



**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
SPECIAL GOVERNING BOARD MEETING  
DECEMBER 15, 2009**

**MINUTES**

A Special Board Meeting of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held at 5:00 p.m. at the Rio Conference Center, 2323 West 14th Street, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

**PRESENT**

**GOVERNING BOARD**

Colleen Clark, President  
Randolph Lumm, Secretary  
Debra Pearson, Member  
Don Campbell, Member  
Jerry Walker, Member

**ADMINISTRATION**

Rufus Glasper  
Maria Harper-Marinick  
Debra Thompson  
Darrel Huish  
Steve Schenk for Steve Helfgot  
Anna Solley  
Lee Combs  
Ken Atwater  
Ernie Lara  
Linda Thor  
Linda Lujan  
Jan Gehler  
Shouan Pan  
Velvie Green  
Gene Giovannini

**CALL TO ORDER**      The special board meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m.

**WELCOME AND OVERVIEW**

The special board meeting was called to order by Board President Colleen Clark. President Clark welcomed everyone present to the follow-up discussion after the Final Report provided by Alvarez and Marsal on December 9. President Clark stated that following Chancellor Glasper's presentation there would be an opportunity to participate in discussions.

**MARICOPA'S REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY FOR THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY ORGANIZATIONAL BLUEPRINT**

Chancellor Glasper welcomed those present. He announced that the posted agenda reflected there would be a discussion of the recommendations presented by Alvarez & Marsal, however, he stated that Administration was in no position to discuss specific recommendations at this time and he would discuss strategies and a plan for considering the recommendations. The Chancellor reminded those in attendance regarding the purpose of the study which had been

“...to provide a broad range of management research and consulting services...with a view toward increased efficiencies, assessment of educational programs, analysis of operations and review on how to enhance linkages with our faculty...ultimate goal of increasing institutional effectiveness and improving our stewardship.” As outlined in the document, information was obtained from many different places. A number of far-reaching recommendations were presented by Alvarez and Marsal. These involved student success, procurement, technology, human resources, facilities and fleet, public safety, business services, and institutional alignment. The report presented many opportunities for potential efficiency, savings, and new resources. Many recommendations build on and align with work that is already underway.

Recommendations should align and advance the Chancellor’s 3 Pillars:

- **“ONE Maricopa”:**
  - Working collaboratively across the system to achieve the mission of the District.
- **Student Success:** recommendations 1-14
  - Narrowing the gap between student aspirations and actual achievement toward the successful completion of educational and/or career goals.
- **Public Stewardship**
  - Fostering the highest standards of personal integrity and honesty in performing our duties.

Dr. Glasper provided the following information pertaining to alignment of work to date using a dashboard:

1. Centralized Marketing & Outreach Activities	80% (or more) complete
2. Localized Marketing & Outreach Activities	30-79% complete
3. Long-term Planning	Less than 30% complete
4. Centralized Dual Enrollment	
5. One Door	80% (or more) complete
6. Placement Testing and Degree Pathway Planning	30-79% complete
7. Mandatory Orientation	Less than 30% complete
8. Mandatory Advisement	

**MARICOPA’S IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY:**

The plan will:

- Align with the District’s vision, mission, and values.
- Maintain academic quality.
- Sustain sound internal controls and compliance with Governing Board policies and regulations, state and federal statutes, accounting rules, and accreditation criteria.
- Not jeopardize the financial condition and stability of the District.
- Be measured against our standards of student success, public stewardship, effective teaching and learning, and organizational effectiveness and efficiency.

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES: OUR STANDARDS**

**Student Success / Effective Teaching & Learning**

Students achieve their educational goals when they:

- Complete courses successfully.
- Persist from semester to semester.
- Complete certificates and enter the workforce.
- Transfer successfully and perform well at the university.

**Public Stewardship**

The efficient and effective use of resources. Examples:

- Strong financial condition.
- Sound internal controls that protect our assets.
- Compliant with legal requirements.
- Financial and other resources meet student's and the broader community's needs.

**Effectiveness/Efficiency**

- Effectiveness – when an institution's results match its mission, but both mission and results must also match stakeholder needs.
- Efficiency – The effective operation of a program or service as measured by comparison of institutional outcomes with cost (as in time and money); also, expenditure activities are produced without waste.
- Characteristics:
  - Productive environment
  - Responsive and proactive
  - Make and implement well thought out and responsible decisions
  - Timely

**MARICOPA'S IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

The plan will:

- ensure vetting proceeds on a timely basis.

- provide specific, measurable outcomes.
- be reviewed on a regular basis after implementation.
- include a process that is transparent.
- include relevant stakeholders (both internal and external).

**CONTEXT FOR 21ST CENTURY MARICOPA (GUIDING PRINCIPLES INTO ACTION)**

State & Federal Law/Accreditation Standards	Board Policy Governance Vision Mission Values Policies	21 <sup>st</sup> Century Blueprint & HLC Findings & Recommendations	Strategic Direction	Chancellor's 3 Pillars: One Maricopa Student Success Public Stewardship	Implementation Items	Ac an
External	Governing Board	External	Governing Board	Chancellor	Chancellor & MCCCCD	Ch M

The plan will include the following phases:

- Vetting process
  - At the January 26, 2010 Governing Board meeting, identify recommendations:
    - that are underway
    - that are new and can be effectively implemented
    - that require additional analysis
  - Provide monthly progress reports to the Governing Board.
  - Analysis of costs of and/or savings from implementation.
  - Timely implementation of recommendations approved and accepted by the Governing Board.

Chancellor Glasper indicated that at any given time, even at the start of the process, it is assumed that vetting and implementation may be occurring simultaneously depending on when the review of the recommendation started.

Work will be completed within the consultants' suggested time frames—1-6 months, 7-12 months, 13-24 months—but as the recommendations are vetted, the needed timeframe for each recommendation may change from initial assessment.

**PROJECT ORGANIZATION**

- Governing Board
- Chancellor/"ONE Maricopa" Steering Team
- Review and Implementation Teams
- Public review will occur at Governing Board meetings and Steering Team meetings
- Governing Board will receive recommendations from the Chancellor and vote to approve implementation as appropriate.

**Chancellor/"ONE Maricopa" Steering Team:**

- The Chancellor will select and chair a 5-9 member Steering Team composed of key internal and external stakeholders.
- At least 2 members will be external, more if the team is larger.
- External members will bring an outside perspective.

**The Steering Team's Charge is to:**

- Have overall responsibility for the management of the project.
- Make recommendations to the Chancellor for presentation to the Governing Board for its action.
- Help oversee the review process and the timely implementation of recommendations.
- Calendar regular agenda items at business meetings of the Governing Board starting in January to report progress and seek direction and/or action.

**Review and Implementation Teams:**

- The Chancellor will appoint project leads/champions.
- Project leads will form small work teams that will include appropriate stakeholders.

**Review and Implementation Teams will:**

- Conduct timely vetting of the recommendations.
- Develop implementation strategies and steps including measures of accountability.

- Set deadlines (project milestones) that reflect the high priority status of the initiative.
- Prepare and submit reports to the Steering Team including monthly progress reports to the Governing Board.
- Develop budget proposals (costs and savings).

### **MARICOPA'S COMMITMENT**

The Maricopa Community Colleges are committed to continually improve teaching and learning, student success, and organizational effectiveness and efficiency. The consultants' report is a welcome opportunity to find and implement new ways to better serve our community.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Governing Board approves Chancellor's recommendations and plan of action for implementation at the January 26, 2010 Governing Board meeting.

### **GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Mr. Lumm expressed excitement regarding the proposed plan, although he did have questions about the details. Chancellor Glasper responded that details will be provided if approved. Mr. Lumm stated that he would like to see someone with project management skills driving this initiative. Chancellor Glasper stated that he has had a number of recommendations from individuals who are willing to volunteer their time and would like to be part of this team.

President Clark questioned what the implementation strategy would look like. Would it be in the form of a SWOT Analysis? Chancellor Glasper responded that if there was an item where expertise was not available, then a SWOT Analysis would be provided. On January 26, the Board will be given a plan and then additional due diligence work can be done. Work will be done at the highest level. The team will do their best to analyze each and every item and then provide a summary. The teams that will be working on this need to have Teresa Toney involved in terms of governance to see if it has a policy impact. She is aware that this is part of her role.

Mrs. Pearson requested extra copies of the report. Her first concern was the need to sit down and mark up these recommendations. She questioned baseline data and whether they were correct. Having just received these last Wednesday, she has not had a chance to review. She did not want to rush into this and yet wanted to make sure things were done in a timely manner. Dr. Glasper commented that he agreed that we needed to determine what the baselines were. He would not give them any recommendations that would put the district in jeopardy.

Mr. Lumm asked how these would be tied to the strategic plan, especially in times of accreditation? Dr. Glasper stated that GateWay Community College is up for accreditation in February. When individual strategic plans are put in place, strategic directions flow down to the colleges, not just at the District level but down to the college level.

Mr. Walker commented that with one major function being workforce development, there is a need to have people from major employers work with us to implement plans. We welcome any of them in an advisory capacity. Colleges need input at that level. Regarding the steering team, would we be asking for ownership of that panel? Will they be held accountable? Chancellor Glasper responded that the Blue Ribbon Panel was brought in for a different reason at a different time. This steering team will not be a team that will tell us what to do.

Dr. Campbell stated that in terms of workforce development, the two skill centers have people who work with them to provide information that is helpful. Dr. Giovannini responded at the request of Dr. Campbell that the Skill Centers have very active advisory groups that provide information and provide quite a bit of input for programs so that they meet workforce needs in a structured, employable manner. Dr. Lara stated he agreed with the comments and that the skill center had occupational programs which created opportunities where students will be employable.

President Clark commented regarding the recommendation of key stakeholders and how they were going to be involved. Would these individuals be invited to discuss current successes in areas where we can grow? Chancellor Glasper asked who were the stakeholders in these areas? They will be invited into the process. The people listed represent areas that we currently have contacts with. We are already involved with many groups that can help us understand how we can work better in these areas. HR, Facilities, and Public Safety already have organizations that we are involved with that can provide information.

President Clark asked if new companies that are not familiar with us will be invited. Chancellor Glasper responded that while we have significant outreach already, he believed we had networks in place that can feed into the process and help us identify others.

Chancellor Glasper stated that in January we will have had a few more weeks to vet the recommendations and will be able to provide more information about moving forward. The more we can look into this, the more information we can provide.

Mrs. Pearson stated that she would have been very surprised if she had come into this meeting and gotten. She commended the Chancellor for the professionalism that she has come to expect and apologized on behalf of those who have been rude. She stated that the report was full of assumed information. ONE Maricopa has already been in place for the last five years. Work already done should be commended.

Chancellor Glasper stated that the presentation was based on facts and we have the opportunity to move forward. It is incumbent upon us to go through the recommendations in earnest and come back with information where we can move ahead. He asked that everyone take ownership.

Mrs. Pearson commented it was nebulous and manipulation of data. Would like to see the working papers. Was that part of the contract? Chancellor Glasper stated that the bottom line was he was not making any comments on any of that at this time. He will look at the outcome and see how we can get there. He will present the Board with cost estimates. Nothing surprised him as that is what consulting companies come in with. He requested the opportunity to do due diligence.

Mr. Lumm commented that he appreciated how Dr. Glasper put the plan together and how the recommendations matched up to his pillars. He requested that the report be studied to see what works and what does not work to see how we can improve student success.

Chancellor Glasper expressed appreciation to members of the faculty, Vice Chancellors and Presidents. He stated we have people who are committed because there are opportunities for improvement. Bottom line is that we would work through this report and there would be more discussion and more vetting of recommendations.

**Audience Comments:**

Spencer Morgan, student at MCC: Expressed a desire to see students involved in these efforts which would involve determining their future.

Jim Simpson, FEC: Requested that Mr. George be asked to provide working papers and backup analysis to determine how they arrived at their conclusions.

Jerry Walker: Intellectual property rights. This is not in contract.

Mrs. Pearson: Thought that we stated that anything that went along with this project belonged to us. Thought this conversation had been held.

President Clark: Not included in the contract. That is not something that the Board asked for. It is intellectual property.

Lee Combs: This topic should be discussed in executive session. Ongoing discussion with contract.

Regi Munro, Faculty President at CGCC: When working with students, she requires that they provide data. As a taxpaying citizen would like to know how they arrived at data. Where did their answers come from?

President Clark: Implication is no support for data provided. Data came from MCCCCD. Be careful that we do not negate data provided.

Chancellor Glasper indicated he thought it was appropriate for backup papers. Can comment that we did not ask for it along the way because we were told it would be provided. He asked in a meeting with Mr. George and was told that it would be in the information we would be provided. We asked where the materials were. Assumed information would be provided.

Mr. Lumm: Welcomed the expressing of feelings by audience. Wanted to move in an inclusive manner. It cost \$1 million but can save \$29 million. A lot of money is going to be saved. He voted for this in the best interest of students.

Mrs. Pearson thanked Regi for coming forward and expressing concerns that many residents are expressing. This is common sense. A math teacher places much value on being able to see the work and understand how student came up with answer so that the process can be validated.

Mr. Lumm commented that we need to act as a district. We can save money if we buy in bulk, buy as a district. Let's not focus on the few items we disagree on such as data manipulation, regression models, but look at what we can save and put the saving in the classroom. Some areas can be cut and others should not be cut. They gave us a working model as to how we can improve and move forward.

Chancellor Glasper stated there were opportunities for savings and will look at each recommendation and put a cost to it. We have paid for the study and now we should use it. There is value in doing this. Next steps would include knowing if he had the next few weeks to work on these recommendations.

Lee Combs: Reminded everyone that no action should be voted on as we cannot poll the Board. Need to derive your sense from Board comments.

**Adjournment of Special Board Meeting:** The special board meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

---

**Randolph Elias Lumm**  
Governing Board Secretary