

A-1

**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD STUDY SESSION
MAY 5, 2009
MINUTES**

A study session and an executive session of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board were scheduled to be held at 5:00 p.m. at the Phoenix College Willo Conference Room in Phoenix, Arizona, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

PRESENT

GOVERNING BOARD

Colleen Clark, President
Randolph Lumm, Secretary
Debra Pearson, Member
Don Campbell, Member
Jerry Walker, Member

ADMINISTRATION

Rufus Glasper
Maria Harper-Marinick
Debra Thompson
Darrel Huish
Steve Helfgot
Al Crusoe
Anna Solley
Pete Kushibab
Paul Dale
Shouan Pan
Linda Lujan for Ken Atwater
Ernie Lara
Gene Giovannini
Linda Thor
Maria Hesse
Jan Gehler
Velvie Green

Attendance: Approximately 50 people

CALL TO ORDER

The study session was called to order at 5:03 p.m. by Governing Board President Colleen Clark. The following items were discussed:

A. MCCCDC Nursing Program – Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick

Focus: How to grow the program and how the Board's RFP on effectiveness, efficiency and stewardship can address this and can be a key catalyst once we begin work with a firm

B. MCCCDC Data Center – Darrel Huish

Focus: Discussion to Answer Board Concerns

C. MCCCDC Bookstores – Debra Thompson

Focus: Bookstore Operations

D. Report on Federal Lobbyists – Bernie Ronan

Focus: Costs and outcomes for last two years

E. SIS Update – Darrel Huish

Focus: Biggest successes, biggest failures

F. Discussion of High Impact Service Plan – Donna Schober

Focus: Copies of printed plan, description, and comparison to various customer service plans

G. Maricopa Mission and Vision – Colleen Clark

Focus: Discussion

H. Definitions of Effectiveness, Efficiency, Affordability, and Stewardship – Dr. Glasper

Focus: Discussion

I. Communication Survey Responses – Colleen Clark

Focus: Discussion

J. Administrative Costs – Debra Thompson

Focus: Discussion

K. Event Debriefing – Debra Pearson

Focus: Discussion of Information Received at Various Events/Conference Attended by Board Members and Administration

L. Chancellor Newsletter – Dr. Glasper

Focus: In-depth information on topics covered in Chancellor Newsletter

M. Agenda Preparation & Dissemination – Debra Pearson

Focus: Timely preparation and dissemination of agenda and meetings materials to Board Members

MCCCDC Nursing Program – Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick

Focus: How to grow the program and how the Board's RFP on effectiveness, efficiency and stewardship can address this and can be a key catalyst once we begin work with a firm

Discussion: Dr. Harper-Marinick called attention to the major priority of the Nursing Program this year which was the re-accreditation of the Nursing Program by National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNA). The program is approved by the Arizona State Board of Nursing. Full

continuing accreditation by NLNAC is eight years and each of the nine colleges will be seeking continuing accreditation in fall, 2009 and spring 2010. Dr. Harper-Marinick also provided the following information:

The accreditation process includes a self-study and a survey visit of three days.

- Self-Study
Workgroups have been evaluating the Program and documenting that we are meeting the standards. The first of nine self-studies will be submitted in mid-August.
- Site Survey Visits
Site survey visits for all 9 colleges are scheduled for fall, 2009 and spring, 2010.

Growing the ProgramConsiderations/challenges

- Decreased statewide need for associate degree registered nurses – healthcare organizations are requiring more of their nursing workforce to be baccalaureate in nursing prepared in order to meet regulatory and accreditation requirements.
- Greater variability in patient census causing fewer opportunities for student clinical patient experiences. The numbers of people seeking elective and other non-urgent healthcare, including health issues that result in hospitalizations, has dropped. This has created more variable patient populations within the hospitals. Both depressed economics as well as the changes in immigration patterns are said to have affected the numbers seeking healthcare in situations that our students can gain clinical experience.
- Less capacity for clinical placements.
 - Diminished resources for student clinical experiences.
- Nursing graduates are having difficulty securing employment, specifically in desired specialty areas – shortage of nurses continues. While this is a contradictory statement we know that the job market for new graduates is currently limited. We hear that there continue to be opportunities for experienced registered nurses. Having said this, we know that the shortage will again be apparent and producing nurses will be critical when the economic slump subsides and as the baby boomer population continues to age and have greater health care needs.
- Simulation labs are supplementing clinical experiences with selected case scenarios related to course competencies. This has been a major advancement in how we prepare nursing students to care for patients. Simulated experiences can range from practicing a skill such as IV insertion to management of a patient in crisis throughout a complex scenario of nursing assessment and interventions.
- Specialty areas of nursing (Obstetrics, Pediatrics, and Psychiatric) cannot accommodate the number of students needing patient care experiences.
- Classroom and lab capacities at the colleges are increasingly unable to meet growing demand due to sheer numbers of students needing block times for skills lab practicums and simulated experiences. Labs

generally cannot accommodate the full cohort of students due to space requirements. Additionally, the students are divided into smaller groups for instruction and evaluation of skills.

Growing the ProgramWhat We Can Do

- Nursing must have increased dedicated funding to increase capacity.
 - Infrastructure
 - Need for clinical lab space is critical to meet the curricular needs of a growing number of students. Simulation labs are being used to increasingly supplement clinical experiences with selected case scenarios related to course competencies.
 - Increase the numbers of qualified fulltime faculty to achieve and maintain around the national standard of faculty/student ratio for associate degrees programs of 1faculty to 15.6 students.
 - Classroom space to accommodate long blocks of didactic time.
 - Healthcare clinical space for student experiences is scarce.

Recommendation to Board:

Support completion of a feasibility study after the accreditation/self-study process is completed. The feasibility study will allow us to determine whether or not we can grow the program and if we do, in which ways the growth will occur and with what resources. Data gathered during self-study as well as areas of strength and improvement will be used as part of the feasibility study.

Discussion:

- Dr. Campbell asked how students are applying that we cannot serve.
Answer: 1400 are waiting for placement but they understand when they come into the pool that the wait time is approximately three semesters. Each semester they are requested to re-up their application.
- Mr. Walker questioned the reasons why students need to wait.
Answer: Lack of physical facilities, lack of classrooms, labs, and qualified nursing faculty due to higher salaries in service industries, lack clinical experience for nursing students to participate in. Administration has looked into holding classes off-time and on Saturday and Sunday. Although simulation is used, it does not take the place of real-time experiences.

MCCCD Data Center – Darrel Huish

Focus: Discussion to Answer Board Concerns.

Discussion: Vice Chancellor Darrel Huish expressed appreciation for this opportunity to present information related to questions and responses regarding the proposed New Data Center and Disaster Recovery Facility. Included in the packet he provided were the following documents:

- Responses to comments and questions submitted by Governing Board Member Randolph Lumm.

- Copy of the June 26, 2007 Consent Agenda Action Item: Acquisition of a 7,191 square foot building in Scottsdale, Az for use as a remote data center.
- Copy of the June 24, 2008 consent Agenda Action Item and supporting documentation: Conceptual Approval for Remodeling the District's New Data Center and Disaster Recovery Facility.
- Copy of the November 25, 2008 Consent Agenda Action Item and supporting documentation: Development of Airpark Data Center.
- Copy of the April 28, 2009 Consent Agenda Action Item (pulled from the Agenda): CMAR Selection and GMP Award for Remodeling the New Data Center and Disaster Recovery Facility.

Mr. Huish explained that the overriding factor for this new facility was to reduce a small but significant risk because we do not have a second data center. If we had problems with the District Office Building, a second data center would not be available. Although he was grateful that there is a small risk, however, he questioned what would life be like if this happened. Alternative sites were explored at the colleges or with outside service providers. (Copy of Mr. Huish's written responses are included with these minutes.)

Vice Chancellor of Business Services Debra Thompson added comments regarding the annual financial statements audit conducted by the State Auditor General. The last three audits have included findings that MCCCCD lacks a backup system.

Governing Board Member Debra Pearson commented that the Auditor General's Office and State Legislature view this as a responsibility to the taxpayers with reference to how business and technology are being addressed. With a system this big, when you consider the cost to reenter data and recover paper, it would a tremendous undertaking.

Chancellor Glasper stated that historically South Mountain Community College was used to house records as best practices indicated they should be offsite. He commented that they awaited the Board's review of responses to questions asked. What appeared to the Board as "piecemealing" was the process being followed in compliance with the District's Capital Plan. The first phase involved buying land with capital money and then the building would follow. Mr. Lumm questioned what dollar amount should not be on the consent agenda. Mrs. Pearson commented that all consent agenda items that do not complete a project should be framed as part of a total project. Mr. Walker asked if this would be one site that would have all data for all colleges. Answer was yes.

MCCCD Bookstores – Debra Thompson

Focus: Bookstore Operations

Discussion:

Vice Chancellor Thompson informed the Board Members that the recent submittal of an action item for approval of a new contract for bookstore management services had brought forth questions about two issues surrounding bookstores – contract management versus self operation and the national issues relating to escalating textbook costs. Since the contract term with the current bookstore contractor is nearly up, the process for an RFP was started to secure a new bookstore contract for the period July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2020. Ms. Thompson referenced Exhibit A of the handout provided (copy included with these minutes) which included more background on the process.

Ms. Thompson further stated that over twenty years ago, MCCCD undertook a privatization process in which the operations of the college stores were outsourced. Reasons at that time included actual monetary losses in the bookstore operations, issues of poor quality of service, outdated physical locations, fixtures and equipment and the passage of a State Constitutional provision on expenditure limitations that made bookstore sales count as part of those calculations. The contract management of bookstores has served the district well in that they are professionally operated with well-trained and supported management and staff, as well as up-to-date technology to support the operations. The service is provided at no cost to the district and there is a contract management and revenue sharing arrangement that currently yields \$3.3 million per year which serves as a source of funding for student scholarships. The contracted bookstores eliminate the need for the District to employ approximately 120 additional employees at a cost exceeding \$2.27 million per year. In addition, textbooks do not need to be purchased nor is there a need for specialized computer systems or capital funds for renovations and improvements to bookstores and their fixtures.

Mr. McIntier explained that the selection of Follett came as a result of looking at a mixture of checking references, percent of commission, experience, and a full list of scoring criteria. In response as to whether the decision was influenced by the invitation to the dinner hosted by Follett during the AACC Conference, the response stated that no members of the scoring committee were invited. The annual dinner includes invitations to all 1200 colleges across the country. An average 25% margin is typical for textbooks sold. This is a standard markup. Faculty decide what textbooks are going to be used.

New Textbook Dollar Breakdown:

32.2 cents goes to publisher's paper, printing, editorial costs
7.0 cents goes to publisher's income
10.9 cents goes to college store personnel
1.0 cents goes to freight expense
7.3 cents goes to college store operations
4.5 cents goes to college store income

- 15.4 cents goes to publisher's marketing costs
- 10.0 cents goes to publisher's general and administrative costs
- 11.7 cents goes to author income

In order to reduce textbook costs to our students, the re-adoption of the same textbooks from semester to semester is encouraged whenever possible. This creates a marketplace for students to sell their used books and used books are less expensive to the student than new. Bundled textbook packages are also discouraged because there is no resale value of these bundles, removing an opportunity for the student to recoup a portion of their costs. The financial benefits to MCCCDC is \$50.5 million over ten years in revenue. \$1 million is donated to the MCCCDC Foundation spread out over ten years, as well as annual general scholarships, and textbook scholarships.

Mrs. Pearson asked how what the percent of low income students there were and what percent of books was held back for low income students. The response was that this was not currently anything that was done. With reference to a question asked by Ms. Clark regarding e-books, the answer was that 20% of students still want a paper copy.

A request was made that this action item be approved at the May 26 Governing Board Meeting. A ten year contract allows for justification of expenses and helps build a good relationship.

Report on Federal Lobbyists – Bernie Ronan

Focus: Costs and outcomes for last two years

Mr. Ronan provided cost numbers and resultant fundings associated with congressionally directed funds for FY08 and FY09. These included the following:

FY2008

Cost: \$120,000

Outcomes:

ACE (SMCC, PC, EMCC)	\$1,000,000
Bilingual Nursing (GWCC/SMCC)	\$341,000
Online Nursing Recertification Program (MCC)	\$121,000

Enhanced relationships with Congressional representatives and federal agencies

FY 2009

Cost: \$120,000

Outcomes:

ACE (SMCC, PC, EMCC)	\$119,000
Bilingual Nursing (GWCC/SMCC)	\$285,000

Online Nursing Recertification Program (MCC) \$951,000

Enhanced relationships with Congressional representatives and federal agencies

Mr. Ronan commented that mischief occurs with earmarks – one votes in favor and another votes down. Would be ideal if we could leverage support. ROI: substantial earmarks fairly specific and help start programs that are of interest to the states and Congress. He stated that in future the federal lobbyist should be more strategic, for example:

- Five colleges in the East Valley would have Veteran's benefits. Congressman Mitchell has submitted these as an earmark. Solicit veterans and assist.
- Emergency Preparedness – working on developing this.
- Aggressively pursuing grants.
- In 2005 HR724 submitted by Congressman Ed Pastor where the Federal Government would match state funds on nursing initiative. Programs have grown significantly. Need to get money into Arizona partnerships so that nursing education colleges can grow their programs. Hope to pursue more deliberately relationships with Federal agencies. Significant level of support from President. Community colleges person has been appointed on a federal level.

President Clark commented that there is a need to be as strategic as possible on federal funding. Identify additional things that should be done but money will not be there. Mrs. Pearson commented that she was surprised that the price was only \$120 for these power gems. The increase to \$140,000 take us to end of the year. She stated that they need to be there so that community college can be looked out for.

Maricopa Mission and Vision – Colleen Clark

Focus: Discussion

Discussion: President Clark opened the discussion on mission and vision as it being a good time because of the RFP Third Party Study to find out what was relevant at this time, what the needs were, and what was important to our state. Chancellor Glasper remarked that areas have expanded over time, going from university transfer, workforce development, and general education to developmental education aimed at serving our population and maintaining a certain service level. The last two areas of civic responsibility and global engagement were included in the last five years. In terms of the commitment to vision and mission, time was spent at each college going over what they felt was important and necessary. The vision and mission has changed because some would believe workforce development was not necessary and that education and development were things they wanted to focus on because they wanted to be known as a transfer college. Mr. Walker stated he didn't see a need to delineate global engagement because as a community college if we

were interested in university transfer, that one term seemed unnecessary. Mr. Lumm remarked that when we look at the term “global engagement” we are looking at a broader vision, a global vision. Mr. Walker indicated he would like more emphasis on Americanism and the Constitution. President Clark responded that global engagement was important, as well as interdependence. Dr. Campbell commented that global engagement takes place when we are interacting with people all over the world. Religion says that God created everyone to be equal. Global engagement can teach us to live together and eliminate wars. Mrs. Pearson remarked that when we look into different elements of vision/mission and how they have grown and changed, we associate a lot of those components with changes in society. In this global engagement, it does not say don’t global education or indoctrination, it says engagement. It does not say don’t teach Americanism. Today’s young people have relationships with others around the world – that is global engagement. Mr. Walker asked if another bullet point could be added referring to U.S. greatness. President Clark indicated that the point was not whether the U.S. has achieved greatness but how MCCCDC engages in globalization. She asked the Chancellor to explain how civic responsibility expressed itself on a day to day basis. The Chancellor stated that there is an attempt to demonstrate to students and employees to be aware that there should be a certain level of civic participation that is expected in the communities we serve, i.e., voting, volunteering, etc. Twenty students that participated in SPPF have worked with students on their respective campuses on voter registration, public elections, volunteering, etc. From financial perspective and staffing, Alberto Olivas is primary staff. Mr. Ronan indicated that they have been leveraging activities that are occurring throughout the district. Referencing Mr. Lumm’s comments on global engagement, this has to do with how involvement in the life of your community is demonstrated on curriculum. We have been doing a lot of straight-forward things that would be classified as citizenship student life outreach such as voter registration drives, forums on campuses, faculty on colleges who have an interest in this are of civic engagement. He would describe this as yeast in the bread of Maricopa and trying to leaven the organization. Would argue that from marketing perspective this gives us an interesting competitive advantage in that it appeals to some students. They have worked with the Maricopa County Recorder’s Office, the Secretary of State’s Office, community advisory meetings twice a year for each constituency group, making arrangements for a Native American Summit, and also a new initiative “Envisioning the 21st Century Community College” which asks citizens what the community colleges ought to do. Mrs. Pearson stated that we need to focus on civic responsibility. Our founding fathers were always pushing civic involvement. New wave is to become more engaged and responsible, and everyone that works for this district is in a civics position. President Clark asked if civic responsibility/service learning was embedded into courses? Chancellor Glasper indicated that when he evaluates the Presidents, he asks them to demonstrate how they incorporate this part of the mission into their performance on a daily basis. The Maricopa service learning program is tops in the country. We are infusing globalization into the curriculum since many students are not able to travel. Dr. Glasper commented

that as the mission statement was looked at and last added to, it is important to know that we are still making choices and if we get a point where we have fewer resources, the litmus test will be the mission statement. As we begin to look at what has the most impact, globalization and civic participation have a high level of importance.

SIS Update – Darrel Huish

Focus: Biggest successes, biggest failures

Vice Chancellor Darrel Huish's comments followed the bullet points listed below:

- Maricopa's SIS system has been operational since Feb 19, 2008. This implementation date was the end of our preparations and the culmination of a lot of hard work – however, it really marks the beginning of the project to serve our students and faculty with this comprehensive new system. With the view that our achievement with the SIS system will be an ongoing process, we offer the following discussion points:

Areas of SIS achievement that we need to MAINTAIN at current level

- Maricopa has a single student system as a foundation for student services
- SIS has been able to handle enrollment growth within Maricopa
- SIS has been reliable and available since go-live on Feb 19, 2008
- Students' lives have been simplified with single system services such as the ability to search for classes at all colleges simultaneously
- Students able to perform many services on their own over the internet (21 hours a day, 7 days a week)
- Faculty have online access to rosters and grading
- Quality of our data has become more consistent
- Software being kept up to date with prompt updates as provided to Maricopa by PeopleSoft
- A District-wide commitment to service from our excellent professional staff (Front-line and technical; Colleges and District Office)

Areas of SIS achievement that need improvement

- Time it takes to develop and implement needed enhancements
- Timely resolution of help desk tickets
- Ability to handle complexity and volume of financial aid
- Duplicated student records in the system requiring manual workarounds
- Amount of time it takes to do a standard process within the system
- Ability to move towards consistent business processes across the District
- Reliance on manual processes over automated processes

- Ability for SIS and HR systems to interface properly
- Level of confusion related to using a large and new system
- Training has not been timely to promote knowledgeable use of the system
- Ability to attract and retain qualified personnel

It is important to take note that 25 years of history had to be processed in the merging of the ten colleges. Processes take longer than the Legacy Program. This will be an on-going process to fix these issues. You are never finished. Rules change and programs must be brought into compliance. Mr. Lumm asked if financial aid requests had to go through one system or through ten systems. Front line helps initially. If system related it is referred to District Office. There are multiple entry points; system is being modified. PeopleSoft sends updates for compliance or for special enhancements. Dr. Glasper commented that we were running systems and now we need to streamline the process, training, and output of financial aid. There is need to give people more access. Enrollment management has gone from ten systems to one system and we will have to change how we do things. NAU & ASU are on same system – one student ID. All matriculating to one system. We cannot compare with any other system because we are largest in the country. Our priority would be financial aid. We also have financial aid applications

Discussion of High Impact Service Plan – Donna Schober

Focus: Copies of printed plan, description, and comparison to various customer service plans

Discussion: Donna Schober provided an overview of the High Impact Customer Service Initiative. She also provided handouts that included the following:

- A message from the Chancellor after the Program's introduction to all District Office employees;
- A copy of the High Impact Service Standards;
- A High Impact Standard Discussion Guide;
- Potential ideas to support the initiative on a short-term and longer term basis;
- A list of existing workshops which support High Impact Service
- A sample Bravo Award
- A sample Leadership Tip of the Month Card
- A copy of the Maricopa Steward webpage
- An Action Plan and Progress Report from the Division of Academic and Student Affairs
- A listing of examples of the Colleges' Customer Service Initiatives

Dr. Glasper explained that at the District Office, individuals needed to be role models in customer service and work with other to help them achieve at higher standards. Mr. Lumm expressed a desire to have the project adopted as a body

and not as individuals. Mrs. Pearson expressed an interest in having further definition of terms.

Definitions of Effectiveness, Efficiency, Affordability, and Stewardship – Dr. Glasper

Focus: Discussion

Dr. Glasper made reference to a handout listing the terms: Effectiveness, Efficiency, Affordability, and Public Stewardship. Listed below each term were definitions as they pertained to Maricopa, as well as examples of reports that provided measurements of these terms. The following information was provided on the handout:

Effectiveness – A college is effective when its results match its mission, but both mission and results must also match stakeholder needs.

- The Monitoring Report = good example.
- Information about results based on indicators established to measure performance or results related to our Mission.
- Board establishes Mission and indicators

Efficiency – The effective operation of a program or service as measured by comparison of institutional outcomes with cost (as in time and money); also, expenditure activities are produced without waste.

- Tuition Waiver Report = good example. Many studies leading to reports are completed for programs and services throughout the District Office and Colleges to determine efficiency.
- A study is conducted that includes measuring outcomes (e.g., number of tuition waivers provided) and reviews whether waivers were properly utilized and examines processes and procedures and legal authority.
- Conclusions are drawn and recommendations for improvement may be made.
- Audit reports are also good examples because waste may be identified and then recommendations are made for improvements.
- Another example – Centralization vs. Decentralization: Institutional Effectiveness Office may be able to provide data and information for all 10 Colleges and avoid the need for 10 people to do the same thing.
- The potential Enrollment Management Study is another example – best practices can be determined.

Affordability – Stakeholder relationships must be maintained within the limits of cost and available resources.

- The decision to raise tuition or not is a good example.
- The Governing Board determines stakeholders can afford to pay a certain amount of tuition and the College District can afford to maintain quality educational programs and services with a certain amount of resources.

Public Stewardship – The efficient and effective use of resources as the Maricopa Community Colleges prepare students for their role as productive world citizens. As caretakers of public resources that have been entrusted to us, we are fully accountable to the constituents that we serve.

- Blue Ribbon Panel recommendations identified improvements.
- Mandatory training for all employees in public stewardship, public sector employment, ethics, etc. helps to ensure accountability.
- Bond Rating Companies.
- Accreditation process.
- Students are provided with quality faculty; diverse curricula; study abroad programs, student services, etc.
- Faculty and Staff are provided with professional development opportunities to help in

Discussion : Mrs. Pearson asked if any external people were part of the groups that contribute to the measurement, studies and audits. Dr. Glasper responded that they do work with external groups such as the Governor's Office, Major Taxpayers, as well full disclosure and access by going on-line.

Communication Survey Responses – Colleen Clark

Focus: Discussion

Discussion: President Clark shared the findings of the employee Communications Survey conducted in April. It was her desire that the findings from this survey would help us all as we work together to effectively share information.

With about 500 employees, representing all employee groups, responding, here's what the survey found:

1. Communication from leadership at the college/site level is:

excellent	33%
good	33%
fair	22%
poor	12%

2. Communication from the District about initiatives, programs and plans is:

excellent	18%
good	42%
fair	28%
poor	12%

3. Ideas for improving communication included many ideas. Some common themes:

- Managers must be held accountable to make sure employees at all levels are informed of initiatives, programs, and operations.
- Do not hold information among favored individuals/groups/managers.

- Employees need to be brought together more for regular, even if brief, meetings that provide for interaction with people outside of their department or direct area.
- Provide opportunities for "campus conversations."

4. What you would like to know more about:

- The budget and college/site proposed cuts
- The review process for measuring program success and making program cuts
- What is being discussed at CEC and other cabinet or leadership meetings, including outcomes
- Understanding more about the function, role and value of the District Office
- Our strategic plan. The specific vision of leadership and how the work of employees relates to the strategic plan.

5. Your preferred mode of communication for receiving information from the District and college/site regarding operational/business matters:

most favored	e-mail
highly acceptable	e-mail and in person meetings
adequate	department/division/college meetings and video messages
not preferred	audio podcasts

6. Employees are provided opportunities for focused feedback to offer suggestions about how operations and processes can be improved:

Always	16.5%
Often	28.5%
Randomly	43.5%
Never	11.6%

7. Employees who have evidence that their ideas are taken seriously:

Many expressed that they do have evidence of that their ideas are taken seriously. However, the majority of employees who participated in the survey expressed that their ideas are not encouraged or taken seriously when offered.

8. Ideas for improving employee feedback on operations and process improvements included:

- More opportunities for anonymous ways to provide feedback

- Process improvement protocols that are leadership supported including ways to place value on those who have the courage to say what others fear to say.
 - Open forums with support for respectful dialogue rules and holding people accountable for results.
 - Response to feedback including meaningful solutions, results and/or action.
 - Inter-departmental meetings involving employees not just managers.
9. Some of the biggest concerns about employee roles include:
- Job stability.
 - That employees are valued and treated as such.
 - Working in a positive environment that is free from fear of retaliation.
 - Holding employees accountable for their actions or inaction
 - Better communication from leadership and managers.
10. Some of the biggest concerns about the District include:
- Quality leadership.
 - Politics versus merit.
 - Operational efficiencies – using resources wisely and eliminating waste
 - Funding to keep programs
 - The role of the Governing Board and what we can expect as employees

President Clark also shared that a survey in which students will be invited to complete this spring would ask about their experience with financial aid, advising, and registration processes as well as their classroom experience. Details about how to participate will be forthcoming and she hoped everyone would support and encourage students to help identify things that work and processes upon which we can improve.

Mrs. Pearson commented that she hoped the approach would be done in a positive, professional manner, rather than just allowing negative, nasty people to just complain. If they were going to complain, then she challenged them to offer solutions, and not just allowed to be acidic. Mr. Lumm stated it felt this would be a good forum for discussion.

Administrative Costs – Debra Thompson

Focus: Discussion

Discussion: Vice Chancellor Thompson stated that on February 3 she provided a copy of the initial study on administrative cost reduction analysis. She

indicated that consensus emerged that the District should work to reduce the share of administrative costs, with a maximum goal of 10%. Ms. Thompson provided the following overview: (A copy of the full analysis/study was distributed and a copy is included with these minutes).

Analysis Overview

Like other colleges and universities in the nation, the Maricopa Community Colleges budget by functional categories pursuant to definitions established by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO); NACUBO established functions in order to allow national comparisons. In addition, postsecondary institutions receiving federal funds must annually report expenditures to the U. S. Department of Education using the NACUBO functional categories. These definitions are attached in Appendix A.

Concern over limited resources necessitates decisions that will maximize available funds to direct services to students, including instruction, academic and student support. In difficult economic times such as now, this concern deepens. The Maricopa Community Colleges should operate with an administrative structure necessary to provide appropriate stewardship of all of its operations and dedicate as much budget as possible to direct service delivery.

At a February 3, 2009 retreat of the Maricopa Community Colleges' Governing Board, discussion ensued about the proportion of the district's budget that is committed to administrative costs. Consensus emerged that the district should work to reduce the share of administrative costs. Furthermore, a maximum goal of 10% was discussed. In order to further examine the potential for and impacts of this reduction, it was decided that the administration would prepare a study for Board review two months from the February retreat date (April 3, 2009).

Key questions to explore are what is meant by administrative expenditures, how such costs relate to other components of the budget as well as the overall budget and potential impacts of reductions in administrative expenditures. The following report sections provide further perspective on administrative and other expenditures, how a 10% limit on Administrative Expenditures against the entire General Fund budget might be achieved and impacts of such a change.

Administrative Costs and the Total Budget of the Maricopa Community Colleges

Maricopa's budget has totaled approximately \$1.4 - \$1.5 billion for the past several years. This total budget is spread across 4 funds: three operating budget funds including the General Fund, Auxiliary

Fund and Restricted Fund and one capital budget fund, the Plant Fund. Appendix B provides information on the way the funds are used and distribution of funds.

Appendix C shows the distribution of the proposed budget by function by unit for FY09-10 as of the April budget. In terms of operational impacts, the use of funds for administrative purposes has far reaching impacts over the Maricopa Community Colleges' ability to achieve the goals supported by funds budgeted in *all* funds, inclusive of the General, Auxiliary, Restricted and Plant Funds. As General Fund administrative costs are examined, we first will frame the discussion in terms of the District's entire budget: while Maricopa budgets across funds, respective of accounting standards that apply to governmental entities, the activities accounted for in each fund do not contain all costs needed to support budgeted activity. In essence, the funds do not exist in a silo, separated from other activities or expenditures. In fact, when General Fund Administrative expenditures are examined in the context of the total budget, the share of the budget for General Fund administrative expenses declines considerably (from 11% for just the General Fund in FY09-10 compared to 4.8% for all funds).

Event Debriefing – Debra Pearson

Focus: Discussion of Information Received at Various Events/Conference
Attended by Board Members and Administration

Discussion: Mrs. Pearson indicated that she would like have discussion from anyone that has been sent to a conference so everyone gets the information that was presented. She also commented that she would like to have the Chancellor provide more detail on topics covered in his Chancellor Newsletter. Dr. Campbell agreed that when multiple board members go to a conference, everyone should attend different sessions. Dr. Glasper indicated he is working with CED on developing an intake form. There is a need to establish a level of trust that there is value to the District or Board to attend the various conferences and workshops.

Chancellor Newsletter – Dr. Glasper

Focus: In-depth information on topics covered in Chancellor Newsletter

Agenda Preparation & Dissemination – Debra Pearson

Focus: Timely preparation and dissemination of agenda and meetings materials to Board Members

Mrs. Pearson voiced concern about her desire to be very involved in digging into things and meeting people and the timeline of getting items just two hours before a meeting being unacceptable. She stated that her position was that all

materials should be delivered five days prior to a meeting and nothing should be so critical that it could not follow that policy. She further stated there should be no amendments to the agenda. Although she recognized that 24 hours was legal for posting of the agenda, everyone should be invited to all meetings.

Adjournment of Study Session: The study session adjourned at 8:35 p.m. Board Members went into an executive session immediately following the study session. Item for discussion was:

1. Discussion or consultation with attorneys of the Governing Board in order to consider its position and instruct its attorneys regarding pending or contemplated litigation --A.R.S. Section 38-431.03 A.4 – General Litigation Update

Randolph Elias Lumm
Governing Board Secretary