



**Maricopa County Community College District
Governing Board Minutes
April 11, 2017**

A Policy Committee, an Agenda Review, and an 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

ADMINISTRATION

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

Policy Committee
Call To Order

The Policy Committee was called to order at 4:01 p.m. by Board Member Dana Saar.

Objective 1: Board
Outcome Policy 1.4

Objective 1. Review and Discuss Board Outcome Policy 1.4
Mr. Saar commented that the objective this evening was to continue discussing Governing Board Outcome Policy 1.4 pertaining to Community Development and Civic and Global Engagement. Included with the agenda was a two-sided handout describing the outcomes and the strategic focus. Mr. Saar requested that Executive Vice Chancellor Dr. Paul Dale explain the outcomes and the handout.

Dr. Dale commented that the drafted handout was intended to start a focused conversation on this policy dealing with Civic and Global Engagement and contained duplicate outcomes. Side one included social justice initiatives to enhance students' knowledge to be able to address local social issues, enhancing students' knowledge of democratic values to understand civic, community-based issues, and lastly, increasing students' capability to succeed in a globalized workforce since many of our certificate completers or graduates will be working for companies with international interests. The second side of the handout included these same outcomes in

a reverse order and phrased slightly differently. Dr. Thor asked if it was the intent to eliminate policy 1.4 and replace with new outcomes? Dr. Dale explained that it was important that certain classes include these outcomes in order to understand globalness or community-based issues. Mr. Saar further explained that this policy became a “catch-all” when it was determined that there would only be four outcomes. Mrs. Livingston commented that we should focus on the issues and move forward. She questioned why we were fixing it – if just for semantics. We needed to focus on true areas of growth to move the colleges forward and help the Chancellor. She felt this policy was fine as it was.

The Chancellor provided history about Policy 1.4 and indeed the Board determined at the time that they only wanted four outcomes but that the outcomes would include all the language that was part of the mission. This was a catchall for global engagement, community engagement, civic engagement, and workforce. In an effort to include these, it resulted in a certain vagueness and these are hard to measure by the IR Department. Any attempt to tighten the language would be helpful in order to develop metrics. Measures can be drawn up once outcomes are decided upon. There is a need to focus on C & D of the Policy 1.4 which focus on students having access to civic, political, and global learning opportunities, and also developing the competencies to analyze and participate in democratic processes through community civic, and global learning activities.

It was suggested that on the two-sided handout, Outcomes One and Three take care of what is needed for C&D. Mr. Gutierrez commented that none of these address community development. The colleges have an enormous impact on the community through various activities, events, and programs and he would like to see some emphasis on community development. We need to market to the larger, external community.

In conclusion, Dr. Dale will come back with a global and community engagement outcome and how it will be measured.

Objective 2. Discussion on Proposed Amendment to the Chancellor Limitations Policies

Objective 2. Discussion on Proposed Amendment to the Chancellor Limitations Policies

Dr. Thor commented that changes had been recommended at the last Policy Committee in March and although the changes were reflected in the minutes, they were not reflected on the agenda. These are the changes that were recommended:

2.1 Treatment of Students

Existing: With respect to treatment of students, or those applying to enroll as students, the Chancellor shall not cause or allow conditions that are unfair, undignified, unsafe, untimely, or unnecessarily intrusive.

AMENDED October 22, 2013, Motion No. 10112

AMENDED February 22, 2011, Motion No. 9781, 9782

Proposed: With respect to treatment of students, or those applying to enroll as students, the Chancellor shall not cause or allow conditions that are unfair, undignified, unsafe, untimely, or unnecessarily intrusive. *In addition, the Chancellor will not allow students to be without adequate counseling and advising as measured by continuous improvement in retention and completion.*

2.2 Treatment of Faculty and Staff

Existing: With respect to the treatment of faculty and staff, and in compliance with all federal and state laws, the Chancellor may not cause or allow conditions or procedures that are unfair, unsafe, or undignified.

AMENDED October 22, 2013, Motion No. 10112

AMENDED February 22, 2011, Motion No. 9781, 9782

Proposed: With respect to the treatment of faculty and staff, and in compliance with all federal and state laws, the Chancellor may not cause or allow conditions or procedures that are unfair, unsafe, or undignified. *In addition, the Chancellor will not allow faculty and staff to be without professional development that enables them to perform current jobs and compete for advancement opportunities.*

2.4 Financial Condition and Activities

Existing: With respect to the actual, ongoing financial condition and activities, the Chancellor shall not cause or allow the development of fiscal jeopardy, non-compliance with local, state or federal laws, or a material deviation of actual expenditures from the Board's Outcomes priorities.

AMENDED October 22, 2013, Motion No. 10112

AMENDED February 22, 2011, Motion No. 9781, 9782

Proposed: With respect to the actual, ongoing financial condition and activities, the Chancellor shall not cause or allow the development of fiscal jeopardy, non-compliance with local, state or federal laws, or a material deviation of actual expenditures from the Board's Outcomes priorities. *The Chancellor will not allow resources to be expended or invested without measurable evidence of a return on investment.*

Objective 3. Discussion on Chancellor Evaluation Process

Objective 3. Discussion on Chancellor Evaluation Process

3.4 Monitoring the Chancellor's Performance

Existing: The Board will have a formal evaluation of the Chancellor in May of each year. The evaluation will be based primarily on a summary/review of the Board's judgment of the Chancellor's performance, per the criteria and process outlined above, during the previous twelve months.

Proposed: The Board will have a formal evaluation of the Chancellor in May of each year. The evaluation will be based primarily on a summary/review of the Board's judgment of the Chancellor's performance, per the criteria and process outlined above, during the previous twelve months. In addition, in

consultation with the Chancellor, the Board may utilize an instrument that evaluates the Chancellor.

**ADJOURNMENT OF POLICY
COMMITTEE MEETING**

The wording shown above was agreed to by board members and this will move forward for second reading. The Policy Committee Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Agenda Review

President Gutierrez called to order the Agenda Review at 5:08 p.m.

Items Discussed in Detail:

*12.3 Approve Virginia G. Piper Charitable Trust Grant to Expand the Achieving a College Education (ACE) Programs

This item was pulled by the Chancellor to be revised to show that the grant was being awarded by the Maricopa Foundation due to the fact that the grant was initially given to the Foundation.

*12.8 Approve \$3Million Grant Award from U. S. Department of Commerce, EDA for Renovation of Building and Equipment to Outfit the Maricopa Makerspace

This item was pulled from Consent and moved to Non-Consent.

12.7 Approve Curriculum-Academic Degrees and Policies

This item has had changes as noted below in second bullet. A white paper is being developed by Curriculum to explain the change(s):

1. 2017 - 2018 Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) A, B, S version

Proposed Changes:

- Processed courses and/or general education designation action from March 2016 through February 2017 affecting the AGEC A, B, S requirements: See attached chart of course changes. Language throughout document edited for readability and clarification (Karen Conzelman).
- **Transfer Credit: Language edited to align with the Chancellor's direct approval on January 4, 2017 to modify AR 2.2.4 (Credit for Prior Learning, Section 3, Articulated Transfer Credit) to allow Maricopa colleges to evaluate coursework and intake transfer credit from any institution included in the current Directory of Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)-Recognized Organizations, which is published by the American Council on Education (ACE), and/or the U.S. Department of Education's Database of Accredited Programs and Institutions.**
- AGEC-S Subject Options: CSC (Computer Science), ECE (Engineering Core), and EEE (Electrical Engineering) prefixes added to existing options (Karen Conzelman).

15.5 Approve \$3Million Grant Award from U.S. Department of Commerce, EDA for Renovation of Building and Equipment to Outfit the Maricopa Makerspace

- Concern about strings attached to this grant and whether it is viable/feasible or not. Step one okay but not with putting in District resources. Why not identify five or ten sponsors and get commitment for a certain number of years. Other local facilities have been fairly successful but parking is an issue at this one. Would

- like more information such as a detailed prospectus with projected expenses.
- Because of experience with Hope Academy and not doing extensive research, Mr. Gutierrez endorses Mr. Saar's caution and wants to proceed in a cautious way.
 - Need to go back to basics in spending.
 - Would like to know if we can accept the grant but not spend it right away.
 - Dr. Gonzales commented that this is a dollar for dollar match and we have two years to investigate. We will not approach in a reckless manner.
 - Congratulations to GWC for this alternative funding source.
 - Need business plan and concerned about parking issues.

14.2 Review Proposed Changes – Governing Board Policy 3.4 Monitoring the Chancellor's Performance

Dr. Thor explained that an evaluation document would be utilized for the Chancellor performance evaluation and this document was given to and reviewed by the Chancellor. Because the original recommendation read: The proposed language and structure of the policy reflects the additional an instrument that evaluates the Chancellor's relationships, leadership, management, and personal qualities. Some board members took issue the term "personal qualities" and how it could be measured, and therefore the language was changed to read: "In addition, the Board will utilize an instrument, accepted by the Chancellor, that evaluates the Chancellor."

15.2 Approve Job Order Contracting Purchase Order to Renovate and Refurbish the Arts and Communications Building (AC30) at Mesa Community College

Mrs. McGrath asked how many bids had been submitted and it was explained on jobs under \$1 million contractors are selected from a list of contractors that have submitted proposals and been approved for smaller projects. This list is referred to as JOC (Job Order Contracting). Although the total project budget for this renovation is \$1,318,842, the work has involved the use of different contractors thus the dollar limit policy was not violated.

15.3 Approve the Proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 Budget

The proposed budget was presented along with different scenarios (Options A, B, C, D, and E) which propose No Tax Increase, 0.5% Tax Increase, 1% Tax Increase, 2% Tax Increase, and Primary Tax Rate = Last Year Primary Tax Rate. A matrix was provided showing these and the resulting dollar amounts.

- Mrs. Livingston asked what had been done to cut, to grow, and save.
- It was explained that four board members had run for the Board and promised no tax increases.

Adjournment Of
Agenda Review

Agenda Review adjourned at 7:05 p.m. Board Members entered into Executive Session following a short break.

Dr. Linda Thor
Governing Board Secretary