PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE - BOARD OF DIRECTORS
12000 S.W. 49th Avenue - Portland, OR 97219

MINUTES
BOARD OF DIRECTORS BUSINESS AND WORK SESSION
Sylvania Campus, Board Rooms A/B
January 25, 2007

BOARD ATTENDANCE
Board Members Present:
Denise Frisbee, Jim Harper, Jaime Lim, Karen McKinney, Bob Palmer, David Squire, Harold Williams

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Lim called the business meeting to order at 4:07 PM and invited all present to introduce themselves.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
The agenda was approved as published.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS
None

BUSINESS MEETING

ELECTION OF NEW CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR
President Pulliams called for nominations to fill the position for Board Chair for the remainder of FY06-07. Director Palmer nominated Director Lim. The Board unanimously voted for Director Lim. President Pulliams administered the oath of office to the new Chair and congratulated him. Chair Lim called for nominations for the Vice Chair. Director Frisbee nominated Director Harper. The vote passed unanimously. President Pulliams administered the oath of office to the Vice Chair. Chair Lim called for nominations for appointment of a Zone 5 Board member to serve through June 30, 2007 when a newly elected Board member will be sworn in to complete the unexpired term of Director Margolin. Director Harper nominated David Squire. The Board voted and the nomination was passed unanimously. President Pulliams administered the oath of office to Mr. Squire and Chair Lim welcomed him to the Board.
None

The Business Meeting was adjourned at 4:20 PM

Call to Order Work Session

Work Session

Session Goals
Preston Pulliams, District President

President Pulliams thanked Board members and staff for attending the work session. He said the work session focus will be the 2008 bond campaign for the College presented in four topic areas: 1.) Continued strategic conversation that the bond campaign driving force remains program and academic planning; 2.) Reviews by staff of continuing program planning for the 2008 bond; 3.) Conversation among Board members regarding the proposed continuation of the 2008 Bond planning and preparation; 4.) Expressed Board support in moving that plan forward.

He asked Dr. Chairsell to begin the work session by using the enhanced Rock Creek Campus version of 1.3 to describe the envisioned future program expansion and academic planning.

Academic Planning: The Process and the Academic Plan Looking Forward
Christine Chairsell, Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs

Dr. Chairsell provided two handouts to illustrate the work in progress on the three-biennia forecast for academic planning beginning 2007-2008. One document was the Three-biennia Student Development Program and the other the Instructional Three-biennia Plan. She said discussions with faculty and staff are being held throughout the District to identify programs that need to be expanded. Within the next few months the Three-biennia Student Development Program and the Instructional plans will be merged into a single plan that will look at the direction instructional planning should go as well as student development programs needed to enhance student retention. Programs highlighted in yellow on the instructional sheet are new and are currently being explored by faculty and administrators to determine which should be tried. Items not highlighted will be discussed by the Cabinet for inclusion in the upcoming budget. She acknowledged that the cost of $3.7 million is a huge request that will not likely be wholly funded but it is a place to begin conversation internally with college stakeholders.

President Pulliams asked if the Board had any questions about this report saying Dr. Chairsell’s report was intended to provide a sense of ongoing discussion about potential expansion of academic programs and student service functions. He also said it is only the beginning of the planning and preparation for a bond initiative in 2008. Director Frisbee asked what the anticipated cost for instruction and student programs is. Dr.
Chairsell answered it is about $3.1 million but it is understood it is unlikely the entire amount will be funded and compromises will likely need to be made.

**Major Elements of Bond Version 1.3 (brief recap)**

Randy McEwen, Vice President, Administrative Services

President Pulliams invited Mr. McEwen to provide a brief recap of the enhanced Rock Creek version of the proposed bond initiative. Mr. McEwen said that currently a bond initiative in the amount of approximately $320 million would go to voters in the November 2008 election if the Board approves moving it forward. The envisioned construction start time would be late in calendar 2010 and the program would run approximately eight years with completion in 2018.

Mr. McEwen said that upon sale of the Capitol Center, Human Resources, Financial Services, and Affirmative Action will likely be consolidated at a single site some place between Sylvania and Cascade Campuses. Secondly the Small Business Development Center, currently housed in leased space at the Lloyd Center would be relocated to a more transit friendly location closer to a major campus, preferably Cascade. Academic functions currently located at Washington County Workforce Training Center would be relocated to a new building that would be constructed at the Willow Creek Transit Center. The Willow Creek project is the number one priority project for support under the State Community College Capital Construction program. The total cost of developing that site, including State money and PCC money, would be roughly $ 30 million.

He said campus specific elements of the plan have not changed from those provided at the August work session. At Cascade campus the current pace of significant development would be continued. The existing Student Center would be demolished and a new modern Student Center would be built along with continued construction of the interior green space mall adjoining the library with the existing library being renovated and expanded. Real estate would be acquired including parcels in the block west of the Moriarty Arts and Humanities Building (MAHB) as well as parcels west of the Public Service Educational Building (PSEB). A parking structure that would accommodate approximately 400 cars would be built north of Terrell Hall in the north parking lot. In the block west of the MAHB which is now only partially owned by the College a new classroom building would be constructed on the north portion and a building that would house the College’s Education program on the south portion. Building would be done in a way that maintains and extends the interior green space mall through an area that is now a parking lot. This Education building is the number two priority on the State’s Community College Capital Construction list.

At Sylvania a separate Early Childhood Education and childcare facility would be constructed. In part to allow the Health Technology Building (HT) to serve as a hub for the envisioned extensively networked health education programs, the HT building would be expanded. These Health Education programs, would feed Simulation Centers at the Rock Creek and Cascade Campuses. The Social Sciences and Science Technology buildings would be renovated. Student Services at Sylvania would be radically reconfigured using a truly student friendly concept that would allow students to conduct
necessary transactions at one location rather than the three or four different areas that are now required.

Rock Creek would attempt to acquire real estate at the northeast quadrant of 185th and Springville Road. Building 5 would be demolished and in its place would be built what would probably be the largest PCC academic building. That building would contain a collegiate quality gymnasium with locker facilities, a centralized student union, food services, nursing simulation center, classrooms, and faculty offices. A modest visual and performing art center would be built and a second entrance to the campus would be constructed.

The proposed plan is to move Southeast Center to comprehensive status in two phases with the second phase being completed with funding from an additional bond program. PCC would attempt to acquire additional needed real estate including two or three properties to the west and two or three properties to the north. Mt. Tabor Hall would be expanded to include a large library, tutoring center, faculty offices, small auditorium, expanded food services, and childcare. Additional surface parking would be constructed along with an additional science lab, and a professional technical education building.

The concept of student access points is not entirely defined but it is clear students’ ideas about access don’t necessarily mean going to a campus. Busy lives and oftentimes limited local opportunity to attend needed classes means more and more often students expect the College to come to them in a virtual way. This need could be accomplished by creating access nodes in Newberg, Sherwood, New Columbia, Hillsboro, Forest Grove and potentially sites on the central east side that would be linked with some of the PDC investment activity on MLK Blvd through which student access could be enhanced. Capital investment needed to do this would be modest. Virtual education holds a lot of promise in terms of offering more education to more students at a reduced cost by using access nodes rather than traditional campus based classroom teaching.

Mr. McEwen said that using 2006 to early 2007 numbers and assuming favorable regulatory perspective and support and the continued support for the State Community College Construction Program the total anticipated amount of the 2008 bond initiate is $320 to $330 million.

Director McKinney thanked Mr. McEwen for his comprehensive update. She expressed concern that in light of the recent defeat of other Oregon community college bond measures like Mt. Hood and Clatsop that getting voters to approve PCC’s $320 million bond initiative may be a challenge. She asked if focus groups are going out to gather input from the community. Mr. McEwen replied that Ms. Watkins will provide that information in her presentation. Director McKinney asked if it becomes apparent that voters won’t approve the whole $320 million project would paring back on proposed projects be done and would it be done by evaluating all programs and projects as a whole or by individual campuses? Ms. Watkins assured Director McKinney that will be covered in her presentation.
President Pulliams said this plan has been developed using a district perspective. Mr. McEwen added that should paring be necessary it would be driven by the academic plan and academic opportunities that exist for the College.

President Pulliams invited Kristin Watkins to come forward to talk about conversations that have been held around the community. He thanked Director Frisbee for her support and involvement throughout this process as well as other Board volunteers and invited them to participate in this process as the College goes into the community to have these conversations.

Interactions and Feedback Since the August Work Session – President Pulliams and Kristin Watkins

Ms. Watkins said beginning conversations have been held over the last several months about the possibility of sending a PCC bond initiative to voters in 2008. She distributed a list of organizations and contacts which include Chambers of Commerce, legislators, representatives and officials from local governments within the district, leaders of local school districts as well as community institutions. She said conversations have also been held with legislators about how a bond initiative might link to the need for additional future facilities and improvements. Meetings have been held with the President’s Kitchen Cabinet, an advisory group of local CEOs from a wide range of business and government entities and Robert Liberty of the Metro Council who brought together local developers and Metro staff to talk with College staff about projects that might be done around Southeast Center. Pages two and three of the list she provided identify a growing list of organizations that will be contacted. She said this list is just the beginning of many conversations that will need to take place with organizations as the Board decides to go forward with the bond initiative.

President Pulliams said he has participated in most of the discussions and meetings Ms. Watkins listed and as he talks with individuals and organizations throughout the community about the potential bond campaign he receives positive response about the College’s reputation within the community in the areas of service and program delivery. Business people he talks to say that as workforce needs change and new skills are needed for the workforce of the 21st century the College needs to be prepared to provide needed training of those skills to create a skilled workforce who earn a livable wage. Polling voters will provide a true measure of how the community sees PCC filling its needs.

The President also said many have talked about transfer opportunities and PCC’s affordability for students entering higher education. Currently about a third of the District’s high school graduates come to PCC immediately following graduation with about a third of those students graduating from PCC and immediately attending universities. The whole notion of access is changing with more and more of the College’s students enrolling into distance learning programs.

Another exciting aspect he often hears about is the community building affected by Southeast Center, Cascade, Rock Creek, and Sylvania campuses. PCC is bringing
change to local communities in very, very positive ways making it easier to get key individuals to work with PCC and support the College’s effort.

The Willow Creek proposal would create opportunity for exciting partnership efforts with OIT, Work Systems, and local school districts throughout the region. Dr. Pulliams said that with Oregon’s current strong economy the governor is able to provide additional revenue to the College but depending primarily on State funding causes a roller coaster effect to the College: high growth in good economy and layoffs and program closures when the economy declines. Effort is being made to find ways to stabilize funding by creating other revenue sources for the College. Board members have suggested key individuals to have conversations with. Director McKinney suggested a process of working with a number of planners and leaders in the Rock Creek service area with the goal of gathering the best innovative and creative ideas. An example of creativity might be mixed use at College sites where new College facilities might be leased or shared by local businesses or commercial entities creating revenue for PCC.

Student demographics are changing with 20% enrollment in distance learning, the fastest growing area. This will lead to both internal and external changes in working with faculty, staff, and programs and will make partnerships with other colleges, universities, and organizations like OHSU, OIT, PDC, and others more important than ever before. Careful evaluation of the benefits in expanded access, services, and programs are exciting concepts to the College and will be essential in this process.

The President then asked the Board for questions and comments. Chair Lim thanked the President for his report. He asked about the possibility of facilities like the College’s gyms and other fitness facilities being reconfigured so the public, as paying guests, could use them. President Pulliams invited Dr. Gatewood, Cascade Campus President, to respond to the question. Dr. Gatewood replied that it is possible the buildings can be reconfigured to develop that concept. President Pulliams then invited Dr. Persson, Rock Creek Campus President, to talk about the use of the Event Center at Rock Creek Campus. Dr. Persson said the Rock Creek Event Center is used as a Community Center meeting space about 50% of the time with users paying on a sliding scale. President Pulliams added that the College needs to consider expanding this opportunity by expanding food services and looking at security needs. The College would need to evaluate the costs and how to recoup those costs to at least break even but with the goal of generating revenue. Dr. Pulliams said that as this plan is explored every viable possibility should be considered.

Director McKinney asked about the likelihood of maxing out space at the campuses. She said Rock Creek Campus will have expansion room for a while but questioned at what point will Sylvania, Cascade, and Southeast reach their maximum expansion capacity? President Pulliams invited Dr. Chairsell to respond. Dr. Chairsell said population increase is expected and along with that must come a financial business plan because increased enrollment will create additional expense for all College facilities along with faculty and staff that would have to be hired. She said Mr. Chung has helped her create a business plan and Mr. McEwen will talk to the Board about that. Dr. Chairsell said population demographics would be an important factor in planning for the
future. From an academic programming standpoint how classrooms are used, what time they’re used, and using distance learning as an option will be reviewed. When wait lists for Winter term were shut off, 1,400 students were still on those wait lists trying to get into distance learning classes. Had those students been enrolled in distance learning classes it would have had the effect of significantly increasing enrollment with less use of classroom space. The movement to Distance Learning classes means class effectiveness will be evaluated and measured by looking at student outcomes rather than classroom seat time. In addition to looking at academic outcomes business standards, business needs, and business’ expectation of PCC graduates will need to be factored into academic planning. This process will include reevaluating how teaching will be delivered, how students will receive learning, and facilities needs. She said she has asked that an extensive LEAN process be used in building the class schedule, scheduling rooms and classes and eventually to review other issues such as time versus outcomes. She believes the College has the ability to expand from a physical standpoint from campus to campus as well.

President Pulliam then invited Mr. McEwen to talk about how this program can be accomplished in terms of physical space. Mr. McEwen said the possibility of the 2008 bond initiative projects maxing out space on any campus is not an issue because the interest in the City of Portland and increasingly at Rock Creek is that buildings be built up as opposed to out. So even after completion of the bond program in constrained sites such as a future Southeast or Cascade there will be room to build more buildings or add on to existing buildings for more elevation on existing footprints.

Mr. McEwen said the more provocative question will become single occupancy vehicle traffic. At Sylvania Campus regulation of single occupancy vehicle trips is the reality now and further single occupancy vehicle regulation will very probably be Sylvania Campus’ next significant development. Solutions could include building a 50,000 square foot building with a $20 million parking structure or developing a very innovative transportation demand management plan. Linkages with MAX and TriMet are going to be very important in the future. He said based on current zoning and regulations today there is no danger of campus space being maxed out.

President Pulliam asked Mr. McEwen to comment on the College’s ability to operate the proposed facilities if built. Mr. McEwen responded that can’t be done with financial support from tuition only if the College has to operate faculty advising, academic support, and administrative support typically needed. The demographic information provided by Ms. Massey and Dr. Chairsell about growth in the community and serving additional students will be part of the College’s plan to serve more students. An important factor is that additional FTE will not necessarily generate additional State support. All aspects are being reviewed and we believe we have a good perspective on the limits and the boundaries. President Pulliam asked if his understanding is correct that there is some risk involved and Mr. McEwen replied that his understanding is correct.

President Pulliam invited questions from the Board.
Director Frisbee said she understands the bond initiative needs to be driven by academic planning but feels there is risk in taking such a large dollar figure bond initiative to the voters. Her concern is that voters would be willing to approve a bond initiative for campuses in their local areas but given district boundaries some voters won’t really see immediate benefits for them and might be unwilling to approve the initiative. She would like to see the 2008 bond characterized to voters as an opportunity for expansion “grant” where the College is meeting Oregon’s needs and meeting student and community needs. She also suggested that rather than having a project list for each campus headings be added to the plan such as; how the College expansion is going to work toward economic revitalization, how the college is going to meet the needs of students who need distance learning or, how the College is going to meet health needs or any other education categories to increase appeal to the voters. She feels the campus approach is best at this stage of planning but there is about $200 million for campus projects and another $120 million for projects that few people are going to be very excited about. She believes looking at the projects in these additional categories will get people energized and excited about this bond initiative. She asked what approach will be used when doing community outreach and what will groups like the Lake Oswego City Council or the Lake Oswego School District be told about the number of students being served by the Gateway to College program and how many small businesses are being assisted in startup. She sees a need to begin developing some of that information to show what the College has been doing, how that’s going to be expanded, and how that planning drives the bond dollar needs. She also believes many of PCC’s community partners as well as Metro would more quickly become engaged if a dollar figure and specific list of how “green” proposals were to be incorporated in the planning was developed.

President Pulliams responded that the next part of the presentation would address the timing process and funding for moving forward with the bond initiative. He said his experience has been that if the public feels this bond initiative improves their quality of life and they have some control over it they will likely support it.

At 5:20PM dinner was served in the meeting room

Work Session – Reconvened at 5:45 PM

President’s Perspectives – President Pulliams

Kristin Watkins handed out the draft timeline that included current thinking about the types of activities and planning that would be done between now and November 2008. She said that if it is the Board’s desire to move forward additional conversations with consultants and professional experts will be needed to refine the timeline based on their expertise. She said that as Dr. Chairsell mentioned the academic planning process is currently underway. The President has begun the process of meeting with professional consultants, key messages have already begun to be developed, work will continue on the bond program budget, and professional studies will be engaged.
Themes Director Frisbee described are some of the messages that have been discussed with community leaders in terms of access, workforce development, improved success for students, and sustainable development of buildings. Development of those messages will continue and sometime within the next couple of months a community survey will be conducted to test those messages and see what it is that the district’s voters will view most favorably?

Outreach will be continued to critical stakeholders and friends of the College and a blue-ribbon committee of community leaders from business, government, and perhaps the philanthropic world will be formed to lead our initial bond communication strategies. Plans will be revised and refined based on results of the community survey and beginning in the spring and summer affiliates would start to identify consultants the College might want to work with. An internal and external information plan would be created along with other activities. She said her projections assume official Board approval of the bond development budget in June 2007 as part of the upcoming biennial budget. Informational campaigns will be continued, and professional studies will be conducted on space utilization, technological infrastructure, and physical condition of College buildings.

Ms. Watkins said results of that work will be presented to the Board at the August work session to get the Board’s feedback. At that point a Political Action Committee (PAC) will be formed to raise funds for the advocacy effort. She noted that College funds may be used for the informational effort and unbiased information can be provided to district residents such as how much things will cost but phrases such as “You should support this.” or other advocacy messages may not be used. Advocacy messages must be paid for from campaign contributions solicited through the PAC. January 2008 is the projected date for completing those professional studies. Sometime in late summer a second community survey or poll will be done to test the bond elements by asking voters specific questions about which projects at which campuses they would support, how they feel about the numbers, how they feel about specific projects, and the types of things they wouldn’t support. The bond initiative plan would then be revised based on the results of the professional studies. January through November the advocacy campaign and informational effort would continue. June of 2008 is the anticipated time for the Board vote to submit the bond measure. Between June and September language and title would be crafted. November 2008 would be the election.

President Pulliams asked the Board for their questions, comments, or reactions.

Director Frisbee thanked Ms. Watkins for her outline and said it provided a good sense of how the timeline would work. Her only question regarded the possible voter elimination of the double majority. She asked if that would alter the choice of timing the bond initiative would be submitted to voters. President Pulliams answered that although unlikely it could affect the decision of when to go to the voters with the bond initiative. He asked Mr. McEwen for additional information. Mr. McEwen replied that while there is no particular problem with a May date it might create a message of unnecessary hurriedness to the voters. Another drawback would be the loss of six months of preparation between May and November.
Ms. Watkins said there would need to be some serious political analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of moving from one date to the other. She said that elimination of the double majority rule could create a flood of measures on the May ballot reducing the possibility of voter approval for the Bond Initiative. Another important consideration is voter turnout for the November election is more likely to be high due to it being a presidential election. Pollsters say that having high voter turnout gives a result most likely to mirror community surveys. There are many different aspects from a political standpoint that would need to be considered including the shortened timeline to put it together. Michael Dembrow commented that conventional wisdom use to be to go out in May but that thinking has changed with the most important factor being a long well crafted campaign.

President Pulliams said there is still a lot of work to be done. He asked if Board members had other questions or comments.

Director McKinney requested that any consultants hired be top notch with experience and expertise in bond initiatives of this type. She also said that the survey instrument used and the questions asked on it are important because their results provide valuable feedback about the size the bond measure and what voters are willing to pay for. She also noted that the fundraising effort may be a difficult because there are a lot of people asking for money.

Director Palmer asked if it would be appropriate for Board members seeking reelection to talk about the bond levy in the course of their campaigning.

President Pulliams responded that all information discussed in Board business meetings and work sessions is public record and there is no reason Director Palmer or others shouldn’t talk about the potential bond initiative, but also we need to be clear that no final decision has been made to go to the voters with an initiative.

Director McKinney said she agreed with Director Frisbee’s request to look at how the bond measure will promote economic revitalization as well as other areas of appeal to the community because voters want to know what this bond is going to do for them and for their area. She requested staff look at cost comparisons to the College for increased enrollment in traditional classroom versus distance learning classes and give feedback to the Board on the findings.

Dr. Chairsell noted that in listening to Board comments and comments of others the plan for the potential bond initiative is consistent with Board values and goals helping create a consistent message voters can get very excited about as the bond campaign moves forward because it so clearly demonstrates what the College values and what the goals are in terms of student access, diversity, continuous improvement, and community partnerships.

President Pulliams said in meetings about the potential bond campaign with the Kitchen cabinet and other institutions and organizations two areas seemed to generate
particularly positive responses. They see the results of the bond projects creating more skilled workers for their businesses and they also see PCC’s commitment to enrollment diversity as a valuable part of creating community diversity. These themes will be discussed further with consultants and staff and updates will be brought to the Board.

Director Harper noted that in the last bond campaign many of the companies that take advantage of training and education opportunities PCC offers their employees posted information on bulletin boards and some wrote personal endorsements in the voters’ handbook encouraging voters to pass the bond initiative because it would allow the College to continue developing the skilled work force these companies need. He also said he believes one of PCC’s major strengths is that the response of the whole employer base is and has always been very positive to PCC.

President Pulliams agreed with Director Harper saying that when information about the potential bond initiative plan was presented in a recent meeting with leadership of the Portland Business Alliance the group was very supportive stating that they like the partnership they already have with the College and the bond initiative makes sense. President Pulliams also noted that the Portland Business Alliance is the group behind funding and championing the Portland School District levy.

Michael Dembrow asked when the operations plan is going to be rolled out how the College plans to operate the proposed buildings. President Pulliams invited Mr. McEwen to answer that question. Mr. McEwen said the answer is iterative. Cost to heat, light, clean, and repair is about $6 per square foot. This plan adds about 400,000 square feet to the College with an approximate annual increase of $2.5 million. Instructional cost, instructional support cost, and student services costs are mission related and less predictable. A very rough estimate can be achieved by figuring the cost per square foot for existing categories and then factoring that cost. The risk in doing this is that some cost will be higher, some lower and at this point they are not entirely predictable. Dr. Chairsell said that will be the role of careful student development and academic program planning for new initiatives.

Director Williams asked President Pulliams about the impact of going forward with the bond initiative if the forecasted State budget is lower than currently anticipated. President Pulliams responded that the budget process is being carefully watched and if at any time the economy becomes unstable, the State Higher Education budget is reduced, or enrollment drops significantly the plan would need to be reevaluated including timing for presenting the bond initiative to voters. He said that although the Governor is committed to education it is too soon to know if the legislature is going to approve his budget.

Director Williams asked the President if his understanding is correct that the College is operating under a State mandated enrollment capacity limitation. President Pulliams asked Mr. McEwen to respond to the question. Mr. McEwen replied that although an enrollment cap is not mandated there is no assurance that increased enrollment will generate additional State support and the additional costs associated with increased enrollment could create a budget problem if added State support is not provided. He
said the funding formula has recently been reconfigured to provide a better State response mechanism to enrollment growth. President Pulliams said the Governor’s commitment to providing more financial aid has the potential of allowing the College to be able to offer more sections and that translates to growth.

Director McKinney said the legislature is going to be looking closely at performance-based measures and will ask for detailed cost records that clearly show what funding is used for instructional purposes and what is used for non-instructional purposes because they want to know what part of the budget is used for student services and what part for administrative costs. President Pulliams agreed with Director McKinney saying the budget watchword will be “performance” for all Oregon community colleges and PCC is gearing up to provide that information.

Director Harper asked if any other Oregon community colleges are planning to put bond initiatives before their district voters in the next two or three years. President Pulliams asked Mr. McEwen to provide the answer. Mr. McEwen said to his knowledge four or five including Mt. Hood, Clatsop, Lane (operating levy), Chemeketa, and Treasure Valley.

President Pulliams concluded his presentation by saying there is still a lot of preparation to be done toward the 2008 bond initiative and asked for confirmation that his understanding is correct that the Board would like that preparation including budgeting to continue. Chair Lim confirmed the Board would like the next phases of the plan to continue to be developed. President Pulliams said the work will continue. He thanked staff for their time and effort in preparing the information needed to successfully plan toward the 2008 bond initiative. He also complimented Mr. Dembrow and the Faculty Federation for their work in this process.

The President thanked Board members who went to Salem with staff and others from PCC to meet with several representatives from the Portland area. President Pulliams said he felt PCC received a very positive response in that ongoing process and he will update the Board about opportunities to lobby and work with the Legislature throughout the process.

The President congratulated Director Squire in joining the College as a new Board member and said he looks forward to working with him.

Chair Lim welcomed Director Squire to the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:25 PM.
NEXT MEETING

The next business meeting of the Portland Community College Board of Directors will be held on March 15, 2007 at 7:30 PM in the Event Center at the Rock Creek Campus.

_____________________________ _____________________________
Chair Lim President Pulliams

Prepared by:

______________________________
Lorna J. O’Guinn
Assistant to Board of Directors

Minutes approved on April 19, 2006