A Work Session of the Coconino Community College District Governing Board was held via interactive videoconferencing (Zoom). Board Chair, Dr. Nat White, called the meeting to order at 4:06 pm.

PRESENT: Eric Eikenberry  
Patricia Garcia  
Patrick Hurley  
Nat White  

ABSENT: Mr. Joseph R. Smith  

Also Present: Dr. Colleen Smith, CCC President; Mr. Anthony Williams, Ms. April Sandoval, Mr. Bob Voytek, Mr. Brian Wilson, Mr. Dietrich Sauer, Ms. Giovanna Macry, Ms. Isabella Zagare, Dr. Jami Van Ess, Ms. Kay Leum, Ms. Kimberly Batty-Herbert, Mr. Kurt Stull, Mr. Larry Hendricks, Dr. Lisa Blank, Ms. Nancy Hagerman, Ms. Nancy Smith, Dr. Nate Southerland, Ms. Sandra Dihlmann, and Ms. Suzzanna Rodriguez.

Reports, summaries, background material and other documents referred to in these minutes can be found in the May 19, 2021 documents file.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. FOLLOW UP ITEMS
There were no follow up items.

2. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS
   A. District Governing Board Retreat (June 10-11, 2021) – Dr. Nat White
   B. President’s Evaluation – Dr. Nat White
   The Board discussed these agenda items together. The Board was comfortable with the retreat schedule and has the ability to add other topics as needed. Dr. White suggested that on Friday morning of the retreat, the first agenda item would be the Board’s discussion of the President’s Evaluation. The evaluation has been compiled by the retreat facilitator, Dr. Rufus Glasper. After that discussion, the Board would invite Dr. Smith to join them to review the evaluation.

   Mr. Eikenberry would also like to talk about amending the President’s evaluation instrument and the inability to comment on some of the items listed. This item could be discussed at the Thursday evening portion of the retreat.

   C. Budget and Property Tax Information (if there are questions) – Dr. Jami Van Ess
   Dr. Jami Van Ess included this agenda item as an opportunity for the Board to ask any final questions about the budget before moving forward with the approval process. Mr. Eric Eikenberry would like to have some simple, easy language to explain to his constituents to explain how raising taxes actually lowers them.
Dr. Van Ess explained that the increase in the College’s property tax amount from one year to the next is based on the total levy amount. That amount is capped and cannot increase more than 2%. If the assessed valuation goes up more than 2%, the tax rate has to go down. If assessed valuations for the County go up more than 2%, the individual homeowner or business tax rate goes down.

The College is authorized to collect a certain amount of money each year which is our total levy amount. That amount cannot grow by more than 2% each year. When you divide that by all households or business in the county, and the overall property taxes increase more than 2%, individual tax rates go down.

The College goes through this process each year to make sure we can increase the property tax pool by the maximum allowed by law. It’s a 2% increase on a very small pool.

This increase doesn’t increase our tax rate, it increases the total amount of the levy we can raise. Some colleges have lost the ability to recoup the lost revenue from years where they did not increase their total levies. Even though the levy increases by 2%, the tax rate per $100 of primary net assessed value goes down, resulting in a decrease in the amount of property taxes paid by individual taxpayers.

ADJOURNMENT: The Work Session Adjourned at 5:30 pm.
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Ms. April Sandoval
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