



## Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board Minutes August 13, 2013

Agenda Review and a Board Retreat of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held beginning at 1:00 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
- Debra Pearson, Member (Absent)

### ADMINISTRATION (AGENDA REVIEW)

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

### ADMINISTRATION (RETREAT)

Rufus Glasper  
Maria Harper-Marinick  
James Bowers  
Lee Combs  
Eugene Giovannini  
Steven Gonzales

### AGENDA REVIEW

Agenda Review began at 1:04 p.m. Board President Doyle Burke took the assembly through the proposed agenda for the August 27, 2013 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.D.1 Approval of Curriculum
  - Was there a reason for the addition of this course? Was it an industry request? (Courses are created in response to many things including grant development, research, and market demand. The rationale will be sent to Board members.)
- IV.D.4 Approval of Rio Salado College A Countrywide ABE/GED/ELAA Program FY July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014
  - What do the supervisors do? Are there different locations?
- IV.D.5 Approval of U.S. Department of Education TRIO Grant Student Support Services at South Mountain Community College
  - There are several grants coming before the Board this month regarding at-risk students—are there any statistics and demographics available on the students in these programs? Are the reports that go to the granting organization shared with the Board? The Board would like to hear success stories and the impact these grants have on the students in the system.
- IV.D.8 Approval of Student and Teacher Technology Transformation Teams (ST4) Grant Project
  - Is this District-wide or only at Rio? (District-wide)
  - Who gets invited to participate? (Colleges work with partner high schools who are invited to participate.)
  - How much is reflected in the common core? (This grant was written before common core; from this point forward, all grants will reflect common core.)

- Are there any data or comments from teachers on how this has helped them?
- How expensive are reports to prepare for grants like this? (NSF requires very detailed reports: data, activities, curriculum, etc.)
- Who is allowed to take the courses, receive stipends, travel, etc.? (Travel is provided so that information can be shared at conferences as a requirement from NSF for funding; employee travel is only paid if the employee is being specially funded by the grant to support it.)
- What are the outcomes/measures? Are exit interviews conducted?
  - Board members would like to see that some reflection that the funds have a benefit to the students. MCCCCD should also be able to hold the K-12 system partners accountable for such efforts. The cost to enhance technology should be promoted at K-12 levels. If MCCCCD notices that the partner K-12 districts are not using technology well, MCCCCD should partner with other districts so efforts aren't wasted.
- Board members would like to move towards getting a brief report with major highlights about grants, outcomes, reflections, etc. If a Board member wants greater detail, it can be provided later. The Board does not get a report on if grant efforts like this are effective or not.
  - President Burke reported that the planning calendar for 2014 will be brought before the Board later this year and at that time recommendations for reports can be added.
- IV.E.1 Approval of a Lease with the Arizona Community College Coordinating Council (ACCC).
  - How much of the ACCCC budget is provided by MCCCCD? (MCCCCD funds about 50%; roughly \$150,000 of a \$300,000 budget. Calculations are based on annual FTSE.)
- IV.E.4 Approval of Reduction of GCC EMT272AA Course Fee
  - How does this compare to other EMT programs in the District? (Will pull together an analysis.)

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

- V.A.1 Approval of Contract Award for New Amphitheater Shade Canopy at Scottsdale Community College
  - What's the projected lifespan of the canopy? (10-15 years.)

#### **OTHER AGENDA ITEMS**

- How are MCCCCD registration numbers? (As of last week, there mostly flat; some colleges are up, some colleges are down, and some are staying steady. Firmer numbers will be available by the end of next week and the official numbers come on the 45<sup>th</sup> day.)
  - Reports from AACC say some community colleges are down 30% in Ohio, while the national trend is a decrease from 10-15% mostly due to changes in financial aid. MCCCCD expects are 2-3% decline overall.
- Is it only financial aid that is affecting enrollment? What about the impact of private colleges and universities? (A report will be prepared.)

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

- Faculty are voting to ratify their RFP this Friday. Previously the Board extended the existing RFP through August 31, 2013. Is it OK to add the new RFP to the agenda, barring any unforeseen issues? (Yes; determine if an Executive Session item needed, as well.)
- Two items from the charter schools will have to be added, as well. Dr. Harper-Marinick just completed the review of the teacher and principle evaluation process and it has to be approved by the Board.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Agenda Review was adjourned at 1:46 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Board Retreat was called to order a 3:06 p.m.

**BOARD SELF-EVALUATION**

President Burke took the assembly through the prepared tally of responses to the Board Self-Evaluation for 2013.

- Board Organization
  - In general, the Board rated itself above average but with room for improvement.
- Policy Role
  - In general, the Board rated itself above average but with room for improvement.
- Community Relations
  - Need to find a way to make sure the Board is available to owners. The Board needs to come up with some concrete plans on how to accomplish this.
    - Agenda Review at different locations.
    - Periodic research—series of surveys (of other issues besides bond planning).
    - Hear from residents to see what's important to them—what degree are colleges disseminating information to the community (collect data).
- Policy Direction
  - The Board doesn't refer enough to the vision, mission, and values of the institution.
  - Where in policy does the Board discuss issues so it can determine if progress is made?
- Board-Chancellor Relations
  - In general, the Board rated itself above average but with room for improvement.
- Fiscal Oversight
  - In general, the Board rated itself above average but with room for improvement.
- Institutional Performance
  - In general, the Board rated itself above average but with room for improvement.
- Board Leadership
  - The definition of diversity needs to be more specific rather than the existing broad definition. It should refer to such things as total numbers enrolled and number of staff by group. Do MCCC's numbers reflect anything in terms of appreciation? What is MCCC doing for veterans, for example?
    - The 8/27 agenda has 4-5 grants which have to do with bringing a diverse student body to achieve. The Board is affirming that end by such actions.
    - Administration will provide a copy of the 2012 ACCT

- diversity presentation to the Board.
      - MCCCCD will participate in a nation-wide tour showcasing what is being done for veterans. A regionalization discussion is occurring with CEC to replicate the GCC model on campus and plan for a regional center that replicates the model.
- Advocating the College
  - The Board would like to focus on areas reflected on this evaluation tally with lower averages to address improvement.
- Board Education
  - The Board would like a more detailed approach on how it can keep up with global educational trends. MCCCCD needs to be a leader in such efforts, rather than reacting to trends. MCCCCD needs to be prepared for a changing workforce.
  - Item #32 on the evaluation should be amended to include ACCT (add “and national”).

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

- The Board is moving in a good direction. There are many opportunities to continue the discussion—and it should continue.
- The Board would like to compare this year’s results with next year’s results to see how it is doing. It would also like reports of continuous improvement as the year progresses.

#### **ISSUE BIN ITEMS**

- Diversity (see notes above)
- Code of Conduct (4.10)
  - Are these all still relevant?
    - Seems to be too extensive as written—should be basic.
    - This language puts people on notice that there are standards of behavior and conduct.
  - Should the code of conduct incorporate statutory language; if so, to what extent?
    - General Counsel stated that as long as the Board is holding itself to lawful conduct, it is not necessary to put law into these provisions.
    - Administration can create an appendix of statutory language rather than incorporating into policy; it must be reviewed periodically.
  - Item 3 does not appear to be systematically addressed (members shall be required to participate in training that focuses on public stewardship and institutional ethics).
    - Training is provided by ACCT (which Board members attend annually) and the district has brought in content experts (Skledany/Smock) several times over the years. General Counsel is also available to provide additional training.

#### **CHANCELLOR EVALUATION**

The Manager of the Office of Public Stewardship, Ms. Teresa Toney, provided a draft monitoring form for review. The intent is to move the Chancellor’s evaluation from an annual “data dump” in May to a regular monitoring process (monthly, quarterly, bi-annually, etc.) with a final summary provided in May. Ms. Toney asked Board members to determine if the questions on the form were the right sorts of questions to present to the Board.

- Board members suggested the process not be implemented until the

policy language changes previously discussed are enacted.

- The Chancellor would like clarification on what he can and cannot do. So the timeframe for implementing these changes should not be extended. Plans are to bring red-line changes for First Read in September and Action in October.
- The form as written is clear, although there was some discussion that perhaps questions 3, 4, and 6 be separately considered (where the Board would first determine if the Chancellor's Interpretations are reasonable) before the remaining questions are used as part of individual report monitoring in support of the Chancellor's Interpretations.
  - General Counsel remarked that the value of keeping questions 3, 4, and 6 on the form is that it fleshes out the interpretation and the data provide additional support that the interpretation is reasonable. The Board has to come to consensus that the Interpretation is reasonable; if it can't the policy language many have to change.
- A summary of all the reports presented to the Board during the year will be provided in May and the Board will then make the determination of whether to extend the Chancellor's contract.
  - **NOTE:** For the 2013 evaluation process, the Chancellor's contract will be discussed in Executive Session at the August meeting. This will close the process for 2013. The discussion above relates to the 2014 evaluation of the Chancellor.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Ms. Toney will prepare a red-line version of recommended policy language changes for discussion at the September 10, 2013 work session. A calendar will also be devised of the monitoring reports that will be used for the Chancellor's 2014 Evaluation. Final recommendations will be presented for First Read at the September 24, 2013 Regular Board Meeting. Action on the suggested changes will be taken at the October 22, 2013 Regular Board Meeting. From that point, the new monitoring process will be put in place.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Board Retreat was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

---

Dana G. Saar  
Governing Board Secretary