair; Alex Cirillo, Vice Chair; Asani Ajogun, Kathy Sheran, Cheryl Tefer.

Other board members present: Ahmitara Alwal, Jay Cowles, Roger Moe, Rudy Rodriguez, George Soule, and Michael Vekich.

Staff present: Devinder Malhotra, Chancellor; Noelle Hawton, Chief Marketing and Communications Officer.

The meeting materials for this meeting are available [here](#), starting on page 103. An audio recording of the meeting is available [here](#).

Committee Chair Erlandson called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Meeting Minutes for Nov. 17, 2020

Committee Chair Erlandson asked if there are any changes or amendments to the minutes then asked for a motion to approve. Trustee Cirillo made the motion and Trustee Sheran provided a second.

A roll call vote was conducted and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 2: Campus partnerships to alleviate food insecurity – Metropolitan State University.

Committee Chair Erlandson invited Noelle Hawton, along with Metropolitan State University President Ginny Arthur, Dean of Students Maya Sullivan, Student Parent and Resource Coordinator Khou Vue, and Good in the 'Hood Executive Director Shawn Morrison to present on the university's partnerships to alleviate food insecurity, as detailed in the meeting materials. The meeting materials for this item begin on page 108.

This being an informational item, there was no vote taken.

Agenda Item 3: Campus partnerships to alleviate food insecurity – Pine Technical and Community College.

Committee Chair Erlandson invited Noelle Hawton, along with Pine Technical and Community College President Joe Mulford, Student Success Advisor Erin White, and Director of Student Success Kierstan Peck to present on the college's partnerships to alleviate food insecurity, as detailed in the meeting materials. The meeting materials for this item begin on page 106.

This being an informational item, there was no vote taken.

Adjournment

The committee chair adjourned the meeting at 10:56 a.m.