



**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
SPECIAL GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 8, 2013**

A Special Session: Election of New Officers, Special Board Meeting, Board Retreat, and Agenda Review of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held at 2:00 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  
Lionel Diaz for Debra Thompson  
Nikki Jackson  
John Webster for George Kahkedjian  
Lee Combs  
Shouan Pan  
Gene Giovannini  
Chris Bustamante

**CALL TO ORDER**

The special board session was called to order at 2:08 p.m.

**SWEARING IN  
CEREMONY**

Ms. Diana Davidson, notary, swore in the new representatives for District 1 (Mr. Doyle Burke) and District 5 (Mr. Ben Miranda).

**ELECTION OF NEW  
OFFICERS**

Board President Doyle Burke presided over the election of new officers. Mr. Doyle Burke's name was put forward for Board President. Mrs. Debra Pearson, Governing Board Member, made a motion to accept the nomination and Mr. Randolph Lumm, Board Member, seconded the motion. Mrs. Pearson called for a close of nominations and Mr. Dana Saar, Board Member, seconded. The vote was 4-0 for Mr. Burke, with Mr. Ben Miranda, Board Member, abstaining.

Mr. Burke then called for nominations for Board Secretary. Mr. Saar's name was put forward. Mrs. Pearson made a motion to accept the nomination and Mr. Lumm seconded the motion. Mrs. Pearson called for a close of nominations and Mr. Lumm seconded. The vote was 4-0 for Mr. Saar, with Mr. Miranda abstaining.

Mr. Burke then led the discussion to the items listed on the agenda.

**ACTION ITEM**

**APPROVAL OF STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM  
FINANCIAL AID COMPLIANCE SUPPORT**—Approval of the

award and expenditure of \$538,000 under RFP 2977-10 *Oracle/Peoplesoft Enterprise System Consulting and Related Services* to ensure Maricopa remains in compliance with State and Federal Financial Aid updates, as well as dispersing of funds, while planning takes place for a major upgrade to the Student Information System.

Dr. Rufus Gasper, Chancellor, asked to introduce the item to the Board and then asked Mr. John Webster, interim CIO, to provide more detailed information to the Board.

Dr. Gasper reported that this will be the first of many presentations to the Board that will follow up on the Student Success Initiative. MCCCDCD is in the process of trying to build an infrastructure for the student success program focused around One Maricopa and in support of all the federal financial aid regulations that have recently been imposed. Dr. Gasper is asking the Board to consider two items which are very time sensitive. He would like to come back to the Board within the month to discuss in more detail on costs and plans. In order for MCCCDCD to stay on schedule, it is important for the Board to consider these items at this time. For Item 3, the responses to the RFP were delayed so it could not be brought any sooner before the Board. Dr. Gasper then introduced Mr. Webster.

Mr. Webster commented that in front of Board were two items. Item 3 is a recommendation for expenditure of \$538,000 to allow MCCCDCD to update its financial aid application currently in use in its PeopleSoft system. This will be for the next fiscal year. Within are two elements: licensing and consulting. MCCCDCD has been negotiating with Oracle for several months and they decided at the last hour to make accommodations. It is considered to be a one-time offer. Without this upgrade, MCCCDCD will not be able to disperse financial aid through the next cycle.

Mr. Lumm asked for clarification on the two separate pieces. Mr. Webster replied that, although financial aid will not move from the current software version to the new software version, without this upgrade Version 8.9 will not allow MCCCDCD to input the new financial aid regulations to the application. Oracle is allowing MCCCDCD an update to version 8.9 as a one-time offer. MCCCDCD must put these bundles in to move forward. Mr. Lumm asked if this was consultant-specific. Mr. Webster replied that, at this point, for this particular set of solutions, they were consultant-specific because of the unique conditions MCCCDCD needs. MCCCDCD IT cannot currently do these modifications in-house and must use consultants.

Dr. Gasper said that future conversations with the Board will detail options including self-support, off-site housing, or consultant work. If housed off-site, many issues such as the need for training and expertise may be allayed and offer a considerable cost savings.

Mrs. Pearson requested a discussion on what can be outsourced compared to in-house. She then commented that the Board approved the original request in 2010 and the deadline to move to the next stage was known at that time (2012) so why were there delays in the RFP? She wanted to know if it was put out to bid or did MCCCCD just ask Oracle if they could accommodate the request. Mr. Webster replied that the RFP process was constrained by internal issues (department reorganization, employee leaves, etc.) The original timing seemed to be right but progress was delayed.

Mrs. Pearson asked for clarification again regarding the bid process. Mr. Jon Clark, Assistant Director of Strategic Information Technology, stated that this proposal was part of an RFQ (request for quote) process because in the original RFP, 10 companies had already been identified as PeopleSoft companies.

Dr. Glasper clarified that with the RFP, MCCCCD could go back to any of the 10 companies that could deploy PeopleSoft products with an RFQ with specific needs. Dr. Glasper recommended if the Board needed additional clarification, the Board should have Mr. Mike McIntier, Director of Strategic Business Support Services, give a full breakdown on the cost and RFP/RFQ processes. Mrs. Pearson said she wanted to have the criteria so she would be able to answer any questions she might receive from the public.

Mr. Webster continued, saying Oracle gave MCCCCD the best price, which had been shared with six other institutions. It was the only vendor that could guarantee the work at the price. Oracle created the code and MCCCCD is in mid-stream in the project.

Dr. Glasper remarked that MCCCCD is processing multiple RFPs to address its needs. MCCCCD cannot have a system that tries to ensure no protests or suits. MCCCCD needs these services and must expedite the RFPs.

Mr. Burke commented that Item 4 meets the One Maricopa criteria and asked if Item 3 included that consideration. Mr. Webster replied that Item 3 was a compliance issue and not specifically responding to the One Maricopa initiative. However, Dr. Glasper remarked that once MCCCCD goes to a single process it will meet the One Maricopa criteria.

Mr. Saar asked for a clarification on the difference between PeopleSoft and Oracle. Mr. Webster responded that Oracle is a database and is considered a leader in its field. PeopleSoft was originally designed as an HR product. It is also a recognized leader in its field. Oracle decided to purchase PeopleSoft and integrate it into its own product even though it is separate from the Oracle

database.

Mr. Burke called for a motion to approve the item.

**MOTION**

**MOTION NO. 10006**

Board Member Randolph Lumm made a motion for approval. Board Member Dana Saar seconded.

Motion approved 4-0; Board Member Ben Miranda abstained.

**ACTION ITEM**

**APPROVAL OF APPLICATION TECHNOLOGY DESIGN—  
STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM**

**(ORACLE/PEOPLESFT UPGRADE: CS9)**—Approval of the award and expenditure of \$719,150 under RFP 2977-10, *Oracle/Peoplesoft Enterprise System Consulting and Related Services*, to develop an application technology design that will include Seamless Student Experience (SSE) initiatives thus moving Maricopa from 10 institutions to a single institution for student success.

Mr. Webster introduced this item with the comment that MCCCCD has 10 colleges that operate independently, each with different processes and ways of doing business. MCCCCD IT recommended that the 10 different processes be brought together into a single process. MCCCCD IT is taking the current architecture of business processes and melding them together. This will include moving from one version of the software (8.9) to the next (9.0). This upgrade will allow the process to be uniform across all the colleges.

Mr. Lumm asked what the timeline for implementation will be. Mr. Webster remarked that the initial design phase will last three months. Mr. Burke asked if it would include financial aid. Mr. Webster clarified that the design and configuration would include all the suites. Mr. Burke commented that this would be a very significant step for MCCCCD and Mr. Webster concurred. Dr. Glasper clarified that work being done will develop an infrastructure moving from 10 to one.

Mr. Webster continued, saying the next phase would include configuring the system, training, etc., so they could roll out the new system. Mr. Miranda asked what the key elements would be when the system was fully operational. Mr. Webster replied: financial aid, enrollment, transcripts, student financials, and student records. Mr. Webster said the MCCCCD is in a time-critical aspect. The process is being designed to work with the MCCCCD calendar. If the work is begun at this time, the system should be ready for use in Spring 2014.

Mr. Saar remarked the MCCCCD is still looking at the purchase of software as well as costs for hardware and training. He wanted to

know if a budget would be presented at some point.

Mr. Webster said that the total contract value included training, hardware, and ancillary support. Some of the costs could be addressed by using a hosted environment. There will be some software component costs and there will be costs for organizational change management. This will be a project of many pieces and the Board will see how the pieces fit together and what the costs will be.

Dr. Glasper said he will schedule time with the Board to share the timeframe and numbers and ask for Board consideration. Dr. Glasper will bring a plan of all the individual items and provide the Board with a high end number that will not be exceeded. Working with all the colleges it is clear that the costs for this change will be major. But the impact on student success is monumental. He assured the Board that he would make it as cost effective as he could.

Mrs. Pearson asked if the final costs of these projects could be defined as property of the District. Dr. Glasper responded that similar costs were defined within the Bond referendum as capital. Mrs. Pearson then asked if these discussions could take place in Executive Session because they are “property” to ensure the costs are not inflated artificially once the intent is made known to the public. Dr. Glasper replied that intellectual property has not been defined as well as real property and they would need input from General Counsel. Mrs. Pearson asked if Bond money could be used. Dr. Glasper responded that such requests have been characterized as capital and could use Bond funds.

Mr. Miranda remarked that MCCCCD is going to invest money as the project moves forward and the Board would need to decide at some point what it wants and at what price. Dr. Glasper said that he would not be asking the Board to pick and choose from a menu of options; rather, he and MCCCCD IT will bring a comprehensive plan before the Board and will clarify if alternate scenarios are asked.

Mr. Miranda wanted to know what would happen to prior data already in the old system and if the new system would integrate the old data. Mr. Webster said, in every project, a design phase is implemented. After the design phase, the project moves to configuration with predetermined items to create a base structure. It becomes a blank system. Once it is determined that the system is working optimally, data conversion begins. Fields are mapped from old to new to ensure data is moved over. At some point, MCCCCD will have two systems running in parallel until the new system is ready to “go live.”

Mr. Saar wanted to know if the learning management system data would be part of the process. Mr. Webster replied that the current

learning management system is subscription based software as service model. It will have the ability to integrate with new systems. All third-party processes will have to be integrated but the students will not “see” it.

Mrs. Pearson expressed concerns about keeping multiple systems in play for a long time, citing experience with previous conversions that never fully integrated with the new system requiring employees to use both old and new—oftentimes for years. Mr. Burke reminded her of the successful conversion to the new student information system. Dr. Glasper assured Mrs. Pearson her concerns were duly noted and would be considered as they moved forward. Mr. Webster replied that data is a critical issue and it is priceless. MCCCCD is moving from one version to another (versus moving from one program to another). Any new functionality will need to be defined and the data set should be moved as seamlessly as possible. Dr. Glasper remarked that the old system will be put to “sleep” but not deleted in case MCCCCD needs back-up.

Mrs. Pearson remarked that such redundancy is inefficient and costly and she asked what would happen when MCCCCD loses its trained employees who were familiar with the old system.

Dr. Glasper remarked that Mr. Lee Combs, General Counsel, had joined the meeting and asked Mrs. Pearson if she would like to follow-up on her question regarding Executive Session and property.

Mrs. Pearson asked if the purchase of capital equipment could be considered property and discussed in Executive Session in order to protect the bid process and integrity of the costs. Mr. Combs replied that the subsection of public meetings law deals specifically with real property. The subsection authorized “real property” not “intellectual property.” If there were a contract before the Board for consideration it would have to be noticed and discussed in an open meeting. Dr. Glasper asked if discussion of cost could be in Executive Session, versus an actual contract item.

Mrs. Pearson expressed frustration that the state statute has not kept up with changing times. She feels the Board needs to be able to discuss what it is willing to pay so it does not affect the price for much the same reason the Board discusses real property.

Mr. Burke called for a motion to approve the item.

## **MOTION**

### **MOTION NO. 10007**

Board Member Dana Saar made a motion for approval. Board Member Debra Pearson seconded.

Motion approved 4-0; Board Member Ben Miranda abstained.

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Ms. Pat Hill, Director of State and Local Government Relations, presented a legislative update to the Board. She first began by outlining the legislative process used internally. The Board adopted a series of strategic directions in development of its legislative agenda. Her office uses these directions when negotiating on bills, using them as guidance on how to react to new legislation. The five strategic directions are 1) oppose intrusions on internal control, 2) protect existing funding sources, 3) identify opportunities to secure new funding sources, 4) promote legislation that enhances student success, and 5) assure student safety.

Ms. Hill provided an overview of the legislative session. The Legislature will convene on January 14, 2013. The House 7-Bill limit is January 17, 2013. Arizona is starting into a new legislative session with many new legislators and the community colleges have been invited to talk about their agendas to the new legislators. Her office is currently focused on higher education and workforce development. They are looking at the release of budgets for Executive and JLBC. They are participating in meeting with the House Higher Education Committee and Senate Education.

The Arizona Community College Presidents' Council legislative agenda is focused on job training, requesting funding for workforce equipment (\$23 million), and requesting a state-match for Adult Basic Education (\$4.5 million). This is the first time that the Arizona community colleges have approached the legislature with a common agenda, which has many policy implications.

Mr. Saar asked if meetings with the committees have already been set. Ms. Hill replied they are anticipating being able to schedule those after January 21. She reminded the Board that her office puts together a weekly legislative update for the Board which will track issues, show set meetings, etc.

Ms. Hill continued, saying that state-match for Adult Basic Education was not funded last year. The federal government provided \$12.5 million last year even though the state did not provide its allocation. The federal government is now looking to the state for commitment and if the state does not fund this year, the federal government may withdraw funding.

Mrs. Pearson asked if the money shows as gone or as money owed. Ms. Hill responded the state chose not to fund so the item was zeroed out. If the line item keeps showing zeroes, it will be dropped. Mrs. Pearson asked if the \$23 million was still showing in formula. Ms. Hill replied it is currently in the budget but the legislature may decide not to fund.

Dr. Glasper commented that he had the sense that the Governor is going to put the \$4.5 million in the Governor's budget. The \$23 million is in statute and required by state law. In conversations with the Governor's staff, he remarked that last year the state gave the universities \$60 million for equity funding. The community colleges are asking them to reallocate the \$23 million to workforce equipment. In conversations with John Cavanaugh, Common Core Standards, odds of getting the \$23 million are pretty low. The message needs to get out there that the colleges cannot deliver when funding has been cut for five years. Dr. Glasper said MCCCCD needs to continue the pipeline and decide what it is willing to do. The state does not have the resources so MCCCCD needs to find the resources to move forward.

Mr. Saar asked if MCCCCD is working with automotive and health care groups to help provide equipment and services. Dr. Glasper replied that it was a continual conversation. MCCCCD is working with several groups along with the Commerce Authority.

Mrs. Pearson recommended MCCCCD work to help such industries to lobby with MCCCCD. She said MCCCCD needs to remind industry partners that their success depends on MCCCCD's success.

Mr. Saar remarked that MCCCCD could do this with help from a bond, but industry needs to help educate the community as to why it is needed and why it is important.

Dr. Glasper said that this was the "big ask." MCCCCD's community is prepared to help. Mr. Saar commented that it would mean more jobs and more tax revenue. Dr. Glasper concurred, saying if more people completed their education, they would improve their prospects and help improve the economy. Mrs. Pearson remarked that regardless of the source of funds, MCCCCD needs to do this. Dr. Glasper reiterated that the federal government is trying to send a message to the state about ownership and support.

Dr. Chris Bustamante, president of Rio Salado College, remarked that federal regulations require a state match, not a local match. Mr. Miranda asked if there were other sources that could be used to supply the funds. Dr. Bustamante said the majority of Adult Basic Education funding is provided by the federal government with some additional funding from local agencies. Dr. Glasper asked how many years MCCCCD has funded it and Dr. Bustamante replied funds have been hobbled together with federal funds for about three years now. The federal government has been forgiving due to the economic situation and MCCCCD agreed to program the same level as before without receiving any money from the state. Mrs. Pearson said the federal government is about to 'drop the hammer' in recognition of such events.

Ms. Hill said at the state-wide level, they are coordinating all the community college lobbyists from all districts and meet weekly to talk about issues and strategies to advance agendas.

Mrs. Pearson returned to the strategic directions shared previously and asked where they came from. Ms. Hill replied the directions came from the October Board Retreat. Mrs. Pearson remarked the wording on the strategic directions could be improved. Dr. Glasper said he would work on wording with the Board to move forward.

Mr. Burke released the meeting for a five minute break.

## **POLICY DISCUSSION**

Mr. Burke reconvened the meeting and directed the Board to consider the Board policies under review.

Beginning in order, he asked the Board members if they had any comments on policy **4.0 Governance Commitment**.

<http://www.maricopa.edu/publicstewardship/governance/boardpolicies/govprocess.php#governance>

Mr. Lumm said he felt the wording was too broad and should include “ensuring quality education, stewardship, and responsibility” or something similar. Mr. Burke remarked that Carver Policy Governance requires that the “owners” be defined and in MCCCDC’s case that would include citizens, residents, tax payers, students. Mr. Saar said there were Title 15 issues and somebody who is not capable of being a voting member of the county cannot be considered an owner. Mr. Burke argued that business pay taxes and Mr. Saar replied they don’t vote. Mr. Lumm said he wanted to include language about a commitment to education. Mrs. Pearson asked for Ms. Teresa Toney, Manager of the Office of Public Stewardship, to address the issue. Mr. Combs reminded the Board the statement is broad on purpose and specificity is detailed in 4.1 through 4.12. Mr. Burke said the Board would come back to 4.0 after looking at the detail. Mrs. Pearson asked if it would take away from the statement to add a few terms. Mr. Combs replied the statement is broad because the Board is holding the organization accountable with broad results. He recommended that “appropriate educational results” might be added to address Mr. Lumm’s concerns.

The Board moved to consider **4.1 Governing Values**.

<http://www.maricopa.edu/publicstewardship/governance/boardpolicies/govprocess.php#values>

Mr. Saar remarked that these reflect enormous amounts of hours put into consideration of the vision, mission, and values. He was loathe

to make changes without due consideration. Mr. Combs reminded the Board that this discussion would represent a period of time to study the words of the policies to understand what they say. He said before making any changes, allow at least one cycle to hear how these policies are understood now. With all that information, the Board will have the basis to affect the outcomes of the process.

Mr. Burke replied the Board has done this for two years now and asked how long was needed. Mr. Combs responded saying the Maricopa Governance process has not operated as it was designed in every respect. The Board is now refining so the policies more clearly articulate what it wants. He reminded the Board that changes to policy language would make changes to the expectations of the Chief Governance Officer (CGO) and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO).

Mr. Burke said the Board is having a discussion of policies. Mrs. Pearson said the Board is focusing more now on working and developing the Board and it has to know what the policies are and the Board has to agree on what they are. She wanted to make sure Mr. Lumm's comments were not lost. Mr. Miranda remarked that 4.0 would be simplified by vision, mission, and manner. Mr. Combs stated that Carver challenges Boards to articulate the mission in a more purpose-driven way. Mr. Miranda said whatever the objective will be will still be subject to outcomes. Mrs. Pearson said that Mr. Combs confirmed that changing the words does not change the intent, it just clarifies it. Mr. Saar said the Chancellor's Limitations have Interpretations to clarify but the policies under the Board's purview do not have such clarification.

Discussion then moved to **4.10 Board Members Code of Conduct.**

<http://www.maricopa.edu/publicstewardship/governance/boardpolicies/govprocess.php#code>

Mr. Saar said it was a great way for the Board to self-evaluate. This policy provides a basis on how to do it. Mr. Combs replied that this was one objective component on evaluating the Board. The Board also needs to look at all of the policies to see if they have effectively guided administration, met community needs, etc. All those other things were important in the self-evaluation process. Mr. Burke commented that the Board needs to focus on writing its own self-evaluation. Mr. Saar commented that all policies should be part of the self-evaluation.

Mrs. Pearson asked if the Board was OK with the current Code of Conduct. Mr. Saar remarked he had some items he wanted to eventually change and the rest of the Board members asked for specific examples. He said, for example, in regards to Item 9 "Board members will support the legitimacy and authority of the final

determination of the Board on any matter, irrespective of the member's personal position on the issue" he feels this could be better stated. Mr. Burke remarked there has never been an instance where conflicting opinions have caused issues with the Board. Mrs. Pearson replied that nowhere in a 3-2 vote does it mean a Board member has to surrender his/her right to his/her position on something. It just means that Board member cannot present it to others later as if the Board was wrong in its decision.

Mr. Lumm reiterated that the Board is just looking at the policies right now. If there are changes that need to be made, that's another process. Mr. Saar said the Board just needs to acquaint itself on what MCCCDC currently has. He does not want to initiate change in policies unless there is a glaring issue uncovered. He reminded the Board that it hasn't talked about a CGO or interpretations. He said the Board needs to declare the Board President/Chair is the CGO by policy. He recommends changing the Board Secretary position to Board Vice-Chair and discuss the creation of duties. The Vice-Chair could then chair the Board Work Sessions to get experience and the position could be viewed as Chair-Elect. Mr. Burke remarked that Carver allows the CGO to have someone else chair the meetings. Mrs. Pearson remarked there is nothing in policy that signifies that the Board Secretary is Vice-Chair.

Mr. Burke broke in to the conversation and stated that the discussion would have to continue at the next meeting. Mrs. Pearson reminded the Board that all it was supposed to be doing is to have conversation so every member has an equal understanding. Mr. Lumm asked each member to read the policies, review the sample Board evaluations, and asked that the self-evaluation be put on another agenda.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Burke adjourned the Special Session at 4:13 p.m. and said the Board would return in a few minutes for Agenda Review.

**AGENDA REVIEW**

The proposed agenda for the January 22, 2013 Regular Board meeting was reviewed by the Board. Adjustments as necessary will be made and the official agenda will be posted at least 24-hours in advance of the meeting at:

<http://www.maricopa.edu/gvbd/agenda.php>

**ADJOURNMENT**

Agenda Review adjourned at 5:51 p.m.