Special BOT Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 22, 2020
Maine School of Science and Mathematics
VIRTUAL

The Special Board Meeting is called for the purpose to discuss the Business Planning Committee Charter and to vote, if warranted, to authorize its creation and membership and to review the revised Portrait of a Graduate and vote, if warranted, to adopt it.

Pursuant to MSSM by-laws only those Board Members in attendance at the Special Board Meeting may vote and pursuant to current State of Maine emergency declarations all votes shall be roll call votes.

Board members present were: K. Beaulieu, T. Bolen, K. Brackett, J. Chalmers, D. Chuhta, D. Coit, D. Ferguson, Chair; J. Havu, J. Herweh, D. King, D. Pearson, Clerk, J. Philbrick, J. Pike, M. Reagan, L. Renick-Butera, R. Rice and A. Scott.

Absent were: M. Anderson, D. Haines, Honorary Member, J. McGreevy, P. Orne and J. Patterson, Honorary Member.

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:00pm by D. Ferguson, Chair, followed by introductions.
- D. Ferguson, Chair, noted that at least 12 members of the Board of Trustees were present, which makes a quorum in order to hold the meeting.
- II. D. Ferguson, Chair, read public comments from Dr. Anders Gårdestig, Dr. Debbie Eustis-Grandy and Dan Melega (located on Google Sites: <a href="https://sites.google.com/a/mssm.org/mssm-bot/home/board-meetings/2019-2020/special-meeting-june-22-2020">https://sites.google.com/a/mssm.org/mssm-bot/home/board-meetings/2019-2020/special-meeting-june-22-2020</a>)
- III. Business Plan Committee Charter
- D. Coit motioned to accept the Business Plan Committee Charter, seconded by M. Reagan
  - J. Philbrick stated we need to take Dr. Eustis-Grandy's public comment to heart. It is very important to have a faculty member representative on this committee. He also feels that a student representative should be on this charter.
  - Dr. Eustis-Grandy suggested staff have a representative.
  - L. Renick-Butera suggested changing faculty representative to say staff representative.
  - D. Chuhta commented that the charter states: proposed business model will be reviewed by legislature;" can someone be more specific about what this means?

- J. Chalmers answered that they did have some specific language, but decided to broaden it and are looking for guidance on how broad or narrow it should be. The State owns the school and we were vague on purpose.
- D. Chuhta stated the Annual Report needs to be sent to the Governor, Appropriations Committee, and legislature. Legislature then acts on the bill and this is how the statute would be changed. If there are changes it would be through a bill. Legislature is likely not the one that will approve something, but they could vote on a bill which would then become law. They don't approve a plan, but they do act on a bill. He wants the committee to be careful with the verbiage they use and have the mechanisms correct in the plan.
- D. Coit stated the verbiage can definitely be changed.
- J. Chalmers asked if we should have a more general agreement?
- R. Rice stated we should solicit feedback from legislature, which will then be presented to all by the BOT.
- D. Chuhta added that the committee chairs in the State office will not be the same. We need to be careful on verbiage.
- L. Renick asked if there is an avenue to do this.
- D. Chuhta answered yes. The Annual Report could be the opportunity to do this as we would like to present this. We would tie the opportunity together.
- D. Coit suggested maybe we may come back with 2 or 3 options. But feels the Annual Report would not be the right place to put this. We can't conclude anything without the support of the state.
- D. Chuhta agreed, but stated this could be a point where the legislature gives us the 2 or 3 options.
- D. Coit asked what is the ideal audience? Sitting here today, we just don't know.
- D. Chuhta stated that the word that struck him in the discussions is "approve." Maybe it is presented for "feedback" or "consideration" or "solicit feedback" as R. Rice suggested.
- D. Coit added "communicate and solicit feedback" (encouragement to keep going)?
- D. Ferguson stated D. Chuhta is saying we won't get an "approval" as this has to be done by the entire legislature.
- D. Coit stated we need some direction to move onto phase 3.
- K. Brackett said there is a question about timelines. Phase 1 has a timeline, but other phases do not have any timeline. We don't want to restrict ourselves to just one timeline. Maybe at least get a loose timeline to keep the committee moving forward at a good pace (i.e. Phase 2 gets done at the next legislative cycle, etc.).
- D. Coit agrees. It would be beneficial to have more specificity.
- D. Chuhta stated that because there are 2 different committees involved (Education of Cultural Affairs Committee and Appropriations Committee), we need to have the "cart and horse" in the right place to allow the Appropriations committee to complete their portion of what they do with budget. The statute needs to be in place before budget. First session of 130th where statute changes and then budget after.
- D. Coit stated maybe Phase 3 of the plan is Education of Cultural Affairs committee and budget wouldn't be until Phase 4. We can't ask for funding until we have commitment from others/partners which may not be until January 2022.

- D. Chuhta stated that in January 2022, the legislature will begin considering the next biennium budget for 2022-2023.
- D. Coit stated that though we have no idea where we are headed at this point we need to move forward now.
- D. Ferguson stated that Phase 1 should be we start a dialogue. Phase 2 we need to look for proposed language and clarity around this. We also talked about membership, timeline, language on Phase 2, are there any other concerns? Is there any proposed language for phase 2?
- R. Rice said the proposal ends with a more concrete business plan. It then comes back to MSSM BOT who will then act on the other phases. Up to Phase 2 of this document, then back to the BOT, then something more formal is put back into the plan. This charge would get the plan to a point to at least start discussions.
- D. Coit added that we don't know what questions to ask right now.
- R. Rice stated that once approved by the Board of Trustees, the proposed business model or models will be offered to the Maine Department of Education and appropriate legislative committees for review and feedback. The objective of the review would be for the Board to gather feedback from constituencies to move the process to Phase 3, in which the Board would authorize a more detailed Business Plan or Plans to be developed.

M. Reagan motioned to amend the language to state that once approved by the Board of Trustees, the proposed business model or models will be offered to the Maine Department of Education and appropriate legislative committees for review and feedback. The objective of the review would be for the Board to gather feedback from constituencies to move the process to Phase 3, in which the Board would authorize a more detailed Business Plan or Plans to be developed, seconded by L. Renick-Butera.

Last sentence on Phase 2 will remain unchanged.

#### Roll Call Vote:

K. Beaulieu, T. Bolen, K. Brackett – Yes, J. Chalmers – Yes, D. Chuhta – Yes, D. Coit – Yes, J. Havu – Yes, D. King – Yes, J. Philbrick – Yes, J. Pike – Yes, M. Reagan, L. Renick-Butera – Yes, R. Rice – Yes, D. Ferguson – Yes.

Passed unanimously.

- L. Renick-Butera requested to discuss membership on the Business Plan Committee.
- J. Chalmers stated the original member list was very long and they trimmed it back. They were fighting to keep it an agile team that could work through the summer. It started with the ad-hoc committee (people that were involved in developing the plan from the beginning) and then filled in gaps from other groups.
- D. Chuhta suggested we consider the possibility that the committee consider the legislative representative on the committee as possibly a person who would sponsor future legislation. Who did the Maine Ocean School use?

R. Rice motioned to make friendly amendment to the language that the committee has the authority to fill empty seats. The Committee consists of members appointed to serve until their resignation or until the Committee is disbanded by the BOT. Designation: Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees or their designee, seconded by L. Renick-Butera.

#### Roll Call Vote:

K. Beaulieu, T. Bolen, K. Brackett – Yes, J. Chalmers – Yes, D. Chuhta – Yes, D. Coit – Yes, J. Havu – Yes, J. Herweh, D. King – Yes, J. Philbrick – Yes, J. Pike – Yes, M. Reagan, L. Renick-Butera – Yes, R. Rice – Yes, D. Ferguson – Yes.

Passed unanimously.

J. Philbrick motioned to add a Student Representative. Designation: Student Representative to the Board of Trustees or their designee Proposed Nominee: M. Brozman, seconded by R. Rice.

#### Roll Call Vote:

K. Beaulieu, T. Bolen, K. Brackett – Yes, J. Chalmers – Yes, D. Chuhta – Yes, D. Coit – Yes, J. Havu – Yes, J. Herweh, D. King – Yes, J. Philbrick – Yes, J. Pike – Yes, M. Reagan, L. Renick-Butera – Yes, R. Rice – Yes, D. Ferguson – Yes.

Passed unanimously.

D. Ferguson motioned to approve the Business Plan Charter, seconded by D. Coit.

#### Roll Call Vote:

K. Beaulieu, T. Bolen, K. Brackett – Yes, J. Chalmers – Yes, D. Chuhta – Yes, D. Coit – Yes, J. Havu – Yes, J. Herweh, D. King – Yes, J. Philbrick – Yes, J. Pike – Yes, M. Reagan, L. Renick-Butera – Yes, R. Rice – Yes, D. Ferguson – Yes.

Passed unanimously.

- IV. Portrait of a Graduate
- D. Coit motioned to accept the Portrait of a Graduate, seconded by M. Reagan.
  - T. Bolen made the comments attached (located on Google Sites: <a href="https://sites.google.com/a/mssm.org/mssm-bot/home/board-meetings/2019-2020/special-meeting-june-22-2020">https://sites.google.com/a/mssm.org/mssm-bot/home/board-meetings/2019-2020/special-meeting-june-22-2020</a>)
  - D. Coit and L. Renick-Butera disagree with those changes due to vetting that was already invested in this.

Friendly amendment to remove period and change to a comma.

- D. Chuhta stated that based on the last meeting we were trying to start with a verb. Removing the period would change that mechanism.
- D. Coit would like to leave it alone.
- J. Philbrick agrees with D. Coit.

### Roll Call Vote:

K. Beaulieu, T. Bolen, K. Brackett – Yes, J. Chalmers – Yes, D. Chuhta – Yes, D. Coit – Yes, J. Havu – Yes, J. Herweh, D. King – Yes, J. Philbrick – Yes, J. Pike – Yes, M. Reagan, L. Renick-Butera – Yes, R. Rice – Yes, D. Ferguson – Yes.

Passed unanimously.

### V. Adjourn

L. Renick-Butera motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:00pm, seconded by R. Rice.

### Roll Call Vote:

K. Beaulieu, T. Bolen, K. Brackett – Yes, J. Chalmers – Yes, D. Chuhta – Yes, D. Coit – Yes, J. Havu – Yes, J. Herweh, D. King – Yes, J. Philbrick – Yes, J. Pike – Yes, M. Reagan, L. Renick-Butera – Yes, R. Rice – Yes, D. Ferguson – Yes.

Passed unanimously.