



MARICOPA  
COMMUNITY  
COLLEGES®

MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
GOVERNING BOARD WORK SESSION  
SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

MINUTES

A Work Session of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held at 5:30 p.m. at the Rio Conference Center, 2323 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Tempe, Arizona to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

**PRESENT**

**GOVERNING BOARD**

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

**ADMINISTRATION**

Rufus Glasper  
Andrea Buehman for Maria Harper-Marinick  
Debra Thompson  
George Kahkedjian  
Steve Helfgot  
Anna Solley  
Paul Dale  
Shouan Pan  
Shari Olson  
Ernie Lara  
Gene Giovannini  
Todd Simmons for Chris Bustamante  
Linda Lujan  
Jan Gehler  
Irene Kovala  
Nikki Jackson  
Lee Combs

**CALL TO ORDER**      The information session was called to order at 5:40 p.m.

**Welcome and Overview**

Governing Board President Randolph Lumm welcomed those in attendance to this discussion session intended to hear how legislation shapes many lives. The Maricopa Community Colleges play an important role in helping get this economy out of the hole through education. The Board needs to decide if they want to take stands at the Legislature or go down to speak with legislators; however, it should visit as a collective Board. He indicated he looked forward to learning from the experts that would be presenting.

Chancellor Dr. Rufus Glasper also welcomed everyone to this opportunity to learn about the fears and inhibitions associated with working with the Legislature. He commented he had spent the last few days with fourteen legislators and what they are doing for community colleges. There are new legislators every two years and it is important that they get to know who we are.

### **Introduction of State and Local Government Relations Team and Support**

Associate Vice Chancellor of Public Affairs Dr. Bernie Ronan provided the outline for the evening's discussion session which included introduction of the legislative team, explaining the process of reviewing legislative bills as they go through the legislative session, briefly highlighting some issues, how they assist in preventing bad bills from getting passed, and the role that the Governing Board plays to get closer to processes and role they want to play and strategic direction.

Members of Legislative Team:

- Pat Hill, State Director of Government Relations
- Judy Gragg, Coordinator for Bill Research and Issues Connected to Legislative Process, Staff to Arizona President's Council
- Intern: Jennifer Papworth, a former members of the Student Public Policy Forum and Rio Student
- Consultant Kevin DeMenna who has 30 years of legislative/public policy experience
- Consultant Alan Maguire, a strategic consultant and economist
- Laura Knaperek, a former legislator
- Other members of their team are Vice Chancellor of Business Services, Debra Thompson; Associate Vice Chancellor of Business Services, Gaye Murphy, and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick

### **State Legislative Initiative Development, Monitoring and Implementation Process**

Ms. Hill came forward to explain the process they follow in the development, monitoring and implementation of state legislative. The following represents the information presented:

Reasons for the Process:

- Organization
- Prioritization
- Inclusive
- Best-practice Model
- Process-oriented
- Maximize Effectiveness

Elements of the Process:

- Identification of Proposals
- Analysis and Prioritization of Options
- Specific Bill Review and Analysis
- Implementation Follow-through

Legislative Issues Development Process

- Governing Board Discussions Provide Strategic Direction
- Develop Materials Distributed
- CEC Members Submit Proposed Legislative Initiatives
- Proposed Issues Assigned to VC's for Analysis

**SEPTEMBER 13, 2011 GOVERNING BOARD WORK SESSION**

- VC's Analyze Proposals
- Government Relations Analyze Proposals
- Summary of Proposals and Analysis
- Chancellor's Review
- Chancellor Finalizes Agenda

**Governing Board Sets Strategic Directions at Study Session**

- Top priorities are presented to Governing Board Members with background information

**Development Materials Distributed**

- Initiator must consider:
  - District-wide Implications
  - Stakeholder Impacts
  - Community Implications
  - Possible Fiscal Impacts
  - Pro's & Con's

**CEC Members Submit Proposed Legislative Issues**

- For example: A CEC member could propose legislation to amend a statute to improve program delivery

**Upon Receipt, Government Relations Distributes Proposed Issues to Vice Chancellors**

- Government Relations sends Vice Chancellors' background and other available information regarding proposals

**Vice Chancellors Analyze Proposals**

- Vice Chancellors conduct preliminary analysis of potential impacts of proposals

**Continuing Analysis Provided By Government Relations**

- Government Relations researches:
  - Potential legislative impact
  - Past legislative sessions
  - Similar proposals

**Summary of Proposals and Analysis**

- Government Relations compiles Vice Chancellors' analyses
- Consistent format submitted to the Chancellor

**Chancellor Establishes Agenda**

- Chancellor reviews proposal summaries, background information and analyses
- Chancellor considers input and impact on:
  - District Missions and Priorities
  - Feasibility
  - Probability
  - Effect on Other Legislative Priorities
- Chancellor Finalizes Agenda

**Bill Review Process**

- Legislation introduced
- Initial screening by Government Relations
- Vice Chancellors and/or Legal notified of legislation of interest by email
  - Brief summary
  - Embedded link to the bill language
- Vice Chancellors review legislation considering:
  - District-wide effects and on colleges
  - May solicit input from “community of experts”
    - At colleges
    - Other areas
- Analysis provided to Government Relations

***Time Sensitive Turnaround!!***

**Bill Analysis Form**

- Bill number: \_\_\_\_\_
- Short title: \_\_\_\_\_
- Possible impact of the bill to the Maricopa Community Colleges:
- Idea for suggested amendment (if applicable):
- Form completed by: \_\_\_\_\_
- Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Implementation Process**

- Government Relations forwards Chapters to responsible parties based on bill review process contacts
- Possible further distribution to other stakeholders during implementation process
- The Chancellor identifies a primary responsibility for timely implementation

Conclusion: Process contributed to format. They provide structured output and results.

**Recent State Legislative Initiatives:**

Dr. Ronan commented that annual reports are onerous and in line with that they worked through reporting process to streamline what is required of the organization. Issues are identified. In 2010 the team worked on trying to reduce the number of reports required. They worked with the Tax Research Association and got their support. They also worked on bookstore voucher process to create partnerships with which they are comfortable and more options for students. They advocated and convinced the Governor vetoed the guns on campus bill. On the perennial baccalaureate issues they made sure the issues of MCCCDC are protected.

**2012 State Legislative Environment:**

Mr. DeMenna explained they read every bill and that the good stuff is at the back. Over the past ten years the average number of bills introduced has been 1282. In 2011 there were 1350. State has grown over last ten years and thus the increase in numbers. The numbers in the past 20-25 years had remained constant. One third of these became law. The process has stayed the same; it is the people that are changing. What we are really looking at is a two-year cycle. The first thing that every president wants out of a first term is a second term. The primary is August 28. Legislative session starts in January. It ends and then you get into the primary that determines

which Republican wins over which Republican. Legislature runs year-round with a 100 day schedule. The November election is important in many respects. Taxpayer funded election will be on the ballot. Russell Pearce subject to recall in the November Election. Leadership changes took place this time in that they changed the Speaker of the House and Majority Leaders in Senate. Kirk Adams is vying for Congressional 6 Seat vacated by Jeff Flake against Matt Salmon. This is the backdrop against which MCCCDC operates

### **Strategic Direction**

Kevin DeMenna interacts with MCCCDC as a member of the team to help determine what might happen. Leadership issues come in the context of the team. Pat is lead and she and Kevin talk daily. He is a lobbyist to things that a government employee cannot do, i.e. fundraising. Pat is point person. She works with County Supervisors, League of Cities and Counties. Alan helps strategize. Laura is involved with grassroots infrastructure. There is the State Agenda and the Maricopa Agenda. Need to see how Maricopa agenda fits in with state agenda. The business officers from the ten different community college districts in the state meet regularly.

### **Questions, Comments, and Discussion:**

Mr. Lumm asked about funding for teachers involved with dual enrollment. Dr. Glasper responded that the State Legislature is only funding 50% of previous year. Community colleges encouraging dual enrollment so that students can move through from K-12 to community Colleges. Vice Chancellor Thompson commented that funding to ten MCCCDC colleges has not changed. The funding used to be \$1,000 per FTSE, now \$200. FTSE less relevant if no state aid. We are going to be asked to take less from State. Dr. Glasper commented that FTSE is not used to build capacity, it applies to our ability to tax. \$200 will probably go away. CEC will talk about a different resource module. Outcomes based funding – universities are doing this. Community colleges are proposing 2008 level of \$165M. What type of funding structure do we think we can put in place? Language is about completion, not enrollment any longer. Tracking intent on intake form. Getting off track will affect financial aid. Ten colleges agreed on three goals: access, retention and completion metrics, and state policy outcomes.

Mr. Burke inquired about funding for workforce development and whether it was reasonable to approach the legislature for this. Mr. Maguire responded that this is a unique moment in time. Lots of discussion on this in the state and nationally. Recession and high unemployment rates. Commerce authorities are looking at incentives programs and job training. Community colleges are most effective job trainers nationally and in the state. Dr. Glasper commented that earlier this year he sat down with Speaker Kirk Adams. MCCCDC was supporting the workforce bill and Kirk Adams was very supportive. Last year it was not about a fight about funding but rather workforce and they got the message and worked with us. The charge was to convince the other nine colleges to work with workforce plan. Many of them do not have the resources. Majority of funds go to Pima and Maricopa.

Mr. Saar asked if it was time to stop fighting with rurals? Mr. DeMenna commented it is all politics. We don't have an urban delegation. MCCCDC not homogenous. Mr. Maguire stated it was fundamental that we have this divide between urban and rural. Each has important issues but in the process we are not improving education.

Ms. Knaparek stated that we need to improve on grassroots efforts. Need to get community colleges together with legislators.

Dr. Campbell commented that there were lots of for-profit colleges and asked how they are impacting community colleges. They are collecting money from students. Dr. Glasper responded that they are very active but are also contracting. University of Phoenix closed down AXIOM Program because students were receiving financial aid but not following through. Our strongest partnerships have been with privates. Need to bring privates to the table. He and Dr. Harper-Marinick met with University of Phoenix regarding the state of the art simulation lab that sits empty. They want to partner with MCCCCD.

Mrs. Pearson suggested tying the decreases in funding to changes in expenditure laws. We need to diversify our income and partner with privates. It should not be that hard to have that conversation. In 1997 a study done by the state legislature showed welfare should be tied to education. She asked if there had been any attempt to look at welfare monies. Make the welfare money recipients register at community colleges. Mr. Maguire responded that welfare benefits used to be tied to education. There is currently no linkage like that. Welfare has decreased and now healthcare cannot do it on the healthcare side. There are capacity limitations. Mr. Saar reiterated that K-12 is part of the pipeline. Need pipeline, and we need to utilize our resources to assist K-12. Dr. Glasper commented that the Governor has been asked to take a position on P-20 Council to be a more functional group that would seek grants and work with philanthropic groups. Groups that are part of Foundation are willing to support seeking funds for P-20 which is sanctioned by executive order. There is a need to find a group that would support P-20. In addition there is no bill to support a community college board. It would cost \$800,000 to resurrect. Mrs. Pearson remarked that community colleges are bad at being involved and showing that they are around. Board members need to be an ambassador to legislative districts they represent. Mr. Lumm commented that he does not feel that individual board members should be down at the legislature unless they are united and have talking points. The main issues they should advocate for are student success, health and welfare of students and employees, nursing, workforce, policy issues, public safety, and weapons. Mrs. Pearson commented that the Board took a stance on the gun bill, and they don't want to hear from us on other issues. Mr. DeMenna indicated it was about local control and resisting preemption of your own control in managing guns on campus.

#### **Identification of Next Steps and Closing Comments**

Chancellor Glasper thanked everyone for their attendance, comments, and discussion. A list of identified topics would be developed and considered for strategic planning. More information would be developed so that intelligent conversations can be held.

**Adjournment of Discussion Session:** The work session adjourned at 7:40 p.m. and Board Members moved to an Executive Session immediately following.

#### **Convening of Special Board Meeting:**

The meeting was called to order by President Randolph Lumm at 7:50 p.m.

**ACTION**

**1. APPROVAL OF PURCHASE OF PROPERTY AT 3700 N. 3RD AVENUE, PHOENIX, ARIZONA** – approve the purchase of property located at 3700 N 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Phoenix, AZ at a price of \$1,510,000 plus closing costs, plus the cost of an environmental pollution coverage policy covering the property. The cost of the policy is approximately \$74,000, or less if bundled with the purchase of another property purchased at the same time.

Dr. Solley explained the need to purchase environmental pollution coverage for the two properties, which would result in a price higher than the Governing Board previously approved. Dr. Solley indicated that it may be possible to combine the two properties in one policy, resulting in a significantly lower cost.

**MOTION NO. 9856**

Governing Board Member Dr. Don Campbell moved for approval of Action Item 1, Purchase of Property at 3700 North Third Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona, plus the purchase of environmental insurance coverage for approximately \$74,000. . Board Member Dana Saar seconded. Motion approved 5-0.

**2. APPROVAL OF PURCHASE OF PROPERTY AT 3717 N. 3RD AVENUE, PHOENIX, ARIZONA** – approve the purchase of property located at 3717 N 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Phoenix, AZ at a price of \$430,000 plus closing costs, plus the cost of an environmental pollution coverage policy covering the property. The cost of the policy is approximately \$73,000, or less if bundled with the purchase of another property purchased at the same time.

**MOTION NO. 9857**

Governing Board Member Dr. Don Campbell moved for approval of Action Item 2, Purchase of Property at 3717 North Third Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona, plus the purchase of environmental insurance coverage for approximately \$73,000. Board Member Dana Saar seconded. Motion approved 5-0.

**Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.**

---

Doyle W. Burke  
Governing Board Secretary