



**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
GOVERNING BOARD RETREAT  
JANUARY 10, 2012**

**MINUTES**

A special board meeting and retreat of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held at 8:00 a.m. at the District Support Services Center in Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

**PRESENT**

**GOVERNING BOARD**

Randolph Lumm, President  
Doyle Burke, Secretary  
Don Campbell, Member  
Dana Saar, Member  
Debra Pearson, Member

**ADMINISTRATION**

Rufus Glasper  
Maria Harper-Marinick  
Debra Thompson  
George Kahkedjian  
Steve Helfgot  
Nikki Jackson  
Anna Solley (late due to other meeting)  
Lee Combs  
Shari Olson  
Ernie Lara  
Gene Giovannini  
Chris Bustamante  
Linda Lujan  
Irene Kovala (late due to other meeting)  
Absent: Paul Dale, Shouan Pan, Jan Gehler

**I. SPECIAL BOARD MEETING**

**CALL TO ORDER** President Lumm called the Special Board Meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

**A. ELECTION OF GOVERNING BOARD OFFICERS FOR  
CALENDAR YEAR 2012**

President Lumm declared the vacancy of the office of President of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board and called for nominations. Governing Board Member Debra Pearson proposed the nomination of Governing Board Member Doyle Burke for the office of President. The nomination was seconded by Governing Board Member Dr. Don Campbell.

**MOTION NO. 9889**

There being no further nominations, President Lumm closed the nominations and called a motion to approve. The election of Mr. Doyle Burke for the office of President of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board for 2012 passed by a vote of 5-0.

President Lumm declared the vacancy of the office of Secretary of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board and called for nominations. Governing Board Member Debra Pearson proposed the nomination of Dana Saar for the office of Secretary. This nomination was seconded by Governing Board Member Dr. Don Campbell.

**MOTION NO. 9890**

There being no further nominations, President Lumm closed the nominations and called a motion to approve. The election of Mr. Dana Saar for the office of Secretary of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board for 2012 passed by a vote of 5-0.

With elections having been completed, Mr. Lumm congratulated Mr. Burke and Mr. Saar on their elections and offered best wishes for a successful year. He then turned the meeting over to new Board President Doyle Burke.

**ADJOURNMENT OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING AND CALL TO ORDER OF BOARD RETREAT ON GOVERNANCE** - The Special Board Meeting adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

**BOARD RETREAT ON DISRUPTIVE INNOVATION/GOVERNANCE AND POLICY GOVERNANCE**

**CALL TO ORDER** The retreat on Disruptive Innovation/Governance and Policy Governance was called to order at 9:15 a.m. by President Doyle Burke.

**WELCOME & PURPOSE** Chancellor Dr. Rufus Glasper welcomed everyone present. He set the stage on the conversation about change. Still a number of questions within the organization and nationally, particularly in supporting the notion of student success. How does ONE Maricopa fall under Disruptive Innovation and another notion of Disruptive Governance? The Chancellor commented that Donna Schober would be co-facilitating.

The Chancellor commented that CEC had spent some time learning about the notion of Disruptive Innovation and the expected outcomes for the retreat this day would be:

1. To increase awareness of Disruptive Innovation as a theory that provides an approach for analysis of higher education delivery.
2. Introduce Disruptive Governance as a way to implement innovations and practices that change the culture and behavior of the board and organization, and create a collective body of knowledge and a new set of habits.

Because the organization needs to change, these concepts will provide direction for the District.

Framework For The Two Theories:

Disruptive Innovation: What is it? What do we know about it? What are elements of it? What are examples? How does it align with ONE Maricopa? How could Maricopa use Disruptive Innovation to improve Student Success?

Disruptive Governance: What is it? What are elements? What are practices? What are important concepts and approaches? How are they aligned with Policy Governance?

The organization cannot continue to reduce budgets over the coming years; the things it needs to do will cost dollars. The framework for ONE Maricopa should be supported by the two theories.

**DISRUPTIVE  
INNOVATION**

As a **Context for the Discussion:** Disruptive Innovation Theory provides a novel approach for the analysis of higher education delivery. An approach that brings a sharp focus to the way colleges and universities add value in the delivery of higher education through the use of three components: people, technology and processes.

Disruptive Innovation is a provocative theory . . . a paradigm shift . . . applied to higher education. Moving from how to enable more students to afford higher education to how we can make a quality postsecondary education (defined as valuable by students) affordable for all.

**Definition.** A process by which  
A sector (such as higher education) that served only a limited few . . .  
With complicated products and services . . .  
That were expensive and inaccessible . . .  
Is transformed into one which offers products and services that are  
simple, affordable, and convenient serving many . . . no matter their  
wealth and expertise.

In simpler words, disruptive innovation refers to an unexpected new

offering – something simple, convenient, low-cost – to a set of customers who have been ignored that, through price or quality improvements, turns a market on its head either creating a new market or reshaping an existing market.

Disruptive Innovation can be attributed to Dr. Clayton M. Christensen, Harvard University Business School Professor around 1997 with publication of his book, *The Innovator's Dilemma, When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail* (Harvard Business Review Press). He has since published other books including one on K-12 education: *Disrupting Class, How Disruptive Innovation Will Change the Way the World Learns*, with Michael B. Horn & Curtis W. Johnson, McGraw-Hill, 2010 and one on health care, *The Innovator's Prescription, A Disruptive Solution for Health Care*, with Dr. Jerome H. Grossman and Dr. Jason Hwang, McGraw-Hill, 2009) and *The Innovative University: Changing the DNA of Higher Education from the Inside Out* (Jossey-Bass Higher & Adult Education Series) with Henry J. Eyring, 2011.

Disruptive Innovation redefines quality in a simple application at first, and is enabled by technology and a new business model. It may serve us well in thinking through the challenges we are currently facing. Disruptive Innovation is a means to achieve student success and look at ways to increase access.

The concept of Community Colleges was a disruptive innovation in higher education. Currently, examples of disruptive innovations cited by Dr. Clayton M. Christensen (in Fast Company interview, March 31, 2011) include banking by wireless phone, software-as-a-service on the Cloud; online learning. Examples of Disruptive Innovation include:

Disruptor	Disruptee
Cell Phone	Fixed Line Telephones
Community Colleges	Four Year Colleges
Discount Retailers	Full Service Dept Stores

Can we maintain quality and how will that quality be measured? If we cannot maintain quality, then we cannot maintain national accreditation. Elements of a Business Model include:

- The Value Proposition
  - Productivity = effective, convenient and affordable solution to the question at hand.
- Resources
  - People, technology, facility, equipment, financial.
- Processes
  - Consistent application of training, development, budget, planning.
- Productivity Improvement
  - Funding strategy to accomplish mission and cost management.

There is a need to have discussions on what Productivity means to us.

ONE Maricopa is being sold as we look at SSE as process changes that include admissions and financial aid. There needs to be more than a process change. The ONE Maricopa Mission aligns with Disruptive Innovation. Will look at a collaborative system versus eleven silos. Work with every element in our system to be disruptive -- what is changing, what is not.

Much has been written and is currently online about Disruptive Innovation. An interesting article can be found at [Disrupting College](#)

**DISCUSSION  
FACILITATED BY  
DONNA SCHOBER**

Donna Schober posed the following questions:

- What are your thoughts on Disruptive Innovation at this moment?
- Louis Soares – what is your reaction to what he has said on Disruptive Innovation?
- What are some examples from your perspective?
- What Disruptive Innovations do you see affecting Maricopa?
- How can Maricopa use ideas around Disruptive Innovation to think differently about the services and products the Colleges provide in the future and improve Student Success?

Comments:

- Dr. Bustamante questioned how institutions can achieve outcomes when you have to do things differently which causes disruption. What policymakers talk about, i.e., online learning to utilize technology to increase access and improve quality. Tradition isn't a bad thing as long as you continue to improve. Achieve outcomes by doing things differently.
- Mr. Saar stated his two favorite words are Disruptive Innovation. Have to draw a line between Disruptive and Destructive. Maybe not having a fixed tuition structure is a way to be disruptive. But have to look at how it may be destructive. Make changes in the best interests of our customers.
- Mr. Burke stated he had read three books over the past six weeks (A New Culture of Learning, Disrupting Class, and Innovative University) and all talk about a different system – a learner centered model – Harvard Model. The key points include:
  1. Students come prepared to learn. Faculty fear losing control over course objectives.
  2. Development of Technology Instructional Design
  3. Competency Based Evaluations
  4. Process allows us to serve more students; budget goes forward; costs lower, improve quality; utilize technology.
  5. Relationship to current operations – don't do away with everything. Introduce new ideas.
  6. Necessity of collaboration.

- Mr. Lumm commented that people need to be moved along or they will rebel and react.
- Mrs. Pearson remarked that this is very exciting, something she believes in. Disruptive approach is exciting, however, even though well intentioned, it does not equal success. Those in status quo will block. Putting a lot of effort to change can be costly.
- Dr. Campbell indicated he had not read the books. If there are problems in teaching, where are they getting the information from to teach?
- Dr. Glasper commented that we have a robust professional development budget and it does a good job in bringing in innovative people. Still need to move the needle. IStartSmart is an example of disruptive innovation. Creation of Rio is another example. There is fear at the end of this journey if there will be jobs or not. Does create new jobs. We cannot be the same organization that has got us here today tomorrow.
- Dr. Campbell commented change is constantly taking place.
- Mrs. Pearson stated that with online classes being cheaper, have to look at who is able to access those classes. Have to think along the lines of being disruptive versus destructive.
- Dr. Harper-Marinick remarked that when we talk about innovation, not starting from a blank slate. Still celebrate what good work we do.
- Dr. Lujan recalled that the book “In Search of Excellence”, the companies declined. Board should set outcomes where we are headed and how to change the culture. Don’t let fear factor stop us.
- Mrs. Pearson indicated that students need us to help them gain access to American Dream. Book “Good to Great” – have right people on the bus. Require everyone to read “Who Moved My Cheese.”
- Dr. Helfgot indicated he has been struggling with notion of intentionally pursuing disruptive innovation. The goal is something else. Should we focus on successful innovations? We have a soft product and need to learn how to put more of our product in the hands of more people. What are the characteristics in our system that separate successful from unsuccessful completers? This would result in a successful innovation.
- Dr. Bustamante reminded not to forget about access. Give people that opportunity. Board needs to understand it and take credit for innovations that take place in the District.
- Mrs. Pearson suggested adding entrepreneurial component to education to help people understand they can be the job creators. (Discussion on Entrepreneurship ensued with Board Members Pearson and Campbell giving feedback.)
- Lee Combs indicated a balance needs to be struck between

disruptive and destructive. Policy Governance serves as a means to develop and achieve goals and outcomes. Board has not yet fully developed the potential for policy governance.

**INFORMATION AND  
INFORMATION  
TECHNOLOGY –  
CLOUD  
TECHNOLOGY: A  
MEANINGFUL  
DISRUPTION**

Break taken at 10:30 a.m.  
Meeting reconvened at 10:35 a.m.

**Cloud Technology – A Brief Background**

Pre Internet – in many ways it feels like it happened quickly. Cloud technology is disruptive but when does it begin and is the question that it continues to evolve? Cloud Technology – information went from hard copy to electronic format (servers). Very text based in the beginning, then data bases, followed by servers interacting with one another.

Concept of cloud technology changed everything. Servers can be anywhere. They can access applications regardless of location. Owner applications have shifted. This is a disruption to the way we do business and opens new markets.

**Discussion:**

1. Dr. Campbell asked for clarification of cloud technology.
2. Mr. Saar talked about software subscription and cloud technology.
3. Mrs. Pearson said we need to have the right kind of thinking (for budgetary purposes).

Mr. Kahkedjian stated that it is a place where applications reside and Legal Issues (privacy) are key components. He then discussed the handout: “A Meaningful Disruption” which speaks about predicting the impact of cloud technology from a public higher education perspective. Mr. Combs asked if there was a movement toward Enterprise Clouds by industry or topic.

**DISRUPTIVE  
GOVERNANCE**

**DISRUPTIVE GOVERNANCE** – a way to implement innovations and practices that change the culture and behavior of the board and organization, and create a collective body of knowledge and a new set of habits – as defined in the *Trustee Workbook*, February 2007 by James E. Orlikoff and Mary K. Totten, Center for Healthcare Governance. How can we apply Disruptive Governance to higher education?

**ELEMENTS** of Disruptive Governance include:

- Controlling how the board spends its time. (For example, a consent agenda represents an efficient and effective use of a board’s time. “Sequencing” of decisions allows discussion of an important issue at a meeting prior to a vote. Reports should not be duplicated-a written report need not be given verbally.)
- Crucial governance conversations. (For example, discussing

current issues or board leadership development.)

- More robust planning. (For example, conducting “deep dive” conversations on issues for the future.)
- More effective strategic leadership. (For example, developing board orientation or board evaluation processes and instruments; improving board-CEO relationship, etc.)
- **PRACTICES** of Disruptive Governance:
- Creating more time for innovative and exceptional governance work (e.g., evaluate the board’s work and make improvements).
- Using “found” time to change existing practices, structures, and culture to promote more critical governance thinking, and creating new shared mental models of governing and innovation. (e.g., conduct “deep dive” conversations on strategic topics; conduct environmental scanning and identify new, strategic issues; discuss readings on current topics, etc.)

**BASIC CONCEPTS and APPROACHES** to understand and practice Disruptive Governance:

- Boards exist only when they meet so time together is the most important commodity.
- Boards should discuss what they think will happen, what they want to happen, not what has happened.
- Board members talk to each other rather than listen passively to reports or others.
- Board member discussions are frank and frame the future desired, then build consensus and synthesize new approaches and provide direction.
- Board members evaluate their work.

**DISCUSSION LED BY  
DR. MARIA  
HARPER-MARINICK**

Dr. Marinick posed the question: How can we put our learning into action?

Mrs. Pearson: Need for more step-by-step/play-by-play information. Chancellor newsletter can be embellished to provide more information to the Board; also work sessions, Governing Board outcomes also give a framework for that.

Harold Cranswick: We are lacking a place to send folks to share information. Mrs. Pearson commented that we need to do a better job in plugging into the public.

Eddie Genna: We can do more to have more meaningful conversations. Faculty want to be engaged in giving feedback. Faculty also serve as a check and balance on the academic side. Want to be part of conversation.

Doyle Burke: Disruptive Innovation has to be collaborative versus imposed. Wants to propose opportunity for Board to have discussions.

Public blog so as not to violate open meeting laws.

Randolph Lumm: Not sure if blog is the best way but can identify topics in advance.

Lee Combs: Several purposes that the web can be used for. Do need to ensure provisions of open meeting law are not violated. Give notice. Agenda. Idea needs further discussion. Mrs. Pearson suggested looking at Yavapai case.

Dana Saar: Fire Truck Example – a lot of discussion took place. Need to be more open in terms of format.

Donna Schober: Decision sequencing is possible.

Lee Combs: If we don't create a legitimate forum, the tendency is to use other means.

Debra Pearson: On agenda Board Chair asks: "Is there any discussion?" That is the opportunity to talk.

Dana Saar: Physical environment of the Board Room could be improved. Culture of the organization.

Doyle Burke: Recommendation for deep discussion is a vision.

Randolph Lumm: As far as Disruptive Innovation, no one really looking at careers in IT.

**FLIPCHART NOTES**

**Flipchart Notes From Governing Board Retreat / January 10, 2012**

**Conversation On Disruptive Innovation (DI)**

- Focus on Outcomes
- Better Quality
- Use technology to lower costs, increase access, and increase quality
- (Three points above are factors for success in the completion agenda)
- Disruptive vs. Destructive
- Costs decrease / Users increase
- Example of no fixed tuition – can be disruptive or destructive.
- Educational Models in books read: mechanistic vs. learner-centered; the learner-centered model has students prepared to learn and teach each other and demonstrate transfer of knowledge (though fear and loss of control may be faculty reactions); online learning used technology and new design and collaboration/connectivity; outcomes are different because there are no grades, just competency-based learning and certified learning.

- Facets of DI by which we could judge innovation: Quality is higher; Serve higher numbers; Costs are lower; Technology use is higher (some lower costs through use of PT faculty, not FT faculty).
- DI currently may be just “tweaking”.
- COLLABORATION is necessary for DI to be successful.
- Training and development are necessary to move people, especially to move people as part of a team; inclusiveness is key.
- Exciting concept; bureaucratic vs. innovative; fear and loss of status vs. entrepreneurial; just being well-intentioned does not ensure success; can be expensive.
- Question: If problems with the current system – where are we getting our knowledge? We are doing well now.
- Examples of Maricopa’s DI: I START SMART; Rio’s creation.
- Online classes may not be cheaper because students need technology; How do poorer people without technology get served. Could be destructive, not disruptive.
- Serving the underserved is an element of DI.
- We should identify great innovation examples and celebrate them and take them to others to replicate.
- Caution about hitting the pinnacle and declining; is this Maricopa? ONE Maricopa = DI. Board has set Outcomes as our anchors.
- Best Practices – can be DI examples.
- Bureaucratic – inputs in educational world and outputs in business world.
- Must serve more people.
- Must have the right people on the bus.
- Intentional pursuit of DI = increasing market share; do we focus on DI or on increasing market share successfully? Our product = student success so market share for us = number of students who complete successfully so we should focus on how to put more successful completion in the hands of more students. We should focus on what characteristics in our system create completers – either at Maricopa or ASU or other higher educational institutions.
- Must add access to the facets of DI.
- Board should take full credit for innovations at the colleges that have been in the national news. Thanks to our Board.
- Are we measuring student success?
- Are we responsible for the millions who are unemployed?
- We should add entrepreneurial education and training (example of early childhood education degree, couldn’t find a job, and started a day care)
- RE: identifying best practices – useful to use Appreciative Inquiry.
- Balance to be struck between Disruptive and Destructive and should be discussed as part of the Policy Governance conversation.
- Sphere of Influence and related paradigm shift. (Added during

break.)

- Object-driven decisions vs. budget-driven decisions. (Added during break.)

## **BREAK**

### **Learning Together . . . Learning To Action**

- More play-by-play info; get more frequent and regular info so board members don't find out info from others in a public setting which is embarrassing. Info helps board members "sell" community colleges better.
- Use Chancellor's Newsletter to get more info out to board members.
- Governing Board Outcomes are an opportunity to change and provide more info.
- Lots of group and individual work is being done – but we lack a place to share the work.
- Tom & George & Eddie & Harold could figure out something that is a better "news system".
- Exciting conversation with faculty as part of the team helping to provide solutions and taking advantage of opportunities.
- Faculty are checks and balance.
- Team perspective = check and balance in an academic environment (not destructive, is collaborative)
- Opportunity for board discussion by creating a public blog for discussion of particular items including agenda items and could be "deep dive" discussions on readings or issues. Ask, if legal? Could use the web for public business but must abide strictly by Open Meeting Law (notice and agenda, etc.) Could be done. Could read blog but not have 3 participate??
- Personal blog doesn't meet Open Meeting Law if board members engage in discussions.
- Legal research is needed (e.g., Yavapai case)
- OK discussion in a public venue?? Good to be more open for such respectful discussions (e.g., fire truck issue) This could be "sequencing" of decisions with discussion at one meeting and a vote at the next meeting.
- Discussion is hampered by physical environment – may want to re-design board room.
- Create forum for board – board controls agenda, or use other means (e.g., FaceBook could be a problem).
- Use DI – get at better info on IT careers; presentation was not sufficient; need a central person to look into the issue, especially if board members don't know much about the issue such as current, existing IT careers, and questions come from potential students.

This is an ISSUE BIN item and will be considered before more

discussion is held. It is symptomatic of ONE Maricopa approach which highlights more centralization and standardization.

**CLOSING  
COMMENTS  
PLUS/DELTA  
COMMENTS/ISSUE  
BIN**

Chancellor Glasper closed by speaking about centralization and standardization. Make individual college responsible if it has a good idea/program. Help to integrate with other colleges.

**PLUS:**

Stimulating conversation  
Coffee  
Forward-looking, policy discussion  
Topics  
Presentations  
Group discussions  
Make-up of group, including faculty  
Synergetic conversation  
Intro to topics – now work them  
Location at different campus  
Exciting

**DELTA:**

Not enough time for conversation  
Narrow scope of topics  
Our timing did not permit some CEC members to participate due to convocations, etc.

**ISSUE BIN ITEMS (NEED MORE DISCUSSION):**

- start change with those in leadership
- plan to train and make employees more comfortable with change.
- more/better info on it careers, certificates, degrees for students

**ADJOURNMENT**      The retreat adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

---

Dana G. Saar  
Governing Board Secretary