



Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board Minutes February 5, 2013

Agenda Review and a Work Session of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board were scheduled to be held at 4:30 p.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
- Debra Pearson, Member

ADMINISTRATION

Rufus Glasper
Maria Harper-Marinick
Debra Thompson
Nikki Jackson
Steve Helfgot
Lee Combs

AGENDA REVIEW

Agenda review was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

Board President Doyle Burke took the assembly through the proposed agenda for the February 26, 2013 Regular Board Meeting. The order of the agenda was amended so that "Awards and Recognition" moved from Community Linkage to General after "Student Life Reports" and the word "Emeritus" was added. All proposed items were approved without change.

In addition to the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and Vice Chancellors of Business Services and Human Resources, members of the Collaborative Policy Development (CPD) and Interest Based Negotiation (IBN) teams were present to provide the Board with information upon request when item **V.B.2 Approval of the Proposed Staff Manual** was reviewed. Discussion at the January 22, 2013 Board Meeting prompted the removal of this item for approval until the Employee Groups could work through concerns they had with language in sections A-4 and A-28. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), signed by the Executive Leaders of the Employee Groups, was included in a new Appendix Item to confirm that all the Employee Groups were satisfied with the manual being presented for approval at the February 26th meeting.

Governing Board Member Debra Pearson stated that she wished the Staff Policy Manual had more clearly addressed how employees treat one another, emphasizing a need to be fair and set the expectation that, regardless of position, certain behaviors are not going to be tolerated and employees will be supported by the institution, and the Board, when conflict does arise. She was especially disappointed that the manual did not adequately address hostile work environment or situations where employees feel threatened by a supervisor who believes the rules do not apply to him/her because of his/her position. Mrs. Pearson feels that Interest Based Negotiation is a good mediation tool but only if all employees understand what it is and how it works. She warned that

keeping people ignorant of facts limits their options. She felt it was imperative that the policies adopted by Maricopa level the playing field and apply to all employees regardless of position. She also argued there was no process to address abuse of power. Vice Chancellor for Human Resources Nikki Jackson asked the Board to allow Human Resources the opportunity to put its efforts in place. She said that IBN is a powerful solution for conflict resolution and policy development. President Burke concluded the discussion with support of the Meet & Confer process and asked that the Board respect their efforts to bring this policy manual before the Board.

At the conclusion of Agenda Review, Governing Board Member Randolph Lumm presented a question regarding formality in addressing the Board during a meeting. Mrs. Pearson suggested the question be postponed and considered during the policy review discussion in the Work Session.

Agenda Review adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

WORK SESSION

The work session was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

MARICOPA GOVERNANCE VS. CARVER POLICY GOVERNANCE

Mr. Lumm's question was revisited at the start of the Work Session. It was determined that maintaining the formality of addressing the Board helped the Board President maintain control of the meeting, especially during times when discussion might become heated. It was decided that the Board President can also allow for a less formal tone if desired by beginning the meeting with a disclaimer. Board Members considered adding language to Board Policy **4.5 Board Meetings** that the MCCC Board would adhere to *Roberts Rules of Order* but determined that it was not necessary. It was decided to provide the appropriate protocol to those interested in presenting to the Board. Additionally, Board members agreed to adopt the protocol of making motions for items that affect their District whenever possible.

Suggested Protocol for Addressing the Board

When addressing initial remarks to the Board

President X, members of the Board, Chancellor, and members of the CEC ...

When responding to questions from individual Board members

President X, Board member X ...

Carver Governance Compared to Maricopa Governance

President Burke then directed the conversation to a review of a comparison of the Carver Policy Governance Model versus the existing Maricopa Governance model. A handout provided by Ms. Teresa Toney, Manager of the Office of Public Stewardship and Maricopa's Governance Manager, provided a brief comparison of the two models. The handout compared the models in seven areas: primary policy areas, Board meeting agenda, Board self-evaluation, ownership connection, chief governance

officer, monitoring performance, and language. A detailed discussion ensued, which touched on each of the seven areas noted in the handout.

Discussion Highlights

Mrs. Pearson commented that Maricopa should remain mindful that “full” Carver Policy Governance is not looked at favorably by all. Mr. Lumm remained adamant that certain items should remain off the consent agenda so the public is assured of the Board’s intentions to disclose information. The Board concluded that opening up the Agenda Review process to the public would allow an opportunity for the public to hear the consent agenda items being discussed in detail. Additionally, the Board agreed as a whole that more efforts need to be made to connect with the community. Governing Board Member Dana Saar asked for help from the Chancellor and his staff in identifying appropriate groups to approach. The Board also agreed that monthly monitoring, versus a once-a-year “data dump,” was a good idea and it would move toward that upon the conclusion of its policy review sessions scheduled for the first half of 2013.

After discussion, the Board agreed to adopt additional components of the Carver model and also maintain different aspects that work better for Maricopa. It will be an evolving process.

POLICY REVIEW

The discussion of the Carver vs. Maricopa Policy Governance models led the Board through some of the policies scheduled for discussion at the Work Session (**4.2 Manner of Governing, 4.4 Board Planning and Agenda Preparation, 4.5 Board Meetings, and 4.7 Board Linkage with the Community**). The language in these items was not looked at directly but alluded to during the conversation.

President Burke asked the Board members to review the sample Board self-evaluations provided so they could create their own tool. Policies **4.6 President’s Role, 3.0 Chancellor’s Role, 3.2 Accountability of the Chancellor, and 3.3 Delegation to the Chancellor** were not discussed and President Burke asked that they be moved to the next Work Session’s agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

President Burke adjourned the work session at 8:39 p.m.

Dana G. Saar
Governing Board Secretary