

**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 13, 2009**

MINUTES

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

PRESENT

GOVERNING BOARD

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

ADMINISTRATION

Rufus Glasper
Pete Kushibab
Gloria Smith

Via Teleconference: Debra Pearson, Member

In Attendance: Approximately 50 members from the public

I. SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

President Clark called the Special Board Meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. Ms. Clark stated that the purpose of the special board meeting was to solidify the criteria (some of which were listed on the action item) for an RFP from a third party who would evaluate the Values of Stewardship of the Maricopa County Community College District. She further stated that the Governing Board was seeking the external evaluation by a third party as it pertained to its Values of Stewardship and Institutional Effectiveness, specifically as the organization pursues its vision, mission, and values (listed below).

Our Vision: A Community of Colleges . . . Colleges for the Community working collectively and responsibly to meet the life-long learning needs of our diverse students and communities.

Our Mission: The Maricopa Community Colleges provide access to higher education for diverse students and communities. We focus on learning through:

- * University Transfer Education
- * General Education
- * Developmental Education
- * Workforce Development

- * Student Development Services
- * Continuing Education
- * Community Education
- * Civic Responsibility
- * Global Engagement

Maricopa Values:

Community - We value all people, our students, our employees, their families, and the communities in which they live and work. We value our global community of which we are an integral part.

Excellence - We value excellence and encourage our internal and external communities to strive for their academic, professional and personal best.

Honesty and Integrity - We value academic and personal honesty and integrity and believe these elements are essential in our learning environment. We strive to treat each other with respect, civility and fairness.

Inclusiveness - We value inclusiveness and respect for one another. We believe that team work is critical, that each team member is important and we depend on each other to accomplish our mission.

Innovation - We value and embrace an innovative and risk-taking approach so that we remain at the forefront of global educational excellence.

Learning - We value lifelong learning opportunities that respond to the needs of our communities and are accessible, affordable, and of the highest quality. We encourage dialogue and the freedom to have an open exchange of ideas for the common good.

Responsibility - We value responsibility and believe that we are each accountable for our personal and professional actions. We are responsible for making our learning experiences significant and meaningful.

Stewardship - We value stewardship and honor the trust placed in us by the community. We are accountable to our communities for the efficient and effective use of resources as we prepare our students for their role as productive world citizens.

Major variables of interest in this RFP and subsequent evaluation are:

- 1) Budget Reduction for FY 10
- 2) Cost benefit analysis in consolidating positions or programs
- 3) Personnel infrastructure
- 4) Residential Faculty agreements

- 5) Adjunct faculty agreements
- 6) Scales of Economy

Discussion:

Mr. Lumm: His thoughts were that action be taken if the Board desired to solicit an RFP to review the organization to make it a slim, efficient machine. The Board would hire an agency which would report to the Board President and create the Request for Proposal. Then at another board meeting the Board would fill the RFP as opposed to attempting to do everything at today's meeting.

Ms. Clark: Restated the motion made by Mr. Lumm to clarify the action to be taken today in that an agency would be sought to create an RFP to look at Institutional Values and Institutional Effectiveness and then retain a firm that would conduct this evaluation for Maricopa.

Mrs. Pearson requested clarification as to what was being requested: a) an organization that would do the RFP from beginning to end; b) an organization to do just the RFP; c) an organization to do the evaluation?

Ms. Clark: Clarification: We would be hiring an external agency to write the RFP.

Mr. Lumm further clarified that this agency would do the RFP but would not be able to conduct the actual audit itself. The Board needed to ensure that the RFP was well written to include its intentions and deliver a good product.

Dr. Campbell: Expressed concern as to why a proposal was being undertaken to bring someone in to do an audit when the organization has had auditors for many years reviewing records. There has been no evidence that any records have ever been negative or mismanagement of any money that the taxpayers have been providing.

Ms. Clark responded that in recognition of who Maricopa was as an institution and in light of the current economic conditions, it was natural to want to look strategically at the vision, mission and values and how we are stewarding these values to ensure funds are being efficiently. As a new Board the timing was opportune to possibly rethink the direction.

Dr. Campbell further expressed that he could understand evaluation of an organization if there were financial issues such as being in the red but this organization was not in this financial situation. There is no evidence that Maricopa was in the hole and could not see the need to waste taxpayers money to do this.

Ms. Clark expressed appreciation for Dr. Campbell's views but expressed that this was a position that many board members held to evaluate where the institution stood and which the direction the Board desired it might want to go. It was never a bad question to ask if the organization was doing things as effectively as it could and it made sense to look at things strategically and not require being in a deficit to do that.

Mrs. Pearson spoke up and stated that she wanted to eliminate the use of the word “audit” because it was not an “audit.” The reason to request an RFP be done externally is for the purpose of having a third party not as close to the situation and being able to bring in “out of the box” approaches and ideas from someone who has cutting edge information. If the intent was to bring in a new realm of ideas and not be too close and seeped into the traditional way of doing things, the Board should have some of criteria for choosing that agency. This should include why they have been chosen (such as new processes, new ways, education, research that make it a 21st/22nd Century type organization). The bottom line is that there are no models that enable an organization to navigate through the current economic crisis. Traditional ways to navigate the crisis are not going to be applicable. Need to be able to develop criteria that will enable this agency to help our organization change its structure with “out of the box” thinking and give it innovative energy and ideas in an effective manner.

Ms. Clark: We need the RFP and a third party. The RFP will come from a third party. Need to focus on the criteria for the RFP.

Mrs. Pearson: Wanted to confirm that this was not an audit but rather an evaluation of how things have been managed. This organization is who it is because of it has had at its helm and how it has been run. Has trust in the integrity of Dr. Glasper and how the organization has been run. Has had concerns about what the organization can do to survive. Someone to provide ideas

Ms. Clark: Have to establish a baseline. Are looking at moving forward to create new ways of innovation.

Mr. Walker: Expressed that he agreed that a third party is needed to look at our stewardship. He does not see that an audit is needed but need for someone to look at how the organization got where it’s at, how fast it is going, and where we go from here.

Ms. Clark: Re-read the action to be taken: The discussion and action for an RFP from a third party to evaluate the values of the Maricopa County Community College District and today, the Board is meeting to discuss the RFP and what it will look like and how we will obtain the information that we desire to evaluate and bring Maricopa to a new level.

Mrs. Pearson: Does this also includes steps and process as to how there people are selected and what type of timeline it is going to take?

Mr. Lumm moved that the Board approve a motion to go out for an RFP from a third party vendor to develop a proposal with criteria for a third party to conduct an evaluation of the Values of Stewardship.

MOTION NO. 9531

The motion to approve a motion to go out for an RFP from a third party vendor to develop a proposal with criteria for a third party to conduct an evaluation of the Values of Stewardship was

approved by a roll call vote of 3-1-1. (Clark, Lumm, Walker - yes; Campbell – no; Pearson – present).

The vendor who will help sculpt the RFP to review Maricopa's Values of Stewardship should allow for comments from the MCCCCD community but in a timely manner so that the final RFP and action will be completed in time to put a budget together for FY10.

In addition, it is important that the language for the RFP be structured so bidders will include a detailed resume highlighting their:

- Work history with demonstrated experience working with a large and complex organization such as MCCCCD
- Recommendations to other customers and institutional results that show how the vendor's recommendations were implemented and assessed
- Evidence of training/education and practice using new or innovative business methodologies--"out of the box" thinking
- Detailed plans to evaluate what MCCCCD is doing now [and what criteria they will use to assess it]

Chancellor Glasper provided the following parameters pertaining to RFP's.

Procurement Methods

Three methods of procurement are used. The type depends upon the dollar amount and product or service needed.

1. ***Under \$50,000***

Competitive bidding and requests for quotations are used for purchases under \$50,000. The buyer solicits bids or quotations from at least three firms. These Request for Quotations may be done in writing or orally, depending on the dollar amount. The bid is awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder.

***Note: Purchasing transactions are not to be artificially divided or fragmented by the requisitioner to meet the lesser requirements of lower dollar transactions.**

2. ***IFBs***

Purchases **above \$50,000** require competitive sealed bidding. Notices in the form of an Invitation for Bid or IFB, are mailed to vendors on the MCCCCD bid list. A public notice announcing these requirements is printed in the Tribune newspaper. All terms, conditions, and specific needs are listed on the IFB document.

The bids are received by a set date and time and are opened publicly. Pricing and other appropriate information is read aloud. The bid is awarded to the vendor submitting the lowest responsive and responsible bid that conforms to all material aspects of the criteria set forth in the IFB document.

3. ***RFPs***

Sealed proposals are used in the **Request for Proposal, or RFP**, process. RFPs are used to obtain services in which price is only part of the consideration in the

procurement process. RFPs are used to contract for professional services such as architects, engineers, and consultants.

4.

This process involves issuance of an RFP document that outlines the project and MCCCCD needs and solicits responses about experience, background, expertise and creative solutions to the needs of the MCCCCD. Discussions may be held with responsible proposers. These discussions are held for clarification and to ensure full understanding of the proposer's qualifications and understanding of the project. No disclosure of information from proposals offered by competing proposers shall be made. The successful proposer is the professional who best meets the needs of the MCCCCD.

The Board President expressed appreciation for the work of Vice Chancellor Debra Thompson and Chancellor Glasper and stated that this plan was not reactionary but a sober reflection on current business practices in MCCCCD with the idea to be prudent stewards of the community's resources and provide our services to the community in the most cost-effective and innovative manner.

II. ADJOURNMENT OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

The Study Session adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Randolph Elias Lumm
Governing Board Secretary