



State Board of Community Colleges

Caswell Building, 200 West Jones Street

Raleigh, North Carolina

March 03, 2017

11:00 a.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Following proper public notification, Chairman Scott Shook called the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) Meeting to order at 11:03 a.m. in the Dr. W. Dallas Herring State Board Room of the Caswell Building.

Chairman Shook welcomed Ms. Whitford to the State Board. Ms. Whitford said that she is looking forward to serving on the State Board again.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Bryan Jenkins called the roll and the following members were present:

Dr. Breeden Blackwell *

Ms. Lisa Estep

Representative Jimmie Ford

Mr. Bobby Irwin

Mr. Schorr Johnson (rep for
Treasurer Dale Folwell)

Mr. Todd Johnson *

Mr. Bill McBrayer *

Mr. Ernie Pearson

Mr. Lynn Raye

Mr. James Rose

Dr. Darrell Saunders

Mr. Scott Shook

Mr. Robert Stephens

Mr. Clark Twiddy *

Mr. Jerry Vaughan

Mr. Hal Weatherman (rep for
Lt. Governor Dan Forest) *

Mrs. Ann Whitford

Dr. Candler Willis *

*Attended by telephone

Absent: Ms. Janet Lowder, Dr. Samuel Powell, and Ms. Kirsten Stovall

ETHICS AWARENESS AND IDENTIFICATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Representative Ford reminded members of the Board of the ethical requirements for those who are public servants and requested that members identify any conflicts or potential conflicts of interest that they may have with respect to any item on the agenda. Having so requested, the Chair asked that the record reflect no conflicts.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA –

Representative Ford made a motion to approve the agenda, Mr. Stephens seconded the motion, and the motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

Dr. Blackwell asked for Chairman Shook to review who was in attendance for the benefit of those on the phone. Chairman Shook reviewed there were representatives from the Presidents Association, the Trustees Association, and Senator Jackson’s office.

BUDGET UPDATE – Ms. Grovenstein reviewed highlights of the Governor’s budget in relation to the Community College System.

NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM BUDGET TRACKING SHEET: FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19									
1	Budget Priorities				Governor				
	2017-18		2018-19		2017-18		2018-19		
2	2017-18 Base Budget	1,068,233,344		1,068,233,344		1,068,233,344		1,068,233,344	
3	Enrollment Adjustment	8,396,208	R	8,396,208	R	8,396,208	R	8,396,208	R
4	Correct 2016 Salary Loss Error/Salary Restoration	10,000,000	R	10,000,000	R	10,000,000	R	10,000,000	R
		10,000,000	NR						
5	Expansion								
6	Short-Term Workforce Training Programs	15,301,375	R	15,301,375	R	15,301,375	R	15,301,375	R
7	Study Workforce Training Costs	98,500	NR	Based on Study		98,500	NR		
8	Start-Up Fund High-Cost Workforce Programs	3,000,000	R	4,500,000	R	3,000,000	R	3,000,000	R
9	Additional Career Coaches	1,100,000	R	1,840,000	R	1,100,000	R	1,840,000	R
10	Increase Student Completion	22,634,940	R	22,634,940	R	7,500,000	R	7,500,000	R
11	Reward Colleges for Outcomes	3,000,000	R	3,000,000	R	3,000,000	R	3,000,000	R
12	Stop-Loss Provision Colleges Significant Enrollment Declines	5,160,677	R	5,160,677	R	-		-	
13	Enrollment Growth Reserve Colleges with Significant Increases	5,000,000	R	5,000,000	R	-		-	
14	NC Getting Ready for Opportunities and Work (NC Grow)	-		-		-		\$19.4M from Lottery	R
15	Financial Assistance Students Seeking Industry Credentials	-		-		\$2.5M from Lottery	R	\$5M from Lottery	R
16	Expansion Subtotal	55,295,492	5.2%	57,436,992	5.4%	29,999,875	2.8%	30,641,375	2.9%
17	Net Adjustments to 2016-17 Base Budget (without salary adj)	\$ 83,691,700	7.8%	\$ 75,833,200	7.1%	\$ 48,396,083	4.5%	\$ 49,037,583	4.6%
18	Recommended FY 2016-17 General Fund Approp. (without salary adj)	\$ 1,151,925,044	7.8%	\$ 1,144,066,544	7.1%	\$ 1,116,629,427	4.5%	\$ 1,117,270,927	4.6%
19	Salaries & Benefits								
20	Faculty & Staff Salary Increases - State Aid					22,994,204	R	22,994,204	R
21	Faculty & Staff Salary Increases - State Aid - Bonus					9,654,055	NR	-	
						Salary increases in the same amount as given to State Employees.			
22	System Office Salary Increases					294,462	R	294,462	R
23	System Office Salary Increases - Bonus					89,080	NR	-	
24	State Retirement Contributions - System Office					13,337	R	86,082	R
						80,020	NR	-	
25	State Retirement Contributions - State Aid					1,016,013	R	6,557,902	R
						6,096,078	NR	-	
26	State Health Plan - System Office					64,048	R	128,095	R
27	State Health Plan - State Aid					6,056,752	R	12,113,503	R
28	Recommended FY 2017-18 General Fund Appropriation	\$ 1,151,925,044	7.8%	\$ 1,144,066,544	7.1%	\$ 1,162,987,476	8.9%	\$ 1,159,445,175	8.5%
29	Adjustments - Recurring	\$ 73,593,200	6.9%	\$ 75,833,200	7.1%	\$ 78,736,399	7.4%	\$ 91,211,831	8.5%
30	Adjustments - Non-Recurring	\$ 10,098,500	0.9%	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 16,017,733	1.5%	\$ -	0.0%

- Line 2 is the base budget for the community college system which the Governor and the General Assembly will use when considering changes to the budget.
- Line 3 is the enrollment adjustment which has been updated to reflect the final fall data so this is a fully funded request in the Governor’s budget.
- Line 4 is the correction of the \$10 million salary loss from the 2016 session.
- Ms. Grovenstein reviewed details the expansion budget starting on line 5.
 - Line 8 would enable the system to provide resources to fund new programs. This is fully funded in the Governor’s budget, but did not include additional funding for FY 2018-19.
 - Line 10 was in the budget priorities funded at \$30 per student to enhance student support. The Governor’s budget funded approximately \$10 per student. This recommendation would change the funding formula a little since the community colleges are usually funded on FTE. The recommendation of the Program Evaluation Division study was for our formula to be supplemented by these funds.
 - Lines 12 and 13 were requested by the board and had been discussed in a study of funding formulas by the Legislature, but was not funded in the Governor budget. These items would provide funding for colleges with significant enrollment declines and/or with significant enrollment growth.
 - Lines 14 and Item 15 were not in the State Board’s request, but they were in the Governor’s budget.

- Line 14 funds financial aid through lottery funds to help recent high school graduates with a GPA of 2.0. The student would need to be a NC resident, a recent high school graduate, at least part time enrolled and GPA of 2.0. The student does not need to show financial need.
- Line 15 complements Line item 6. The funding comes from the lottery and the state board would determine the parameters of the scholarships. This would be students enrolled in short term programs seeking industry credentials.
- Ms. Grovenstein reviewed details the Salaries and Benefits starting on Line 19.
 - Recurring salary increase 2% or \$800.
 - Non-recurring bonus of \$500.
 - Benefit cost increases for retirement and health plan.
- Back of the sheet provides a summary as well as key items in the Governor’s recommended budget.

NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
SUMMARY OF BUDGET PROPOSAL: FY 2017-18

	FY 2016-17 Certified Budget	FY 2017-18 Base Budget	GOVERNOR			
			FY 2017-18 Adjustments	FY 2017-18 Recommended	% Change vs. 16-17 Cert.	% Change vs. 17-18 Base
1						
2	NCCCS State Funding					
3	Requirements*	1,480,340,859	1,465,717,504	95,451,311	1,561,168,815	5.5%
4	Receipts	414,445,339	397,484,160	697,179	398,181,339	-3.9%
5	GF Appropriation	\$1,065,895,520	\$1,068,233,344	\$94,754,132	\$1,162,987,476	9.1%
6	NCCCS State Funding per FTE					
7	BFTE	224,092	225,933	-	225,933	
8	Requirements*	\$6,605.95	\$6,487.40	\$422.48	\$6,909.88	4.6%
9	Receipts	\$1,849.44	\$1,759.30	\$3.09	\$1,762.39	-4.7%
10	GF Appropriation	\$4,756.51	\$4,728.10	\$419.39	\$5,147.49	8.2%

- 11 *Requirements = Spending Authority
- Other Key Items in the Governor’s Recommended Budget:
- 12 NC GROW (Getting Ready for Opportunities in the Workforce) Scholarship - Last dollar scholarship for recent high school graduates with a GPA of 2.0 or higher. \$19.4 million from lottery funds effective with 2018-19 fiscal year.
Financial Assistance for Students Seeking Industry Credentials - Financial aid of up to \$1,000 per student for students who enroll in non-credit, short-term workforce training programs that lead to an industry credential. \$2.5 million from lottery funds in 2017-18 and \$5 million in 2018-19. NOTE: \$500,000 of the \$2.5 million is to be used for marketing this and the NC GROW programs.
 - 13
 - 14 Salary increase is 2% or \$800, whichever is higher, and a \$500 NR bonus.
 - 15 No tuition increase proposed.
 - 16 The Public Schools section of the budget did NOT include any additional funding to LEAs for new Cooperative and Innovative High Schools.

This is the starting point of the budget process. It has been presented to the Full Appropriations Committee and Tuesday, March 7, 2017, the Education Appropriations Committee will hear the information and hear from the education partners.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Ms. Shuping shared the current activities of the General Assembly.

- There is a firearms bill that will be introduced Monday, March 6, 2017 which will allow anyone who has a concealed carry permit or is exempt from the concealed carry law to be able to take their firearm on UNC campuses and Community College campuses. Will provide more information at the March 17, 2017 board meeting. Discussed the current laws and the impact of these changes.
- HB12 and HB14 as introduced would take the Governor’s appointing authority away and give it to the General Assembly for Boards of Trustees at Stanly Community College and Montgomery Community College. The bills were heard in the House Community Colleges’ Committee and several colleges were added to the bills in committee as well as a few added on the floor of the House. This makes a total of sixteen colleges whose appointments would be made by the General

Assembly instead of the Governor. For two of those colleges, the Board of Education appointments would be removed and given to the County Commissioners. If the bill passes, current members would continue to serve through the end of their term. It was amended on the floor to add a requirement that the President Pro Tempore and the Speaker would have to consult with the local legislative delegation on the appointments. Discussed the impact of these changes. Currently there are three colleges that the Board of Education appointees were given to the County Commissioners. Ms. Shuping said there is a long way to go, but there could be several different appointing authorities across the system. There is no specific rationale at this moment. If the bill affects fewer than fifteen counties it is considered a local bill and is not subject to veto. If it becomes a statewide bill, goes above the threshold of fifteen counties, or there are enough local bills that fifty-one counties are impacted, then under the North Carolina Constitution and it would be a public bill and subject to veto.

POLICY COMMITTEE, Mr. Ernest Pearson, Chair

NC Community College System Governance

Mr. Pearson reviewed the information that lead to this meeting. The three main topics that the Board will discuss are:

- Meeting frequency
- Term Limits
- SBCC Assumption of Duties

Chairman Shook asked for input from President Lamm, NCACCP and Dr. Hunter, NCACCT

President Lamm stated the Presidents' Association met on Wednesday, March 1, 2017 to discuss the proposed North Carolina Community College System Governance Options presented at the State Board's February meeting. The overarching desire of the presidents is to actively participate with all stakeholders to develop strategies which would resolve any shortcomings within the governance model, without summarily dismissing the local autonomy that truly makes the North Carolina Community College System the best in the world.

NCACCP submits the following two recommendations for consideration by the State Board of Community Colleges:

1. That the State Board seek legislation to create a "Study Committee" to examine and develop options, which would strengthen the governance model within the NC Community College System. Committee members would consist of members of the State Board, System Office, Trustees' Association, Presidents' Association, and perhaps other appropriate representatives. The committee would meet following the conclusion of the long session and work toward a report; any legislative proposals would be submitted prior to the convening of the short session. Presidents believe that this deliberative approach will result in a more effective and efficient solution.
2. That the State Board take no action regarding the proposed System Governance Options GS115D-13, GS115D-18, and GA115D-19. The Presidents' Association is requesting more time for all stakeholder to review and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of changes which could permanently alter the course of the Community College System's framework.

NCACCP remains committed to the success of the system, and it pledges its support in joining all stakeholders to ensure the continued success of the 58 colleges. The presidents feel strongly with all parties working together, vetting issues and solutions, sound judgements will result.

Dr. Donny Hunter, NCACCT stated the nation believes that the North Carolina Community College System is the best in the country. The reason the system is great is because of what happens across the 58 colleges and the work they do. The main reason the colleges are successful is because they are “community” colleges. They are the center of what goes on in many of the counties and service areas. One of the reasons they are so strong is the local autonomy. The local community appoints 66% of the trustees of the board. Previous State Boards have wanted authority to appoint trustees and the Trustees’ Association was opposed to the change. The control of the college should remain with the local board and the local community. The trustees don’t have an opinion about the change in appointments from the Governor to the General Assembly. The removal of the Board of Education appointments is sad because of the relationship but at least the appointment remained in the community.

In the system’s history, there have been problems with colleges, like Cape Fear forty years ago. Very seldom the situation rises to the level that the college needs outside help. History tells us the current tools the State Board has have been adequate for 52 years and the past boards have dealt with situations with the tools that exist. Maybe the State Board has not been utilizing the tools that are available to them. In past situations, the Trustees’ Association was asked to step in and help with local Board of Trustees if there were problems. With Martin Community College, NCACCT offered services and were not asked to help. SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) has helped in situations at Robeson Community College, Halifax Community College, and Central Carolina Community College with no lasting stigmatism about needing help. Colleges will ask SACS to come evaluate and give recommendations.

Dr. Hunter asked what has changed that requires the things being discussed today to happen at such a rapid pace and piled on top of what we should be doing, which is spending time in the General Assembly trying to the \$10 million lost in last year’s budget. Over the last six days, Dr. Hunter said he hasn’t spoken about the budget because he works for the Trustees of North Carolina and this Governance discussion is about the Trustees. Dr. Hunter stated the Trustees’ Association will not support any solution that includes the General Assembly as a solution to this problem. Why is the State Board responding to newspaper articles and the General Assembly rather than trying to look at the issue and figure out what the real problem is and how it can be resolved? The problem at Martin Community College existed for five years. What the State Board needs to figure out, with the help of all the stakeholders, what happened during those five years and why didn’t the college get help. The problem at Martin Community College was a mole hill that was allowed to grow into a mountain over time.

The Trustees’ position is if things are sent to the General Assembly it throws the door wide open. Legislative action is not needed on these issues. What the Trustees are willing to do is to come together as a cabinet to discuss how to work through and resolve issues. The local college governance could be in a dilemma by sending these recommendations to the General Assembly. These items will only affect the local boards not the State Board. It is the hope of the associations that the State Board will reach out to work together. There needs to be something in place when something happens. There needs to be a

diverse group to figure out what to do when there is an issue. With what the State Board has at their disposal currently, the Board has the power to do what needs to be done. The Trustees' Association will work as partners to come up with plans that will be administrated by the State Board to deal with situations.

Recess for lunch to be distributed from 11:51 am till 12:00 pm

TERM LIMITS

Mr. Pearson opened the discussion about proposed section G.S. 115D-13 which would limit consecutive terms to no more than two terms.

Ms. Whitford asked the State Board who had served on a local Board of Trustees and for how long. Mr. Raye stated he had served for twelve years and Dr. Blackwell stated he had served for four years. Ms. Whitford shared she served on a local board for sixteen years and the institutional memory was helpful to retain. Ms. Whitford recommended if the State Board recommend term limits, it should be twelve years. Mr. Raye shared he has worked with trustees who have been active for many years, but he could see where term limits could help get members that aren't doing what they need to be doing off the board and replace them with someone who will be active. Mr. Stephens stated the terms should mirror the term limits of the State Board. Dr. Blackwell stated he would not be in favor of term limits for trustees. The trustees can police themselves and take care of issues. There are some long standing trustees who have a huge impact on the local community college.

Mr. Johnson reminded the board that decisions being made about the issues at hand are not about presidents, trustees, and state board members, rather the decisions should be about how it impacts the students and the communities. Mr. Johnson stated he has an issue with any position having a lifetime appointment and agrees that the term should mimic those of the State Board. The longer term would help with the learning curve. In rural areas where the population is declining, the pool of interest to serve is declining.

Ms. Estep said that as a member of her local Board of Education, they are currently discussing the re-appointment at the local college. The Board of Education members are willing to reappoint the local college trustee with no documentation. There are no minutes, voting records, attendance records, etc. provided and no policy or process in place to determine how the trustees are functioning at the community college. If there are term limits, there are other ways to stay involved other than just serving on the board. Ms. Estep stated that she would support twelve years but after a certain amount of time there is a declining value.

Mr. Pearson stated the secret to success for the system is the autonomy, so he would not support this.

Mr. Irwin serves on the Alleghany Board of County Commissioner and is part of a three-county system that shares Wilkes Community College. All 58 colleges represent a different section of the state and have different needs. The experience is needed, but there is a need for fresh thoughts as well. If you are a trustee of any board, then you need to be an active member.

Ms. Estep asked what can be done when no one is paying attention or reviewing the materials from the local meetings. There is no mechanism to make sure the trustees are doing what they have been appointed to do. Ms. Whitford said that the issue at Martin Community College was not new. There are things that could have been done to resolve the issues by speaking to the appointing entities who didn't realize the issues.

Representative Ford stated President Lamm suggested that the people involved work on solutions and bring back recommendations to the State Board. The local people are the ones that are impacted by the decisions about term limits on trustees.

Mr. McBrayer stated the last thing the State Board wants to do is to be viewed as overstepping bounds. There are two sides to the argument. He agreed with Representative Ford it is important to not make decisions around the table without the input of the people at the local level.

Mr. Raye stated the most important thing the Board of Trustees does is hire and fire the president and assure the college is fiscally sound. Currently, the only accountability the board member has is attendance. Maybe if there was accountability required of the appointing entities it would help them make informed decisions about reappointment.

MEETING FREQUENCY

Mr. Pearson reminded the members the items that are to be discussed are all based on a request by the State Board to staff. Mr. Pearson opened the discussion about proposed section G.S. 115D-18 to address meeting frequency.

Mr. Raye stressed it is important that a board meets more often than once a quarter so members know what is going on at the college.

Mr. Stephens stated he would be in favor of local boards meeting six times a year, but would prefer the language, "Once every two months". Representative Ford stated he would like to consider the boards meet every month. The members who have served on local boards shared how the meetings were scheduled for their local colleges. Dr. Saunders stated in some rural areas it could be difficult for a Board of Trustees to meet monthly.

Mr. Rose asked Dr. Hunter if there are records of how often colleges meet. Dr. Hunter stated they need to meet enough to take care of the business of the colleges. It could be tracked by the minutes and meeting announcements, which are public record. The issue of frequency could be how to enforce such a rule. Dr. Hunter stated this issue could be addressed through training and would encourage the colleges to meet a minimum of every two months as recommended. He would be in support of enforcing this, however would not be in support of new legislation.

SBCC ASSUMPTION OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mr. Pearson stated this is the most strenuous of the proposed governance items. The autonomy of the local colleges is important, but the State Board needs the ability to do something if things at a college are going poorly. This needs to be an extraordinary remedy used after consultation with NCACCP and

NCACCT. Mr. Pearson shared his thoughts and edits to the proposed language to G.S. 115D-19 for consideration. This action would only be used in extreme circumstances with findings of willful and/or gross negligence. He understands the reluctance of issues being addressed by the General Assembly and there is concern about a lack of unity. If the board recommends any of the pieces of legislation, they should be filed by the filing deadline, then the stakeholders should start consultations to discuss if there needs to be amendments or for the request to be pulled.

Mr. Pearson opened the discussion about proposed section G.S. 115D-19

Mr. Shook stated the concern of the board was self-reflective of how the board got to where it did with Martin Community College. The board needs a formalized process to make sure the tools are in place to close the open-ended options that exist currently. Chairman Shook stated that he believes in the autonomy of the colleges, but the State Board has a responsibility to the system. The board needs have a process in place to avoid getting to extreme measures. The goal of these discussions is to avoid getting close to closing a college. A school closing the impacts the students, the employees, and the tax payers. Chairman Shook hopes the board never gets into a situation like Martin CC again but needs to have options in place if it does. The discussion items are the things needing the General Assembly to change through legislation. There are other items which can be changed in rules or policy. Chairman Shook shared President Lamm and the NCACCP have suggested having task forces within the regions which could bring experienced help to colleges when problems arise.

There are a lot of stakeholders in the system, but ultimately once it gets to the point of the situation at Martin Community College, the State Board was the only one who could deal with the issue. Chairman Shook state members understood the gravity of the situation and were committed to making the change in the educational system in that area. There are differences in the order of magnitude when a college is struggling. The size and community impact of a college can change who is paying attention to issues at the college. The entire system can be impacted. The issue at Martin Community College landed in the lap of the State Board. The board is trying to take the steps to not have this situation happen again.

Ms. Austin stated she was on the Board of Trustees at Johnston Community College when the school was at risk of closing because of removal of state funds. The board figured out how to remedy the situation and did so without impacting the students. There doesn't need to be major governance changes but the stakeholders need to sit down and develop a system to use when situations arise.

Mr. Irwin asked a question about wording in the "red-line" version of the proposed bill and how it would have impacted the contract with the President's buyout. Ms. Haygood addressed Mr. Irwin's question.

Mr. Raye asked if there can be a chain of command if a college starts to have issues. What would the Trustees' Association have done if they had been asked to intervene? Dr. Hunter stated the association would have brought a team to meet with the local board to discuss the issue and encourage them to work together. Due to the nature of the association, they would not have addressed the finance or personnel issues.

The Board and staff discussed the issue of rolling contracts for presidents. Ms. Haygood shared in 2005, the State Board addressed the fact that colleges should not have rolling contracts and recommended

having general counsel review contracts. Mr. David Sullivan, VP Legal Services/Risk Management at Fayetteville Technical Community College asked to speak to the board. Mr. Sullivan served as General Counsel prior to Ms. Martin. During his tenure, a numbered memo was sent to the colleges about rolling contracts, however there was no enforcing authority behind that memo. Ms. Haygood shared the issue of rolling contracts can be dealt with by updating policy. Chairman Shook stated the biggest concern is the impact to the institutional funds. It was agreed that the contracts are ultimately between the Board of Trustees and the President but the trustees need to understand the liability.

Mrs. Whitford stated it seems that two different things are being discussed, legislation and details.

Dr. Boham stated he has lived through issues at a college like this twice. Several years ago, Governor Scott asked Dr. Boham to take over at Mayland Community College when they asked their president to leave only a few months before a scheduled SACS visit. The Board of Trustees were not working together. The SACS committee came and helped guide and strengthen the board and the school.

Dr. Boham shared not using the nuclear option at Martin showed a lot of restraint and many people respect the State Board for it. Representative Ford agrees that requesting legislation from the General Assembly could be a risk.

Mr. Stephens stated the comments have been helpful. He likes the changes that Mr. Pearson has made. It would be unlikely that the State Board would need to use this, but it would be good to have as a resource.

Mr. Pearson stated the State Board is racing against a deadline. Would it not suffice to get the input from the stakeholders once the bill is filed? The language states actions would not occur without consultation with NCACCP and NCACCT. Mr. Sullivan recommended if the board waits riders could be used later in the budget if needed to add the language.

Chairman Shook asked if members wished to move on any recommended legislative items.

Mr. Vaughan stated before calling a question on the three options, the recommendation from NCACCP and Dr. Lamm about forming a study group should be addressed. It could be a benefit to have a group in place. Ms. Estep asked if the cabinet is currently meeting. Chairman Shook shared the cabinet and the study group would not necessarily be the same people. Dr. Lamm stated she could be part of the study committee. Chairman Shook stated the recommendation is to seek legislation to form a study committee. The study group could be an action later if needed and would not have to be legislatively mandated.

Chairman Shook asked for a motion on G.S. 115D-13 Terms of Office of Trustees

Mr. Vaughan made a motion to approve G.S. 115D-13 setting the term of office of trustees a maximum of 12 consecutive years sub-divided at the discretion of local government. Mr. Stephens made a substitute motion for the term of office to two consecutive terms of 6 years. Ms. Estep seconded the

motion. Mr. Jenkins conducted a roll call vote. The motion passed with nine members for the motion and seven against.

Chairman Shook asked for a motion on G.S. 115D-18 Organization of boards; meetings
Mr. Raye made a motion to approve G.S. 115D-18 requiring boards to meet a minimum of six meetings every year, at least once every two months. Mr. Stephens seconded the motion. Mr. Jenkins conducted a roll call vote. The motion passed with fifteen members for the motion and one against.

Chairman Shook asked for a motion on G.S. 115D-19 Removal of Trustees. Discussed if the board would vote on the revised version provided by Mr. Pearson during the meeting. Ms. Martin asked if committee agrees with Mr. Pearson's draft, she be allowed to make technical changes, if needed. There were no issues. Mr. Stephens suggested "notice" instead of "warning".

Mrs. Estep made a motion to approve G.S. 115D-19 Removal of Trustees with the revisions recommended by Mr. Pearson and the use of wording "notice" instead of "warning" Mr. Stephens seconded the motion.

Mr. Vaughan stated this item seems more structural and asked if there would be an opportunity for feedback from NCACCT and NCACCP on the bill before given to the Legislature. Mr. Pearson stated it could be filed on the last day to allow for time for the stakeholders to discuss. Chairman Shook shared this motion would provide a remedy like the authority given to the public-schools. Ms. Martin stated that it was patterned after the language for school systems.

Mr. Jenkins conducted a roll call vote. The motion passed with twelve for the motion and three against.

Question/Comment:

Mr. Jenkins verified staff is directed to draft the approved items in bill form and submit them to the General Assembly by the bill filing deadline.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. McBrayer made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Dr. Blackwell unanimously approved by voice vote at 1:35 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY:
Secretary

APPROVED BY:

James C. Williamson, PhD, System President

Mr. Scott Shook, Chair