



## Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board Minutes January 14, 2014

Agenda Review and Election of New Officers and Board Retreat of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held beginning at 4:00 p.m. at the District Support Services Center, 2411 West 14th Street, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to A.R.S. Section 38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

### GOVERNING BOARD

- Doyle Burke, President
- Dana Saar, Secretary
- Randolph Lumm, Member
- Ben Miranda, Member (1949-2013)
- Debra Pearson, Member

### ADMINISTRATION (AGENDA REVIEW)

Rufus Glasper  
Maria Harper-Marinick  
Debra Thompson  
James Bowers  
Steve Helfgot  
Lee Combs

### ADMINISTRATION (RETREAT)

Rufus Glasper  
Maria Harper-Marinick  
Debra Thompson  
James Bowers  
Steve Helfgot  
Lee Combs  
Linda Lujan  
Steven Gonzales  
Anna Solley  
Jan Gehler  
Shari Olson  
Gene Giovannini

### AGENDA REVIEW

Agenda Review began at 4:05 p.m. Board President Doyle Burke then took the assembly through the proposed agenda for the January 28, 2014 Regular Board Meeting. Clarification was asked on a few items as they were presented; below are requests made by Board Members for additional information.

### CONSENT AGENDA

- **IV.C.1-IV.C.4 EMPLOYMENTS**
  - Resend copy of Separations reasons and forward Justifications to Board ASAP for January
- **IV.D.1 AND IV.D.2 APPROVAL OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING COMMUNITY SERVICE GRANT (KBAQ) AND (KJZZ)**
  - Share the radio station's complete budget with the Board.
  - How have the grants changed regarding funds allocated? What are the funding trends over time? (Dr. Harper-Marinick is following up on these details and will report back to the Board.)
- **IV.D.3 APPROVAL OF CORPORATE TRAINER FOR FORD MOTOR COMPANY MARICOPA CORPORATE COLLEGE**
  - Where is this going to go? Is it equipment or a person? What exactly is Maricopa doing? At what level? What specifically is Ford sending its employees to Maricopa to learn? What are they working on? Is there specialized equipment involved? (Dr. Harper-Marinick will report back with additional

information about this.)

- **IV.D.4 APPROVAL OF 2014-2015 SABBATICAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

- What do OYO and OSO mean? (One Year Only or One Semester Only)
- Is the sabbaticals list growing? There is some concern over the number of sabbaticals each year. (This list is a little larger than last year but not larger than average. The largest group, historically, was in the 30s.)
  - It was noted that the number of faculty members receiving a sabbatical for the coming year is approximately 1.6% of the total number of Maricopa faculty
- Is there a way to revise the criteria to make it more rigorous? (The FPG committee implemented revisions about three years ago, increasing the requirements and minimum score needed to be awarded. Those new procedures were shared with the Board.)
- Is there anyone comparing MCCCC's FPG program to others, nationally? Is there a standard or comparison device? (There is no national standard. Universities are traditionally the ones to offer sabbaticals as most community colleges do not have the resources to do so. Maricopa has a very stringent review by its FPG committee. The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost reads application abstracts and every final report, as well. The system in Maricopa is very rigorous.)
- Tax payers may not understand—how does MCCCC compare to universities? (It's not the same system but Dr. Harper-Marinick will share the criteria for MCCCC's FPG sabbaticals.) Is MCCCC comparable to universities? Are MCCCC's criteria harder? (Many sabbaticals in universities occur automatically once a faculty member has reached a certain date. MCCCC has more requirements than many universities.)
  - Any information about the sabbaticals process for community colleges compared to universities or other systems would be appreciated.

#### **NON-CONSENT AGENDA**

- **V.A.1 APPROVAL OF CONTRACT AWARD FOR JANITORIAL SERVICES AT GATEWAY COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

- Do all colleges have contractual services for janitorial? Why is the Board involved in this decision? (Not all colleges have a contract for all M&O operational issues; the Board is involved because the dollar amount is over \$250,000.)
- How much savings is MCCCC seeing, if any for contracting out M&O work? (MCCCC recommended adopting a 40:60 ratio rather than eliminate all M&O/Custodial as recommended by the A&M report after negotiations with MCCCC M&O.) But is MCCCC saving any money by contracting work out? Are there security or safety issues cropping up because the work is not in-house? (It varies; some colleges experience management issues and MCCCC changes around management or staff to alleviate concerns. The goal is to maintain the 40:60 ratio. Administration meets regularly with the M&O Directors to

determine how to evaluate contract and in-house employees.)

- One of the concerns to the A&M recommendation to cut all M&O funding was the disconnect between “counting beans” and the reality of college life—colleges have classes, activities, sports events, etc., that occur around the clock. That has to be kept in mind at all times. If you have special circumstances that fall outside a standard contract and contract employees must respond to those circumstances—there go any savings you may have. MCCC has to maintain that 40% in-house employee pool to deal with the day-to-day business of being a college. All these other variables are as important as cost.

#### **ADDITIONAL AGENDA COMMENTS**

- **ITEM VI.B MONITORING REPORT EVALUATION FORM: REVIEW OF BOARD POLICY 2.1 TREATMENT OF STUDENTS (MONTHLY STUDENT CLUB REPORT)**
  - It was recommended that this item be struck from January’s agenda because the Chancellor has no influence on what the college Student Life Groups choose to present to the Board. It would be difficult to assess as part of his evaluation. Dr. Gasper said he would work with Dr. Harper-Marinick to come up with some recommended reports instead of the monthly student club report.
    - A Board member concurred then recommended reconsideration of the Alternative Dispute Resolution process promoted by Mr. Van Braswell, president of *DisputeResolutions.com*, during a Citizen’s Interim presentation January 22, 2013. The process could be the basis and foundation for this. (See <https://www.maricopa.edu/gvbd/minutes/2013mins/IV.A.1.a%2001.22.13%20Regular%20Board%20Meeting%20Minutes%20REV.pdf>.)
    - A Board member then advocated including a student as a Board member. A second Board member declared a preference for looking at indicators rather than having a single student representing the entire student population.
      - Administration has been investigating a non-voting type of position for a student on the Board, but needs Legal to determine if that would require legislative change.
    - Another Board member remarked that having a student advocate on the Board would also necessitate faculty and employee advocates.
      - Conflict of interest laws do not allow Maricopa employees to be on the Board.
    - Comparisons to other systems that have students on their boards show those students are highly engaged and challenge Board perceptions. They are brilliant, motivating, and exceptional. The idea should be explored further.

- What other evidence would show that the Chancellor is in compliance with this limitation?
  - The Students Rights and Responsibilities section of the Administrative Regulations (Section 2) falls into this.
- What's the evidence that it is working?
  - A report on the number of grievances at each college and the resolution to concerns.
  - Modifications occur annually via the Common Pages process which addresses issues that have come up that year.
- What kind of evidence is the Board expecting at this Board meeting? What kind of report?
  - There will be no report until a measurement can be defined. The Chancellor's Interpretations state that compliance will be demonstrated by, among other factors, providing appropriate training for all employees, insuring negative conditions are dealt with in a quick and effective manner, and showing evidence proactive measures are in place and acted upon.
- What evidence is out there that shows MCCCDC is doing fine?
  - Training is timely and routinely implemented, policies are posted and shared via web and college publications, etc.
- Is there a real easy evidentiary piece?
  - Incident reports and other types of occurrences can be codified. Evidence something has occurred and what was done to address it.
  - MCCCDC surveys students every three years with the Noel-Levitz climate engagement survey; it also participates in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) every three years; and the SENSE survey every three years. Between the three, data from those questions can be shared with the Board every year.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Agenda Review was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Election of New Officers and Board Retreat was called to order a 6:05 p.m. A citizen asked to address the Board on an important matter but was informed that, due to Open Meeting laws, since a Citizen's Interim was not on the agenda, the Board could not hear comments at this meeting. Board members indicated that Citizen's Interim has been scheduled at the January 28, 2013 Regular Board meeting and encouraged the citizen to attend. The citizen shared a copy of prepared comments with the Board Assistant. Those comments will be included in the minutes of the January 28, 2013 Board meeting if the citizen chooses to attend.

**ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS**

President Burke then opened the meeting and asked for nominations for Board President. Mr. Lumm nominated Mr. Saar for Board President. No additional nominations were put forward. Mrs. Pearson asked nominations be closed. President Burke asked for a vote. By a vote of 4-0, Mr. Saar was elected to serve as Board President for 2014.

President Burke then asked for nominations for Board Secretary. Mr. Burke nominated Mr. Lumm for Board Secretary. No additional nominations were put forward. Mrs. Pearson asked nominations be closed. President Burke asked for a vote. By a vote of 4-0, Mr. Lumm was elected to serve as Board Secretary for 2014.

Mr. Burke handed the gavel over to President Saar who continued with the agenda.

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Ms. Dawn Wallace, District Director for Government Relations, was delayed so President Saar asked the Board to vote to table this discussion until after the policy discussion. Mrs. Pearson moved to table the discussion and Mr. Lumm seconded the motion. Motion carried, 4-0.

**POLICY DISCUSSION WITH RESPECT TO RESOURCE ALLOCATION**

President Saar asked Dr. Glasper if he would care to begin the discussion.

Dr. Glasper said when the Board adopted its outcomes for this year he had spoken to them about looking at a focused item for resource allocation that was consistent with its outcomes regarding student success. His recommendation at that time was, during the budgeting process, he wanted to come back to the Board for recommendations and focus on student success initiatives relating to developmental education. He would like to have some conversations about that and be able to spend time with the Executive Provost and Vice Chancellor after she presents recommendations from faculty to put a dollar amount to it. This would be the focus area for FY2014-2015.

President Saar asked, in terms of the outcomes in general, and getting more detail or more high-level in terms of the Board's priorities for budgeting and resource allocation, is there anything the Board would like to suggest it does or does not do in that regard? Dr. Glasper asked for clarification on what was meant by "higher-level." President Saar replied that nowhere is student success mentioned in the outcome statements. He recommended it be added to the upper level of the outcomes. Mr. Burkard pointed out that 1.1.C stated "students will be prepared to successfully pursue higher education beyond the community college." Mr. Saar asked if student success should be true in all four outcomes. Mrs. Pearson remarked that this statement should include all students, not just those who want to further their education. Additionally, the language should be amended to repeat the student's intent for every instance (i.e., students with the intent to earn a degree will successfully attain a degree; students with the intent to earn a certificate will successfully attain a certificate; etc.). Mr. Saar then asked the Board, staff, and guests to take a few minutes to write down their own definition of student success, which would be collected and shared.

Mrs. Pearson said measurement discussions at ACCT 2013 discussed how student success was defined based on federal definitions and held institutions accountable to those standards. However, it was consistently found that community colleges did not want universities (or any other agency) to define their success. Student success needs to be measured by students' intent and how well community colleges performed in helping them achieve their goals. It becomes an extremely complex analysis if other parameters are used but if you have students participate in entrance and exit reviews, measurement becomes easy if their declared intent was fulfilled (or if it changed, as Mr. Saar pointed out; flexibility needs to be built in.)

Mr. Lumm pointed out that many students come to Maricopa who aren't college ready. How is MCCC getting those students through the process? Do those students have the same goal or intent? Mr. Saar said that was a good point and it is

why he felt that student success needs to be included in all of the outcomes. If the Board is going to use student success as an element of its outcomes, some definition needs to be agreed upon. He wanted to spend some time making sure the Board and administration are on the same page in terms of what student success means to them. Mr. Lumm commented that, life happens. A student may have the intent to get a certificate but someone died, he/she got married, he/she got a job, etc. Those students are not counted as “complete” because of life circumstances. Mr. Saar asked if they were counted and was told there was no way to capture that beyond self-disclosure. Mr. Saar remarked Maricopa can only take responsibility for what it can take control over. Mrs. Pearson pointed out that the federal governing is going to measure community colleges on completion and say, this is the institution’s rate, regardless. When there is a push for more degrees and more success in community colleges as the justification for the monies that are allocated, MCCCDC needs to show it is really good at scoring this, measuring this, and improving it in some way. The definition needs to be self-defined, not imposed. Mr. Saar said he wanted to define student success solely for Maricopa. Mrs. Pearson argued that Maricopa is looked at by other institutions as a model and what is done here should factor that in. It’s not just ‘solely’ for Maricopa—this Board has got to have a different attitude. Maricopa should be the leader in how this is measured.

Mr. Burke asked if the Board wanted a general statement for all policies, or just the outcomes. Mr. Saar replied that the statement would be for the four outcomes in particular, but could translate to all the policies in section 4 (Governance Process).

Dr. Glasper remarked that he was trying to determine where the Board was looking. Maricopa set up ways to capture student intent and is monitoring that. He is also taking into consideration the Board’s definition, other institution’s definition, and the federal definition. The Board was given data at the November Outcomes Retreat—those were measurements of success. If those numbers do not move, MCCCDC needs to find out why. Putting in place additional measures at this point may add some confusion. Does the Board want to expand measurements or pick a few select ones? Mrs. Pearson replied she wanted the Chancellor’s feedback to tell the Board where the best place is for it to be put. She does not want to set a bar that becomes a ceiling. She wants to set a broader definition that makes anything spectacular possible, to which the Chancellor can then interpret. Dr. Glasper responded his recommendation would then be to make more of an umbrella statement rather than adding it to each outcome. Dr. Harper-Marinick concurred.

Mr. Saar remarked that the comments came back with very similar responses that fell within three broad categories (see Appendix for detail):

1. Student success is achieved when a student has completed his/her goal. (The majority of responses reflected this perspective.)
2. Student success means a student develops the knowledge, skills, and perspectives necessary to meet his/her career goals and to be an active and engaged citizen.
3. Student success is the achievement of the goal to graduate and follow an extended goal to attain a Baccalaureate degree.

Mr. Saar was pleased because it meant the outcomes are more valuable because they have the same significance.

Mr. Saar also wanted the Board to consider those individuals who take classes for personal interest as their intent. Dr. Glasper recommended language that includes “achieving learning goals and placement as appropriate.” Dr. Glasper said it sounded as if the Board wants more of a guarantee (i.e., x% guarantee MCCCDC will train students for a job within two years). Mr. Saar said some other institutions got in trouble because they couldn’t follow-through on such guarantees. Mr. Burke also said that wouldn’t take in to account how difficult it

is right at this moment to get any kind of job. Mr. Saar said things are cyclical, MCCCDC adapts (i.e., MCCCDC doesn't teach DOS anymore.) Mrs. Pearson said the bottom line is MCCCDC should be tying what it offers and connecting it to something useful. Mr. Burke said Maricopa already has something in place for this in response to guidelines regarding being eligible to receive federal financial aid. Mr. Saar said yes, but that doesn't take into consideration the fact that students come in wanting to learn X because they want to, not because they are guaranteed a job.

Mr. Saar then asked how important/appropriate was placement in the outcomes. Mrs. Pearson asked if it should be in the university and transfer section. Dr. Glasper replied that MCCCDC needs to align training with the job market, but "guaranteeing" a certain percentage may not be the mental model for setting the goal in place. Mr. Saar replied that policies need to be attainable. Mrs. Pearson also wants consideration placed in areas like nursing where MCCCDC trains hundreds of students for a limited number of jobs. Guaranteeing placement under those circumstances would seem disingenuous. Mr. Lumm asked if Maricopa could be more engaged in the job placement process because it can't guarantee jobs. Mr. Burke said MCCCDC has a strong connection with employers already in place, such as those expecting a high turnover due to retirement, along with other program partnerships (i.e., auto mechanics). Maybe the Board just needs more information on the existing Workforce Development Program and how successful it is. Mr. Saar remarked that Maricopa uses KUDER as a tool to evaluate potential careers so students can see what kind of future there is out there.

Mr. Burke asked for clarification on what the Board was trying to do right then. Mr. Saar replied that the Board was trying to determine if placement needs to be part of all four outcomes. He asked if the Board wanted to put placement at a higher level similar to student success or add specific placement goals to each outcome. Mr. Burke recommended not adding a specific measure because it might place administration in a place they couldn't get to due to unfulfilled promises. Mrs. Pearson remarked on a frustration she had as a legislator which was how few people saw that community colleges as a driver of the economic recovery engine. Community colleges have a hard time selling this concept to legislators because they can't back up their claims with hard data. Without that evidence, legislators cut budgets.

Mr. Burke reiterated that success is embedded in all outcomes. The issue was the global statement and he asked what needed to be changed. Mr. Saar replied that language similar to 1.1.A needs to be added to 1.0. Mr. Lumm then asked if diversity should also be added to the outcomes. Mr. Burke replied it's included in the statement "diverse communities" in 1.0. Mr. Lumm remarked that communities are changing, college populations are changing, and that needs to be included in the discussion. Mr. Saar said defining things is important if the Board is going to measure them. The Board is starting to get used to definitions and make sure MCCCDC has measurable outcomes to move forward. If MCCCDC wants to add additional outcomes, great, but it needs to focus on monitoring the limitations. There are a lot of initiatives to help meet the outcomes already in place—if they don't meet Board outcomes, they need to be rethought. The existing four outcomes are really important. Mrs. Pearson suggested an outcome focused on diversity because she was concerned that if the Board doesn't state it, it won't be considered a priority, and there would be no reason for anyone to address it. Mr. Saar remarked diversity is written in the Chancellor's limitations and also as part of the vision, mission, and values. Mrs. Pearson said MCCCDC needs to move beyond the definition of diversity based on the law. She recommends getting rid of the word diversity and move toward representing individual needs (cultures, intent) so that everything MCCCDC does is tailored and focused on the student's declared intent. Then

Maricopa needs to focus on those that are being left out.

Mr. Saar said reflections on section 4.0 (Governance Process) will be ongoing through the year. He specifically wants to look at the vision, mission, and values. This Board is off to a good start in understanding its policies and what citizens put the Board here to do. Mrs. Pearson pointed out that some decisions have been made for 'economic' reasons that have much broader implications when put in practice. Like the decision to terminate the child-care centers at the colleges. Research shows that 48% of single moms and their children are living at the poverty level and are most likely to stay at that level. The U.S. is approaching the same status as developing nations whose children are dying simply because they are poor. If community colleges are truly an economic recovery engine, then programmatic decisions need to go beyond 'bean counting.' Mr. Saar replied that the Board can talk about adding additional detail to its policies—keeping aware of the impact of focusing on specific targets. Mrs. Pearson just wants to make sure MCCCDC programs align with what is real. MCCCDC can't say it is meeting workforce needs if a ton of money is spent and only a few students get a job.

President Saar said discussions at this level need to continue to occur, even though they are not easy. He wants the Board to take this year to think about these things. There are many resources available to help. The Board needs to make sure the needs of the community are met. He then concluded this discussion and asked Ms. Wallace to provide a legislative update.

#### LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Ms. Wallace reported that, at the November Regular Board Meeting, she gave the Board a sense of what the Arizona Community College Coordinating Council (AC4) request of the Governor would be (\$17.8 million to fund the community college systems three statutory state aid formulas—M&O, equalization, and STEM workforce; \$1.5 million increase to each District's base budget for a total of \$15 million; and \$20 million in programmatic funding to address the Governor's Arizona Ready Goals related to college degree completion and degree attainment). She was unhappy to report that the Governor did not include the urban community college districts in her budget (Pima and Maricopa). Although the budget doesn't come out until January 17, 2013, her office released an advance preview. Maricopa will continue to work with the Legislature, where it has strong support on both sides. She will continue to meet with leadership, telling MCCCDC's story—what it does and how important the work is.

There are currently about 132 bills to drop, with six memorandum/resolutions or technical corrections that are substantive. Five of those have direct impact on community colleges. There are two bills regarding firearms (one provides a definition of what a firearm is and the other will permit firearms in public venues when no locked storage is available). One bill shows how the two provisional community college districts want access to Prop 301 funds. One makes a statutory change to how students who are non-residents/out-of-county are recorded at the County Superintendent's office to help alleviate back-up (paper reduction). The fifth bill proposes to allow community colleges to offer 4-year degrees in specific fields (Nursing/Teaching). Ms. Wallace asked for questions and concluded her remarks.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Board Retreat was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.