A Special Session, a Policy Committee, Election of Officers, an Agenda Review, and a Legislative Update of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board were scheduled to be held beginning at 2:00 p.m. at the District Support Services Center, 2411 West 14th Street, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to ARS §38-431.07, notice having been duly given.

GOVERNING BOARD
Alfredo Gutierrez, President
Johanna Haver, Member
Laurin Hendrix, Member
Linda Thor, Member
Jean McGrath, Member
Dana Saar, Member
Tracy Livingston, Member

ADMINISTRATION
Maria Harper-Marinick
Barbara Basel for LaCoya Shelton
Paul Dale, Interim EVC & Provost
Gaye Murphy
Veronica Garcia for Paul Dale (PVC)
Edward Kelty
Christina Schultz
Chris Bustamante
Bill Guerriero
Steven Gonzales
Jan Gehler
Chris Haines
Terry Leyba-Ruiz
Ernie Lara
Shari Olson
Sasan Pourreetezadi
Maggie McConnell, Legal

SWEARING-IN
The Swearing-In Ceremony began at 2:02 p.m. Board President Alfredo Gutierrez introduced Ms. Dina Jaramillo, Notary, to officiate the swearing-in. Members sworn in included: Mr. Alfredo Gutierrez (District 5), Mr. Laurin Hendrix (District 1), Dr. Linda Thor (At-Large), and Mr. Dana Saar (District 2).

Members signed their Oaths of Office and President Gutierrez adjourned the session at 2:15 p.m.

POLICY COMMITTEE
The Policy Committee was called to order by Board Member Dana Saar. Mr. Saar commented that the Board was reviewing what was currently being done and planned pertaining to Developmental Education and that it was the intent to add policy language which would result in students being successful in the classes they take. A matrix titled “Sample Developmental Education Board Outcomes” was discussed. It included Version A and Version B of Board Outcomes, 2017-2020 Strategic Plan Commitments, 2017-2020 Strategic Plan Outcomes, and Sample Metrics.
Discussion:

- Both appear to accomplish the same outcome – need to consider adding years out of high school on outcomes to compare with those recently graduated.
- Version B: State plan outcomes increase to 75%. What rate do we have now? (66%).
- Numbers vary as people are further away from having graduated.
- Why is the percent so low? Should they not be here at all? Answer: Hard to get them to educated levels. This can depend on many things. Lack of study skills, homework, when they graduated, not asking for help. There is a need to identify institutional barriers that contribute to that. Course placement is crucial.
- We need to demo how to ask for help. Answer: Part of the Student Success Course is to help them achieve academic success. Faculty are passionate about getting students to use Student Success Centers.
- Even though the rates are not where we want them to be, new strategies are being implemented. As shown in the Monitoring Report, all the metrics improved, especially among African-American students. We should have targets.
- Do we count students who start and then drop out? Answer: That data is much less because we track those who complete. We should be able to look at gross number of students versus those who complete.
- Important to be realistic and that we not lower our standards. Not dissatisfied with 66% or 76%. Math is 61%.
- November Monitoring Report indicated that we are higher than national average. We should have a percentage by discipline. Prefers Version B to A. A is softer. Response: We have always known that faculty treat students as a homogenous group. There is a group in the middle and the group at the bottom need better developmental education. They may need other areas of support.
- Find an equitable way to be more strategic. Assessment program is not as robust. Look at solutions other than putting students in lower courses.
- Where do they go when they drop out?
- Are we at 10% or 25%? Response: We looked at historical data over ten years and benchmarked it. Hard to move the middle based on historical review.
- What is the definition of “graduation rate?” Response: Graduation rate is a cohort-based rate of students who have declared graduation or transferring and they are watched for six years. There are 20,000 in the group.
- Look at teacher strategies to help get them to graduation.
- Other metrics that seem to be missing is the level that students come in at. Some faculty predict that some students who come in so low may be failures. This should be part of the metrics. Are there
strategies we have? We need to measure faculty performance as well.

- In five year or ten years, is the cohort going to vary? Create policy on what is best way to show progress for the various subgroups. What is the best way to show progress?
- Board went through revising policy in 2010; they inserted 88-90 metrics and in 2013 the board removed the metrics. Percentages are part of the strategic plan but not included in policy plan.
- On Version B add more expansive language. We are reliant on support services and they are essential to our success. Need to make sure that those individuals that need it, avail themselves of assistance.
- Board Members Hendrix, Haver and Thor favor Version B
- Leave open to subdividing our cohort to those we can track.
- Mr. Hendrix – okay with 75%. What is it that we are striving for?
  Response: 10% is bold goal. Increase 17% by 10% to 27%.
- Somebody has to help dev ed students learn. Until they get a handle on things, education is difficult. Important that we work with partners to help students. Version B is a good starting point. Monitor each year.
- Would like to have 10% clarified, as well as timeframe of three years.

Addressed Workforce and Developmental Education. Fourth outcome is Global Engagement. Actual outcomes need better definition. Numbers don’t match the words. Limitation of policy and interpretations.

There is a section of the Governing Board Policies known as Chancellor Limitations that tell the Chancellor what she must be doing so as not to harm students. Chancellor has an opportunity to interpret and show that actions are being taken. Affirm, delete, or modify. Important for the Chancellor and Board. Limitations have been the basis of Chancellor evaluation.

The Limitations were written in negative fashion and there has been objection to negative connotation. Find it to be unhelpful to steward an organization. If we re-examine, we need to put them in a positive fashion.

Conversation is worth having on what we do now, what we could do, and consequences. Committees need to be three members. We have operated as a committee of the whole so that all board members are invited to participate.

ADJOURNMENT OF POLICY COMMITTEE

The Policy Committee adjourned at 3:20 p.m.
ELECTION OF OFFICERS

President Gutierrez called the Election of Officers Session to order at 4:55 p.m. He called for nominations for the Office of Board President. Board Member Haver nominated Board President Alfredo Gutierrez for a second term as President. Board Member McGrath nominated Tracy Livingston for President. No further nominations were made and nominations were closed.

Roll Call Vote for Board President:
- Livingstone: No for Gutierrez   Yes for Self
- McGrath: Yes for Livingston
- Hendrix: Yes for Livingston
- Saar: Yes for Gutierrez
- Haver: Yes for Gutierrez
- Thor: Yes for Gutierrez
- Gutierrez: Yes for Gutierrez

Talley: Livingston: 3 votes   Gutierrez: 4 votes

Nominations for Board Secretary:

President Gutierrez called for nominations for the Office of Board Secretary. Board Member Dana Saar nominated Linda Thor for Board Secretary. Board Member Tracy Livingston nominated Jean McGrath for Board Secretary. No further nominations were made and nominations were closed.

Roll Call Vote for Board Secretary:
- Livingstone: Yes for Jean McGrath
- Gutierrez: Yes for Linda Thor
- Saar: Yes for Linda Thor
- Haver: Yes for Linda Thor
- Hendrix: Yes for Linda Thor
- McGrath: Yes for Jean McGrath

Talley: Linda Thor: 5 votes   Jean McGrath: 2 votes

It was announced that Mr. Alfredo Gutierrez would serve as Board President for 2017 and Dr. Linda Thor would serve as Board Secretary for 2017.

AGENDA REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

President Gutierrez called to order the Agenda Review for the January 24 Regular Board Meeting at 5:35 p.m. Before proceeding to the review of action items on the proposed agenda for January 24, President Gutierrez called attention to the Substitute Resolution on Transformation of the Maricopa District and asked for comments from Board Members:

SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION OF TRANSFORMATION

Board Member Livingston: The resolution seems much like ONE Maricopa and sounds good but sometimes resolutions don’t work. She understands the need for transparency.
Board President Gutierrez: Reason he sees this as necessary is that he sees a need for major change. He wants all constituents involved. Asks that in 90 days the Chancellor bring forth a specific plan.

Board Member Saar: Resolution is not at a stage to tell you what to do. Policies exist and all have to work towards outcomes. Conversations with public are reflected. Time for Chancellor to make her changes.

Board Member Livingston: It is just so much fluff. We are in a moment of change. Just want us to take the bull by the horns and for Chancellor to go for it. Make the changes and stop being worried. Resolution does not say anything. Make a change. We can’t afford to wait.

Board Member Haver: We need to have discussion about this. We need to bring leaders in with the Board and talk about what should be covered at the District and at colleges. We need to be specific about where we want to go.

Board Member Thor: Important to pass this resolution. It was very apparent that some of the language drove fear into the workplace. When you have a staff that is in fear, they are frozen to act. What the new draft provides is guidance to the Chancellor. Provides a framework for becoming more efficient and efficient. Need to have transparent conversations with staff, administration and community.

Board President Gutierrez: This is substantially different than when our discussion began. Chancellor has authority. Public hearings brought concerns from a variety of sources. Resolution also gives clear guidance for the Chancellor. We are a Board that sets policy. Authorizes Chancellor to come up with specificity that involves staff and Presidents. Respects the fine line between setting the policy and managing the administration. Will support.

President Gutierrez stated that he has appointed a committee that will consist of three members specifically so that three members can meet without violating open meeting laws. Subject matter is evaluation of Chancellor. He appointed Dr. Thor as Chair of this committee due to her experience. He appointed Mr. Saar as a long-standing member and Mr. Hendrix who will bring fresh perspective. This committee will be moving quickly to bring a document to executive session to get further input and then recommend a document that will have consensus.

TEFRA Public Hearing: Vice Chancellor Gaye Murphy provided the reasons for holding this public hearing due to the transfer of the Communiversity from Rio Salado College to Ottawa University.

Item 15.1 Discussion held about the criteria used to determine which universities can lease space.
Item 16.2 This was long-standing litigation and a good settlement was reached. This will be paid for by insurance.

Item 17.1 This item was moved to the Consent Agenda and renumbered 16.1.

President Gutierrez adjourned the Agenda Review at 5:30 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

President Gutierrez called to order the Legislative Update at 5:35 p.m.

Director of State and Local Government Relations Brooke White provided information about current leadership at the State Legislature and presented the Chancellor’s Agenda. She explained that we would be asking for $8.8 million from surplus money which is reasonable. This is not merely an appropriation; it requires a bill. Things take a few years at the legislature. Requires that we have bill sponsors.

The Chancellor indicated she did hear about teacher education program. Those students start at our colleges. The other side was about the CTE. There is an interest in the business community to come up with a strategy that moves this forward.

We need ongoing liaison with the business community and educational institutions. If we are to have an impact at the legislature, we have to take strategies worthwhile to the legislation. We have to mobilize them on specific bills. It will take resources to get this done. We have to think in terms of next year’s budget. Very clear to President Gutierrez that there is an army of people willing to go down and speak on our behalf. We know what is coming. We have to begin to fight this fight.

Community colleges are not mentioned at all. Need to ask Governor for money that will affect the economy. We need to ask for $8.8 million and get back into the funding formula. We can put this into CTE and invest into the economy. Make it an investment that we will show returns.

Closing Comments: Ms. White summarized her comments as follows:

Arizona Community College Coordinating Council
The Arizona Community College Coordinating Council is requesting $15 million over three years to design and implement industry led courses and credentials in the top five industry sectors, 1) Aerospace & Defense, 2) Technology & Innovation 3) Renewable Energy, 4) Bioscience & Healthcare and 5) Advanced Manufacturing.

State of the State Address
Governor Ducey’s remarks in this year’s State of the State Address focused primarily on K-12 education. While community college funding was not mentioned in the Address, the Governor referenced community colleges in his call for the development of an Arizona Teachers’ Academy in partnership
with the three public universities to help address student loan debt for new teachers. Full details are expected to be included in the Governor’s Executive Budget Recommendation being released on January 13.

The Chancellor suggested that presentations such as this be done following future Agenda Reviews and not just at Regular Board Meeting if there were no objections.

ADJOURNMENT

Meetings were adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

_____________________
Dr. Linda Thor
Governing Board Secretary