



MARICOPA  
COMMUNITY  
COLLEGES®

MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
GOVERNING BOARD WORK SESSION  
FEBRUARY 8, 2011

MINUTES

A Work Session of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was scheduled to be held at 5:30 p.m. at the Rio Salado Conference Center, 2323 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Tempe, Arizona to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

PRESENT

GOVERNING BOARD

Randolph Lumm, President  
Doyle Burke, Secretary,  
Debra Pearson, Member  
Don Campbell, Member  
Dana Saar, Member

ADMINISTRATION

Rufus Glasper  
Maria Harper-Marinick  
Debra Thompson  
Steve Creswell for George Kahkedjian  
Nikki Jackson  
Steve Helfgot  
Anna Solley  
Joyce Elsner  
Ernie Lara  
Todd Simmons for Chris Bustamante  
Linda Lujan  
Jan Gehler  
Paul Dale  
Shouan Pan  
Gene Giovannini  
Absent: Velvie Green

**CALL TO ORDER** The information session was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

**Welcome and Overview**

The work session was called to order by Executive Vice Chancellor Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick who welcomed those in attendance for this Work Session on Outcomes, Priorities for the Maricopa Community Colleges, and framework for moving forward on the Monitoring Report to be prepared later this year. She informed those in attendance that Maricopa Manager of Public Stewardship, Teresa Toney, would provide a reminder of the definitions of the various Board Policies, and Chancellor Glasper would provide context for the conversation to be held based on the national agenda for completion in development metrics and what was happening in our state which would help frame the conversation.

Teresa Toney came forward and explained that as a result of working with the consultant Bill Charney in looking at the current governance model and making recommendations towards transitioning to a more traditional model, we wanted to spend some time this evening laying the

groundwork as to what exacting is being referred to pertaining to Board Policies. Ms. Toney remarked that under the Board Policies, there are four primary categories of board policy types and they were:

1. **Outcomes:** Policies that determine benefits that will occur for the Board’s constituents. These are prioritized and reflected in the budget.
2. **Management Limitations:** Policies that provide the prudent and ethical boundaries of acceptable Chancellor acts, practices, and circumstances.
3. **Board-Staff Relations:** Policies that describe the Board’s relationship and accountability linkage (generally through the Chancellor).
4. **Governance Process:** Policies that clarify the Board’s own job and rules, including how it plans to connect with others.

Ms. Toney went on to explain that the MCCCDC Policy Governance can be depicted in four quadrants (see below). Quadrants include the Governance Process (Board Means), Ends (Intended Organizational Results), Board-Management Delegation (Board Means), and Management Limitations (Staff Means) (formerly referred to as executive duties and responsibilities). In tonight’s discussion the left hand side of the quadrants would not be discussed. The Ends included University Transfer Education and General Education, Workforce Development Continuing/Community Education, and Civic Responsibility and Global Engagement. Management Limitations include: Treatment of Students, Treatment of Faculty and Staff, Interactions with Public and other Constituents, Financial Condition and Activities, Asset Protection, Financial Planning and Budgeting, Staff Compensation and Benefits, Communication and Counsel to the Board, Operational Succession Planning, Public Safety, College Course Materials, and International Education.



Mr. Charney made certain proposals and this evening, the materials would be explored to determine whether or not all categories and outcomes that we would like to have replaced and benefits that we would like to have delivered to our stakeholders. One of the first things that we

have determined that we would like to pull out is the developmental education and later on in the discussion other outcomes would be considered for removal or changes.

Chancellor Glasper came forward to provide the context for the conversation this evening. He stated that we now need every young American not only to complete high school, but to obtain a post-secondary credential or degree with currency in the labor market. Most Americans now seem to have gotten the message that a high school education is no longer sufficient to secure a path to the middle class. (Pathways to Prosperity Project). In a single generation, the US has fallen from first place to twelfth place in college graduations for young adults (College Board July 2010). The unemployment rate for people who have never gone to college is more than double what it is for those who have gone to college (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics July 2010). By the end of the decade, eight out of ten new jobs will require post-secondary education (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics December 2009). Jobs requiring at least an associate's degree are projected to grow twice as fast as jobs requiring no college experience. We will not fill those jobs on our shores, without the training offered by community colleges (President Obama).

The Chancellor continued by stating that there are six million Americans in community colleges. President Obama announced a goal of 5 million additional community-college graduates by 2020. Middle school students overwhelmingly aspire to go to college. College enrollment has been steadily rising over the past decade. The problem is completion: nearly half of those who enroll leave without a degree (Pathways to Prosperity Project). National Initiatives include:

- National Governors Association
  - Complete to Compete
    - Recommendations on the common higher education measures that states should collect and report publicly.
    - Collecting and reporting metrics at the campus, system, and state levels is a necessary first step for states as they seek to improve completion rates and productivity in higher education.
- Democracy's Colleges: A Call to Action: to increase student completion rates by 50 percent over the next decade
- American Association of Community Colleges
  - Voluntary Framework for Accountability
    - The VFA will result in more accurate ways to measure community college performance. Initially, the VFA performance indicators will assess effectiveness in the areas of college readiness, student progress and completion, and job preparation and employment.

State Efforts: We know that five of the top 10 fastest growing careers will require an associate's degree, bachelor's degree or higher. Yet only 25 percent of Arizona adults hold a bachelor's degree. It is critical to our state's future that more students enter college, complete degrees and qualify to assume positions in competitive industries that will foster a healthier Arizona for decades to come. (Governor Brewer)

Arizona ranks

- **50th** in State-by-State college-going rate
- **47th** in Percentage of Adults (ages 25-34) with a High School Diploma
- **35th** in Degree Attainment for 2-year or 4-year Diplomas

State Efforts include:

- Getting Ahead (Lumina) (Half million dollar grant to help capitalize initiatives)
- The Arizona Higher Education Enterprise- ABOR (new restructuring proposed by the three state universities)
- Vision for Community Colleges

The University of Arizona has been given permission to cap enrollment at 40,000 students and they are currently at 38,000 students and can only increase their enrollment through out-of-state students and if they cap it, then students from Arizona would be unable to attend of the UofA. NAU would be given authority to be on other educational sites (such as MCCCDC campuses and Yavapai). Due to the lack of the State Board for the Community Colleges, there is no collective vision for the ten community college districts in the state. Maricopa has taken the initiative to bring the ten districts together to talk about a vision/framework for the community colleges and take our vision, accountability and proposed metrics and map them with the vision that ABOR has adopted and align ourselves rather than going in ten different directions.

Referencing Reforming Arizona’s higher Education System to serve more students, meet workforce needs and realizing economic success, Maricopa is involved more so than others. The goals of this “Getting Ahead” initiative are:

- Broader geographic access for student convenience
- Seamless credit transfer
- Lower-cost options through campus partnership
- Improved coordination, planning, and governance – joint council of Presidents that meet regularly and talk about agendas that will move the community colleges along collectively. There are two governance models in the state – the ABOR and the community colleges. Because of lack of funding there was an inability to pass a community college governance bill last year and unless Maricopa wants to assume the funding for the next 5-seven years, the Chancellor doubted that there will be a community college governance model soon.

The Chancellor then spoke about the progress made in higher education from 2007-2009:

Total enrollment (CC)	+ 11%
Total enrollment (U)	+ 6%
Four-year graduation rate (CC)	+ 4.5%
Community college transfers	+ 8.3%
Freshman retention (U)	+ 1.5%
Six-year graduation rate (U)	+ 2.4%
Bachelor degrees awarded	+ 8.8%
Associate degrees awarded	+ 6.9%

Many would say that the progress in Arizona has escalated and it is recognized by Lumina as having a model that is working, but how long can we sustain this given the lack of funding. He stated the public universities in Arizona are focusing on educational attainment through access, academic excellence, discovery and creativity, and serving the citizens of Arizona in order to provide board access to innovative, world-class university education to all segments of Arizona’s society. They are looking to increase bachelor’s degrees to adults to 30%. Bachelor’s degrees produced annual are 36,000. The goals and recommendations for the 2020 Vision are: Productivity, new compact with the state of Arizona, enhancing enterprise efficiency and effectiveness, tuition and cost of access, financial aid, privatization, and administrative changes.

The themes and trends for the evening’s consideration because they are important to the Board will be access (how long can we keep our doors open), persistence, student success, completion and accountability.

Vision: Arizona community colleges seek to collaborate with educational, business, and community partners to dramatically increase the number of Arizonans who achieve their postsecondary education and training goals, complete a degree or certificate, and/or transfer to a university

Arizona Community Colleges: Areas of Focus

Access: Broad access to high-quality education and training for all Arizonans at times and places that are convenient for learners. Retention: Improve the retention of learners through the achievement of their education or training goals. Completion: Greater completion and transfer.

**CONVERSATION:**

What is important to Maricopa, what should be the Priorities, what are the Outcomes that the Board will consider for adoption? A few handouts would help guide the conversation: Set of questions on Proposed Outcomes, a matrix of the proposed framework and draft outcomes from February 8, and finally the work that Mr. Charney presented to the Board. Dr. Harper-Marinick asked that everyone review the following matrix and consider if they were the right priorities for MCCCDC and areas of our mission that are wanted:

MCCCDC Mission Areas	Primary Focus Areas: National, State, & Local		
	Access	Student Success: Retention/Completion	Stewardship (Accountability)
General Education and University Transfer			
Workforce Development			
Developmental Education			
Community, Civic, and Global Engagement			

Discussion:

Ms. Toney indicated that outcome statements included ideas from the five community forums held. Mrs. Pearson commented that there was no evidence that this was from any long term research. Ms. Toney responded that we don’t have to accept but recommendations should be reviewed, including information gathered from our own staff. Dr. Harper-Marinick indicated that three-to-five areas of accountability were listed, and we could keep current outcomes, accept what Mr. Charney provided, or adopt framework proposed tonight. There was no opportunity to discuss on January 11. Mr. Lumm commented that adopted five or six major areas were adopted and we did not have three extra ones that were added later on. Dr. Harper-Marinick stated that

community colleges are the only ones that offer developmental ed. Mrs. Pearson commented that we should move away from developmental ed. Mr. Lumm indicated that public sentiment in the last couple of weeks recommended that developmental ed students should pay a fee due to lack of resources. Getting younger students. If our focus becomes university transfer, we will lose a significant part of our population. Mr. Saar stated if we don't do the developmental ed, this would happen.

### **Conclusion and Questions**

Dr. Harper-Marinick thanked everyone for their input and conversation. Dr. Glasper thanked the board for their participation as we move for adoption. This is an opportunity for change. If we feel there is an opportunity, need to give some framework that will to assess for success or failure. This is an opportunity look at access, retention, and completion. Whatever the board adopts then the colleges need to adopt it at the local level. Make sure that questions they might have. Then metrics will make more sense. Mr. Lumm thanked everyone to be focus dialogue on goals and vision and student success. Categories adequate to our needs. Students have no right to fail and right to succeed. Dr. Harper-Marinick stated that once outcomes are adopted then metrics need to be defined. Dr. Glasper commented that by July 1 the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Initiatives will go away and we will be immersed in discussions taking place. Nomenclature will change. Dr. Harper-Marinick displayed a slide that showed how the metrics related to outcomes (see PowerPoint page 36). The Monitoring Report will provide metrics for outcomes that will be adopted. Ms. Toney explained that full policy changes would be provided at the February 22 meeting and then metrics would be developed. The next step would be to work with Vice Chancellor's on Management Limitations. Comments should include concerns such as developing partnerships with high schools. Mr. Saar stated that it was the Board's responsibility to get to that level and make sure that students are prepared to enter college.

**Adjournment of Work Session:** The work session adjourned at 7:09 p.m.

---

Doyle W. Burke  
Governing Board Secretary