



**Maricopa County Community College District
Governing Board Minutes
February 7, 2017**

A Policy Committee, an Agenda Review, and Executive Session of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board were scheduled to be held beginning at 4:00 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 (via teleconference)

ADMINISTRATION

Maria Harper-Marinick
LaCoya Shelton
Paul Dale, Interim EVC & Provost
Gaye Murphy
Edward Kelty
Christina Schultz
Chris Bustamante
Bill Guerriero
Steven Gonzales
Jan Gehler
Chris Haines
Terry Leyba-Ruiz
Shari Olson
Sasan Poureetezadi
Maggie McConnell, Legal

**POLICY COMMITTEE
CALL TO ORDER**

The Policy Committee was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Board Member Dana Saar. Mr. Saar commented that the Board would be discussing and reviewing changes and revisions pertaining to Governing Board Outcomes Policy 1.3 on Developmental Education. He explained that it was the intent to add policy language which would result in students being successful in the classes they take.

**REVIEW OF THE "FIRST
READ" DRAFT**

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Dr. Paul Dale explained that the old policy would be deleted and replaced by the proposed new policy. Both action items were listed on the agenda, as well as the proposed outcomes approved at the last meeting. The next steps would be the development of targets and metrics. It was suggested that changes to the outcomes be highlighted. It was also suggested that the term "underprepared" be inserted as a footnote in the third column "2017-2020 Strategic Plan Outcomes". With reference to the target of 10% increase to the graduation rate of academically underserved and underprepared students, Dr. Dale explained that our current graduation rate is 17% and the 10% would increase this to 27%. In defining "underprepared/underserved student, it is important not to make a generalization of this. There is a need for a baseline in the strategic plan of this 10%. To be more specific, need to

identify the starting point. We will make some notation of what baselines are for the different disciplines. We are at 75% in Reading and it varies by discipline.

The first read on the policy action items will take place on February 28 and vote on the policy action items will take place in one month (March 28). The metrics provided at this time are only sample metrics and there are many more. These provide high level data and they are different between the cohort and all students. Prior to second read, more robust metrics will be brought forward. It was requested that data pertaining to years out of high school be included. Based on current resources what is needed to reach the goals of 10% and 75%? The Chancellor has been working with Gaye Murphy and Paul Dale on this to address strategic commitments. We need to allocate funds in a better fashion.

If we are going to improve graduation rates for developmental education, that means that there are also many that are not successful. Are there resources that we could provide to help? One of our four outcomes is to help the economy of the state. This is one of the charges of the task force. Where is the greatest need and do we have the resources? Investment needs to produce a return. This is a huge dollar amount that can be documented to show returns. We need to be intentional when we ask for money.

The first read will be in two weeks. Need to make changes known to Paul Dale. We have gone through two of the major outcomes and we will now need to address #4 on Global Engagement. We do a lot in this area but actually only 15-20,000 students actively participate in this area.

We need to better define what it means and how to measure. Need to look at limitations. These will be ready when the Board is ready to discuss. Need to write limitations in a positive fashion. A meeting is needed to review existing Board policy that is based on outcomes and limitations.

Chancellor Evaluation: The Board Committee met earlier in the day to discuss Chancellor evaluation. Will need to add an additional instrument that deals with behaviors. Contract calls for Chancellor to be evaluated in May. Will review contract that we made and make one revision to allow for this self-appraisal instrument. Will bring to Policy Committee next month. Include this year because May is so close.

Agree on adding strategic plan. Not set in stone. Concerned about timing in contract called for May and last year did not happen until November. Want to be sure that the committee comes back with sufficient time to meet that deadline. Prepare self-appraisal based on Board outcomes and approve at April meeting. First read will be in March.

November Monitoring Report reflects progress made in previous year. This is an important piece in Chancellor's evaluation. Talk about alignment between Monitoring Report and evaluation. Things happen around November but looking at logistics it would be more disruptive. It is more

complicated that it appears. We collect data through June and it takes time to evaluate and analyze.

ADJOURNMENT

The Policy Committee adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

AGENDA REVIEW

President Gutierrez called to order the Agenda Review at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes: Deemed to be too lengthy. One board member supported the detailed minutes as being necessary for a government entity.

14.2 Authorization by Governing Board of the President's Involvement in the General Counsel Search:

- Board Member McGrath noted that in November of 2014, the Board turned over the hiring/firing of employees to the Chancellor. Wanted to know if this position was to be the only employee hiring the Board would be involved with? Response: It was explained that this was the only position in the organization that reported to both the Chancellor and Board. The majority of the time this position will operate under the Chancellor and working with the Board will be the exception.
- Board Member Livingston noted she agreed with Mrs. McGrath in that we were moving from a policy that had been put together previously. Response: This is the only position that reports to both the Board and Chancellor. It is time to put a person in place. The last search was not successful. The committee will have external and internal members on the committee in addition to the Board President and Chancellor doing the final interview. The Chancellor has to make final decision.

14.3 Resolution Regrading Governing Board Fiduciary Responsibilities:

Discussion: There are questions as to whether staff can speak to board members. Under state law and own board policies and procedures for accreditation, Board has to be actively involved in monitoring. Chancellor remains administrative officer but employees can speak to board members. Under board policies, Chancellor can request that board members report back on conversation. Staff can speak without reservation to board members. Speaking to board members will not jeopardize jobs. Conversations should be pertinent, not just about problems or things that are negative.

15.2 Agreement for Dual Enrollment with Charter Schools

Discussion: Instructors must meet requirements because of A.R.S. We have requested an extension from HLC on requirements. Have not received response.

15.3 Student Health Assessment Districtwide

Discussion: The I.R.B. decided to adopt this practice a few years back and guidelines provide strict confidentiality. President Gutierrez wants to ensure that this will abide with confidentiality clause.

15.4 MCCCC Prop 301

Discussion: Budget similar to last year. Unused money can be carried from year to year. This year planning to pay down the carryforward to fund crucial needs. Will be transitioning all 301 faculty by 2021.

15.5 Curriculum

Discussion: New programs require a lot of time. We need faster responses to community's needs. Occupation deans are planning to streamline occupational, as well as academic programs.

16.1 Sale of a Portion of Land to City of Glendale for a new Bus Stop

Discussion: This a new bus stop.

16.3 Lease of 7,478 sf in Desert Sky Station Educational Space

Discussion: This not a dual enrollment effort. It is a continuation of and existing partnership. Tuition pays for lease.

18.5 Proposed Tuition & Fees Fiscal Year 2017-18

Discussion: No change in tuition rate of \$86. There is a need to relate seat times to outcomes and fees charged. Make decisions relative to students being able to find jobs. MCCCCD had highest tuition in the state and wondered if we had seen any student from other counties registering at Maricopa.

20.1 Proposed Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget

Discussion: This is the first draft. Have just received assessed valuation from Maricopa County and this will enable us to update property tax numbers. Presentation to be made at Budget and Finance Committee Meeting on February 28. Need to have a conversation on taxes and also bonds. We are facing a funding challenge and we no longer have a capital allotment. It was suggested that we review documentation on CTE and returns, as well Economic Impact Study that has that shows property has not changed. Is Bonding necessary and do we want to go forward. It is a tough process.

Mr. Saar asked if the budget included a tax increase in order for us to be able to fund developmental ed if necessary. Response: In February the Board will discuss the Preliminary Adoption of the Budget and then move forward with final adoption in March. If direction is given to included taxes, the process will be moved out one month. Truth in Taxation Hearing will need to be scheduled and budget action published in newspaper.

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