MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD MONITORING REPORT AND STRATEGIC PLANNING DISCUSSION RETREAT
NOVEMBER 13, 2012
MINUTES

A Retreat of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held at 6:00 p.m. in the Rio Salado Conference Center in Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

PRESENT

GOVERNING BOARD	**ADMINISTRATION**
Doyle Burke, President	Rufus Glasper
Dana Saar, Secretary	Maria Harper-Marinick
Randolph Lumm, Member	Nikki Jackson
Don Campbell, Member	Debra Thompson
Debra Pearson, Member	Teresa Toney
Ben Miranda, Member-Elect	Steve Helfgot
	Lee Combs
	Anna Solley
	Paul Dale
	Shouan Pan
	Gene Giovannini
	Linda Lujan
	Jan Gehler
	Felicia Ganther
	Andrea Buehman
	Sherri Ondrus

BOARD RETREAT – Monitoring Report and Strategic Planning Discussion

CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME	Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, called the retreat to order at 6:01 p.m. She then introduced the Chancellor, Dr. Rufus Glasper to give a welcome and overview of the proceedings.
OVERVIEW OF STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS	Dr. Glasper informed the group that this was an annual retreat planned to discuss Maricopa's progress in regards to meeting stated Board Outcomes. He explained that this was the first year that data based on approved metrics would be reviewed. This review would then establish a baseline for MCCCD in regards to those metrics and would be used to move Maricopa forward.

In fall 2010, Maricopa adopted the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) resolution to increase the number of certificates and degrees awarded to students by fifty percent by the year 2020. This goal |

was picked up nationally by other community college districts. An AACC report based on the work of seven different committees resulted in an overarching goal for all of the Arizona community college districts to increase productivity. This included the work being done as part of the Getting Ahead initiative in Arizona which was designed to increase the number of pathways available to students to meet their goals. Maricopa is looking at doing business differently.

Dr. Glasper declared that the retreat discussion would provide a sense of which of the metrics were important and which would help determine the focus of future planning for the next two to five years. Dr. Glasper said MCCCD's goal was to move the needle from year to year in order to move the system forward.

Dr. Glasper stressed that goals cannot be achieved by staying in silos. MCCCD must look at all resources available. Nationally, some institutions had opted to change measures or change their definitions of success in order to appear compliant but MCCCD's Board had not chosen to do this.

Future planning will be connected to performance-based funding. The Governor's office wants all higher education sectors to have in place a formula for students based on outcomes and performance metrics and not just enrollment numbers at 45th day.

All the measures adopted by MCCCD were similar to those the Arizona Board of Regents had established for the state universities. Metrics will drive reporting to the state (and state funding).

The Board was asked to weigh in on the discussion and to ask questions. Dr. Glasper wanted them to look at the information relative to Maricopa's Seamless Student Experience (SSE), Developmental Education initiatives, etc. in order to increase the output in the system to the highest level of quality. He hoped for an engaged conversation.

The format was designed so that data were presented to the Board to review progress, consider new approaches to strategic planning, and to share progress on key metrics. The full report detailing data in response to all metrics is posted on the Institutional Effectiveness website (http://www.maricopa.edu/business/ir/monitoring_reports.php).

Before turning the discussion over, Dr. Glasper took a moment to introduce the newest Board member, Mr. Ben Miranda.

Dr. Glasper then reintroduced Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick.

PROGRESS REPORT ON BOARD OUTCOMES AND METRICS

Mrs. Debra Pearson, Governing Board member, asked how the metrics to be discussed were chosen versus all that were included in the full report. Dr. Harper-Marinick replied that the question would be answered during the presentation.

Dr. Harper-Marinick began by stating once the outcomes were adopted in February 2011 and the metrics in April 2011 a change in the planning model was required to align with the new outcomes. A new system-wide integrated plan resulted—a systemic plan was formulated and aligned with the One Maricopa vision. She reminded the Board when planning began MCCCD was just concluding its 21st Century Maricopa initiatives so it became part of the consideration.

Governing Board outcomes drove all decisions regarding planning. One Maricopa, Seamless Student Experience, Developmental Education Initiative, and the Completion Agenda were incorporated and innovations at both college and system levels were included. It also incorporated a comprehensive environmental scanning process. This resulted in a transition and difference in reporting so that MCCCD was aligned with AACC.

Dr. Harper-Marinick noted that comparisons between this year's report and the previous year's report would not provide a direct comparison as the cohorts shown are different.

Prior Monitoring Report Methodology	New Reporting Methodology
General relationship to MCCCD Mission	Directly responsive to Board priorities
Focused on Course Performance, Retention, Transfer, and Workforce Indicators	Includes past topics but adds emphasis on Completion Rates, Time Progress Toward Degree, Community Engagement Indicators, and student voices via survey results
Benchmarked to 2006 NCCBP targets	Focuses on trends and improvement over time
Fewer indicators of performance (approximately 20)	More indicators of performance (approximately 50)
Most measures focused on all students so challenging to track over time	Most measurements aligned with V2020 methodology which focuses on new student populations; MCCCD will be tracking groups of students (cohorts) over time

Dr. Harper-Marinick then introduced Dr. Sheri Ondrus, Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Strategy, who guided the presentation of metrics data. Dr. Harper-Marinick asked the Board members to ask questions at any time as the presentation progressed.

Who are MCCCD's students?
Based on traditional demographics in race/ethnicity and gender, for fall 45th day 2012, the headcount was 137,982 (unduplicated). Approximately 56% were female, 51% were white, and 23% were Hispanic.

In response to the Board metrics, new intent codes were created asking more specific questions of the cohorts to give a better idea of why students are at MCCCD. These intent codes included:

- Earn a degree/certificate for transfer (44%)
- Earn a degree/certificate for job market (24%)
- Take courses for job skills (12%)
- Personal interest (11%)
- Current high school student taking dual/concurrent courses (7%)
- Take courses for transfer (2%)
- Current university student taking courses (1%)
- Undeclared (0%)

Student counts in "underserved populations" had grown over the past three years. These included Black (grown from 7-8%), Hispanic (grown from 20-23%), Native American (3% steady), Pell Grant Recipient (grown from 21-33%), Male (43% steady), and Age >24 with No Prior College (grown from 18-23%).

What is MCCCD's non-credit enrollment?
Headcount in non-credit courses declined over the past three years for both vocational and avocational courses. Vocational enrollment has remained fairly steady (5,909-5,775) but avocational enrollment dropped (16,593-13,289). Avocational would include courses strictly for personal interest.

Board Resolution to increase by 50% the number of students with degrees and certificates by 2020
Is MCCCD going to meet the Completion Agenda? Based on the data, MCCCD has been increasing for the past two years and current projections show MCCCD will be on track to meet the goal. Mr. Saar, Governing Board member, asked for clarification, wondering if completion percentages took in to account increased enrollment. Mrs. Pearson asked if certificates were included. Dr. Ondrus responded that enrollment numbers are unduplicated and showed the total number of awards, not students. In 2011-12, 56% of all awards earned were Associates degrees. The unduplicated number of students achieving a transfer degree or Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) certificate increased over the last three years, as well.

MCCCD has been successful in increasing the number of awards, but is challenged to increase the *proportion* of students earning awards.
Cohorts are those students new to higher education and who are enrolled either full or part-time. Cohorts were allocated six years to complete their degree/certificate goal which is why data may appear to be old (2004 cohort completed in 2010; 2005 in 2011; and 2006 in 2012). System-wide, the six-year graduation rate has varied little over the past

three years (from 19-20%). Findings show that a larger proportion of new students, who began as full-time, rather than part-time, earned an award within six years. This is a flag for colleges to devise intervention strategies for part-time students. The occupational graduation rate has remained fairly steady, although it has declined in the most recent year (3-year 14%; 6-year 18%). The percentage of students completing an AGEC or transfer degree within three years increased slightly over the past three years to 8% and the percentage of students completing within six years increased to 15%.

What contributes to graduation rates?
The key to increasing graduation rates is to keep students in class. The fall-to-fall retention rate was 67% for full-time students compared to 39% for part-time students for the latest cohort. The retention rates of Asian and Hispanic students increased over the past three years, while retention rates of Black and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students declined. Maricopa is at the median (based on national benchmarks) for graduation.

Mr. Lumm, Governing Board member, asked how MCCCD's graduation rate compares nationally. Dr. Ondrus replied the national rate is approximately 26%. The national median is 22% and MCCCD's median is 25% for full-time students. The Board members all agreed that MCCCD does not want to strive for median rates.

Approximately 54% of students come back each fall. All metrics are lower if students do not return. Students who start their college experience in full-time status have a return rate of 67%; if they begin as part-time students they have a return rate of 39%. Yet another flag for college support strategies.

What contributes to retention rates?
The college-level course success rate has held constant over the past three years (68%). Course success is defined as a grade of A, B, C or P. The course success rates for Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic students increased over the past three years, while the course success rate for Black students declined.

Several courses appear to act as gatekeepers for student success. The following list shows the percentage of failure (D, F or W grades) for new students. Courses in red are considered developmental education courses.

GBS151, Intro to Business, 49%
CIS105, Computer Info Systems, 45%
MAT120, Intermediate Algebra, 41%
SOC101, Intro to Sociology, 41%
MAT092, Introductory Algebra, 41%
MAT082, Basic Arithmetic, 40%
MAT121, Intermediate Algebra, 39%

MAT091, Introductory Algebra, 39%
COM100, Intro to Human Communication, 38%
ENG091, Fundamentals of Writing, 36%
PSY101, Intro to Psychology, 29%
ENG101, First-Year Composition, 28%

Based on these results, it is clear that developmental education courses continue to challenge students. It was also noted that there were five math classes on the list.

Mr. Lumm asked why these particular courses are considered gatekeeper courses. Dr. Ondrus replied that these courses were the ones that new students received the most D, F or W grades in for fall 2012. The colleges and District need to look at what/why so intervention strategies and focus can be determined.

What contributes to college-level course success?
The success rate in developmental math, English, and reading courses taken in the first academic year improved for the fall 2011 cohort (64%).

How do students perform after successfully completing Developmental Education courses?
Students who successfully complete development education courses will succeed in other courses (math 65%; English 71%).

What percentages of students are having a successful outcome?
First, "successful outcome" had to be redefined to include more than just number of awards/certificates completed. The percentage of students achieving a successful outcome within six years increased from 62% to 64% over the past three years. This can be broken down as follows: 19% received an award, 24% transferred, 11% are still enrolled, and 10% have earned 30+ credits with a GPA of at least 2.0 for the most recent cohort. Based on these data, at least two-thirds of our students are succeeding. The challenge is to meet the needs of the remaining one-third.

MCCCD needs to demonstrate progress. This can be done by developing and presenting MCCCD-appropriate metrics and have the state legislature support them based on these new measures.

MCCCD has changed how it asks student intent to include dual enrollment, university student, etc. These questions were not asked before. *(**NOTE:** Dual enrollment numbers were removed from the report.)*

Mrs. Pearson again asked how these metrics were chosen.

Dr. Harper-Marinick answered saying many are considered key higher education metrics (retention, graduation rates, and awards) which are most frequently followed. MCCCD calculated three years but this is the

first year these specific values were calculated. These were to create a baseline of information to be used to determine what additional metrics would serve Maricopa best.

Mrs. Pearson asked for clarification, wondering if the chosen metrics were specifically to show retention. Dr. Harper-Marinick replied these metrics were to give scope to big issue ideas. When the metrics were first introduced to the Board in February 2011, these were the key metrics presented as being the most important pieces of information for the Board.

Mrs. Pearson then asked if the criteria matched with others who measure them as well. Dr. Harper-Marinick responded that MCCCD worked with the other Arizona community college districts and chose to voluntarily use the AACC framework of accountability for metrics. MCCCD has more metrics than the state-level document. MCCCD is trying to align with the AACC initiative. As everything has evolved since planning began 1.5 years ago, some areas were changed. Right now, all the community colleges in the state are aligned. MCCCD has the ability to influence other institutions that have not made final decisions.

Dr. Harper-Marinick reiterated that these data represent a baseline and show where MCCCD is and what MCCCD looks like at this point in time (snapshot). They can be used to set targets based on what was learned.

STRATEGIC PLAN NEXT STEPS

What are we doing to continue to improve?
Dr. Ondrus then introduced MCCCD Strategic Planning Goals for 2012-2016. She said the strategic planning group is still working on the details but they have come up with four overarching goals (#1-3 are focused on student outcomes and #4 is focused on organizational outcomes).

Goal 1: Access to Learning
MCCCD will improve access to learning opportunities for students and community.

Goal 2: Pathways to Success
MCCCD will enhance educational and career pathways to support student goal attainment.

Goal 3: Effective Learning and Teaching
MCCCD will improve student learning outcomes and teaching effectiveness.

Goal 4: Organizational Integrity
MCCCD will strengthen policies and practices to guide the effective use of public resources.

Each goal has several strategies defined to help meet the aims. These will involve stakeholder groups working in partnership. The expectation

is across all goals to see movement in the metrics.

Goal 1 Strategies
1. Enhance student services designed for underserved populations.
2. Implement a coordinated approach for effective recruitment and marketing that leads to improved retention.
3. Implement a uniform student enrollment process through the Seamless Student Experience initiative.
4. Provide student-centered course schedules and learning options.

Mrs. Pearson asked if there were any data that show marketing/recruiting help with retention. Dr. Harper-Marinick replied that marketing/recruiting works in conjunction with all parts of the plan to make sure retention increases. For example, Mesa Community College's Completion Campaign with Phi Theta Kappa (PTK) markets the importance of completing degree/certificate goals because not only do students attain a degree it can also lead to obtaining a better job. Such marketing strategies help increase self-awareness.

Mrs. Pearson asked if the data show marketing/recruitment have a correlation. Dr. Harper-Marinick replied that MCCCD is working on retaining the students that are currently enrolled. MCC's data was anecdotal. Right now, MCCCD is setting goals to measure and provide evidence.

Dr. Linda Lujan, president of Chandler-Gilbert Community College, responded that these strategies are imbedded in efficiency and cost cutting. Currently, MCCCD creates 10 sets of materials, 10 packages, etc. Resources could be re-worked to be more efficient and effective. This would help attract and retain students in MCCCD.

Mrs. Pearson then asked if there was a correlation with the drop-out rate or if it was tailored to specific student populations. She wanted to know if marketing could be used to determine what these students need. She wanted know if MCCCD was looking at why these changes were occurring. She wants the culture to change to fit the needs of students.

Dr. Harper-Marinick responded with another example, the Minority Male Initiative. MCCCD considers its message, how it reaches out to this population, and what resources and materials are available. Marketing/recruiting is not the only solution presented but it does help MCCCD to develop a unified message to convey to students.

Mrs. Pearson declared that until the program addresses cultural needs, messaging will not work. MCCCD needs to determine what is going on and come up with specific strategies to address specific needs.

Goal 2 Strategies
1. Implement student success initiative to fulfill the Completion

Agenda mandate.
2. Redesign the developmental education program.
3. Clarify pathways and simplify program and degree options to enhance student success.

These strategies are dedicated to simplifying the pathways to student success in order to increase student success.

Goal 3 Strategies
1. Implement a systemic early intervention model for students.
2. Improve curriculum process to be responsive to market needs.
3. Improve residential-to-adjunct faculty teaching ratio to support student success.
4. Focus faculty professional development activities on effective learning and teaching.

These strategies are committed to focusing and clarifying MCCCD response to student learning.

Goal 4 Strategies
1. Improve systems designed to attract, develop, and retain a talented and diverse workforce.
2. Transition to a performance-based funding model.
3. Engage in instructional and administrative program prioritization.

These strategies are focused on clearly defining priorities for MCCCD.

Mrs. Pearson said that MCCCD needs to know what to do specifically for a particular group of students. She wants the story behind the numbers so that specific interventions can be designed.

Mr. Lumm asked for clarification on what it means to implement student success initiatives.

Dr. Harper-Marinick responded with the example of the Student Success Initiative (SSI) where all students who are new to college seeking a degree or to transfer, who are either full-time or part-time, are now required to participate in mandatory orientation and advising. If any of these students are assessed into a developmental education course they must also enroll in a college success course. Another example would be that several Mathematics faculty are participating in systemic developmental math curriculum reform. Some strategies will be implemented at the system level while others will need to be implemented at the college level and tailored to that college's students' needs.

Mr. Lumm asked if the strategies need to be measurable. Dr. Harper-Marinick replied that students will get degrees or transfer and those numbers could be counted. He then asked if there were any clues as to

why the numbers for Black students were falling. Clearly this group of students needs attention and he wanted to know what MCCCD is doing to address the concern. He noted that each college would have to respond to its own specific populations.

Mr. Saar commented that the Board Outcomes are not disaggregated by ethnicity and that there are performance gaps being created by under-represented student populations. Mr. Burke responded that it is implied in the overarching language in the Board's Treatment of Students policy and the policy did not really need to be broken down. Mr. Saar disagreed and thought it should be added. Dr. Harper-Marinick clarified that underserved populations are addressed with several metrics under multiple components.

Mrs. Pearson asked why MCCCD is having such a dismal success rate when broken down by ethnicity. She reminded the Board that this was an intensive part of the original discussion for outcomes. MCCCD needs to build an inclusive program for all student populations. Mr. Saar stated that policy needs to be addressed for more specific outcomes in getting ethnic groups up to par. 36% is not good enough, the Board needs to set a standard (i.e., 86%) and then meet it.

Mr. Saar then asked if it is the Board's role to establish where MCCCD should be in these metrics. Is MCCCD satisfied with "middle of the road" levels?

Dr. Harper-Marinick replied that MCCCD does not have targets this year because a baseline needed to be established first. Now MCCCD has to decide how to set the targets, what methodology will be followed, etc. She is looking at peer institutions and AACC for national benchmarks to begin the discussion.

Dr. Glasper responded by saying these data provide MCCCD's baseline. If changes are to be made, discussion of goals and how to get there need to commence. MCCCD can look at its peers and then raise the bar.

Mr. Saar said that the Board has to decide where it wants to be, what they will be satisfied with, and how much they are willing to support the District's efforts.

Mrs. Pearson cautioned that using national benchmarks could cause MCCCD to begin limiting access and restricting enrollment in order for MCCCD to match those national benchmarks. MCCCD has a completely different demographic and should keep those in mind when planning. MCCCD needs to define what success is for MCCCD, not rely on a national definition. Planning needs to keep in mind that comparison to other states or private institutions might not effectively work with Arizona's populations.

Dr. Harper-Marinick asked for concluding questions. Mr. Miranda, Board Member-Elect for District 5, summed up his understanding of the presentation. MCCCD is relying heavily on metrics and transitioning from previous methods and measurements—as a new Board member, he would like to have more definition and specific examples that will be implemented (i.e., interventions, strategies). He would like to see campus-specific as well as systemic plans.

Dr. Harper-Marinick responded that this model was just implemented this year. By the end of this year, MCCCD will be able to report on specific results and those will be shared with the Board as planning is ongoing.

Mr. Lumm stated the Board needs to have a discussion so that MCCCD is inclusive of everybody. This is a strategic need so students are not blocked. He asked if the strategies will be consistent across colleges.

Dr. Harper-Marinick responded that changes to policy are occurring. This fall policy will be changed so that first time students must participate in mandatory orientation and advisement and those who are assessed into a development education course have to enroll in a college success course.

Mr. Lumm asked if mandatory testing occurs for all students.

Mr. Miranda responded that he knew there was mandatory assessment for placement into Math and English classes but asked if there were others. Dr. Harper-Marinick replied that Reading is also assessed. Also, if English is a pre-requisite for another course, testing would occur because the student would need to place into the proper English class. That is how the assessments are linked to other courses for all students.

Mr. Saar asked if the colleges were considering something similar for science or other disciplines. Dr. Harper-Marinick responded that it might be considered. She said MCCCD uses common scores in several areas, such as language arts, to make additional determinations.

Mr. Saar asked if there were way to reduce the drop-out rates. That information should be shared with faculty in gatekeeper classes. Mrs. Pearson stated that was not the Board's job.

Mr. Lumm commended the presenters and said they did an outstanding job. He thanked them and the committee for all their hard work. He said the Board needs to decide how to lead and not get enmeshed into the details.

Dr. Harper-Marinick responded that having outcomes and metrics helps with planning and that she will ensure reports are provided to the Board more frequently than in the past.

CONCLUDING
REMARKS

Dr. Glasper concluded the session with a summative statement. The Board is extremely open to looking at Board policy and confirming the vision, mission, and values. He will work with the Board to create a framework to set the mission.

For all MCCCD initiatives, such as SSE/SSI/etc., MCCCD will look at individual strategies through the lens of One Maricopa so they are instituted system-wide for all students.

MCCCD will look at outcomes and competencies that the colleges and faculty need to deliver in light of the change in business where some things will just not be optional for students any longer. If a student cannot read, he/she cannot pass and the notion that every student has the "right to fail" is no longer acceptable. Hence the change to include mandatory orientation. Once MCCCD starts requiring specific actions, students will either follow the directive or make another choice. MCCCD will also reach out to the K-12 system and put some intervention strategies in place.

The strategic planning goal strategies go in to detail and we need to determine if MCCCD can move that needle. The strategies may change along the way. More discussion will be available to the Board.

Mr. Burke thanked the committee for all their work.

Mr. Miranda and Mr. Lumm requested specific examples of what kinds of things are being done to help students succeed, strategic plans, etc. Mr. Lumm remarked that Dr. Kay McCleny stated at the Student Success Conference in October that every MCCCD employee contributes to student success and they all have a role in that. He asked participants to consider what the other employee groups could do to help students succeed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

_____
Dana G. Saar
Governing Board Secretary