A Capital Planning Retreat of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held at 2:30 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	ADMINISTRATION
Doyle Burke, President	Rufus Glasper
Dana Saar, Secretary	Samuel Dosumu for Maria Harper-Marinick
Randolph Lumm, Member	Debbie Thompson
Ben Miranda, Member	Jim Bowers
Debra Pearson, Member (Absent)	Lee Combs
	Linda Lujan
	Ernie Lara
	Steven Gonzales
	Irene Kovala
	Shouan Pan
	Paul Dale
	Anna Solley
	Todd Simmons for Chris Bustamante
	Daniel Coor for Jan Gehler
	Shari Olson
	Gene Giovannini

WELCOME AND COMMENTS

The capital planning retreat was called to order at 2:25 p.m. The meeting was called to order and Mr. Andrew Tucker, Manager of District College Media Relations, announced a slight change to the order of the agenda. Mr. Jim Haynes from Behavior Research Center would present the results of the poll first to accommodate another meeting.

VOTER POLL RESULTS

The results of the second annual survey of resident attitudes continue to demonstrate that residents have a very favorable view of the community colleges.

- Among those with any knowledge of the community colleges in Maricopa County, 91% have a positive impression and only 3% say their impression is negative (2012 results: 92% positive, 4% negative).
- When asked whether they would support a property tax increase of a dollar a month on the average home, 62% said they would while 29% said they would not (2012 results: 74% support, 23% opposed).
  - 61% would support a two dollar a month tax increase while 34% would oppose it (2012 results: 69% support, 29% oppose).
- When asked whether certain types of spending would cause them to react more favorably to a tax increase, 85% said that spending on educational technology would cause such a reaction, while 79% said spending on new classroom buildings on existing campuses would do so. 78% said remodeling older classroom buildings would cause them to react favorably.
- Approximately 2/3 of respondents said that they or someone close to

them had taken courses at a Maricopa community college and, of those, 95% said they would recommend the colleges to a friend, relative, or co-worker who was interested in taking college courses (2012 results were similar).

- Almost half (47%) of respondents said they know "only a little" or "nothing at all" about the community colleges in Maricopa County. This number has not changed from last year.
- The slight decrease in support for tax increases mirrors a decrease over last year in how respondents felt about their own household economic situation two years out.
- People know little about how the colleges are funded. When asked whether a variety of possible funding sources were actually used to finance college operations, 60% cited private gifts and donations, 52% said state support, 49% said corporate sponsorships, and 35% said local sales taxes.

Discussion
A question about the sample size for the survey was asked. About 600 residents were polled with a 4.5% margin of error. All were adult heads of household. Voter status was not asked as it was not a political poll. Also, audience members wanted to know how detailed the questions were regarding infrastructure and support for these types of expenditures Did the questions drill down to parking lots, electrical wiring, etc.? Such detail was not asked. Future surveys may want to consider the question because aging campuses will have these needs. Any suggested topics should be forwarded to Mr. Andrew Tucker at District for inclusion in the next survey. Next, a question was asked if an actual number was used for the a capital program and it was not; rather they asked if respondents would support a $2/month tax increase or a $1/month tax increase. The $1/month was more popular. Finally, a Board member wanted to know how detailed the informational pamphlet description was planned to be and it was noted that descriptions in the past were generic stating, for example, "infrastructure improvements such as ..."

DEFINING THE VISION FOR 2025   Chancellor Rufus Glasper reminded the Board that it had wanted to hear the Chancellor's perspective about his vision for the MCCCD. He said future planning begins with the ONE Maricopa focus moving forward. Plans include reaching out to high schools, acknowledging there are more educational institutions in Arizona than ever before, and taking into consideration the lack of State support (less than 1% for the past six years) for urban counties. The MCCCD consists of 10 separate institutions that have evolved very organically and independently over time and whose students exchange between colleges continually.

A future survey might consider questions of support for the notion of the regionalization of programs and services. In 2004, there was 76.4% support for the bond, perhaps because there was something in that program for every college. How will MCCCD balance disparate needs (aging infrastructures, new technologies, older buildings, etc. and keep the program to a reasonable dollar amount?

Ideas to Consider
- The idea of standardization of programs and services. MCCCD needs to ask

itself if it should retain the same mix of programs at all 10 colleges. Can high cost programs be re-packaged and only provided at some colleges?

- The balance between technology vs. bricks and mortar. The past capital program saw 1.6 million new square feet and 900,000 remodeled square feet at the colleges. There is a focus on online learning, students coming to college with a minimum of two smart devices needing support, and migrating to hybrid classes which is becoming more pervasive as MCCCD moves forward. How will these ideas be communicated to the community?

- Creating P-20 sites which embrace the concept of combining, rather than keeping separate, K-12, community college, and university together. Can facilities and procurement be shared and partnerships created with feeder high schools (beyond dual enrollment)? There needs to be a more seamless transition and sharing of resources at all levels. Consideration should also be made for the option of employees being able to migrate easily between facilities.

- Expanded partnerships with the state universities and extending partnerships to private institutions. If MCCCD can partner up with these institutions, then it doesn't need to expand its own programming.

- Communiversities—how many should MCCCD build? MCCCD needs to think differently than ever before and find new partners and share resources.

- Planning with partners about footprint, cost, bond dollars, etc., to cover things like athletics, student housing, and partnerships with outside organizations (i.e., PVCC at Black Mountain partnership with the YMCA and SMCC Library partnership with City of Phoenix).

- Emphasis should be placed on how MCCCD will be creating jobs, include projects with job/career training, money being put into the community, and providing lower cost education. Consideration should also be made for creating partnerships with other agencies (i.e., cyber security, culinary arts programs, auto programs, etc.) More information about the regionalization concept is needed, as well. How will MCCCD explain not having every program at every college but still allow students to get what they want easily and less expensively?

- Regarding the regionalization of programs and services—the Maricopa Corporate College is a great example of a regional approach to non-credit training in one location. Also, how will MCCCD advance the idea of a seamless educational system (P-20-W)? How will it train the workforce? Regarding bricks vs. clicks, student access to technology on campus is critically important—technology will rule MCCCD processes—but how will security be addressed?

- Consider a recent study that stated 30% of Kindergarteners today have a smart phone. Technology is so pervasive and good chunk of funds goes to making systems secure and sustainable over time. Access is also a consideration—not all students will have access to computers and MCCCD needs to provide sites for students who don't have technology at home so they can still get their education.

- Partnerships exist now, like the one with Phoenix Union's bioscience high school, T-Gen, and NAU on-site. How can programs like this be scaled up yet kept local community-focused? How can faculty and resources be shared? Can MCCCD be all things to all people, especially considering access, retention, completion, and work progression goals?

- The question was asked if the connection to campus might get lost if MCCCD regionalizes programs. The answer is maybe and it's something to be conscious of.
- A Board member said the idea of a placement center or employment center should be considered. MCCCD could provide the HR work for local businesses and contract it out. MCCCD could train their employees and walk them through the hiring process. Dr. Glasper said that could fall into an expansion of the SBDC or made a component of the Corporate College. Another Board member also said the existing college Career Services Centers might also be used for this effort. Dr. Glasper will prepare a report for the Board showing how many students are currently being serviced by Career Services and what services are being provided.

ONE Maricopa drives student success efforts and community engagement and support. Dr. Glasper concluded his remarks and invited the college presidents to share their ideas regarding bond fund priorities at their colleges.

POTENTIAL CAPITAL PROJECTS AND PRIORITIES

Presidents offered the following suggestions, many overlapping or facing the same issues of aging infrastructure, older buildings, and the continual need for being on the cutting edge in providing new technologies.

- Parking concerns at land-locked campuses or older parking lots that need to be refurbished.
- Expanding and/or remodeling purchased properties to provide new or additional services to students and employees.
- Expanding on existing college properties (current campuses or already purchased land for future expansion). This also takes into consideration if demolishing existing structures would be more cost-effective than remodeling.
- Removing and/or replacing outdated, expensive modular buildings.
- Creating a college "feel" on approach and reworking the land and outdoor spaces to encourage people to come on campus (and define where the campus actually begins).
- Aging facilities that need to invest in new infrastructure (wiring, HVAC, access, finished materials, water storage, fire sprinklers, emergency notification systems, etc.)
- Technology—access, keeping up with student expectations and use—MCCCD needs to have the latest to maintain student interest; this includes specialized equipment to support program studies (i.e., sciences, living labs, auto, and health care program labs and equipment).
- Sustainability and security needs. Have adequate emergency back-up systems; renewable energy systems. Make existing buildings energy efficient.
- Gyms—either adding a new one to campuses that don't have one or refurbishing or remodeling aging buildings.
- Adding athletic programs to campuses that do not have them or expanding existing programs (which might require additional dedicated areas for the programs).
- Moving programs to offsite facilities which will free up on-campus spaces to be repurposed; those spaces will need to be remodeled.
- Create ideal learning and working spaces developed specifically to

entice students to remain on campus. "Soft spaces" are a wise investment because it encourages students to socialize.
- Create spaces that meet community needs; allow broader community use of existing facilities (plan for new).
- Combine services with Skill Centers and College so it doesn't have to be duplicated (i.e., student services—advising, financial aid, etc.)

Ideas for Regionalization
- Have a flagship for Health Care, Culinary Arts, and Legal Studies.
- West Valley stats show 75% of courses are in liberal arts and preparing to transfer—have one college become a liberal arts center and another nearby could move to CTE delivery.
- Communiversity a great model that can be replicated. Allows a student to get everything he/she needs at one location. Ask the community what it needs and create pathways.
- Have specific lead colleges/partner colleges in dual enrollment—it's time to have another conversation with the high schools considering if MCCCD started today, what would it mean and how should it look?
- GWCC could take advantage of its proximity to downtown, light rail, ASU, and the airport to create partnerships.
- Possibly regionalize some programs (examples, only, HVAC, auto, welding) and look at partnerships with JTEDs.
- Is it time to work with legislators to allow MCCCD to provide 4-year degrees?
- Create a developmental education model with a single location dedicated to serving development students specifically; modular idea for developmental courses so students stop in and get what they need and then move on without being tied to a 16-week traditional course format.
- Film school would scale well; focus on unique programs or programs that colleges do well—examples, only, are equine science, graphic design, and culinary arts might lend themselves to regionalization.
- Expand partnerships to include other educational institutions than state universities (e.g., Ottawa, Southwest College of Naturopathic Medicine, etc.)
- Centers of Excellence: Storytelling Institute, community entrepreneurship, and development education faculty moving students through the system. Expanded partnership with Gila River Indian community; AAEC; and PUHSD wants to put their overflow students.
- Leverage existing faculty talent—are they in the right location? Repurpose underutilized spaces. Can be all things to all people but not at all sites.
- Create North valley 101 corridor. Maybe a medical campus partnership with the Mayo hospital; Black Mountain could be a premier physics/astronomy center since it's a low light area.
- Create a Center of Excellence in Energy with a partnership with WEST-MEC.

Other Ideas
- On-site production of power on campus. In the future, MCCCD needs more control over its power supplies so it should consider investing in non-traditional power like solar or traditional like natural gas/hydrogen. MCCCD needs to look at alternatives.

- AAEC model—charter school and concurrent and dual enrollment (in class courses and online) provides students more choices so they graduate from high school with a two-year degree or very close to a two-year degree.
- Look at facilities that have been abandoned by K-12 and create new partnerships to use those spaces at a low cost.
- Partner with other community college systems that border our county. Create joint facilities and break down that culture that MCCCD has to have its own students. Great opportunity for synergies and partnerships.

2016 CAPITAL PLANNING ACTIVITY SCHEDULE

Mr. Arlen Solocheck, District Director of Facilities Planning and Development, reported on the age of district facilities and the schedule of 2016 capital program activities.

A Board member asked Mr. Solocheck how many structures needed to be torn down versus remodeled. Mr. Solocheck replied that it was tough to say since they are able to take the structure of the building and do substantial rehabilitation. Changes to buildings that incorporate energy conservation help offset operational costs over time, as well.

Age of District Facilities
- <20 years old: 3,285,878 ft^2 (55%)
- 20-30 years old: 445,642 ft^2 (7%)
- 30-40 years old: 1,211,181 ft^2 (20%)
- 40-50 years old: 813,915 ft^2 (14%)
- 50+ years old: 252,900 ft^2 (4%)

Mr. Solocheck reported that many buildings are well past the useful age for systems and finished materials. Using industry standards, over the next 10 years, MCCCD will need to spend $250-$325 million to keep its buildings in their *current* condition. MCCCD Facilities is ready with a facilities condition index for college planning and prioritizing. A utilization study is underway for each college.

The schedule shows that MCCCD is late in preparing for a 2016 bond compared to the 2004 bond timeline. If the Board chooses to move forward, the majority of the planning will need to take place in 2014, with final referendum proposed in 2015 and finalized in 2016.

NEXT RETREAT

Ms. Debbie Thompson stated the next retreat will be on October 21, 2013. Board Member Lumm asked if the time could be changed to accommodate his schedule and Ms. Thompson said she would verify if the retreat could be moved to 11:00 a.m. instead of 2:30 p.m. as originally scheduled. This retreat will recap needs, including a possible overview from IT, and allow them to get a sense from the Board if they should proceed with master planning for a possible future capital program.

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Dr. Rufus Glasper wrapped up the conversation by saying MCCCD is still looking at growth/no growth. What if MCCCD had limited resources what would it do? This option might be presented at a future retreat. Board members thanked

presenters for the information and planning and look forward to future conversations. Dr. Glasper thanked the Board for the opportunity to present and thanked the presidents for a look at what's going on at their colleges. He asked those present to consider what their true appetite is for MCCCD to do business differently. What will it do to MCCCD over the next 10-20 years in how MCCCD approaches its communities? He intends to continue to make strides in terms of ONE Maricopa and act as a role model for other institutions across the country. He wants to demonstrate that MCCCD is a good steward and to help people understand that the market is changing and everyone can work together.

ADJOURNMENT   President Burke adjourned the retreat at 5:00 p.m.

_____
Dana G. Saar
Governing Board Secretary