



## Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board Minutes July 16, 2013

A Policy Discussion of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held at 9:00 a.m. at the District Support Services Center, 2411 West 14th Street, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to A.R.S. Section 38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

### PRESENT

#### GOVERNING BOARD

- Doyle Burke, President
- Dana Saar, Secretary
- Randolph Lumm, Member
- Ben Miranda, Member (absent)
- Debra Pearson, Member (absent)

#### ADMINISTRATION

George Kahkedjian for Rufus Glasper  
Sherri Lewis for Maria Harper-Marinick  
Jim Bowers  
Lee Combs  
Teresa Toney

#### POLICY DISCUSSION

A quorum was not established at 9:00 a.m. so President Burke did not call the meeting to order officially, although the discussion did commence. The policy discussion was called to order at 9:07 a.m. once a quorum was present.

#### POLICY REVIEW

President Burke asked for input from the Board members regarding their ideas for amending the policy language as written. He directed the discussion through the Board Outcomes Statements (1.0-1.4).

#### Recap of March 26, 2013 Policy Review

- General Comments about Key Metrics
  - Is there is a better way to report the measures rather than using percentages so the details aren't lost in the aggregate?
  - Need to look at metrics in increments; it takes 3-5 years to see change in a large system, but reporting needs to come in small steps.
  - Metrics need to measure performance college by college.
  - Survey employers to see if MCCCCD students are coming to them well-prepared.
  - Track where high school students are going, especially those not attending MCCCCD.

#### Proposed Policy Changes from July 16, 2013

- 1.0 Global Ends / Broadest Outcome Statement
  - No recommended changes
- 1.1 University Transfer Education and General Education
  - Should the resolution for 2020 be incorporated? Do we hold administration accountable to meet this goal without it being put in policy? How?
  - Placement is most important ... what kinds of data are being collected to provide support for this?
    - Numbers available from university transfer partners; what about workforce, business/industry?
- 1.2 Workforce and Economic Development
  - Propose to add a summary statement before the bullets: "Provide a qualified workforce that meets the market-driven needs of business and industry."
  - Suggest adding a statement addressing "placement."

- Concerns rose regarding ability to communicate effectively strategies, resources, and tools already in place for students; right now, a student would need to know where to go to get help and many haven't got any idea where to start.
  - Better web page design, better marketing, cross-training and "generalists" versus "specialists" to help during advising process, start the conversation early in K-12 process and keep talking.
- 1.3 Developmental Education
  - Suggest adding a statement about "placement" here, as well.
- 1.4 Community Development and Civic and Global Engagement
  - Is this where the Corporate College fits? (Non-credit classes.)
  - What about plays, musical events, and libraries...service the community is asking for.
    - Better and consistent communication needed!
  - Awareness should be added; this might address the Board's concerns and administration can figure out the 'how.'

### Broader Discussion Considerations

- What does MCCCDC mean by "enhanced educational delivery options" as written in policy?
  - Metrics define this as any online, hybrid, or alternative delivery method of instruction
- How does MCCCDC measure the "benefit"?
  - Opportunity to enroll in alternative delivery format is a benefit.
  - Board members should look at the subsections within all of the Outcomes for the big picture.
  - Metrics are defined for each outcome.
- The Board should consider more than just transfer as evidence to support efforts. (i.e., GED gets "lost" in the language of the policy—it is so generalized.)
  - Outcomes are broken down separately by category; data are more holistic (a student is more than just a developmental student, for example). Metrics are designed to measure a precise group.
- It is difficult to see how broad outcomes statements turn into specific measures.
  - It was suggested that adopting a Performance Management Process will allow MCCCDC to take the Board policy language and map it to all parts of the institution. MCCCDC ought to have 2-3 strategic goals that are measurable, attainable, and timely which can be aligned downward with a direct connection to Board policy. Relationships can be shown at any time when this process is used (software available for this).
- Board members want to see a direct tie between how business is being done and Board policy.
  - General Counsel recommends the Board review monitoring data as presented by the Chancellor to determine if the Board's goals are being met.
- Board members feel what is missing is the understanding of how MCCCDC individualizes student services to overcome student obstacles/barriers to success.
  - Monitoring reports will provide detail to the Board. If what the Board wants to know is not presented, it can request special reports be created to provide that data.
  - If the data cannot be presented, then amend policy language and define the metrics that will be used to measure success.

- The Board can have its questions answered so it can do its duty and administration should be prepared to give an answer to those questions, whether they are written in policy or not. If policy language is kept more generalized, there is greater flexibility to change through an ongoing monitoring dialog.
- Board members want proof that policies are being served. Is what MCCCDC doing adequate enough? (How is “adequate” defined?)
  - Administration can provide monitoring reports with respect to items the Board has been asked to approve on its agenda (action items). Specificity can be added showing how the action item relates to a specific board policy in a specific way. Is this what the Board wants?
  - Remember, outcomes and limitations are separate segments of the policy governance process, with separate definitions. Presenting monitoring data regularly, versus a data dump in May and a huge metrics report in November, might provide a better ongoing picture to the Board.
- There is a question of what the value would be to have “everyone” familiar with MCCCDC’s four outcomes. The real value is what MCCCDC is doing at the colleges to meet student needs.
  - At the policy level, the Board has articulated policies broadly. The key is to monitor compliance as the Board understands them. That leads to developing consensus with administration to shared understanding. It is much more effective if you set up a dialog and get systems to line up and provide data to the Board that answers questions that might come up. If the Board develops an interest in any particular area, outside the established cycle, it can ask for more information through a special monitoring process. That monitoring process (which will provide the Board details such as how is MCCCDC doing “this,” is it effective, can it be proven, etc.) is the best way to provide effective meaning to Board policies.
- There is some concern that creating multiple strategic plans (District plus each college) is inappropriate.
  - The accountability process is the monitoring process. The Board should be seeing information that provides data in support of the goals and limitations set by the Board so it can determine if the data provides enough to answer questions.
  - Monitoring can also show when MCCCDC is not making any progress or moving outside of goals.
- How will such monitoring occur? Is there a tool?
  - The monitoring process and Performance Management should be the same process and be the basis for measuring progress. Alignment of tasks should meet both goals so there is no duplication of effort.
    - Can such a process show how a specific goal relates to all functions (i.e., GED)? How does the focus on GED relate to all areas?
      - The outcome is general and specific goals would be able to show alignment
    - *A tool is being developed and will be shared with Board at the August 17 Retreat.*
- MCCCDC must do what it needs to do to get the job done (organizational efficiency).
  - MCCCDC will never have enough resources to perfectly supply all needs to all things at all times. The Board has to define its expectations so the institution can prove if it is meeting those

expectations. MCCCDC is at the beginning of the process. The Board has the prerogative to set priorities and, in the absence of those priorities, the Chancellor will set them.

- Does the administration feel the Board has prioritized the four outcomes?
  - Administration is treating each equally in the absence of a clearly stated priority.
  - One issue to consider in establishing priorities—they may shift over time. The current policy language enables the Board to focus on its evaluation of the Chancellor in particular areas of concern. If the Board formally in policy says this outcome or limitation is more important than another, it will be cemented into place. To change it later would require a change in policy.
- Where does organizational efficiency, use of resources, treatment of employees, come in to outcomes?
  - The Chancellor Limitations set the boundaries within which the Chancellor can work to meet the goals.
  - Outcomes are the deliverables identified by the Board to bring to the community. The limitations are the framework for the Chancellor to work within.

#### **Preparation for Next Discussions**

- If the Board determines it has an interest in a particular area, it can ask for a special report. Then the Board needs to determine if it would be a one-time report or if it needs to be codified into policy so it is continually monitored.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The next discussion is set for Tuesday, July 23, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at the District Office in the Employee Lounge (first floor). Section 2.0, Chancellor Limitations, will be discussed.

President Burke adjourned the policy discussion at 11:03 a.m.

---

Dana G. Saar  
Governing Board Secretary