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MCCCD News Articles (Selected)

MCCCD Football Enters Its Final Season (September 14, 2018)
https://kjzz.org/content/698975/mcccd-football-enters-its-final-season

KJZZ executive demoted after workplace investigation finds ‘thoughtless, sexist’ behavior (September 13, 2018)
https://azc.cc/2CSFuxU

National Faculty Association Investigates MCCCD Over Decision To Eliminate Meet And Confer (September 7, 2018)
https://kjzz.org/content/696236/national-faculty-association-investigates-mcccd-over-decision-to-eliminate-meet-and-confer

‘A chronic problem’: Maricopa Community Colleges still struggling with payroll errors (September 7, 2018)

AAUP Will Investigate Apparent Violations at Maricopa (September 6, 2018)

VIDEO: Major payroll problems at Maricopa Community Colleges (September 5, 2018)

Is Arizona junior college football dead after this season? (August 23, 2018)

Former Glendale CC coach leads fight to save junior college football in Maricopa County (August 17, 2018)

Rio Salado College Employees Cope As New Leadership Works To Address Harassment (August 14, 2018)
https://kjzz.org/content/685874/rio-salado-college-employees-cope-new-leadership-works-address-harassment

KJZZ’s top executive retires after investigation finds he sexually harassed employees (July 26, 2018)
https://azc.cc/2Ndlop
Reaction To KJZZ Sexual Harassment Report (July 26, 2018)
https://kjzz.org/content/676548/reaction-kjzz-sexual-harassment-report

Report Substantiates Sexual Harassment Complaints Against KJZZ Leader (July 26, 2018)
https://kjzz.org/content/675735/report-substantiates-sexual-harassment-complaints-against-kjzz-leader

Community Disunity (July 2018)

Arizona Community College Cuts Football (June 15, 2018)

Díaz: Is MCCCD the victim of a hostile takeover or a conspiracy theory? (May 16, 2018)

Rio Salado College vice president denies allegations of sexual harassment (May 8, 2018)
https://azc.cc/2IlHOiJ

Your Turn: MCCCD governing board still getting it wrong on Meet and Confer. Why? (May 5, 2018)
https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/op-ed/2018/05/05/mcccd-governing-board-wrong-meet-confer/569833002/

Rio Salado College vice president to resign amid allegations of sexual touching, harassment (May 4, 2018)
https://azc.cc/2rnfQ7

Radio Executives at KJZZ Under Investigation (May 4, 2018)

2 Rio Salado College Executives Put on Leave (May 3, 2018)
https://kjzz.org/content/638656/2-rio-salado-college-executives-put-leave

AAUP on Maricopa Shared Governance (April 27, 2018)
Maricopa Community Colleges Consider $1/Credit Tuition Decrease, Adjunct Salary Increase  
(April 13, 2018)  
https://kjzz.org/content/634853/maricopa-community-colleges-consider-1-credit-tuition-decrease-adjunct-salary-increase

Díaz: MCCCD payroll glitch is latest mess for colleges - but there's a quick fix (April 11, 2018)  

Hundreds overpaid or underpaid in Maricopa Community Colleges after payroll system upgrade  
(April 11, 2018)  

Chancellor: MCCCd has challenges. Here's how we're overcoming them (April 7, 2018)  
https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/op-ed/2018/04/07/chancellor-mcccd-has-challenges-heres-how-were-overcoming-them/464448002/

Díaz: MCCCD board just sped up community colleges' collapse (March 14, 2018)  

Maricopa Community Colleges faculty sues governing board (March 9, 2018)  

Maricopa County Community College faculty and student support groups–stunned after MCCCd Governing Board vote to eliminate Residential Faculty Policies and Meet and Confer (March 3, 2018)  

MCCCD Board Eliminates ‘Meet And Confer’ Employee Bargaining Tool (February 28, 2018)  
https://kjzz.org/content/614076/mcccd-board-eliminates-meet-and-confer-employee-bargaining-tool

Players protest Maricopa community colleges' decision to drop football (February 28, 2018)  

MCCCD Board Meeting To Consider Controversial Resolution (February 27, 2018)  
https://kjzz.org/content/613942/mcccd-board-meeting-consider-controversial-resolution
Díaz: Maricopa community colleges are full of bad news, and no one cares (February 26, 2018)

Community College Faculty Upset Over Proposed Policy Change - Audio story (February 21, 2018)
https://kjzz.org/content/610861/community-college-faculty-upset-over-proposed-policy-change

Maricopa Community Colleges Board May Ditch Employee Bargaining Process (February 21, 2018)
https://kjzz.org/content/610929/maricopa-community-colleges-board-may-ditch-employee-bargaining-process

Teachers cry foul, as Maricopa Community College District set to change faculty input process (February 19, 2018)

'It's a sad day': Reaction strong to news of football being cut at Maricopa County community colleges (February 6, 2018)

Maricopa Community Colleges to eliminate football (February 5, 2018)

Maricopa Colleges board president steps down in flap over employee probe (June 1, 2017)

Maricopa Community Colleges probe finds 'serious departmental issues' but no forgery or email monitoring (May 25, 2017)

Employee group alleges document tampering, email monitoring at Maricopa Community Colleges (May 17, 2017)
September 10, 2018

Mr. Eric Reginald Wilson
Napier, Coury & Baillie, P.C.
2525 E. Arizona Biltmore Circle, Suite 135
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Dear Mr. Wilson:

I write to address the public records requests that your firm has propounded to the Maricopa County Community College District, on behalf of the Faculty Executive Council (FEC). As of September 4, 2018, your firm has propounded a total of 39 records requests, with subparts, with each subpart containing numerous search terms on behalf of the FEC. The District has responded to nine of those requests (although some of the responses are partial and still in process). Its response to those nine requests has resulted in the production of more than 10,000 pages, and will undoubtedly required the review of many thousands more pages. Furthermore, a number of requests remain to be fulfilled. The purpose of this letter to explain why the FEC’s records requests constitute an unreasonable administrative burden. In light of the administrative burden imposed by this requests, the District is requiring that the requests be narrowed and prioritized in a fashion that will allow the District to fulfill its obligations under the public records laws in a timely manner while still carrying out its other functions. The District recognizes that you recently prioritized a few of the most recent requests. While it is helpful to know which of the nearly three dozen outstanding requests are most important to the FEC, the District is now requiring the FEC to meaningfully narrow its requests so that it can respond without needlessly consuming scarce resources. When the District receives a narrowed set of prioritized requests, it will resume production. The District is, of course, willing to engage in a dialog to help narrow and better define the records to be produced; we suggest proceeding along the lines now required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which were recently amended to recognize the burden that unrestrained requests for electronically stored information can impose on parties.

The District understands that Arizona’s public records statutes “evince a clear policy favoring disclosure.” *Carlson v. Pima County*, 141 Ariz. 487 (1984). In fact, as explained in more detail below, the District has a division, the Office of Public Stewardship, responsible for responding to public records requests. The District recognizes the obligation of public agencies to be transparent and to provide access to their public records.

While committed to this bedrock principle of democratic government, the District also must also note that even the Arizona Supreme Court has recognized that “sometimes the benefits of public disclosure must yield to the burden imposed on . . . the government itself by disclosure.” *London v. Broderick*, 206 Ariz. 490, ¶ 9 (2003); accord *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. City of Phoenix*, 228 Ariz. 393, ¶ 17 (Ct App. 2011) (“the burden of producing public records can outweigh the public's
interest in inspecting those records”); *Arpaio v. Davis*, 221 Ariz. 116, ¶¶ 21–22, (Ct. App. 2009) (denial of all-inclusive, blanket records request which would have required “unreasonable expenditure of resources and time” to fulfill was not abuse of discretion). The Arizona Supreme Court has established a test for determining whether production poses an unreasonable administrative burden. In making that determination, “a court considers whether the general presumption of disclosure is overcome by:

(1) the resources and time it will take to locate, compile, and redact the requested materials;
(2) the volume of materials requested; and,
(3) the extent to which compliance with the request will disrupt the agency’s ability to perform its core functions. See *London*, 206 Ariz. 490, ¶ 9; *Judicial Watch*, 228 Ariz. 393, ¶ 18; *Arpaio*, 221 Ariz. 116, ¶ 20–22.

At this point, responding to the FEC's many requests constitutes an unreasonable administrative burden. As the following demonstrates, it is taking so much time to respond to FEC requests that the Office of Public Stewardship cannot perform its other functions.

To understand why this is true, it helps to understand the purpose and functions of the Office of Public Stewardship. The District’s Office of Public Stewardship (OPS), which is a division of the Office of General Counsel, is responsible for locating, reviewing, redacting, and producing responsive records. See *District Administrative Regulation 4.15*. In addition to responding to public records requests, the Office of Public Stewardship is responsible for responding to inquiries and complaints made through the Maricopa Concernline, as well as for Citizens’ Ombuds Services, and Employee Ombuds Services. It also administers the District’s Tuition Waiver Program, which includes monitoring the use of waivers by employees, dependents of employees, and non-employees authorized by state statute to attend our colleges on a waiver. It has responsibility for Maricopa governance, which includes maintaining Board policies, the District Administrative Regulations, Employee Policies, and the Common Pages. Collectively, these are the policies which govern the District’s major functions. The administration of these policies includes ensuring that they are consistent with state and federal law, and the Board’s direction, as well as internally consistent and workable. In today’s world of rapidly changing laws and policies, keeping this suite of governing documents up-to-date takes substantial time and attention. The Office has two staff members that provide administrative support for these functions.

Understanding the process of responding to records requests will also help you understand the administrative burden imposed by the numerous requests made by the FEC. The process the OPS follows for responding to records requests, which is governed by law and is substantially similar to that for any other large public agency with significant quantities of highly confidential information, takes time. It begins with identifying a pool of possible custodians and relevant documents. That task alone is time-consuming, given the nature of the requests at issue. For example, locating the pool of relevant documents potentially responsive to the first request made on March 2, 2018, required 105 separate searches because it identified seven email accounts and 15 search terms. The searches each encompassed a period of 15 months, meaning that many searches undoubtedly produced hundreds of documents that had to be reviewed. Similarly, in responding to the third request of March 2, using the search term “Faculty Association” in VCHR Shelton-Johnson’s account returned 1,900 separate emails, many with attachments. In fact, responding to all of the outstanding requests will require over 700 separate searches, which will in turn require review of thousands of pages.
Once the pool of potentially relevant documents is located and segregated, the documents must be reviewed for responsiveness, a review that requires reading each email and its attachments. After responsive documents are identified, the OPS reviews each document and its attachments to determine if redactions are necessary. As you must know, federal law compels the protection of student information, information that is frequently found in documents from an institution of higher education like this one. Federal law also compels the protection of protected health information for both students and employees. In addition, the District is obligated by its own privacy and security policies, which have the force of law within the institution, to protect other information about its employees such as social security number. Reviewing thousands of emails, and their attachments, for such information and properly redacting it takes substantial time.

The nature of the FEC's requests complicates the already unreasonable burden of responding. As both the Public Steward and I have noted, the FEC has asked the District to search for common words like “FA,” “meeting,” and “M&C,” which are used in many contexts; consequently, searches for those common terms yield voluminous broad results. For instance, a search for “FA” will yield any word containing “FA.” Additionally, the FEC's requests span a substantial time period, with many covering two years of emails. Another request seeks all of the emails to and from the Assistant to the Governing Board, and asks that they be retrieved and released on an ongoing basis through December 2018. Such requests would appear to require the District dedicate a resource to continual review, redaction, and production of some employees' email.

The District estimates, conservatively, that its employees have spent several hundred hours at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars to date responding to the requests. This work has required not only employees in the Office of Public Stewardship, but also employees of the Office of General Counsel, the Chancellor's Office, the Governing Board Office, and Information Technology Services, some of whom have been called from their other duties to assist in the collection, review, and production of records. Because the employees in the Office of Public Stewardship have spent so much time over the past six months responding to records requests propounded by the FEC, they have been unable to work on other important matters, including review and revision of the District’s Administrative Regulations, policy maintenance, implementation of technology related to policy development, closing out hot line concerns, stewardship webpage maintenance, and tuition waiver monitoring.

I am available at your convenience to discuss how the existing records requests can be narrowed and prioritized so that your client can obtain the records in a timely fashion without unduly burdening the District.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Leslie Kyman Cooper
General Counsel
4.2 Manner of Governing

The Board will govern lawfully, in a manner that is nonpartisan, with an emphasis on a) integrity and truthfulness in all of its activities and practices, b) outward vision, c) encouragement of diversity in viewpoints, d) strategic leadership, e) clear distinction between Board and Chancellor roles, f) collective rather than individual decisions, and g) proactive leadership.

More specifically:

1. The Board will operate in all ways mindful of its civic trusteeship obligation to those who own the organization, the residents of Maricopa County.

2. The Board will conduct itself in a manner that complies with all relevant laws and regulations. The Board will fulfill all of its legal and fiduciary responsibilities as required by state statutes, the Arizona Constitution, and all state administrative rules. These include responsibilities such as approval of the budget; tuition and fees; degrees, certificates and diplomas; graduation requirements; curriculum catalog policies; and travel regulations and procedures upon recommendation from the Chancellor.

3. The Board will cultivate a sense of group responsibility and shall work together harmoniously in pursuit of this obligation. The Board will conduct its business in a respectful and civil manner, always mindful of the Maricopa County Community College District's public image.

4. The Board will carefully establish performance standards and expectations for the district through articulation of written governing policies. The Board's major focus will be on the achievement of intended long term impacts outside the operating organization (outcomes), not on the administrative or programmatic means of attaining those results, except as they conflict with statutory law.

5. The Board will observe "Policy Governance" principles as the framework for setting forth these policy standards/expectations for the Board's own processes, as well as for articulating performance standards and the manner of assessment of the work of the Chancellor. Through these policies, the Board will establish and adhere to expectations for its own conduct, addressing matters such as attendance, policy making principles, respect of roles, respect for democratic processes, speaking to management and the public with one voice, and ensuring the continuity of governance capability.

6. Continual Board development will include periodic discussion of its governing performance, orientation of new members in the Board's governance process and these policies, and annual Board review of both the Board's and the Chancellor's progress in light of the Board's performance expectations.

7. The Board may use the expertise of individual members to enhance the Board's understanding of issues, but will not substitute such expertise for the judgment of the Board.

8. The Board will keep well-informed about relevant global and local educational trends and other issues, by actively gathering information and attendance at appropriate workshops and conferences to fulfill its role.

9. The Board will govern with appreciation of the diversity of our internal and external communities. Diversity is defined as the environment created within Maricopa that demonstrates equity and mutual respect of each person.

10. All of the Board's governing policies are contained in this document, and they remain in effect, unless amended or deleted by Board action.

11. Although the Board can change its governing policies at any time, it will conscientiously observe those currently in effect.

12. The Board will allow no officer, individual, or Board Committee to prevent, or be an excuse for, the Board not fulfilling its duties and commitments.

13. The Board will regularly evaluate and strive to improve its process and performance. Self-assessment will compare Board activity and discipline to the Board's performance criteria set forth in the "Governance Process" and "Board-Staff Relations" sections of these governing policies.

14. The Board will reserve authority to approve the following types of agreements:
   A. Cooperative agreements with outside entities requiring a significant commitment of District funds or that may impair the District's bonding capacity.
   B. Leases involving a commitment of the District's funds in excess of the annual amount specified in Arizona Revised Statute §15-1444B-2 [or in excess of a total of $300,000 over the original term].
C. Contracts for District-wide services for insurance, bookstores, and food service.
D. Real property leases or continuous use of District property by outside entities for commercial activity or for any activity that substantially increases the potential liability for the District or may impair its bonding capacity.
E. Dual enrollment agreements where an intergovernmental agreement is not required.
F. Contracts in which the legal authority to proceed is not explicit in statute or confirmed through case law or Attorney General's opinion.
G. Purchases described below:
   i. A construction contract or construction consulting services contract, including those for architects and engineers, exceeding $250,000.
   ii. Any purchase of a single piece of information technology equipment or software exceeding $250,000.
   iii. Any purchase of services exceeding $250,000, other than recurring annual services for support of District-wide systems or operations such as utilities, equipment, or software maintenance.
H. Purchases or sale of real property.
I. Agreements that by law must have Governing Board approval.

AMENDED October 22, 2013, Motion No. 10112
AMENDED February 22, 2011, Motion No. 9781, 9782
4.10 Board Members Code of Conduct

The Board expects of itself, as a whole and of its members, ethical, professional, and lawful conduct. This commitment includes proper use of authority and appropriate decorum when acting as Board Members.

1. Board Members must demonstrate unconflicted loyalty to the interests of the entire community of Maricopa County. This accountability supersedes any conflicting loyalty such as that to family members, the District’s employees, advocacy or interest groups, membership on other boards or staffs, or any personal interests as a consumer of the District’s services. Likewise, Board Members are elected to serve on a nonpartisan basis when serving as a steward on behalf of the college district.

2. Board members are expected to discharge their duties honestly and in good faith. Board Members shall exercise the degree of care, diligence, and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in similar circumstances.

3. Governing Board Members shall be required to participate in training that focuses on public stewardship and institutional ethics. Such training shall be rigorous, practical, and application based.

4. Board Members must avoid any conflict of interest with respect to their fiduciary responsibility.
   A. There must be no self-dealing or any conduct of private business or personal services between any Board Member and the organization except as procedurally controlled to assure openness, competitive opportunity, and equal access to “inside” information.
   B. Board Members must not use their positions to obtain employment in the organization for themselves, family members, or close associates. Should a Board member apply for staff employment in the District, he or she must first resign from the Board.
   C. When the Board is to decide an issue about which a member has an actual or potential conflict of interest, that member shall disclose the conflict to the Board and absent herself or himself without comment from not only the vote but also from the deliberation.
   D. Board members will annually complete a form disclosing their involvements and interests that could give rise to a conflict of interest, including but not limited to roles as directors or officers of other organizations, substantial/direct business/investment holdings, or other transactions or affiliations with businesses and other organizations or those of family members. Board Members will promptly update their disclosures if, during the year, a material change in circumstances should occur.

5. Board Members may not attempt to exercise individual authority over the organization except as explicitly set forth in Board policies.
   A. Board Members’ interactions with the Chancellor or with staff must recognize the lack of authority in any individual Board Member or group of Board Members except when explicitly Board authorized.
   B. Board Members’ interaction with public, media, or other entities must recognize this limitation and that Board Members are not to speak for the District or the Chancellor, or to speak for the Board, except to repeat explicitly stated Board decisions.

6. Board Members must deal civilly and respectfully with each other, including the use of open and honest communication.

7. A Board Member aware of credible information that suggests that a Board policy has been violated, by either the Board or the Chancellor, has an affirmative obligation to bring the concern to the Board’s agenda for monitoring.

8. Board Members must respect the confidentiality appropriate to issues of a sensitive nature. This includes all items discussed in Executive Session, the confidentiality of which is mandated by Statute.

9. Board members will support the legitimacy and authority of the final determination of the Board on any matter, irrespective of the member’s personal position on the issue.

10. The Board and its members are committed to faithful compliance with the provisions of the Board’s governing policies. To uphold the Board’s integrity and reputation, the Board will constructively address perceived violations of these policies, using the following process:
   A. The concerned Board Member (or, if applicable, the Chancellor) is encouraged to have a conversation in a private setting with the Board Member whose actions are perceived to be non-
compliant with Board policies. If a complaint pertaining to a Board Member’s conduct is conveyed to the Chancellor by an outside party, the Chancellor shall, as soon as practical, refer the complaint to the President for appropriate action (as outlined herein). If the complaint involves the President, the Chancellor shall refer the matter to the Board Secretary for necessary action.

B. Second, if the concerned party is not comfortable pursuing such a discussion, or if the conversation does not produce sufficient resolution as agreed on by the concerned parties, either party shall apprise the President, who may choose to address the situation individually with the involved party, or advance to #C below. If the concern involves the President’s actions, the Board Secretary shall be similarly informed.

C. Third, if the first two steps don’t produce sufficient resolution, or if in the estimation of any of the concerned parties there remains a credible concern that the incident may cause legal or reputational jeopardy to the District, the Board will be apprised of the situation. The Board may request that the Chancellor arrange for an independent review to be conducted for the purpose of advising the Board if noncompliance with its own policies has occurred by an appropriate individual(s). After receipt of the results of the review, or if the Board deems itself to have adequate information without the review, the Board will make a subsequent determination, by vote, as to whether the Board Member’s actions were consistent with Board policy.

D. If the Board determines that there was no violation of the expectations set forth in the Board’s Governing Policies, the issue shall be considered resolved.

E. If, in the judgment of the majority of the Board, Board policy has been violated, the Board shall take what it considers to be appropriate steps to remedy the situation and protect the interests of the District. These may include:

   i. Reminding the Board Member of the expectation and fiduciary duty to cease such actions/behaviors.
   ii. Limiting any authority that has been delegated to the Board Member to represent the Board.
   iii. A resolution publicly admonishing the action/behaviors.
   iv. A resolution requesting the Board Member’s resignation.
   v. If the party deemed to be in violation of Board policy is an officer, removal from the elected officer position.

11. Per Arizona Revised Statutes, Board Members must avoid relationships with outside organizations that do business or may do business with the district, and must also avoid activities and circumstances that could create an appearance that the Board Member seeks to influence the selection of a vendor or the terms of a contract. Board Members shall adhere to the provisions outlined in the Gifts, Gratuities, and Unrelated Compensation Administrative Regulation, which outlines the restrictions for the acceptance of gifts, gratuities, and unrelated compensation from vendors and others that are either doing business with or that seek to do business with the officers, employees, and others who serve as agents on behalf of the Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD).

AMENDED May 26, 2015, Motion No. 10304
AMENDED February 22, 2011, Motion No. 9781, 9782
Good morning, Board Chair Gutierrez and Secretary Thor,

FYI, see below, I believe the source of information is a report prepared by MCC Vice President Darbut which he shared with Mrs. McGrath several weeks ago. I have attached the report. I was not aware of this report and it appears that neither was the interim college president. I received a copy of the report, at Mrs. McGrath's request, at the end of last week. I have asked Mr. Darbut to please include his name as author of the report and resend it to whoever received it before because without a name it appears as an official "blueprint" for the Transformation of the system, and that can create confusion with the work the Task Force is doing and the potential recommendations that I will make to the Board after the Task Force concludes its work. As with other recommendations that we have received, Ms. Renfro has the report to include in the conversations of the Task Force as pertinent.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
Subject: Former State Legislator Says Maricopa Community College Doesn't Need More Taxpayer Money

I serve on the Board of Maricopa County Community College District and the reason they are asking for money is that they are miffed at being left out of the budget.

The District is receiving $226 million a year in tuition and $447 a year in property tax. The financial stability fund balance is $52.7 million with a remaining fund balance of $114.5 million.

The District has $100.0 million of capital funds available. The District has $18.5 million from Proposition 301.

$958.7 million is more than enough. Please spend the state's money where it is needed, not at the community college district in Maricopa County.

Jean McGrath

623-221-4558  cell
623-931-9444  home
Maricopa Community Colleges has experienced significant tuition and property tax increases, low quality student services, declining enrollment, poor graduation rates and high student loan default rates and lack of new programs. Environmental threats are increasing and include greater competition, changes in Higher Learning Commission (“HLC”) accreditation criteria, stricter Federal student loan requirements, new teaching & learning techniques and technology and new types of educational credentials in the marketplace. To fulfill its mission of graduating Maricopa County citizens with useful degrees and certificates, Maricopa Community Colleges must transform itself or become irrelevant and a dying institution.

This “Transformational Blueprint” represents the application of my education and experience. With a 30-year career in the global manufacturing sector, with significant restructuring work, coupled with an MBA and continuous training I have prepared this report. Importantly, most of ideas have been provided by faculty and staff. I want to express my appreciation of those faculty that “over a beer” shared their frustrations and ideas to better the institution. On reflection, I do not believe any one idea is new or novel or a surprise as they are discussed at leadership meetings, open forums, employee meetings and within the community. What is new is organizing these ideas into a “blueprint” to transform Maricopa Community College into a world-class educational institution for the 21st century.

By necessity many estimates have been used, but are believed to be directionally correct. Estimated reductions to general operating expenses, which can be achieved over several years, is $185 million. Another $160 million in capital can be raised from the sale of assets and better use of existing funds.

More importantly than efficiency is improving effectiveness. That is, increasing the percentage of students that receive a degree or certificate so that they can join the workforce as quickly as possible. Imagine if the percent of students receiving a degree jumped from about 15% to 30% or even 75%. The economic and social impact would be enormous.

The Chancellor and Governing Board of Maricopa Community Colleges have the power to implement the Transformational Blueprint presented here. There is the opportunity to be bold.
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A Transformational Blueprint

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT)

SWOT Analysis is the most renowned tool for audit and analysis of the overall strategic position of an organization and its environment. Its key purpose is to identify the strategies that will create a specific business model that will best align an organization’s resources and capabilities to fulfill its mission within the environment in which the organization operates. This SWOT analysis presents observations and trends from the public documents, data analysis, literature and more importantly from regular discussions by faculty and staff. These discussions take place at lunch, over a beer, at parties and anywhere employee gather.

Institutional Strengths

1. Economies of scale. Due to the large number of students (225,000), number of colleges (10), and course offerings (over 8,000) the organization has the ability to provide high quality and low cost education to the community.

2. Strong financial strength. MCCCD is required to maintain a financial stability balance equal to 8% of the annual projected revenue which equates to $52.7 million. The remaining fund balance of $114.5 million is more than double the targeted figure and is comprised of college surpluses, designations for future operations, and minimum financial condition measure for future years, allowance for student bad debt, priority initiatives, capital master planning, reserves for potential claims and contingency, enrollment growth/retention, and an undesignated balance of $3.0M. This financial strength has been maintained for many years.

3. Excellent legal structure and funding model. Maricopa Community College (MCCCD) is a special District created by the State of Arizona’s constitution and statutes. It is governed by a seven member elected Governing Board with the power, subject to some limitations, to set tuition, tax property owners and borrow funds through the sale of bonds and control costs. The District does not receive funding from State Legislature and is not subject to their supervision or uncertainties from its annual budgetary process.

4. Capital funds availability. In 2004, Maricopa County voters overwhelmingly approved a $951 million General Obligation Bond Program. Bonds totaling $951 million have been issued as of June, 2013. As of June 30, 2016 about $75.0 million has not been appropriated and could be reallocated to new priorities. Additionally, General Capital Fund (710) has about $25.0 million of unassigned funds available. There is potentially $100.0 million of capital funds available.

5. Supplemental funding from Proposition 301, a statewide November 2000 referendum that raised sales taxes for education. Community colleges are required to use the funds for workforce development and training. The FY2016/2017 Adopted Budget shows $18.5 million is not allocated to any project and will be carry-forwarded to future years.
Institutional Weaknesses

1. Tuition has increased 32% from $65.00 per credit hour in FY 2007/2008 to $86.00 in FY 2016/2017. Tuition generates $226 million or 33% of total revenues. Annual student tuition increased from $1,950 in FY 2007/2008 to $2,580 in FY 2016/2017.

2. Property Tax rate per $100 of assessed value increased 49% from $0.9760 in FY 2007/2008 to $1.4651 in FY 2016/2017. Property Taxes generate $447 million or 65% of total revenues.

3. Net current assets have increased dramatically from Fiscal 2009 and total $425 million at year-end Fiscal 2015. Normally, high net current assets would be viewed as a strength; however, due to annual reports by a residential faculty member, this high balance is viewed negatively by faculty, staff and the public because it demonstrates that tuition and property tax increases have not been required. Do we really know how much money we have?

4. Enrollment (FTSE) has declined in each of the past 5 years from a peak of 84,544 in FY2010/2011 to 71,889 in FY2015/2016 for a cumulative decline of 12,655 or 15 percent. FY2016/2017 has an estimated enrollment decline of 3 percent. Seven of the ten colleges have enrollment below 9,000. Further declines are likely.

5. Enrollment (FTSE) projections used for Expenditure Limitation Calculation has been significantly overstated beginning with FY2011/2012 budget when projected enrollment jumped from 85,000 to 92,850 while actual FTSE is declining. FY2016/2017 projected enrollment is 80,678 while the previous year actual posted another decline to 71,889. This overstatement misleads the Governing Board and creates loss of trust by the community, faculty and staff.

6. Employee manuals create a faculty-centric culture that prevents the institution from fulfilling its primary mission of graduating students, improving teaching and learning or addressing environmental threats. For example, Mesa Community College has an accreditation requirement for faculty to measure learning outcomes. After 3 years, faculty participation (which is voluntary) in this requirement is very low at 15% and College Leadership is powerless to insist that faculty comply with accreditation requirements.

### FTSE

**Full-time Equivalent Students**

All colleges and universities use FTSE to measure number of students because it takes into account credit hours generated by students rather than a headcount or enrollment numbers that may over count part-time students. The metric allows comparison between colleges.

One FTES represents 30 credit hours of classes taken by a student over an academic year and is calculated on an annual basis by taking the total credit hours taught divided by 30.

\[
FTSE = \frac{\text{total credit hours}}{30}
\]
Loss of accreditation is a possibility. There are many examples like this one where faculty are not accountable to anyone for anything.

7. Lack of defined programs of study that clearly show students how to complete their degree in the shortest time and lowest cost. Good colleges have always had these tools from day one of their creation. Poor colleges, defined as those with a faculty-centric culture, maintain a college without programs of study. I graduated from a good community college in 1972.

   a. Mesa Community College, and other poor colleges nationwide, have just recognized this weaknesses and launched a great initiative, Guided Pathways for Success, to correct it. This is like General Motors announcing that after 75 years they have created instructions on how to build a car. It demonstrates that Maricopa Community Colleges have never been focused on awarding degrees, just teaching a bunch of classes.

   b. Now that we have determined that this lack of Programs of Study is the number one cause for low graduation rates, the faculty states it will take 3-5 years to create them (written on a piece of paper.) District Information Technology leadership wants to create a District-wide project to automate this which means it will never get done.

8. Cost per FTSE has increase from $8,160 in FY2008 to estimated $10,790 in Fiscal 2017 or 32 percent. Cost per FTSE has increased every year from the peak enrollment year of Fiscal 2011 at $7,752 with the cumulative increase at 39 percent. Although the colleges have decreased spending each year from Fiscal 2011 due to declining enrollment, the cost per FTSE has jumped dramatically due to higher employee salaries and benefits.

9. Cost per Award (degrees and certificates) in Fiscal 2016 is $26,200; while Cost per Degree (excluding transfer certificates) is $36,700. At about $18,000 per year, the cost of a degree at Maricopa Community College, funded one-third by students and two-thirds by taxpayers, is similar to that of high cost private colleges.

Opportunities

1. Degree and certificates that lead to employment in a short period should be priority one. Transfer degrees should be priority two. Graduation rates range between 12% and 17% depending on the metric. Occupational degrees awarded account for about 40% of total awards, while transfer degrees account for about 28%. Excluding transfer degrees (AGEC) which only require 35 credit hours and the number of degrees awarded plunges.

2. Adopt a focus on number of degrees awarded, not number of students enrolled or number of courses taught.

3. Transfer curriculum control and development from faculty to administration. Faculty participates but should not initiate or direct programs of study or courses. Each year, old programs must be discontinued; while new programs in high demand by business are created.
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4. Career & Technical Education (“CTE”) programs should be priority one. Certificate programs that only require 6, 12, or 30 credit hours, instead of 60-70 or 100 credit hours, will allow more students to earn credentials and enter the workforce quickly. And at much lower cost.

5. Create an organization that is student-centric; not today’s faculty (and staff) centric model. A phrase borrowed from Michael Crow, President of Arizona State University.

6. Reduce the cost of education for students while minimizing taxes on property owners. The Arizona Constitution mandates the provision of higher education "as nearly free as possible." The cost of education includes tuition, course fees and books. Technology and policy changes can reduce estimated annual cost from $5,200 by 25%.

Environmental Threats

1. Accrediting agencies and lawmakers are looking at accreditation reform. Institutions with low graduation numbers will need to have a plan for increasing those rates. The Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC) is targeting two-year institutions with graduation rates of 15 percent or lower over 4 years.

2. Competition is increasing with universities and for-profit institutes. Two of the country’s most innovative universities, ASU and GCU, are located in Maricopa County. Each is significantly improving student services, breath of programs and teaching methods.

3. New programs required by the marketplace are being fulfilled by other organizations as MCCCD faculty are unwilling and unable to respond. Maricopa Community College runs the risk of becoming irreverent to students.

4. High student loan default rate created by non-completion and lack of post-graduation employment. Many Maricopa Community College have defaults rates in the 20s. Potential new Federal regulations could deny a college from awarding federal grants or loans if the rate exceeds 30%.

5. Stricter Federal student loan requirements lowers the amount of time and funding available to students.

6. New teaching and learning technologies improve course completion and improve core student skills which makes many course curriculum and faculty obsolete.

7. New Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation criteria including continuous improvement.

8. National declining enrollment trends at community colleges which are generally perceived as “low quality” or for “kids not smart enough to get into a real college.”
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Blueprint to Transform the Institution

A Student Centric Organization: A New Philosophy

“Creating and supporting a cohesive system for students means making institution-wide changes to achieve success. Clearing barriers so that the best of your recruited students can continue to excel, and providing a safety net for those at risk of dropping out, is of the highest priority. Equally important, is that the changes must work to make colleges more affordable as well as managing an alumni and employer ecosystem to create career opportunities for graduates.”

Changing the Culture to Improve Outcomes

1. Revise Mission Statement

| Today’s 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 | Proposed Mission: Prepare individuals to succeed in life by providing affordable access to high quality career education delivered in an innovative learning environment. |
Mission statements are important because (i) the High Learning Commission provides accreditation based on fulfilling the mission and (ii) it focus resources on mission important activities and eliminates programs that do not meet the mission. The current mission statement commits the Board to funding programs that are not important.

A focused mission can eliminate $3.0 to $10.0 million of costs associated with unimportant programs and initiatives.

2. Recruit and develop decision-making leaders instead of administrators. Change the designation of “administrators” to “management” and replace titles. Chancellor becomes President, Vice Chancellor of Business Services becomes Chief Financial Officer, Deans become Directors, etc. Changes to the Residential Faculty Policy (RFP) and Staff manuals are a prerequisite to redefining who makes decisions.

3. Human Resources needs to be redefined as a support function and removed from operational decisions. As a support function, HR facilitates policy development with executive leadership. Operating leaders are the decision-makers for the application policy. If operational managers make mistakes, then they should be held accountable.

4. Define role of District Office functions and College functions to eliminate confusion, infighting and lower efficiency.

5. Key to creation of a student-centric organization is the repeal the Residential Faculty Policy (RFP) manual and replacing it.
   a. Faculty Association membership is about 30 percent of total faculty and the non-members have just withdrawn from participation. That leaves the “radical” members to control policy. This statement made by senior faculty members.
   b. There are other colleges nationwide with faculty manual which can be used as a template. Start by looking at Arizona State University, the number one innovation university in the country. GCU is excellent too.
   c. Eliminate the Faculty Association (aka faculty union) as the sole bargaining agent for all faculty. ABOR policy already does this for the State universities.
      i. ABOR Policy 6-906 Labor Union Membership

      “The Board does not oppose labor organization membership of employees as such membership is their right and in no way affects their employment relationship, but the Board, as a public employer functioning under the provisions of A.R.S. 15-1626, does not have legal authority to recognize a labor organization as the employees' agent for purposes of collective bargaining. In addition, neither the Board nor the universities shall engage in "meet and confer" activities. (A.R.S. 15-1626)”
d. Convert faculty to “at-will” employment contracts. Tenure is no longer in the best interests of students
e. Require residential to have the College as its full-time employers and prohibit a second full-time employment position
f. Require residential faculty to work 40 hours per week with casual overtime expected
g. Establish annual employee performance appraisals patterned after ASU forms and procedures
h. Install merit-based pay system that rewards for results not seniority
i. Eliminate “shared governance” clause. Faculty should participate with management, but not initiate or stop initiatives
j. Eliminate mandatory budget participation and staff hiring committee participation
k. Establish employee performance appraisal conducted by managers
l. Remove employee group leaders from decision-making review and approval
m. Replace faculty elected department chairs with full-time exempt employees appointed by the College President

6. **Rescind** the authority delegated to the Chancellor in December 2014 to approve changes to Faculty and Staff employee manuals. Employee salary and benefits account for 85% of annual operating costs and changes to the manuals significantly increase costs and should be approved by the Governing Board. Communicates to faculty, staff and the public that these important costs are reviewed in public and at the highest levels.
   a. Increasing the number of residential faculty (60/40) is an example of this. Over 10 years this provision will add 360 residential faculty positions at an estimated annual cost of $36.0 million with no improvement in number of degrees awarded.

7. **Change enrollment projection process used for the Expenditure Limitation Calculation**
   a. This is a provision of the State Constitution and Arizona Revised Statutes that limits the expenditure of local tax revenues (e.g. primary property taxes and State Aid). The limitation is set by the Economic Estimates Commission (EEC) by applying growth in enrollment (FTSE) and inflation over a base budget year.
   b. Define change as an Administrative Regulation to restore the public’s confidence in leadership. Stop “cooking the books”
   c. Historically, FTSE figures used for spending authorization has been 10% to 20% higher than prior years’ actuals.
   d. **USE PREVIOUS YEARS’ UNAUDITED ACTUALS**
   e. Provide Pro Forma calculations in the budget using lower future enrollment (2%, 3%, 5%) as supplemental information
Cost Reductions that Improve Efficiency

8. Eliminate all Athletic programs; this is a quick one with large savings.
   a. Annual savings in operating costs are $12.5 million
   b. The cost per FTSE, excluding Athletic costs is $7,500, while the cost per student athletic adds another $6,400 for a total cost per student athletic of $13,900
   c. Avoids needed capital improvements estimated at $3.0 to $5.0 million annually
   d. Eliminates compliance and student athlete safety issues
   e. Sell athletic land and buildings – generates $25-$75 million cash; alternatively, lease the land to create an on-going revenue stream (this is the ASU model)
   f. Viewed by many faculty members as not contributing to the college mission.
   g. There are no Student Outcomes that support the enormous cost of Athletic Programs.

9. Convert Rio Salado College from its custom built in-house Learning Management System (LMS) to the already owned and highly effective Canvas software used by the nine other colleges.
   a. Quick and easy to implement
   b. Estimated annual savings $5-8 million
   c. Canvas is a superior student management learning system

10. Restructure the college academic affairs function that creates separate vice presidents for Career & Technical Education (CTE) from traditional academic programs (English, Math, History, etc.). Each is sufficiently different from the other. It increases the focus and accountability for Outcomes of each.

11. Convert academic department chairs from part-time faculty to full-time Classified Staff positions hired by the College President or designee. Proper management of a department requires full-time managers; instead of a faculty who teach, works 9 months a year and not trained to perform the managerial functions needed. Additionally, Academic Department Chairs, who are elected by their faculty, are often placed in a position of “conflict of interest” by making financial decisions (scheduling, class load, reassign time, etc.) that benefit individual faculty, but are detrimental to the college.

12. Dramatically reduce the amount or faculty reassigned time from teaching. Mesa Community College averages 900 teaching hour per semester which requires hiring 30 additional faculty at a cost of $3.0 million a year. District-wide the cost is about $15.0 million. A reduction of 50% could save $7.5 million.

13. Increase the compensation for adjunct faculty to market rates. MCCCD pays about 50% of what ASU pays. This lower pay will prevent the District from attracting qualified
instructors and compete with ASU and GCU which offer higher compensation. Many MCCCD faculty teach part-time at ASU and GCU because of the higher compensation. Qualified adjunct faculty are necessary to provide students with instructors with real world experience. Estimated annual cost $30-$40 million.

14. Set salary ranges based on market rates not inflation and non-value adding credentials. Freeze residential faculty salaries as existing salary ranges and their applications creates residential faculty salaries that are estimate to be 20-30% above market. Reduces residential faculty costs by $40-60 million.

15. Adopt a single HLC accreditation for Maricopa Community Colleges. This will create class scheduling improvements for students, allow faster consolidation of small academic programs into larger centers of excellence could save $5.0 to $10.0 million annually, promotes Maricopa Community Colleges instead of small neighbor schools. Also, eliminates duplicate administrative costs creating annual savings of $2.0 - $3.0 million.

16. Revise long-range financial plan (latest version FY2013-14 through FY2021-22) to show important assumptions, strategies and initiatives that enlighten the Chancellor, the Board and the public. Transparency of cost and benefits will place controls on high cost and low student Outcomes.
   a. Add Expenditure Limitation calculation and variations
      i. Show FTSE assumptions; scenarios at 5% and 10% enrollment decline
   b. Show separately MCCCD budget contingency (difference between bottoms-up and total budget) separately
   c. Show routine Maintenance Capital funding separately $25-$30 million a year
   d. Show cost of MCCCD initiatives separately including mandatory costs increases from existing employee policy manual provisions.
      i. RFP 60/40 Requirement adds costs $36 million annually over 10 years
      ii. Other salary increase provisions

17. Improve Annual Budgeting Process
   a. Delete open positions older that one year will save 100 positions or $5,000,000
   b. Remove Faculty Senate formal and informal influence over resource allocations and budget changes
   c. Provide a comparison between actuals and budget by account with a written analysis
   d. For each college show a reconciliation of funding separately from reconciliation of expenses
   e. Require Colleges to present their key operational objectives with the budget
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f. Hold College Presidents accountable for accurate and proper allocation of resources without the fear of Faculty Senate

18. Adopt an **outsourcing strategy** to replace the ingrained “do it in-house” philosophy that can save $20-40 million annually. Functions that readily become more efficient with outsourcing are:
   a. Information technology, maybe 50% of what they do
   b. Grounds and custodian services, can be 75%
   c. Data Networks, can be 100%
   d. Call & Contact Centers, can be 90%
   e. Child Care Centers, can be 100%
   f. Learning Management Systems (LMS)
   g. E-mail system, convert to Microsoft exchange
   h. Public Safety, can be 50%

19. Create Capital Plans required for accreditation and good business practice
   a. Identify Growth vs Maintenance Capital requirements
   b. Sweep unused $50 to $80 million 2004 Bond funds from colleges and District Office and reallocate funds based on need
   c. Hire consultants to assess condition of facilities for the purpose of defining amount of maintenance capital needed. Cost estimated at $1.0 million.
   d. Create an annual District and College Capital Plan that separates Growth Capital (new buildings) and Maintenance Capital (maintaining existing buildings and equipment)

20. *Create a curriculum process that is led by management*, faculty participates not directs, that defines degrees, certificates and courses *based on market needs* that are identical across all colleges.
   a. Require a program of study for each degree and certificate
   b. Associate degrees should not exceed 60 credit hours
   c. Standardize courses across all colleges
   d. Eliminate 20% of about 8,000 courses offered
   e. Annually add 10% and delete 10% of total courses and programs to ensure programs in high demand are added and old programs are eliminated.
   f. Eliminate faculty control over class scheduling; it’s a conflict of interest; increasing average class size 10% from about 20 to 24 could reduce the number of residential faculty by 140 that generates $15.0 million savings.
   g. Create “badges” or certificates that can be earned with 6 to 30 credit hours to allow students to gain skills and a job without a 2 or 4-year degree
21. *Sell underutilized buildings and campuses*; proceeds can reduce Bonds and lower taxes or redeploy to other capital needs. Estimated annual operating cost savings are:
   a. Red Mountain Campus $5.0 million per year
   b. Communiversities (2) $3.0 million per year
   c. South Mountain College convert to a Phoenix College Campus $15.0 -20.0 million per year
   d. Glendale Community College’s Happy Valley Road Campus $2.0 to $5.0 million
   e. Close Corporate College $1.0 million per year; this is now in process.
   f. Evaluate all satellite campuses and locations creates savings of $5.0 to $15.0 per year

22. Eliminate costly provisions of the Residential Faculty Policy (RFP)
   a. Eliminate 60/40 Residential Faculty hiring clause and freeze hiring of residential faculty saving $20 to $30 million annually and avoids future cost increases
   b. Eliminate faculty staffing levels for counseling and library which create savings of $5 to $8 million annually and avoids future cost increases

23. Make Staff Policy Manual Revisions
   a. Create a work ethic environment by establishing all employee as “at-will”; eliminate the culture of “guaranteed lifetime employment without accountability”
   b. Eliminate “Meet and Confer-like” process recently established with Classified Staff employees that gives them almost collective bargaining rights
   c. Consolidate employee groups
      i. Eliminates paid assignments
      ii. Eliminates employees from stopping improvements
   d. Establish annual employee performance appraisals patterned after ASU forms and procedures
   e. Install merit-based pay system that rewards performers will save $3.0 million annually
   f. Improve employee productivity by adopting stricter controls on FLMA and ADA employee accommodations will save $3.0 million annually
   g. Create a “business environment” by eliminating academic titles for senior administrators from vice chancellor to senior vice president, etc. This is a common practice at ASU

24. Lower costs by implementing Maricopa Priorities recommendations
   a. require Leadership to prioritize programs and services identify the bottom 20%
   b. Require new programs be launched each year; and old one deleted
   c. Lower costs by eliminating low (under 15) attendance courses and high cost programs
25. Improve effectiveness of developmental education
   a. Define rigorous Outcomes that ensure students can successfully advance to college-level work
   b. Create separate department within each college; instead of being embedded in academic departments
   c. Create a new category of residential faculty with lower pay ranges (about 25% below existing residential faculty teaching college-level courses) similar to high school teachers. Savings estimated at $5,000,000 annually
   d. Create a career path for these faculty to move to teaching college-level courses
   e. Adopt new teaching techniques and update annually

26. Reduce course fees for students by stricter definitions that will reduce annual costs to students by $5.0 million

27. Require all faculty, whether residential or adjunct, to use Canvas LMS software for all courses taught that allows adoption of innovative learning technology and techniques. Improves learning experience for students and develops learning skills required by employers. Again, the focus is on students not faculty.

28. Dramatically reduce the cost of books for students by mandating e-books and similar technology. Goal is to reduce an estimated annual cost to students for books of $75.0 million by $50.0 million.

29. Offer health insurance to students similar to international students. ASU and other universities also offer low cost health insurance. An analysis showing incremental revenues and costs will likely show a cost reduction District-wide.
### Appendix A: Financial Summary of Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative Number</th>
<th>Initiative Description</th>
<th>Operating Budget</th>
<th>Capital Budget</th>
<th>Student Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2016/2017 Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 733,700,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eliminate non mission critical programs</td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eliminate all Athletic programs</td>
<td>(12,500,000)</td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sell athletic land &amp; buildings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(75,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Convert Rio Salado to Canvas LMS</td>
<td>(8,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Restructure academic affairs department</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Convert academic department chairs from part-time faculty to full-time Classified Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reduce the amount or faculty reassigned time</td>
<td>(7,500,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Increase the compensation for adjunct faculty</td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Set salary ranges based on market rates</td>
<td>(60,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Consolidate duplicate programs</td>
<td>(10,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adopt single HLC accreditation</td>
<td>(3,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Revise long-range financial plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Improve Annual Budgeting Process</td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Adopt outsourcing strategy</td>
<td>(40,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Create capital plans and reallocate unused capital funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(80,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Create a curriculum process that is led by management</td>
<td>(15,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sell underutilized buildings and campuses</td>
<td>(30,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Eliminate costly provisions of the Residential Faculty Policy (RFP)</td>
<td>(15,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Make Staff Policy Manual Revisions</td>
<td>(6,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Implementing Maricopa Priorities recommendations</td>
<td>(3,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Improve effectiveness of developmental education</td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Reduce course fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Require use Canvas LMS by all faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reduce the cost of books for students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(50,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(185,000,000)</td>
<td>(160,000,000)</td>
<td>(55,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro Forma Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 548,700,000</td>
<td>$ (160,000,000)</td>
<td>$ (55,000,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated FTSE**: 68,000

**Cost per FTSE**: $8,069
Appendix B: Enrollment Trends

Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTSE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>71,800</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>73,620</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>75,610</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>77,730</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>79,910</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>84,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>87,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>89,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>92,690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>95,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: FTSE Projections Used for Expenditure Limitation Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>70,099</td>
<td>78,149</td>
<td>84,544</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td>81,218</td>
<td>78,454</td>
<td>76,150</td>
<td>71,889</td>
<td>80,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>70,099</td>
<td>78,149</td>
<td>84,544</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td>81,218</td>
<td>78,454</td>
<td>76,150</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>70,099</td>
<td>78,149</td>
<td>84,544</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td>81,218</td>
<td>78,454</td>
<td>88,500</td>
<td>88,500</td>
<td>88,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>70,099</td>
<td>78,149</td>
<td>84,544</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td>81,218</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>70,099</td>
<td>78,149</td>
<td>84,544</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>70,099</td>
<td>78,149</td>
<td>84,544</td>
<td>92,850</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
<td>94,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>70,099</td>
<td>78,149</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY2016/2017 FTSE is estimated to decline to 68,000 creating a projection overstatement of almost 13,000. Each 1,000 of FTSE creates about $5.0 million of funding, and accordingly the inflated projection increases the limitation by $65.0 million.

In Legislature approved a change in FTSE definition that allows certain Career & Technical Education (CTE) course to be counted as 1.5 FTSE. This change will close the gap between projection and actuals.
Notes

Expenditure Limitation Report, dated June 30, 2013. The Annual Budgeted Expenditure Limitation Report (ABELR) is presented as prescribed by the Uniform Expenditure Reporting System (UERS), as required by Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §41-1279.07. The ABELR excludes expenditures of certain revenues specified in the Arizona Constitution, Article IX, §21, from the total budgeted expenditures.

The information reported in both the ABELR and the financial statements is derived from the same underlying accounting data. However, the formats of the ABELR and the financial statements differ. The ABELR presents budgeted expenditures, exclusions, and amounts subject to the limitation by fund type as required by A.R.S. §41-1279.07. The financial statements present the net position, changes in net position, and cash flows in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

In accordance with the UERS requirements, a note to the ABELR is presented below for any exclusion reported in the Total column on Part II that cannot be traced directly to an amount reported in the annual financial statements.
Chancellor,

You will see the continuation of Mrs. McGrath’s email below.

I told Mrs. McGrath that we were instructing both lobbyists to make every effort to prevent both bills from being first read but that I do not agree with sending any sort of communication to the governor. In turn, she contacted the lobbyist to confirm. We need to notify the lobbyists that this is our position. If we are not in agreement that this is our position, then let’s discuss further. I do not want any rogue member communication with the governor’s office. We have made progress at developing a united board and administration. We need to continue in that direction.

I was approached by Roc Arnett this morning. He brought up meet and confer. The issue is out there. I don’t know if it is suspicion, actual knowledge, or a campaign issue. I definitely want to move in the direction that we discussed but I need to get a more detailed understanding of exactly how meet and confer works and what requirements it places on the district so that I can speak more intelligently about the details. Who is the best person to talk to about the details? You? Leslie? LaCoya? I know enough about the general concept to be certain that I want to move in the direction that we discussed but I need a more detailed understanding before it is discussed public.

I left a message for Dr. Thor to discuss ideas for a policy to dictate individual board member expenses.

Laurin

---

From: Jean Mcgrath [mailto:nicemcgrath@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 8:12 AM
To: Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net>; Jeffrey Darbut <jeffrey_darbut@msn.com>
Subject: Fwd: More money for MCCC

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jose Borrajero <joseb4538@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: More money for MCCC
Date: January 30, 2018 at 5:30:38 PM MST
To: Jean Mcgrath <nicemcgrath@gmail.com>

They had a willing accomplice in Heather Carter, who never met a money grab she did not like. Anyway, if it is any help here is the full
text of the bill, which is unusually short and straight forward.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Appropriation: Maricopa county community college district; science, technology, engineering and mathematics and workforce programs

In addition to any other appropriations made in fiscal year 2018-2019, the sum of $11,000,000 is appropriated from the state general fund in fiscal year 2018-2019 to the Maricopa county community college district for science, technology, engineering and mathematics and workforce programs as prescribed in section 15-1464, subsection C, Arizona Revised Statutes.

On Tue, Jan 30, 2018 at 5:13 PM, Jean Mcgrath <nicemcgrath@gmail.com> wrote:

My computer isn’t working very well and I couldn’t open the bill. I do know that MCCCD does NOT need any money from the state. The Board has discovered that we have $495 million sitting around in various savings accounts.

The Board President, Laurin Hendrix, is planning to write a letter to the governor and legislative leadership telling them we need no money.

The liberal staff went behind our back and hired a lobbyist to lobby for money from the state.

Thanks for asking and for alerting me.

Jean

On Jan 30, 2018, at 12:43 PM, Jose Borrajero <joseb4538@gmail.com> wrote:

Jean:

Do you have an opinion on this bill introduced by Carter and company?

HB2494 appropriation; Maricopa community colleges; STEM

Thanks,

Jose Borrajero
We hope to do the same for the professors union. We plan to wait a bit though. Right now we are going after meet and confer.

Sometimes it is fun to be the most unpopular person on campus.

Jean

On Thu, Aug 24, 2017 at 6:42 AM, Jeff Darbut <jeffrey.darbut@mesacc.edu> wrote:

Jean:

Eliminating reassign time is a big step in the right direction. Kris Bliss sent the e-mail below to all employees.

Best regards,

Jeff

From: Kris Bliss [mailto:kristina.bliss@mesacc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2017 11:23 AM
Subject: Update and information

Hello all Classified Staff -

As you may or may not be aware, a Governing Board agenda item was passed last night that eliminated funding for reassign and release time for all Classified Staff Council Officers and Representatives. Those of us who were reassigned have been asked to return to our respective campuses and regular full-time jobs. This is all the information we have at this time - we will share more when we are able.

Please know as we are now focused on our regular full-time jobs, we may not be able to respond to your requests and questions as quickly as in the past. Please continue to reach out, but be patient as we work through the details.
Thank you for your support.

**Kris Bliss**  
Classified Staff Council President  
Director of Support and Retention Programs  
http://www.mesacc.edu/children/  
http://www.mesacc.edu/student-life  
(p) 480-461-7082 (f) 480-844-3253

Shannon Ridgeway-Monaco  
Classified Staff Council Conflict Resolution Officer  
(p) 480-461-7408

Jean McGrath: Governing Board Member  
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281  
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120  
email | jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu  
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
I talk about this when addressing groups and I am getting applauded for eliminating a public employees union.

Thanks for sending it to me.

Jean

On Wed, Feb 14, 2018 at 6:06 AM, Jeff Darbut <jeffrey.darbut@mesacc.edu> wrote:

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Mike Mitchell <michael.mitchell@paradisevalley.edu>
Date: Tue, Feb 13, 2018 at 8:33 PM
Subject: Our Future
To: DL-FAC-ALL <dl-fac-all@memo.maricopa.edu>

For many years, the Faculty Association and other Faculty leaders have been warning of a looming danger – that a politicized Governing Board might one day eliminate the Residential Faculty Policies (RFP). Recently, we may have witnessed the first step toward that looming danger becoming a stark reality.

Governing Board President Laurin Hendrix recently verified that the Governing Board intends to consider a vote to terminate the Meet & Confer process. Consequently, this means that the RFP can be altered unilaterally or dissolved completely. The Meet & Confer process has long been the mechanism by which faculty and the administration have worked together to identify and resolve issues related to our working conditions, which are then codified in the RFP. Much like the Governing Board action taken against the Classified Staff Council last Spring, this action comes without prior consultation and will be difficult to stop. It appears motivated by political ideology and undermines the successful relationship between our residential faculty and many successive administrations and Governing Boards for the past 50 years. Without any consideration for how the Meet & Confer process could be used to modify itself, the Board seems intent on eliminating Meet & Confer.

If the Board follows its own guidelines for changes to policy, a “first read” of proposed changes could be conducted as early as Feb. 27, followed by an adoption of the changes at the Mar. 27 meeting. I emphasize “if the Board follows its own guidelines” because they have violated their own internal process for modifying policy as recently as the Jan. 23 Governing Board meeting.

It is important to know that any changes to the RFP regarding the Meet & Confer process
would not be effective until July 1, 2018. Until that time, the current RFP would remain in full effect. This means that we may hold the administration to the agreements contained within it, and they can do likewise. We must continue to serve our students and our community with integrity, excellence and accountability during this time. We must be the standard bearers of collaboration, decorum and professionalism if we are to protect our students and ourselves.

As we all know, this conflict is not an issue about faculty rights. It is about the conditions and the protections that are necessary for students to succeed. Students and our community expect the MCCCD to fulfill its mission. That mission requires the support of key values which the RFP preserves. Attacks on the RFP are attacks on our ability to do our work. As we repeatedly try to make clear to everyone, faculty working conditions are student learning conditions.

In the coming days, you will be informed of our plans to mobilize the faculty in response to this attack on the faculty’s central role in our colleges and district. It will be in this time that the true power and efficacy of the Faculty Association will be revealed by our coordinated and unified action. Know that this is not a moment of our choosing. Know also that we are likely in this struggle alone. We must act together if we are to preserve the fifty-year relationship that allows us to pursue excellence in teaching and learning.

One final note, there is a real possibility that the District All-Faculty Distribution list could be eliminated. This is a vulnerability for which we must be prepared. For this reason, and because we should not needlessly broadcast private Faculty Association business, it is important that we have current home email addresses for all faculty so that we might communicate with you reliably and freely. If you have never provided the Faculty Association a home email address, please click here. If you have previously provided the Faculty Association your home email address, please confirm your email address here. Your Faculty Association leadership is proud to serve you.

Here is the link: http://eepurl.com/djGF5H
Jean McGrath: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
Improving Education

- 2018 - voted with the majority to eliminate collective bargaining with faculty union
- 2017 - sponsored budget changes that provides annual funding for maintenance of college buildings and student spaces without new General Obligation Bonds or State funding
- 2016 - sponsored a study, Organizational Change at Maricopa Community Colleges, to improve student graduation rates and promote cost efficiencies

Lowering Tuition

- 2013 - voted with fiscally responsible majority to lower tuition
- 2018 - voted with fiscally responsible majority to lower student course fees by 50%
- 2017 and 2016 voted with fiscally responsible majority against higher tuition

Reducing Taxes

- 2018 - 2017 - 2016 voted against higher property taxes
- 2018 - promoted new funding model eliminating the need for future general obligation bonds & higher taxes
- 2018 - sponsored a transformation plan for Maricopa Community Colleges Foundation that increases student scholarships while fixing operational problems
I will bring this list tomorrow and we can discuss your position moving forward.

Thank you

On Sun, Jan 28, 2018 at 9:16 AM, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

I understand that Demenna’s contract was $7k per month for 6 months. How much and how long is the other one?

We can talk Monday but my concerns are multiple. 1) election issues created by lobbyist employment; 2) i’ve been eluding to a potential decrease in out-of-state tuition while indicating that we may have excess funds and are examining peculiarities in prior budget process. Difficult to explain support for these bills in that context 3) i actually told the governors office that I didn’t anticipate the need for funding this year but would ask that they be prepared for a request after (next year) we complete the budget review and adjust out of state tuition.

State Republican convention was yesterday. This is election year. Republicans are impressed with the conservative direction of MCCCD. Frankly, I was surprised by the comments.

Lets talk tomorrow but I’d like to 1) consider a letter from the board or district to the governor thanking him for considering bills but making clear that Maricopa does not need state funds at this time. 2) remove meet and confer immediately, 3) have a draft of new faculty manual in 30 days with goal of final approval in 60 days; 4) analyze budget with hope of making significant decrease in out of state tuition effective next term, possibly small decrease in in state tuition; 5) we don’t need to waste any staff time on any sort of analysis of future bond offerings at this time. 6) i’d like to continue discussing an aggressive plan to make the foundation functional and respectable. 7) demenna suggested inviting some of our elected leaders to attend graduations. If that is advisable, need to get invitations out. 8) Let’s get a plan for lobbyists. 9) I’d like to discuss Maricopa position supporting HLC change in units required in field for teacher requirements, particularly as taught for co-enrollment. 10) i’d like to discuss possibility of opening additional charter schools.

Until I attended the County and State conventions, I didn’t realize how many people are watching and paying attention to us. People are beginning to believe that MCCCD may be moving in a moderate as opposed to progressive direction.
On that note, I don’t have any idea why he would care about MCCCD but Mark Brnovich indicated we needed to have lunch.

Jarod Taylor asked if I could facilitate a meeting with you. He is a member of Gilbert Town counsel and was appointed to board of education by Ducey. If you’re interested, I will facilitate it. If not, that is fine too.

Sent from Hendrix Control Center

On Jan 28, 2018, at 8:02 AM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Mr. Hendrix,

In case this information is of value: last year we spent $232,000 in lobbying efforts because I had chosen to keep in place contracts issued by former Chancellor while I figured out what was best for MCCCD. Total this year total cost will be $102,000, with $20,000 of that going to our efforts to obtain federal grants which are extremely beneficial to our students and colleges.

---

On Fri, Jan 26, 2018 at 5:13 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

FYI

---

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Brooke White <brooke.white@domail.maricopa.edu>
Date: Fri, Jan 26, 2018 at 3:18 PM
Subject: legislative strategy
To: Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu>
Cc: Darcy Renfro <darcy.renfro@domail.maricopa.edu>, Nora Aguilar <nora.aguilar@domail.maricopa.edu>
Chancellor,

Attached is a summary of our legislative strategy and appropriation bill. I have also included a copy of another bill, SB 1330, that was just introduced by Senator Steve Farley, a Democrat from Tucson. The bill appropriates $11.1m to MCCCD and $2.4m to Pima for STEM. I did not request Senator Farley to sponsor this bill. He has always been an advocate of community college funding so I suspect he did this on his own. Just wanted to give you a heads up.

If you have any questions about our strategy I'm happy to chat with you in person. Some of these things are hard to convey over email.

Thank you,
Brooke
I am available anytime except between 6:00 and 10:00 tonight.

Football is on her list but the list is long. As long as we pick at the list occasionally, we should be fine. Coincidentally, football is on Gutierrez’s list as well.

As far as sabbaticals, I don’t want to create unnecessary work but if we keep small victories going, it will be much easier to keep the major issues on track. The transformation is the big item. I’d like to keep as much of the complaining as possible focused in another direction. So far, that has gone well.

As for CORE, I don’t disagree with you. However, it appears that there is going to be discontent focused somewhere. I’m not convinced that the current direction is bad. Ms. Cooper does seem to be moving the ball. This is another issue that, although not minor, may serve to focus the attention of some in a direction that allows you to focus on the transformation. Stratton may end up being a scapegoat, deservedly or not. We will have to see how the meeting goes. If there ends up being a scapegoat, we need to make sure that the scapegoat is not you, and preferably not Cooper. I’m not suggesting that anyone has done anything wrong. I’m just saying that we need to maintain the primary focus on the big issues like the transformation, HR development and not get distracted by petty bickering and issues that don’t forward our mission.

Everyone has to feel important and involved. If some feel good about complaining about the CORE issue, so be it. If some are focused on sabbaticals, so be it. These are great things for them to focus their effort on. The most important issue that we need to stay focused upon is keeping you and your staff focused upon important issues such as the transformation and HR. These sideline issues are necessary but must not become distractions for you or your staff.

Laurin

From: Maria Harper-Marinick [mailto:maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2017 11:09 AM
To: Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net>
Subject: RE: email

Thanks for the honesty and support. I know this is taking a lot of your time, and I sincerely appreciate it.

If having sabbaticals on agenda helps, we can do that. Am still working on the union stuff and getting clarity about what we exactly do with "membership" organizations. Is she in favor of keeping football or eliminating? It is not prudent to take that one on at this time, my professional and political judgement.

There are bigger issues than Cooper’s actions recently. Others cannot forget that board gave
direction to the lawyers before she was hired and you got on the board, and the direction was followed. We had many exec sessions about this topic. However, we serve at the pleasure of the board. If board wants a negotiator, we will hire one. If that person needs to work directly with you as chair, that is fine. I don't have an issue with that. But if some board members want to again start undermining authority and want to use this matter as the excuse, then that will be less easy to accept by me. We have really important work to do that is critical to the future of our system and the communities we serve, and hopefully the board continues to support our efforts.

I am available later today, weekend, and Monday late morning or after I get back from MCC where I will have a town hall to talk about transformation as I continue to visit the college's to share vision and progress.

Thanks

Sent from my phone

On 20 Oct 2017 11:51 am, "Laurin Hendrix" <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

I will be at the meeting next week.

As for a resolution, it was my intent to try to have something on each agenda that provides talking points for a few of the members that are making the speaking tour rounds as part of campaigns. If they can focus their talking points on these victories, it will take the focus off of other issues. Ms. McGrath’s hot buttons at the moment are sabbaticals, travel, union memberships, and most recently football. If we give her victories to take to her supporters, it will keep her on board for the bigger agenda, namely the transformation. The ball that we need to keep our eye on is the transformation. This other stuff is window dressing but we need it so that the board members can share their list of victories with their supporters and remain supportive for the bigger picture.

The meeting went well this morning but the executive session is going to be challenging. For the moment, the focus has been diverted away from you but the flip side is that it is being re-directed toward Ms. Cooper. I’m not exactly sure how to handle the executive session. There is going to be some testy points brought up. It appears that we may have a situation where some minds have been made up and they are not open to being confused by facts.

I can’t speak to board members without getting into an open meeting issue but I believe that there is going to be a push to hire someone outside to make an effort at negotiating a settlement. I believe that a specific timeline will be suggested and if we can’t reach a settlement within that timeline, then we will proceed with litigation. Opinions change on an hourly basis but it appears that the discussion will revolve around whether the outside person should be hired by the board directly, by you, or by our general counsel. Alfredo wishes to have our GC completely removed from the process. This may be reflective of a larger issue. I don’t like the idea of the board hiring counsel but I could live with it. If these are the only three options, then I would prefer that you be the one to retain an outside person but this issue isn’t the best use of your time. I suspect that there will be discussion as to whether we want to hire a person with legal knowledge or a person with business knowledge.
I don’t see any urgency but let’s talk before the meeting.

Laurin

From: Maria Harper-Marinick [mailto:maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2017 10:16 AM
To: Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net>
Subject: email

Mr. Hendrix, am on email but can't access my texts. Should be able to in a couple of hours.

I thought you were OK with waiting until November for a resolution on Sabbaticals and other personnel policy items, but if you want to specifically eliminate Sabbaticals for staff in October, I will work with Cooper this afternoon today to draft something for your consideration. She is dealing with a personal matter this morning and will be in the office at 1:00 p.m.

Will you be at the Board meeting next week or is Dr. Thor going to preside?

Thanks

Maria Harper-Marinick, Ph.D.
Chancellor
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8108 • fax | (480) 731-8120
cell | (480) 364-6744
email | maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu
website | www.maricopa.edu
Reviewed the video of the last board meeting
4 messages

Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu>  Wed, Dec 13, 2017 at 10:47 AM
Reply-To: johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu
To: DL-BOARD <dl-board@memo.maricopa.edu>, Sasan Poureetezadi <sasan.poureetezadi@mesacc.edu>, Keith Heffner <keith.heffner@mesacc.edu>

Dear Friends,

I reviewed my comments and those of Mrs. McGrath that were criticized by the leaders of the student groups at MCC. I thought maybe I had misspoke in some way but I had not - nor had Mrs. McGrath. There is such a thing as supporting "values" at an institute of higher learning. We must do that or we will continue to lose students to schools that do ascribe to building character and maintaining values. Parents want that for their children.

I have encouraged a young man in high school and his younger sister who are part of my family and live in Mesa to attend MCC. I am now thinking that may not be the best fit for either of them. They are not into promiscuity nor supportive of terrorist groups, so most likely they would not fit in.

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 - fax | (480) 731-8120
e-mail | johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board

Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu>  Wed, Dec 13, 2017 at 11:51 AM
Reply-To: johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu
To: DL-BOARD <dl-board@memo.maricopa.edu>, Sasan Poureetezadi <sasan.poureetezadi@mesacc.edu>, Keith Heffner <keith.heffner@mesacc.edu>

I meant to write "had misspoken."

On Wed, Dec 13, 2017 at 10:47 AM, Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu> wrote:
Dear Friends,

I reviewed my comments and those of Mrs. McGrath that were criticized by the leaders of the student groups at MCC. I thought maybe I had misspoke in some way but I had not - nor had Mrs. McGrath. There is such a thing as supporting "values" at an institute of higher learning. We must do that or we will continue to lose students to schools that do ascribe to building character and maintaining values. Parents want that for their children.

I have encouraged a young man in high school and his younger sister who are part of my family and live in Mesa to attend MCC. I am now thinking that may not be the best fit for either of them. They are not into promiscuity nor supportive of terrorist groups, so most likely they would not fit in.
Begin forwarded message:

From: Jean Mcgrath <nicemcgrath@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Chicano Park radicalism
Date: January 10, 2018 at 12:12:46 PM MST
To: Johanna Haver <j.haver@cox.net>

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jean Mcgrath <nicemcgrath@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Chicano Park radicalism
Date: October 25, 2017 at 3:45 PM MST
To: Johanna Haver <j.haver@cox.net>

Thanks for doing the research. Jean

On Oct 25, 2017, at 3:45 PM, Johanna Haver <j.haver@cox.net> wrote:

Jean – I could not be sure about Angelica Yanez but believe she is a teacher of multiculturalism. Chicano Park is a highly controversial park with murals and anti-Trump stuff. Our students have no business going there. This is a trip to convert students to the ultra-left. I will keep checking out speakers. Johanna
Begin forwarded message:

From: Jean McGrath <nicemcgrath@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwdr Islamic Indoctrination in American Schools
Date: October 15, 2017 at 7:48:50 PM MST
To: Johannsa Haver <j.haver@cox.net>

I understand your concern, Mrs. McGrath. Thank you for sharing.

Maria Harper-Marlind, Ph.D.
Chancellor
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8108 • fax | (480) 731-8120
cell | (480) 384-8744
email | maria.harper@donnell.maricopa.edu
website | www.maricopa.edu

On Sat, Oct 7, 2017 at 7:05 AM, Jean McGrath <nicemcgrath@gmail.com> wrote:
This is why I am so opposed to Dr. Sozani's Mesa Community College Cultural Bridges trip. The first day the participants receive

A lecture from a Member of Council on American Islamic Relations, Cali.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ideology of Islam <ideologyofislam@cox.net>
Subject: Islamic Indoctrination in American Schools
Date: October 6, 2017 at 11:22:10 AM MST
To: Jean <nicemcgrath@gmail.com>
Reply-To: <us15-b666a6e237-765d491d4d@conversation01.mailchimp.com>

A major part of the Muslim Brotherhood's stealth civilization jihad is to indoctrinate our school children to view Islam and Muslims favorably. The Muslim Brotherhood has made great strides in schools throughout America. This article focuses on Newton, Massachusetts.

TO UNDERSTAND NAZISM, READ "MEIN KAMPF". TO UNDERSTAND ISLAM, READ THE KORANI

October 6, 2017

Has Your Kid Gone on an Imaginary Hajj Today?

By William F. Marshell

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=1386430893&jsver=plG7tiCEwPU.an.&view=pl&search= inbox&th=160e18756f9382&sim=160e18756f9... 1/4
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As examples abound, it is clear that the conflict between the Jewish and the Palestinian israelis is a major factor in shaping the younger generation's views on the region. The conflict is often portrayed in a biased manner, with the Arab-Israeli conflict being presented as a continuous cycle of violence and hatred.

The Cambridge Appeal for Peace in the Middle East (CAMEP) has published a significant new monograph entitled "Indoctrinating Our Youth: How a U.S. Public School Curriculum Shapes the Arab-Israeli Conflict and Islam." This book meticulously documents the materials used by the Newton Public Schools system in its high schools -- Newton North and Newton South -- to teach 9th and 10th graders about Islam and the never-ending Arab-Israeli conflict. The book notes that the conflict over Israel is NOT an "Arab-Israeli" conflict. It is an ISLAMIC JIHAD holy war against the Jews, just like the Hamas Charter says it is. The book also discusses the role of Newton's legal system in releasing the materials, and the implications for parents and educators.

The book includes a set of teaching materials that are currently being used in Newton's schools. These materials are based on the "Bible" of Arab-intellectuals, "Arab-Israeli Conflict and Islam," and are required by Newton's school system to be included in the history curriculum. The book notes that these materials are often used in public schools, and that they are not approved by the American Historical Association.

In addition to the teaching materials, the book also documents the role of the American School of Peace and Development (ASPD) in Newton, which is a non-governmental organization that provides training for teachers and schools in the region. The book notes that ASPD is a nonprofit organization that is funded by the United Nations and other international organizations.

The book concludes by calling for a more balanced and accurate portrayal of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the media and in educational materials. It argues that this is necessary for the sake of peace and understanding in the region. The book also recommends that parents and educators be aware of the materials that are being used in their children's schools, and that they take steps to ensure that their children are not being indoctrinated in a biased manner.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=1t10t2018 Maricopa Community College District Mail - Fwd: Islamic Indoctrination In American Schools

Newton, Massachusetts, that Ground Zero (or Mecca?) of political correctness, provides America with a glimpse of the future, or at least highly distorted, understanding that modern liberals would have America's youth believe about the practice and history of Islam and the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America (CAMERA) has published an important new monograph, entitled "Indoctrinating Our Youth: How a U.S. Public School Curriculum Shapes the Arab-Israeli Conflict and Islam" that has meticulously dissected the materials used by the Newton Public Schools system in its high schools -- Newton North and Newton South -- to teach 9th and 10th graders about Islam and the never-ending Arab-Israeli conflict. NOTE: The conflict over Israel is NOT an "Arab-Israeli" conflict. It is an ISLAMIC JIHAD holy war against the Jews, just like the Hamas Charter says it is. The book is a fine case study in the process by which our nation's young adults are propagandized about Islam, and develop a bias against America and Israel. It should be read by every parent of high school-aged (and younger) students, high school administrators, and teachers.

The core of the book is a set of teaching materials that my friend and colleague, the Harvard/MIT-trained defense policy expert and intelligence specialist, Dr. William Sexton (now head of the nonprofit research and education organization, Citizens For National Security) and I, working through Judicial Watch, obtained from the City of Newton after we waged a nearly two-year-long administrative Jihad with the attorneys of Newton to release the records. In addition to our time, we were required by Newton's legal system to pay thousands of dollars to have the materials provided to us, to cover the collection and processing of these presumably public materials.

In the first of several open records requests I sent to the City of Newton, filed on October 31, 2014, I sought all records relating to the teaching of Islam and the Arab-Israeli conflict, including such items as lesson plans, handouts, textbook titles and excerpts, class notes, multimedia presentations and the like. What was eventually produced in the nearly 500 pages of material was deeply concerning, as the experts at CAMERA revealed.

The authors of "Indoctrinating Our Youth" did yeoman's work in carefully examining the materials used to teach the 9th grade World History unit on Islam and the 10th grade World History unit on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, which exposed the use of slanted texts written by Muslim apologists, such as Georgetown's John Esposito, often factually flawed material, superficial anti-Israel/Palestinian opinion pieces in non-scholarly publications like Time magazine and the Guardian newspaper, and videos produced in collaboration with the likes of University of California Irvine Professor Mark LeVine, a prominent advocate of the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) movement, which is based on the economic destruction of the state of Israel.

Examples abound in "Indoctrinating Our Youth's" explanation of Newton's whitewashing of Islam in its teaching materials. The authors note the use in the 9th grade course of a textbook called A Muslim Primer: Beginner's Guide to Islam, written by Ina Zepp, to discuss the status of women in Islam. The CAMERA analysis note that Mr. Zepp "has no formal credentials in Islamic scholarship" and the chapter used: "Gala to offer a serious, dispassionate survey of women's conditions in Islamic culture."

The CAMERA experts note: "A more serious shortcoming is the author's [Zepp's] concealment of information about practices like honor killings, genital mutilation, the stoning of women accused of adultery, or the treatment of women as property in some Islamic countries."

"Indoctrinating Our Youth" cites Dr. Sexton, whose organization, Citizens for National Security, is the nation's leader in examining school textbooks for factual accuracy. They write, "Sexton estimates that he fields about six inquiries related to inaccuracies in textbooks on the subject of Islam and the Arab-Israeli conflict every day."

A major fault that the CAMERA analysis found of the Newton schools' Islamic materials is the teachers' heavy reliance on unvetted, unscholarly, and frequently dubious handouts given to students, often pulled off the Internet, which contain unsupported assertions. For example, one hand-out given to Newton students stated that "All Muslim scholars agree on the fact that the first, greatest Jihad is the personal-spiritual struggle towards discipline."

As the CAMERA authors point out, highly renowned scholars of Islam, like Bernard Lewis of Princeton, offer "a different definition of Jihad, contending that it was used traditionally to rally Muslims to war against non-believers and that its object was to 'bring the whole world under Islamic law.'" Similarly, they note, a Muslim scholar named Mohammad of the University of San...
Diego “stressed the importance of understanding that over the course of Islam’s history, the main emphasis of Jihad has shifted between the inner struggle to the obligation to war in the name of Islam. He [Prof. Mohammed] stated, ‘Islam knows its share of violence, and to deny that history is disingenuous.’”

[NOTE: Even Jihad is defined as spiritual struggle, it means to prepare oneself for total devotion to Allah, and that entails fighting the military Jihad against non-Muslims. The authoritative manual on Sharia law, "Reliance of the Traveller", defines Jihad thus: "Jihad means to war against non-Muslims". No word about spiritual struggle.]

In my own review of the raw materials from Newton, I thought the CAMERA authors may have been too generous in their assessment of the Newton materials. On one page of a lesson plan (page 105) in which the “Spread of Islam” is discussed, to explain the rapid spread of the religion, the teacher’s notes indicate: “In general, decent conquerors (easier on some than their previous conquerors had been) offered: 1) convert of (sic) Islam; 2) pay a reasonable tax; 3) die.” Sound like decent conquerors to me.

In one class assignment (page 216) entitled “Cities: Connecting the Islamic World,” students become pretend Muslims. The teacher writes: “As our concluding project on the Islamic world, you will work in groups to simulate a historical hajj (pilgrimage) to Mecca in class. Each of you will be part of a group of Muslim pilgrims from one of the following eight Islamic cities or regions, around a rough time period.” The teacher then lists eight “Islamic” cities (which includes Jerusalem, by the way). Each group of students is told they will set up a “tent” (presumably imaginary?) which will display newspaper articles the students have written about “their” cities and cultural artifacts they have created to represent their Islamic “hometowns.”

Imagine for a moment if the classroom assignment were to pretend to be part of a group of Christian pilgrims visiting Rome to attend Mass given by the pope in St. Peter’s Square, or a group of orthodox Jews visiting the Wailing Wall to pray, and each student had to write articles and bring artifacts from their “Christian” or “Jewish” city. I suspect Newton’s liberals would be outraged and. ACLU lawyers would have a field day on talk shows about “separation of church and state.”

This analysis of Newton’s Islamic teaching materials should serve as a signal flare to parents everywhere. Find out what your children are being taught about Islam and Israel. Is it imbalanced? Is it inaccurate? Is the violent history of Islam virtually ignored, as it is by Newton? If so, it might be time to chat with the school board.

William J. Marshall has been an intelligence analyst and investigator in the government, private and non-profit sectors for over 30 years. Presently he is a Senior Investigator for Judicial Watch, Inc. (The views expressed are the author’s alone, and not necessarily those of Judicial Watch.)
Cultural Bridges Trip

The Cultural Bridges Trip is being advertised at Mesa CC. It is the same program with the District paying for the trip. Will you please put a stop to this misappropriation of public funds?

Jean McGrath: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889. Will • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board

I am quite surprised and disappointed. I agree with Mrs. McGrath.

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889. Will • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board

Chancellor,

As work is being done on guiding documents/admin regs for funding student travel, we’ve worked with the MCC foundation to fund this for this year only, as students were expecting/registered for the program/trip. No taxpayer public/funds will be used for this trip.

Dr. Fisher, if you’d like to discuss further, please let me know. I recall we briefly discussed how we might “bridge” the transition.

Regards,
Sasan

Sasan Poureetezadi
Interim President
Mesa Community College

Begin forwarded message:

From: Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu>
Subject: Re: Cultural Bridges Trip
Thanks, where is the funding coming from in the foundation?

Sent from my phone

Funding for students: MCC General Scholarship Fund

Funding for staff/Faculty: Donor(s) for the Bridging Cultures Program

Dear Mrs. McGrath and Mrs. Haver,

As I had indicated before, we cannot censor a course/faculty member because some of us may disagree with the content of the course. What I had communicated was that public resources would not be used to pay for students to participate, and that is still the case. There will be no tax payers/public funds used to support the course.

Please let me know if you have other questions.

Thank you

MARIA HARPER-MARINICK, PH.D.
MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Chancellor
2411 West 14th Street
Phone (480) 731-8109 I Fax (480) 731-8120 I Cell (480) 364-6744
maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu
www.maricopa.edu
Travel Expenses
7 messages

Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu>
Reply-To: jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu
To: Gaye Murphy <gaye.murphy@domain.maricopa.edu>
Cc: saslj27622 <saslj27622@mesacc.edu>

Good Morning,

The Cultural Bridges trip put together each year by Dr. Robert Soza has been investigated. Several Board members are so outraged by the messages delivered on the trip that they plan to vote no on any expenditure that benefits Mesa CC. I suggest that until the Board has been notified that this trip is cancelled, no requests that benefit MCC be put on the agenda so as not to embarrass them.

I note that the travel expense at MCC greatly exceeds that of any of the other campuses. Can you please present the MCC travel expenses along with the explanation for each so we can make better informed decisions at the upcoming budget meetings.

Jean McGrath: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone (480) 731-8880 • fax (480) 731-8120
email jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu
website https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board

Sasan Poureestadl <sasl)27622@mesacc.edu>
To: Maria Harper-Marlinick <maria.harper@domain.maricopa.edu>

FYI

Sasan Poureestadl
Interim President
Mesa Community College

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu>
Subject: Travel Expenses
Date: November 1, 2017 at 10:41:32 AM MST
To: Gaye Murphy <gaye.murphy@domain.maricopa.edu>
Cc: saslj27622 <saslj27622@mesacc.edu>
Reply-To: jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu

[Quoted text hidden]

Maria Harper-Marlinick <maria.harper@domain.maricopa.edu>
Reply-To: maria.harper@domain.maricopa.edu
To: Sasan Poureestadl <sasl)27622@mesacc.edu>

How often do you do the trip?
Once a year,

Sasan Poureetezadi
Interim President
Mesa Community College

--- Forwarded message ---

From: Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu>
Date: Wed, Nov 1, 2017 at 10:41 AM
Subject: Travel Expenses

Chancellor,
I have received this note from Mrs. McGrath and wanted to ask you how you would like me to proceed.

I know that Dr. Soza's program concerns Mrs. McGrath as I have heard her make general statements about it many times. With regard to her request to remove MCC items from the Board Agenda, I am unable to commit to any items being either "on" or "off" the agenda since that falls under Mr. Hendrix's authority as Board President.

Mrs. McGrath, as an elected Governing Board member or even as a Maricopa County Citizen, can request operational information. I have no problem working with Dr. Poureetezadi to compile the travel expenditures and the explanation for each. I believe that since the request is to explain each trip, that it will take some time to compile. A simple download of expenditures would not include the itemized explanation that is requested.

Please let me know.

Gaye

--- Forwarded message ---

From: Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu>
Date: Wed, Nov 1, 2017 at 10:41 AM
Subject: Travel Expenses

To: Gaye Murphy <gaye.murphy@domain.maricopa.edu>
Cc: Sasan Poureetezadi <saslj27622@mesacc.edu>, Darcy Renfro <darcy.renfro@domain.maricopa.edu>, Matthew Hasson <matthew.hasson@domain.maricopa.edu>, Nora Aguilar <nora.aguilar@domain.maricopa.edu>
As we discussed, we will provide Mrs. McGrath information requested. You are correct in indicating that Mr. Hendrix, as president of the Board, can ask that we remove or add items to the agenda. But during Board meetings, any Board member or I could remove items too for discussion. Those are the options Board members have currently.

Thank you

Marla Harper-Marlnick, Ph.D.
Chancellor
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone I (480) 731-8108 • fax I (480) 731-8120
email I marla.harper@email.maricopa.edu
website I www.maricopa.edu
Here is a video of Edilberto Flores addressing a group of people on "Informative Justice:" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wWMFPsNh2FE.

He is one of the speakers scheduled to address 50 students, 5 student leaders, 1 alumni lead, and approximately 4 staff members from Mesa Community College during their trip inappropriately called "Bridging Cultures."

This is not the only experience the group will have that is politically extreme. The cost of the trip is $15,000, paid by MCC. The other speakers and places visited tend to be very left-leaning - something I do not believe is appropriate at a publicly funded college.

I am sure others know about this annual trip. Surely parents have learned about it. It may have something to do with the declining enrollment at MCC.

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone (480) 731-8889  fax (480) 731-8120
email johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu
website https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board

I agree with Ms. Haver that the College should not be promoting such topics outside the classroom. This event is an extra-curricular activity and is not related to any course. Thus, any "academic freedom" argument is not valid. It is a discretionary event which should be denied.

Jeff
Fwd: Bridging Cultures Purpose Summary - Invitation to edit
12 messages

Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu>
Reply-To: jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu
From: "Robert Soza (via Google Docs)" <drive-shares-noreply@google.com>
To: Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu>
Cc: Tracy Livingston <tracynanlivingston@gmail.com>, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu>, Gloria Smith <gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu>, Linda Back <linda.back@domail.maricopa.edu>, sasan.poureetezadi@mesacc.edu

I don't think the taxpayers should be funding activities such as this. I am especially opposed to offering trips to any other than full-time students. Note that one of the presenters is affiliated with CAIR. This does not pass my FAR test, front page of the Arizona Republic. I've been told that not all trippers are legal citizens of the U.S.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: "Robert Soza (via Google Docs)" <drive-shares-noreply@google.com>
Date: Sun, 04 Jun 2017 09:22:47 +0000
Subject: Bridging Cultures Purpose Summary - Invitation to edit
To: jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu
Cc: maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu, gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu, linda.back@domail.maricopa.edu

I've shared an item with you:

Bridging Cultures Purpose Summary
https://docs.google.com/a/domail.maricopa.edu/document/d/1kGHZPd8wURE8nDGFzc8tA5w08VLMcRIV5yS5bEONYe/edit?usp=sharing&ts=5933d167

It's not an attachment -- it's stored online. To open this item, just click the link above.

Ms. McGrath and all,
Enclosed is a link to the requested materials for the MCC co-curricular event Bridging Cultures.

I am currently out of the country participating in a Fulbright-Hays program; I will return on July 4th, and will be in-and-out of town for the remainder of the summer. If desired, I will make myself available to meet to further discuss this project or provide additional information.

Respectfully,
Robert

Gloria Smith <gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu>
Reply-To: gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu
From: Gloria Smith <gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu>
To: Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu>
Cc: Robert Soza <robert.soza@mesacc.edu>, Sasal Poureetezadi <sasan.poureetezadi@mesacc.edu>, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu>

Dear Mrs. McGrath:

Here is the report that Robert Soza sent you on June 4 regarding the trip he hosts.

Gloria
Robert Soza has invited you to edit the following document:

Bridging Cultures Purpose Summary

Ms. McGrath and all,

Enclosed is a link to the requested materials for the MCC co-curricular event Bridging Cultures.

I am currently out of the country participating in a Fulbright-Hays program; I will return on July 4th, and will be in-and-out of town for the remainder of the summer. If desired, I will make myself available to meet to further discuss this project or provide additional information.

Respectfully,
Robert

Google Docs: Create and edit documents online.
Google Inc. 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA
You have received this email because someone shared a document with you from Google Docs.

Gloria Smith <gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu>
Reply-To: gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu
To: Robert Soza <robert.soza@mesacc.edu>
Cc: Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu>, Sasan Pouretoezadi <sasan.pouretoezadi@mesacc.edu>, Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu>

Hi Robert:

In the report you mention the budget which was supposed to be attached. None was attached.

Would you mind forwarding that?

Thank you.

Gloria

GLORIA SMITH
MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Assistant to the Governing Board
Dear Jeff and Sasan,

I understand you will no longer fund the Bridging Cultures trip. The first time I heard about the trip, explained by Robert Soza, it sounded fine - but even then I assumed the students not the college paid for it. I have read the description and found links to the speakers - so I can tell you quite vehemently that the entire trip is highly political. My taking MCCCD students to what I had described beforehand as a "Cultural" event and then it consisted of speakers whose loved ones had been murdered by illegals would be the same thing in reverse. So I hope you discourage Robert Soza from continuing anything like this in the name of MCC. It is very bad publicity for your college.

Thank you,
Johanna

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
FYI. I love Ms. Haver for her note.

From: Jeff Darbut
To: "jean.mcgraith@domain.maricopa.edu"
Subject: FW: Bridging Cultures
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2017 3:10:00 PM

Sasan:

I agree with Ms. Haver that the College should not be promoting such topics outside the classroom. This event is an extra-curricular activity and is not related to any course. Thus, any "academic freedom" argument is not valid. It is a discretionary event which should be denied.

Jeff

From: Johanna Haver [mailto:johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2017 2:09 PM
To: DL-BOARD <dl-board@memo.maricopa.edu>; Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domain.maricopa.edu>; Sasan Poureetezadi <sasan.poureetezadi@mesacc.edu>; Jeff Darbut <jeffrey.darbut@mesacc.edu>
Subject: Bridging Cultures

Here is a video of Edilberto Flores addressing a group of people on "informative justice:" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wNMFPnsH2FE.

He is one of the speakers scheduled to address 50 students, 5 student leaders, 1 alumni lead, and approximately 4 staff members from Mesa Community College during their trip inappropriately called "Bridging Cultures."

This is not the only experience the group will have that is politically extreme. The cost of the trip is $15,000, paid by MCC. The other speakers and places visited tend to be very left-leaning - something I do not believe is appropriate at a publicly funded college.

I am sure others know about this annual trip. Surely parents have learned about it. It many have something to do with the declining enrollment at MCC.

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
Considering how MCC is spending its money, I will be disinclined to vote for any MCC funding request in the future. Johanna

On Thu, Oct 26, 2017 at 9:27 AM, Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

We should at least insist on a balanced approach when something like this is planned. There is a great deal here and in CA that celebrates the accomplishments of minorities. I think our students need hope - not disillusionment. Thanks, Johanna

On Thu, Oct 26, 2017 at 5:34 AM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Good morning, Mrs. Haver. Thank you for expressing your opinions and concerns so clearly. I will look into how we choose to use the public resources and if there is any way that faculty members can raise funds in a different way to do this type of activity. It is less easy to curtail faculty's ability to decide what is best for their students, unless it is unsafe, because it is protected by academic freedom.

I appreciate your position and thank you for sending the note.
Imraan Siddiqi, AZ Director of CAIR, gives a lecture on "Islamophobia." Edilberto Flores talks about "transformative justice" that calls out the police as violent and our court system as unfair. They visit Chicano Park that depicts the injustices of Hispanics. Evidently, there was a recent anti-trump incident there that was video-taped.

Whereas we of the majority culture are not perfect, this appears terribly one-sided and encourages victimization. There appears to be nothing that builds on the fact that all people in this country have more opportunities than the people in general in any other country in the world. I would like to see a celebration of the many minorities who have succeeded in this country - with the idea that our minority students can do the same. After all, everything that we are doing in every single college focuses on making life better ESPECIALLY for the minority students.

I believe this is a form of indoctrination and a waste of money.

Thank you,
Johanna
Bridging cultures

email: "johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu"  Thursday, October 26, 2017 at 12:31:09 PM Mountain Standard Time
Johanna Haver

To: email: "laurin.hendrix@domain.maricopa.edu Laurin Hendrix", email: "jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu Jean McGrath"

I am not satisfied with Maria’s response. I discovered a while back that a teacher was put on suspension for sending an email that was obviously conservative - maybe a quote of Rush Limbaugh or something like that. We should not have to accept indoctrination on the left. I am beginning to have second thoughts about recommending MCC to anyone. Also, I will be disinclined to vote for any request from that college.

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
Re: Imraan Siddiqi

email: "j.haver@cox.net j.haver"  Wednesday, October 25, 2017 at 4:08:10 PM Mountain Standard Time
To: email: "jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu"

AGREED. I see no point in teaching hatred for our government and our institutions which are the best in the world. This has really upset me.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

------- Original message -------
From: Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu>
Date: 10/25/17 3:43 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: Johanna Haver <j.haver@cox.net>
Subject: Re: Imraan Siddiqi

We need to convince Mesa CC to stop wasting taxpayer dollars funding Dr. Soza's trip.

Jean

On Wed, Oct 25, 2017 at 3:27 PM, Johanna Haver <j.haver@cox.net> wrote:

Jean — You are right about Imraan Siddiqi. I object to our funding a guy who is the AZ Director of CAIR and has a very hateful website https://hatehurts.net/. I will check into the other speakers and get back to you.

Johanna

Jean McGrath: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889  fax | (480) 731-8120
e-mail | jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
Re: Imraan Siddiqi

email: "j.haver@cox.net Johanna Haver" To: email: "jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu"

Jean – I am more upset about the topics being covered than the cost. Maybe we should ask him about taking the students to visit Reagan and Nixon’s libraries. I have been to both and found them to be very worthwhile. However, even at that, the students should pay – not us. Johanna

From: Jean McGrath

Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2017 3:43 PM

To: Johanna Haver

Subject: Re: Imraan Siddiqi

We need to convince Mesa CC to stop wasting taxpayer dollars funding Dr. Soza’s trip. Jean

On Wed, Oct 25, 2017 at 3:27 PM, Johanna Haver <j.haver@cox.net> wrote:

Jean – You are right about Imraan Siddiqi. I object to our funding a guy who is the AZ Director of CAIR and has a very hateful website https://hatehurts.net/. I will check into the other speakers and get back to you.

Johanna
Re: Using the hands of non-Moslems to subvert our schools

Thank you, Jean.

On Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 1:21 PM, Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:
Maria explained to me that if Fisher does not work out she will be let go in 6 months. I didn't think she was terribly bad - certainly better than the gentleman, in my opinion. Maria is hiring a new Chief Financial Officer - should be someone with business acumen - perhaps a person under him or her could be hired to act as Chief Operating Officer.

You are right that education courses DO NOT PREPARE people for running much of anything - including classrooms! I really like the charter schools affiliated with our colleges. The teachers have advanced degrees in subject matter - not education. That is the case with our college instructors - for the most part. I would really like to see us pay the adjuncts better.

I am glad we have people on the board who know something about real estate and business in general.

I am adamant that we must control who ends up in the Hope facility. I have a feeling that something fishy is going on with Core.

Johanna

On Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 11:40 AM, Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:
I think the solution is to have all spending, especially travel, reviewed by the Board or a representative of the Board. I would like to hire a Chief Operating Officer to help make better decisions and find ways to reduce spending across the District.

I thought Maria was going to start acting in a more conservative fashion but she did a reversal and hired Dr. Fisher as Provost. I think we have the votes to hire a COO and put him/her in charge of the budget and help Maria make better financial decisions. I would like the COO to be a Board employee as Maria is.

I want the District to become self funding and not rely on bonds. At times I think the District looks for ways to waste money and to turn our District into a left leaning institution that harms both the students and the taxpayers.

I have long believed that people who major in education are not prepared to manage multi million dollar schools. It isn't fair to them to expect them to know how to do that. I think a head of education and a head of finances in each district might solve the over budget problems that practically all school districts seem to suffer from. I would like to give it a try and see if it helps. We will never know unless we try and we can always go back to the old way if it doesn't succeed.

Jean

On Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 7:27 AM, Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:
Robert described his trip quite differently. We need to get to the bottom of this. Johanna

On Sun, Oct 15, 2017 at 6:27 PM, Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:
I have trouble with my computer and it often sends my e-mails before I finish them.

I want everyone to be aware that the taxpayers are paying for Dr. Robert Soza's trip called "Cultural Bridges". He takes a large group, sometimes as many as 50, on a 4 night tour during spring break. The first stop on the tour is a lecture by a CAIR member, Imran Siddiqi, who talks about Islamophobia. We pay him $250 for the lecture.

I think the Board should start reviewing and approving the purpose of trips such as this. When I tell people how their tax money is being spent, they get very upset.

We do so many good things and could accomplish more if we didn't waste money on liberal causes such as Dr. Soza's trip.

On Sun, Oct 15, 2017 at 12:42 PM, Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:
My 13-year-old grandson has a Muslim teacher for one class. I will ask him how that has worked out when I see him over Thanksgiving. I find it very disconcerting. I read Brigitte Gabriel's book Because They Hate about how welcoming her country Lebanon was to Palestinian Arab refugees. Their numbers grew big enough that they were able to gain a political foothold, kill anyone who didn't agree with their Muslim religion, and destroy her country. Thanks for sending the article, Johanna

On Sun, Oct 15, 2017 at 9:33 AM, Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:
MCCCD has been spending taxpayer dollars for indoctrination of faculty and students by CAIR.

https://ediscovery.google.com/discovery/DisplayMessage?hl=en&sm=18291914.0058867.3000.11.0000000000&al=A0CD7onqXm0IYatsZ_4Tq8oaPHa...
Begin forwarded message:

From: Ideology of Islam <ideologyofislam@cox.net>
Subject: Using the hands of non-Moslems to subvert our schools
Date: October 14, 2017 at 3:28:37 PM MST
To: Jean <nicemcgrath@qmail.com>
Reply-To: <us15-9b6dAde237-9f044ee4b0@conversalign01.mailchimpapp.com>

The Muslim Brotherhood said it would use the hands of non-Moslems to destroy our system and make Islam victorious over all other religions:

The process of settlement is a 'civilization-jihadist process' with all the grand word means. The Muslim Brotherhood must understand that their work in America is a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and 'sabotaging' its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers so that it is eliminated and God's (Allah's) religion is made victorious over all other religions."

In this article we see how non-Moslem school administrators bring in the terrorist-linked, pro-Hamas Muslim Brotherhood front group, The Council on American Islamic Relations, to indoctrinate our school children.

TO UNDERSTAND NAZISM, READ "MEIN KAMPF". TO UNDERSTAND ISLAM, READ THE KORANI.

NOTE: If you cannot open the pictures, please click on the link to the original article.

Hamas-linked CAIR indoctrinated Philadelphia public school teachers about “Islamophobia”

October 14, 2017 12:00 pm By Robert Spencer 4 Comments

CAIR is an unindicted co-conspirator in a Hamas terror funding case — so named by the Justice Department. CAIR officials have repeatedly refused to denounce Hamas and Hizballah as terrorist groups. Several former CAIR officials have been convicted of various crimes related to jihad terror. CAIR’s cofounder and longtime Board chairman (Omar Ahmad), as well as its chief spokesman (Ibrahim Hooper), have made Islamic supremacist statements about how Islamic law should be imposed in the U.S. (Ahmad denies this, but the original reporter stands by her story.) CAIR chapters frequently distribute pamphlets telling Muslims not to cooperate with law enforcement.

CAIR has opposed virtually every anti-terror measure that has been proposed or implemented and has been declared a terror organization by the United Arab Emirates. A CAIR operative recently called for the overthrow of the U.S. government.

This unsavory gang of thugs and jihad enablers should not be allowed anywhere near any public schools. But that would, of course, be "Islamophobic."

"Islamophobia" is a propaganda term designed to manipulate people into thinking it wrong to oppose jihad terror. It operates by conflating vigilante attacks against innocent Muslims, which are never justified, with honest analysis of the motivating ideology behind jihad terror.
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Philadelphia's public school system allowed the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) to conduct sensitivity training for its teachers last year, CAIR press releases and school district documents obtained by the Investigative Project on Terrorism show.

CAIR attorneys conducted a presentation for educators on Election Day, focusing on Islamophobia and the civil rights of Muslim students, a November press release said. The seminar was described as the first in a series of planned workshops on those issues.

"In the current political environment, Muslim American students are facing increased rates of bullying, emotional abuse, physical threats, and verbal epithets due to their faith, race, or ethnicity," CAIR Philadelphia said in the release.

CAIR Philadelphia provides zero evidence to support this assertion.

Still, the director of the school system's Multilingual Family Support Center argued that, "We need CAIR helping our schools."

Asheq Fazlullah, a member of CAIR Philadelphia's executive committee, and then-CAIR attorney Ryan Houldin conducted the Nov. 8 training, a school district email shows.

For a subsequent session, Fazlullah and Houldin would discuss "issues of diversity, equity, and fairness" at a January 3 professional development day, Colette Langston, principal at Philadelphia's Swenson Arts and Technology High School, wrote in an
email to teachers. The morning seminar was called, "Cultural Sensitivity and Diversity Workshop #1 Topic: Islamophobia."

The school district did not provide course materials in response to the IPT’s public records request. School district officials did not respond to queries as to whether they conduct sensitivity training for other religious groups including Christians, Jews, Sikhs, or Hindus.

The school district’s reliance on CAIR could raise constitutional issues because the group’s executive director has described CAIR as a religious ministry.

Nihad Awad, CAIR’s executive director, testified before the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) last spring that CAIR was a religious organization whose primary purpose is to spread Islam.

[Award] testified at length about the Employer’s role in conducting educational services in the fields of religion, culture, education, society, and history concerning Islamic issues. These services are provided to both Muslims and non-Muslims alike. [Awad] described the Employer’s role in explaining the Islamic faith itself," Charles L. Posner, regional director of the National Labor Relations Board, wrote in an April 7 ruling.

Awad's acknowledgement prompted the San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) to publicly back away from a CAIR-sponsored anti-bullying program. The Freedom of Conscience Defense Fund (FCDF) was suing to bar CAIR from influencing public school programming.

San Diego’s anti-bullying plan violated California law, along with students’ 1st and 14th amendment rights because CAIR is a religious organization and because the program gave Muslim students special treatment, the lawsuit said.

Those arguments could apply equally to Philadelphia’s public schools. “The San Diego case is far from over, so there is no doubt it could have precedential value in a legal challenge to Philadelphia schools’ partnership with CAIR,” FCDF Executive Director Daniel Pierre told the IPT.

School districts may not aid one religion, one religion over another, or religion over non-religion, an American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) legal bulletin said. It cites the seminal 1972 U.S. Supreme Court case, Lemon v. Kurtzman.

“Under the so-called ‘Lemon test,’ a court must inquire (1) whether the government’s action has a secular or a religious purpose; (2) whether the primary effect of the government’s action is to advance or endorse religion; and (3) whether the government’s policy or practice fosters an excessive entanglement between government and religion,” the ACLU bulletin said.

In the San Diego case, FCDF argued that CAIR’s definition of Islamophobia is too vague and that what it considers bullying could ensnare legitimate criticisms of Islamic practice. FCDF also asserted that the SDUSD’s “anti-bullying” program unconstitutionally established Muslims “as a privileged group within the school community.”

Hamas-linked CAIR, SPLC enraged over Iowa and Nebraska presentations about the global jihad threat
Google Apps Vault - Re: Using the hands of non-Moslems to subvert our schools
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Our email address is: ideologyofislam@cox.net
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Please feel free to forward this posting to your contacts and urge them to subscribe to this distribution list by sending an email to ideologyofislam@cox.net.

Carl Goldberg, PhD
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Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889  fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@email.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
J. Haver
RE: Robert Sosa's "Bridging Cultures: A Southwest Studies Experience"

Very well stated. I agree.

From: Johanna Haver [mailto:johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2017 11:30 PM
To: Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harpær@domail.maricopa.edu>; Laurin Hendrix <laurin.hendrix@domail.maricopa.edu>; Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu>
Subject: Robert Sosa's "Bridging Cultures: A Southwest Studies Experience"

Dear Chancellor,

It would be a good idea for us to review Robert Sosa’s project in which he takes students on a 4-day tour to various places to hear highly partisan lectures. They focus mostly on the victimization of minorities by the majority culture in this country. For example, Imran Siddiqi, AZ Director of CAIR, gives a lecture on "Islamophobia." Edilberto Flores talks about "transformative justice" that calls out the police as violent and our court system as unfair. They visit Chicano Park that depicts the injustices of Hispanics. Evidently, there was a recent anti-trump incident there - that was video-taped.

Whereas we of the majority culture are not perfect, this appears terribly one-sided and encourages victimization. There appears to be nothing that builds on the fact that all people in this country have more opportunities than the people in general in any other country in the world. I would like to see a celebration of the many minorities who have succeeded in this country - with the idea that our minority students can do the same. After all, everything that we are doing in every single college focuses on making life better ESPECIALLY for the minority students.

I believe this is a form of indoctrination and a waste of money.

Thank you,
Johanna

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member
Google Apps Vault - RE: Robert Sosa's "Bridging Cultures: A Southwest Studies Experience"

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
e-mail | johnne.haver@domall.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Jeff Darbut <JEF2160622@mesacc.edu>
Date: Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 8:28 AM
Subject: RE: FW: AAEC Charter School
To: jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu

Jean:

A suggestion. The Board can simply pass a Resolution to cancel the Cultural Bridges and similar extracurricular events.

Jeff

From: Jean McGrath [mailto:jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Saturday, November 25, 2017 10:28 AM
To: Jeffrey Darbut <jef2160622@mesacc.edu>
Subject: Re: FW: AAEC Charter School

Jeff,

Johanna told me she won't be voting for the charter school lease. She is sticking by her vow to not fund anything for Mesa until the Cultural Bridges trip is cancelled. Both Laurin and I will vote with her and explain our vote. Perhaps Maria and Sasan will get the message when that happens.

Laurin is going to meet with her and try to get her to change her mind but I don't have my hopes up.

Jean
On Wed, Nov 22, 2017 at 4:46 PM, Jean McGrath <jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

I'm beginning to think that Dana, Alfredo and Thor have their noses out of joint because they are no longer in charge of the agenda.

Dana seems to be enjoying the roll of Chief Pot Stirrer.

I hope the letter Sasan sent will answer any questions Johanna has. I sent her a message after attending the CAIR, ACLU and Black Lives Matter presentation today. about the charter school.

When the meeting was over, I used the women's bathroom in the Kirk Building. Imagine my surprise when I discovered there was a large tub of Trojan brand condoms on the counter, free for the taking. I ran into Jared and complained and he is going to investigate.

On Wed, Nov 22, 2017 at 11:06 AM, Jeffrey Darbut <jef2160622@mesacc.edu> wrote:

FYI

Sent from my Windows 10 phone

From: Dana Saar
Sent: Wednesday, November 22, 2017 10:16 AM
To: jeffrey.darbut@mesacc.edu
Cc: Sasan Poureetezadi; Maria Harper-Marinick
Subject: AAEC Charter School

Jeff,

I'm still not sure the votes are there for the lease to AAEC as it stands.

Have you entertained leasing them a portion of the parking lot immediately behind the
Tech building? Their stables could be constructed on the property (across the access road) that is currently used for storage as far as I can tell. The adjacent properties already accommodates livestock according to the signage.

It's pretty certain that our parking needs will not be an issue within the 33-year time frame.

Dana

Dana Saar: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | 480-221-5638
email | Dana.Saar@domain.maricopa.edu
website | www.maricopa.edu

Jean McGrath: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889  •  fax | (480) 731-8120
email | jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board

Jean McGrath: Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889  •  fax | (480) 731-8120
email | jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
Chancellor:
I want to express my thanks to Jeffrey Darbut MBA, Vice President of Administrative Services at Mesa Community College, for responding to my request for cost reduction ideas with a fantastic Position Paper. I just re-read his Organizational Change Position Paper and want to tell you how impressed I am by the depth of his perceptions, research and proposals. The SWOT analysis is excellent and every element of the report is exceptional.

I want you to know that many voters believe in a student centric rather than a faculty centric model and I encourage you to move in that direction. A student centric model can significantly improve our Outcomes by measuring success as graduating employable students or successful transfer students, not just enrolling students. This Position Paper contains many ideas to become student centric.

Finally, I want to also express my thanks to you for following up on our discussion and requesting the report from Mr. Darbut.

Sincerely,

Jean McGrath
Chancellor and Mr. Hendrix,

I believe that Mrs. McGrath's request to attend faculty meet and confer meetings and her practice of giving directives to staff is inappropriate and inconsistent with the Board policies on Manner of Governing and Code of Conduct (among others) and can also lead to accreditation issues. The same is true of Mr. Saar and the occupational deals. I also note that our policies call for the board to participate in training as well as evaluate our own performance. In addition to having a private discussion with Mrs. McGrath and Mr. Saar as called for in the Code of Conduct, I think it is advisable to schedule ACCT or another qualified organization to conduct training on the role of the board as well as assist with a self-assessment.

Thanks for bringing this to our attention.

Dr. Linda M. Thor
Governing Board Member
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | 480-731-8889 (messages); 480-226-9176 (cell)
email | linda.thor@domail.maricopa.edu
website | https://www.maricopa.edu

On Wed, Aug 9, 2017 at 2:28 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

President Hendrix and VP Thor,

I bring this to your attention because I would like to suggest that perhaps the Board can benefit from educational opportunities regarding the role of a policy governance board. I sat through a very good session this morning as part of the AACC Board retreat and training, and know that ACCT offers very good workshops too.

Here are my concerns: Mrs. McGrath has gone to the DO almost every day for the last few weeks and goes directly to staff to give directives. When I reach out to her to ask how I can be of help, I do not get a reply. Now she wants to attend M&C meetings (FYI, those are only for faculty policy development; we do not follow M&C for staff). As I had mentioned to you before, Mr. Saar also goes directly to staff with requests and directives, and has asked to be included in all meetings of the occupational administrators, most of whom are deans reporting to a VP at the colleges and are not individuals addressing strategic matters necessarily. You also know that Mr. Gutierrez has done similar things.

While we cannot keep Board members from approaching faculty and staff directly, and I am not trying or would ever attempt to do so, it is not effective Board behavior to not address concerns with the CEO first and give me an opportunity to seek the appropriate solutions. If the problem to be solved or the questions that need answers could be articulated and directed
to me, I can engage the appropriate individual(s) and will respond in a timely manner to inform all Board members of the decisions made.

Regarding the request in the email below, if the Board chooses to engage in policy development in a new manner that doesn't include Meet and Confer teams, we would follow your directive. However, it is my belief that attendance by individual Board members at meetings of faculty and staff may not bring the desired outcomes.

I may need to rely on you, as the officers of the Board, to help Board members understand that there are more effective ways to deal with issues than giving direction directly to staff. Or you may have a different view of what role Board members need to play, and I welcome that perspective too.

Thank you

Maria Harper-Marinick, Ph.D.
Chancellor
2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8108 • fax | (480) 731-8120
cell | (480) 364-6744
email | maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu
website | www.maricopa.edu

----------- Forwarded message -----------
From: Gaye Murphy <gaye.murphy@domail.maricopa.edu>
Date: Wed, Aug 9, 2017 at 2:00 PM
Subject: Mrs McGrath and Meet & Confer
To: "maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu" <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> 
Cc: Darcy Renfro <darcy.renfro@domail.maricopa.edu>, Linda Back <linda.back@domail.maricopa.edu>, LaCoya Shelton-Johnson <lacoya.shelton-johnson@domail.maricopa.edu>

Chancellor
Mrs McGrath just stopped in my office and asked me to ensure that she was notified of both Faculty and Staff Meet & Confer meetings. I told her that I am not involved with those meetings and did not know when any were scheduled, but I would pass along her request.

Gaye

--
Gaye Murphy: Vice Chancellor, Business Services

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | 480-731-8638
email | gaye.murphy@domail.maricopa.edu
website | www.maricopa.edu
Dear College Community,

Maricopa County Community Colleges District (MCCCD) will eliminate football following the upcoming 2018 season as a MCCCD sponsored sport. Ongoing financial constraints, including leveling off of enrollment growth at a majority of the colleges as well as the zeroing out of state support for MCCCD has led to the need for the district to look at the prioritization of resources to ensure we continue to meet the changing educational needs of the community.

In May 2017, the Maricopa Priorities Athletic Task Force submitted a list of recommendations to District Administration regarding the MCCCD athletic programs. These recommendations focused on student success, effective allocation of resources, and long-term compliance and sustainability. Their exhaustive study discovered that among all athletic programs, football was the lowest performing against key student success metrics including dropout rates, student-athlete GPAs, and course completion. Football also had the highest student loan default rate.

These recommendations, coupled with the elimination of financial investment from the state in community college education, forced very difficult conversations about our ability to serve the growing education needs of our community, especially those for whom access is already a challenge.

The football program makes up 20 percent of the total MCCCD athletic budget and is responsible for more than 50 percent of related insurance costs. Ongoing costs to maintain the football programs could exceed $20 million in needed capital improvements and associated expenses.

Football programs will be eliminated at Mesa Community College, Scottsdale Community College, Glendale Community College, and Phoenix College following the Fall 2018 season. We will honor the scholarships of our players through the Spring 2019 semester. No other sports programs will be impacted by this decision.

Sincerely,

Sasan Poureetezadi
Interim President
An Executive Session and a Regular Board Meeting of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board were scheduled to be held beginning at 5:00 p.m. at the District Support Services Center, 2411 West 14th Street, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to ARS §38-431.07, notice having been duly given.

GOVERNING BOARD
Laurin Hendrix, President
Linda Thor, Vice President
Johanna Haver, Member
Jean McGrath, Member
Dana Saar, Member
Tracy Livingston, Member
Absent: Alfredo Gutierrez, Member

ADMINISTRATION
Maria Harper-Marinick
LaCoya Shelton
Debbie Kushibab, Interim EVC & Provost
Gaye Murphy
Paul Dale
Edward Kelty
Christina Schultz
Chris Bustamante
Bill Guerriero
Maria Wise for Steven Gonzales
Jan Gehler
Chris Haines
Eric Leshinskie for Terry Leyba-Ruiz
Heather Weber for Ernie Lara
Shari Olson
Sasan Pourretezadi
Leslie Cooper, Legal

EXECUTIVE SESSION
The Executive Session was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING
President Hendrix called to order the Regular Board Meeting of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board for August 22, 2017 at 6:33 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The assembly pledged allegiance to the United States of America led by Mesa Community College Student Erik Aguilar.

SUBSTITUTIONS
There were two substitutions for members of the CEC.

STUDENT LIFE REPORTS
Students from the Mesa Community College Associated Students were in attendance this evening. Specific members were Lorena Austin, Jasmine Rundall, Erik Aguilar, Ariana Granger, and Brian Bernal. The group provided a description of their goals for the year 2017-18 which included:
- Increased Communication
- Empowering Students
- Collaboration with the Community
- Technological Advancements, including the development of a CANVAS App and ASMCC App

**EMERITUS, AWARDS, AND RECOGNITION**

There were five awards this month. The following college presidents or representatives approached the podium to introduce their emeritus recipients:

Eric Leshinskie, Vice President of Academic Affairs at GCC, introduced Dr. Robert Bowker and Timothy Sylvester. Dr. Bowker contributed 30 years to GCC’s Biology Department as a herpetologist. In addition to taking students into the field to study the desert ecosystem and learn ecological principles, he was instrumental in developing curriculum. Mr. Sylvester served 25 years at GCC as faculty in Business and Information Technology. He was instrumental in the design and leadership of the new faculty orientation project called FYRE which has been a hallmark program.

Dr. Bill Guerriero, Interim President of CGCC, introduced retiring Mathematics Faculty Melinda Rudibaugh, a much sought-after instructor in math developmental levels through calculus and differential equations.

A fifth emeritus recipient, Elizabeth O’Brien from Phoenix College was also honored but was unable to be in attendance.

**PRESENTATION OF CHECKS FROM CRAFTS EMPLOYEES**

Ralph Castillo and Richard Gonzales representing the Crafts Employees came forward to present checks to three colleges (MCC, GCC, GWC) who had accepted interns this past year for training purposes. The remainder of their funds were given to the Maricopa Foundation. This has been their tradition for many, many years and they wanted to once again show their appreciation for the internship program.

**CHANCELLOR REPORT**

The Chancellor provided an Update on the Transformation Plan which was approved earlier in the year. The Chancellor stated that the goal was to bring the necessary changes to our system that would allow the organization to better meet the educational and employment needs of the community through more effective deployment of resources, increased responsiveness, and collaborative innovation. Chancellor Harper-Marinick highlighted the four pillars of transformation: Student Support, Industry Partnerships (Workforce Development), Guided Pathways, and Enterprise Performance (Technology, Business Services, and HR).

Next, the Chancellor spoke about the key elements of transformation included within the pillars. These include:

- Programs that are fully mapped out and aligned with further education and career advancement while providing structured or guided exploration for undecided students.
• Proactive academic and career advising from start through completion and/or transfer, with assigned point of contact at each stage.
• Consistent, effective and collaborative business practices to bring MCCCD forward into a competitive marketplace.
• A robust and comprehensive talent management system that ensures we retain and attract the best and brightest.
• Develop systemic and strategic partnerships with employers to foster growth in industry sectors that matter to Maricopa’s economic development.
• Establish hands-on workplace experiences for students driven by local businesses.
• Enhance the student experience by developing and implementing system-wide tools to find, engage and enroll students seamlessly.
• Student services that effectively target and deliver students to the right college, with the right program, at the right time.

The Chancellor next spoke about the substantial goals which were assigned to the Transformation Plan: They included:
• Double the rate of degree completion by 2025
• Double the rate of certificate completion by 2025
• Increase retention and persistence
• Reduce excess credits and loan debt for students
• Refine “successful” student completion to include employment and economic metrics
• Reduce attainment gap students

The Transformation ensures we are meeting the economic, workforce, and educational needs of Maricopa County employers and residents:
• Transformation is focused on student success, alignment with industry, and sustainable operations and infrastructure.
• Shifting our culture to a system of colleges ensures that we are more entrepreneurial, increases efficiency and collaboration, and better leverages resources across the system.

Dr. Paul Dale, President of Paradise Valley Community College, spoke about the Transformation Plan as it relates to Student Support. These include student services that effectively target and deliver students to the right college, with the right program, at the right time. It also includes enhancing the student experience by developing and implementing system-wide tools to find, engage and enroll students seamlessly. These changes include implementation of:
• Maricopa Call Center to conduct outreach and service student callers not currently being helped at the colleges due to operational capacity
• Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system to track all lifecycle interactions between the student and any Maricopa entity
• Establishes standard service delivery program for all colleges and includes targeted training programs for all student services areas (enrollment, financial aid, etc.)
• Creates more convenient, integrated technology tools for students to access their Maricopa services

Dr. Ernie Lara spoke about the Transformation Goal of Guided Pathways.
• These are programs that are fully mapped out and aligned with further education and career advancement while providing structured or guided exploration for undecided students.
• Proactive academic and career advising from the start through completion and/or transfer, with assigned point of contact at each stage

Daniel Barajas spoke about Industry Partnerships as they pertain to the Transformation Plan. He stated they were working with the end in mind and they would be establishing hands-on workplace experiences for students driven by local businesses. They plan to develop systemic and strategic partnerships with employers to foster growth in industry sectors

In closing, the Chancellor indicated that the Enterprise Performance Segment would include consistent, effective, and collaborative business practices to bring MCCCD forward into a competitive marketplace. It would also include a robust and comprehensive talent acquisition and management system and a new budget development and resource allocation model.

MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Board President Hendrix requested a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Board Member Saar requested the removal of Action Items 8.6 through 10.1, with the exception of 9.7. The following items remained on the Consent Agenda:

7.1 APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 27, 2017 EXECUTIVE SESSION, PUBLIC HEARING FOR ADOPTION OF THE CHARTER SCHOOL BUDGETS AND REGULAR BOARD MEETING

8.1 APPROVE FACULTY EMERITUS DISTINCTION – GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE – DR. DEBORAH VANMARCHE - award Faculty Emeritus Distinction to Dr. Deborah VanMarche, Faculty, Psychology.

8.2 APPROVE FACULTY EMERITUS DISTINCTION – GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE – DR. ROBERT BOWKER - award Faculty Emeritus Distinction to Dr. Robert Bowker, Faculty, Biology.
8.3 APPROVE FACULTY EMERITUS DISTINCTION – GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE – TIMOTHY SYLVESTER - award Faculty Emeritus Distinction to Timothy Sylvester, Faculty, Business and Information Technology.

8.4 APPROVE FACULTY EMERITUS DISTINCTION – CHANDLER-GILBERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE – MELINDA RUDIBAUGH - award Faculty Emeritus Distinction to Melinda Rudibaugh, Mathematics Faculty at Chandler-Gilbert Community College.

8.5 APPROVE EMERITUS DISTINCTION – PHOENIX COLLEGE - ELIZABETH O’BRIEN - award Faculty Emeritus Distinction to Elizabeth O’Brien for her meritorious contributions to the students of the Maricopa County Community College District.

9.7 APPROVAL TO ACCEPT THE TRANSFER OF A GRANT FROM THE MCCCD FOUNDATION FOR THE NINA MASON PULLIAM LEGACY SCHOLARS PROGRAM - accept the transfer of a grant of $484,650 from the Maricopa Community Colleges Foundation. The grant was made to the Maricopa Community Colleges Foundation by the Nina Mason Pulliam Charitable Trust. The funds awarded shall be used to pay the student support costs and program/administrative support costs with the Nina Mason Pulliam Legacy Scholars. This program supports the educational aspirations of nontraditional students. The grant term is from July 1, 2017 to September 30, 2021. The project will be coordinated by the District Office of Student Affairs in the Division of Academic and Student Affairs.

10.2 APPROVAL OF CONTRACT AWARD FOR COOLING TOWER REPLACEMENT AT RIO SALADO OFFICE AND CLASSROOM BUILDING IN TEMPE – RIO SALADO COLLEGE - approve a contract award in the amount of Three Hundred Four Thousand Two Hundred Eighty Five and 00/100ths Dollars ($304,285.00) to Bel-Aire Mechanical to replace the cooling towers at the six-story Rio Salado College office and classroom building in Tempe.

10.3 APPROVAL OF CONTRACT AWARD FOR COOLING TOWER REPLACEMENT AT RIO SALADO OFFICE AND CLASSROOM BUILDING IN TEMPE – RIO SALADO COLLEGE - approve a contract award in the amount of Three Hundred Fifteen Thousand, One Hundred Forty-Three Dollars and 00/100 ($315,143.00) to Copper ST Construction and Design, LLC to remodel the existing Gila Hall Building on the Chandler-Gilbert Pecos Campus.

10.4 APPROVAL OF PARTIAL GUARANTEED MAXIMUM PRICE AMENDMENT NUMBER TWO FOR C BUILDING REMODEL AT PHOENIX COLLEGE - approve a second partial Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) Contract, Amendment Number Two, in the amount not to exceed Eight Million Eight Five Thousand Four Hundred Fifty One and 00/100ths Dollars ($8,085,451.00) to
RYAN Companies US, Inc. for the remodeling of the existing C Building at Phoenix College. This is the second of three anticipated GMP awards to RYAN Companies for the construction of this project.

10.5 APPROVAL OF AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO A LEASE FOR AGAVE HALL AND BRADSHAW HALL SPACE USE BETWEEN CHANDLER-GILBERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE WILLIAMS CAMPUS (CGCC) AND PHOENIX CHILDREN’S CHORUS -  Approve a lease with Phoenix Children’s Chorus (PCC) at the Chandler-Gilbert Community College (CGCC) Pecos Campus with an initial term of August 22, 2017 through May 30, 2017 and automatic annual renewals for five years unless terminated by either party with ninety-day written notice.

10.6 APPROVAL OF UPGRADES TO PLANETARIUM ROOM AT MESA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SOUTHERN & DOBSON CAMPUS -  Grant Mesa Community College (MCC) approval to upgrade the Planetarium (Room PS115) in the Physical Science (PS15) Building at Southern & Dobson campus. This project will replace existing computer hardware and software, digital projectors, dome lighting, and audio processors with new components for the existing Planetarium. The new computing system and audio-visual hardware will replace the existing components in the equipment room of the Planetarium. New digital projectors will be ceiling mounted to open floor space currently occupied by existing pedestal-mounted digital projectors. New lighting hardware will replace the existing lighting system mounted on the edge (“cove”) of the planetarium's domed screen. The existing dome screen, seating, audio speaker hardware, and existing carpeting WILL NOT be renovated as part of this project.

Motion 10512
Board Member Saar moved for approval of the Consent Agenda. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 5-1 (McGrath – No; Gutierrez not in attendance).

Motion 10513
Board Member Saar moved for approval of Item 8.6. Board Vice President Thor seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).
Discussion:
No discussion. Board Member Saar stated questions had been answered during Transformation presentation.

REMOVED BY BOARD MEMBER SAAR FROM CONSENT AGENDA

8.7 APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH MSS TECHNOLOGIES FOR CONSULTING SERVICES FOR MCCCD TRANSFORMATION PLAN - approve business management consulting services of MSS Technologies to complete the Transformation organizational infrastructure, governance, and budget controls system with ROI tracking consistent with Board expectations. MSS is an approved Maricopa County Community Colleges District Vendor via RFP #3135-10. The estimate cost for 120 days of engagement is $338,000. Deliverables for this period include:

- **Refine Strategies, Projects, Outcomes**
  - Develop/approve scope
  - Solidify teams/stakeholders
  - Clarify individual projects

- **Develop Initial Program Roadmap**
  - Develop initial timeline
  - Clarify Sequencing/Dependencies
  - Identify Resource Requirements (preliminary)

- **Fast-track 90 Day Activities**
  - Validate
  - Scope/Plan
  - Launch/Support

- **Launch Projects**
  - Assemble Teams
  - Kickoff Initiatives
  - Integrate across all strategies and communications

- **Refine Program Roadmap**
  - Build Detailed Project Plans
  - Identify Milestones
  - Resource Requirements

MOTION

Motion 10514
Board Member Livingston moved for approval of Item 8.7. Board Vice President Thor seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
Board Member Saar asked if there would be a Governing Board contact. The Chancellor responded that she would be point of contact. There will be monthly reporting or special sessions. The group is a business change management group that will put a structure and governance in place. They will work with the Chancellor and Darcy Renfro who is heading up the transformation project and the team.
8.8 APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT – MESA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS - authorize the Chancellor or her designee to prepare and execute documents necessary to resolve a claim of age and race discrimination asserted by two Mesa Community College faculty members, Karen Hardin and Sonia Esposito, for a total lump sum of $175,000 in accordance with the terms presented to and discussed with the Governing Board in an email dated August 3, 2017, and to make the disbursements required by the terms of the agreement.

MOTION

Motion 10515
Board Member Saar moved for approval of Item 8.8. Board Vice President Thor seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
Board Member Saar asked what would be happening with employees who had caused the discrimination to arise. The Chancellor responded that this was handled according to policies and procedures. The Chancellor stated she would speaking privately with Board Member Saar about this.

8.9 APPROVAL OF ELIMINATION OF DISTRICT-REIMBURSED RELEASE TIME FOR CLASSIFIED STAFF COUNCIL (CSC) OFFICERS AND CSC REPRESENTATIVES - approve the elimination of all District-reimbursed release time for Classified Staff Council officers and representatives who are conducting CSC business. It is further recommended that the Board direct the Chancellor to develop an employee policy for consideration by the Governing Board that provides for Classified Staff Council officer and representative participation in District governance.

MOTION

Motion 10516
Board Vice President Thor moved for approval of Item 8.9. Board Member McGrath seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
Board Member Saar commented that involvement of our staff is important to him and hopefully to the rest of the board and hopes that “we are a team.” Everybody’s voice needs to be heard and this has made our system work very well in the past. The Chancellor commented that a new policy will be forthcoming – a policy of inclusion. Policies will come back to the Board by September Meeting. Board Vice President Thor wanted to make clear that this action is not about limiting participation or curtailing shared governance. The issue here is that State law requires that the Board have a policy before it releases employees and in turn reimburses the colleges for those employees’ release time. This Board never adopted such a policy so what this action does is stop activity that is not authorized by policy but then asks the Chancellor to come back to the Board with a policy for employee participation. This is about
bringing us in line with the law. Board Member Livingston commented that this group has been paid a lot of money (1/2 million) and we wanted everyone to get along. For the last year or so the atmosphere when you walked into the room was icy and cold and did not feel welcoming. Does not know what it is like to work on a campus. If we were giving you release time to work in a positive manner, it has backfired. The group did not come to the table and play well. The group is not getting along very well and has heard that things are going so badly that they may be afraid to come talk to Board Members. This cannot go on any longer. It is a relative farce and she intended to vote in favor on the action.

9.1 APPROVAL TO ACCEPT THE TRANSFER OF A GRANT FROM THE MCCCD FOUNDATION FOR THE FOSTER YOUTH STUDENT SUCCESS PROJECT- accept the transfer of a grant of $108,000 from the Maricopa Community Colleges Foundation. The grant was made to the Maricopa Community Colleges Foundation by the Nina Mason Pulliam Charitable Trust. The funds awarded shall be used to support the Foster Youth Student Success Project. The purpose of this project is to increase the college completion rates of students aging out of the foster care system. The grant term is from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018. The project will be coordinated by the District Office of Student Affairs in the Division of Academic and Student Affairs.

Motion 10517
Board Member Saar moved for approval of Item 9.1. Board Member Livingston seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
Board Member Saar asked if there was a starting point or a baseline for the completion rates. The Chancellor provided statistics of students who had connection to the foster care system and their desire to attend college; however, the percentage of those graduating is very low. The generous support of the Foundation allows the Maricopa system to sponsor scholarships.

9.2 APPROVAL TO ACCEPT A GRANT AWARD FROM FIRST THINGS FIRST FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD PROFESSIONALS AT RIO SALADO COLLEGE - accept the 2018 grant award from the Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board - Phoenix South Regional Partnership Council (First Things First) to the Maricopa County Community College District on behalf of Rio Salado College for the Professional Development for Early Childhood Professionals program. The total grant award is $310,000. Approval of the 12-month allowable expenditure period is requested for July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

Motion 10518
Board Member Saar moved for approval of Item 9.2. Board Vice President Thor seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
The Chancellor stated this was a continuing grant that was in its third year and currently worked with 31 child care centers in South Phoenix.

**9.3 APPROVAL TO ACCEPT A GRANT FROM US DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO MESA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE INITIATIVE – BUILDING GLOBAL TRUST THROUGH EDUCATION AT AMERICAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

Motion 10519
Board Member Saar moved for approval of Item 9.3. Board Member Livingston seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
Board Member Saar inquired about how money would be divided per student. The Chancellor responded that the grant goes through North Virginia Community College. It has resulted in 60 academic certificates, 73 CCI certificates, 74 students, 12 countries represented, and 150 host families have been engaged.

**9.4 APPROVAL TO ACCEPT A GRANT FROM US DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO SCOTTSDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE INITIATIVE – BUILDING GLOBAL TRUST THROUGH EDUCATION AT AMERICAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

Motion 10520
Board Member Livingston moved for approval of Item 9.4. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
This grant is the same as the one for Mesa Community College.

**9.5 APPROVAL OF CARL D. PERKINS IV BASIC GRANT FOR FY17-18 FEDERAL CAREER & TECHNICAL EDUCATION FUNDING**

Motion 10520
Board Member Haver moved for approval of Item 9.5. Board Member Saar seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
This grant will be used to support programs and services for occupational students.
MOTION

Motion 10521
Board Member Livingston moved for approval of Item 9.5. Board Member Hendrix seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
Board Member Saar inquired about the distribution of money. The Chancellor commented that distribution has been the same for seven years but will re-examine the process in order to make better use of funds and allocate into areas where money is needed.

REMOVED BY BOARD MEMBER SAAR FROM CONSENT AGENDA

9.6 APPROVAL OF NEGOTIATED CONTRACT FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY TO THE SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS NETWORK TO OPERATE THE ARIZONA PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER - approve acceptance of a negotiated contract in the amount of $378,798 from the U.S. Department Defense Logistics Agency, Office of Small Business Programs, to the Maricopa Community Colleges. The contract was awarded for the Arizona Small Business Development Center Network to operate the Arizona Procurement Technical Assistance Center for the period September 1, 2017 – August 31, 2018.

MOTION

Motion 10522
Board Member Saar moved for approval of Item 9.6. Board Vice President Thor seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Gutierrez – not in attendance).

Discussion:
Prior to this program, funds were going out of state and now our in-state clients have received 494 contracts totaling $481 million which has made a huge impact on Arizona’s economy. Great job of keeping funds here in Arizona. Appreciation expressed to Janice Washington and her staff for the leadership they have shown with the PTAC Program.

REMOVED BY BOARD MEMBER SAAR FROM CONSENT AGENDA

10.1 APPROVAL OF SUBLEASE OF PAPAGO RESERVE BUILDING - approve a sublease of 15,825 sq. ft. of space of the 19,564 sq. ft. that MCCCD currently leases in The Papago Reserve Building at 1050 W. Washington St. in Tempe, Arizona to Early Warning Systems, LLC.

MOTION

Motion 10523
Roll Call Vote on Item 10.1
Board Member Livingston moved for approval of Item 10.1. Board Member Haver seconded. Approval of Item 10.1 was done by roll call vote. Motion not passed 2-4 (Livingston & Thor – Yes; Haver, McGrath, Saar and Hendrix – No) Mr. Gutierrez not in attendance.

Discussion:
Board Member Saar stated that this space has been empty for eighteen months and we were now contemplating an offer that was not acceptable. Essentially the new occupants would be receiving six months of free rent.

The following citizens came forward to offer comments:

Douglas Penwell, CSC Member from Glendale Community College, stated he wanted to go on record to say that the proposed action on the agenda this evening pertaining to the Classified Staff Council sent the wrong message regarding shared governance and would affect morale of the Classified Staff; however, the Classified Staff Council looked forward to working with the Governing Board on the concept of shared governance.

Alisha Rose, CGCC Dance Program Student, came forward to speak about the hiring process for the recent residential dance position. She stated she was the parent of three teenagers that would soon be ready to enter community college and was concerned about the education at CGCC. She was stunned when interim dance instructor Cheri McDowell was not given the fulltime position. She knows quality education when she see it and she was impressed by Ms. McDowell’s instruction. Ms. McDowell was greatly respected and took students to dance festivals and she interacted very well with other faculty. When she did not receive the position at CGCC, she was very surprised and hoped that the concerns expressed this evening would be heard and taken to heart.

Courtney Miles, a former CGCC Dance Program Student, came forward to speak about the hiring process regarding the residential dance position. She indicated that she was present this evening representing 260 students that signed petitions. She claimed that President Bill Guerriero manipulated (at this point President Hendrix asked her to stop; disparaging comments would not be allowed). She continued by stating that classes which have been previously held at CGCC have been cancelled. These classes were a great way to reach out and introduce students to the college. When Ms. Miles stated she questioned the ethics used in the hiring process President Hendrix asked her to stop again and take her seat.

Samantha McNeilly, CGCC Dance Program student, approached the podium to also speak about the dance program residential faculty hiring process. She stated that she represented 260 petition signers who felt there had been manipulation in the hiring process and it was biased and improper. She stated that Cheri McDowell was the most qualified candidate for the position and that the person selected had less teaching experience and no experience running an educational dance program. (At this point President Hendrix asked Ms. McNeilly to stop her comments.)
INFORMATION ITEMS

11.1 REVIEW EMPLOYMENTS (REGULAR, SHORT-TERM, AND SPECIALLY FUNDED) JUNE, 2017) AND SEPARATIONS (JUNE, 2017) - During this time period, there were 68 hires and 69 separations.

MONITORING REPORTS

12.1 REVIEW BUDGET ANALYSIS REPORT, FUND 1 – GENERAL UNRESTRICTED FUND, FOR THE ONE MONTH ENDING JULY 31, 2017 - Expenditure analysis indicates 3.9% of the budget has been expended this year as compared to 3.2% expended at this same point last year. 50.0% of the budget remained unexpended or unencumbered compared to 47.7% in the prior year. Revenue analysis indicated that 9.4% of the budgeted revenue has been recognized as compared to 9.4% in the prior year. The projected fund balance will increase by ~$3.7M this fiscal year and the projected ending fund balance for June 2018 is $180.6M. The District should meet its financial stability requirements.

12.2 REVIEW PRELIMINARY BUDGET ANALYSIS REPORT, FUND 1 – GENERAL UNRESTRICTED FUND, FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDING JUNE 30, 2017 - Expenditure analysis indicates 87.2% of the budget has been expended this year as compared to 89.3% expended at this same point last year. 12.8% of the budget remained unexpended or unencumbered compared to 10.7% in the prior year. Revenue analysis indicated that 95.5% of the budgeted revenue has been recognized as compared to 95.7% in the prior year. The projected fund balance will increase by ~$3.3M this fiscal year and the projected ending fund balance for June 2017 is $173.6M. The District should meet its financial stability requirements.

12.3 REVIEW FINAL BUDGET ANALYSIS REPORT, FUND 1 – GENERAL UNRESTRICTED FUND, FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDING JUNE 30, 2016 FINAL - Expenditure analysis indicates 89.3% of the budget has been expended this year as compared to 84.7% expended at this same point last year. 10.7% of the budget remained unexpended or unencumbered compared to 15.3% in the prior year. Revenue analysis indicated that 90.1% of the budgeted revenue has been recognized as compared to 85.1% in the prior year. The projected fund balance increased by ~$6.4M this fiscal year and the projected ending fund balance for June 2017 was $173.6M. The District should meet its financial stability requirements.

There was no report.

Patricia Gail Haase, Adjunct Faculty Association President provided the following comments:

“We worked hard last year to establish community, communication and collegiality. I believe we made progress, thanks to a great deal of support from administration, residential faculty, the staff and each other. We have recently secured approval to use our professional development funds to help with tuition for those taking classes to become qualified under the HLC requirements. This is a temporary exception to the policy, since tuition is not normally covered, and those who qualify are very appreciative.

This year, the AFA will emphasize Professional Development, including a new intensive program to strengthen candidates for full-time positions. We are going to put major energy into a pilot leadership program which will provide adjuncts a broader-base of understanding of all things Maricopa. Right now, this is called the Institute.

In our broader focus, we will continue to partner with a Faculty Development Committee program, called Learning Today to Shape Tomorrow. The Centers for Teaching and Learning have excellent training available, so we will try to help connect adjuncts with the great opportunities. We will push major district events such as the Student Success Conference as well as our own conferences, which are planned to address effective practices, student engagement, assessment, and accommodation and inclusion.

Our new Glendale board representative, Ted Hibbeler, is the creator of Hoops for Learning. We plan to use his expertise to determine how adjuncts can both be informed and equipped to support students in various existing programs such as ACE and Hoops to increase retention and completion.

One of the most hopeful developments on the horizon for me is the development of an Adjunct Page on the new employee portal. The plan is to have ‘all things adjunct’ in one central location that can link all relevant information; from finding payroll information, or how to certify 45th day, to syllabus samples. Doing this well will depend on cooperation of several departments, since not all colleges have identical processes. We want to make sure we respect that, and always provide accurate information. I am looking forward to the challenge... I think it will really help. Thanks you so much for your support.”
COMMUNITY LINKAGE

BOARD MEMBERS

Dr. Thor: No report
Mr. Saar: No report
Mrs. Haver: Reported that she had recently met someone very familiar with hiking trails in Arizona and was more than willing to share with faculty whose curriculum included activities such as this.
Mrs. Livingston: No report
Mr. Hendrix: No report
Mr. Gutierrez: No report

EXTERNAL COMMUNITY

AADGB: No report
ASBA: Mr. Saar had no report
ACCT: No Report

NEXT BOARD MEETINGS

President Hendrix announced the following future meetings.
September 12, 2017, 4:00 p.m., Agenda Review
September 19, 2017, 6:30 p.m., Regular Board Meeting, GB Room
September 19, 2017, 5:00 p.m., Executive Session if needed

MOTION

MOTION
President Hendrix requested a motion to adjourn the regular board meeting. Board Member Thor motioned for adjournment of the regular board meeting. Board Member McGrath seconded.

ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Board Meeting of the Maricopa Community College District adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

_______________________
Dr. Linda M. Thor
Governing Board Vice President
Chancellor - We are thinking we should vote on the item to eliminate paid release time for CSC officials at the same time we vote on whether to appeal DACA. Does that seem reasonable to you?

On Sat, Jun 24, 2017 at 1:27 PM, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

> We will probably need to allow for a period of time for the transition. I’d suggest making it as rapid as possible but we must be reasonable at the same time. Since you have the ball rolling, do you want to communicate with Maria? We will probably have a special meeting in July to vote on the Daca issue. We could probably add it to that agenda. The sooner we act on it the better. If we act on it in July, the affected people could probably return to their jobs in the Fall.

Probably we must wait until August to put it on the agendas and the five officers need to be told that we are doing this so they can arrange to return to their regular jobs. Be sure we have the vote and then ask Maria and/or LaCoya how best to handle it.

On Saturday, June 24, 2017, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:
> Let’s move forward with doing it. I’m with you.
> 
> From: Johanna Haver [mailto:johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu]
> Sent: Saturday, June 24, 2017 11:45 AM
> To: Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net>
> Subject: Re: Update

> I gave the list of diversity questions to Maria who, i believe, will eliminate most of them from the collection. Even the faculty officers I met for coffee agreed with me on that issue I would prefer to eliminate release pay only for the CSC since it corresponds to the practice of ASU. It would put the faculty on notice - that we could do the same to them.
> 
> On Saturday, June 24, 2017, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:
>> Johanna,
I agree with all of your comments. You have raised a couple of very serious issues. Just an FYI, the Faculty association does not include CTE instructors or adjuncts. Although they claim to represent 60% of instructors, if you back out these two groups, they represent about 22%. Less than 15% of the potential CSC are actually members of CSC.

Laurin

From: Jean McGrath [mailto:jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Saturday, June 24, 2017 9:42 AM
To: Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu>; Ourrentalhome <laurinh@cox.net>
Subject: Re: Update

I agree about the faculty association. My complaint is that the taxpayers have been paying for their work release.

I think the "diversity" questions are unacceptable for employment. They have nothing to do with the job someone is being hired for and I'm sure violate privacy.

On Fri, Jun 23, 2017 at 11:45 AM, Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

I printed out the "diversity" questions and gave them to the Chancellor this morning. I believe she will eliminate the unacceptable ones from the list. In addition, I think it perfectly reasonable to end release time for the 5 CSC officers. The main reason is that we want to be a student-centric district - not one controlled by the employees because that leads to a lack of accountability and interference with administrative decisions that focus on improving academics for the students. In addition, it appears to be highly unusual for such an employees group to have release time.

I believe we should leave the faculty association alone because it has been established for many years, includes at least 60% of the teachers, and has not been a problem. We can go after them later if we feel it is necessary - more to reduce rather than eliminate release time. It is quite usual for school districts to allow the officials of such employee groups release time.
It is interesting how ASU manages what they call Staff Council.

Cultural competence is the creation of Dr. Sasan Pooreetazadi in his new hiring directive for MCC.

Diversity is old language and I don't know what it means either just as I still haven't found out what social justice means.

Interestingly, the diversity questions are new and the guys from the faculty association whom I had coffee with today, Keith Hefner, Mike Mitchell, and a science teacher from PC, were aghast. They wondered about "culture competence" and having to explain "diversity." They agreed with me that this diversity stuff is nonsense. Keith said he believed the questions came from HR.

Regarding the release time. I heard from the Constituent Communications Coordinator at ASU who let me know that the University Senate leadership consisted of 6 individuals - one from each campus. They elect their own President of the Senate who receives 2 hours of release time. The other five receive 1 hour of release time each. The ASU Staff Council corresponds to our CSC. They serve on a volunteer basis. No one receives release time.
Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
Move forward. We can’t please everyone all the time.

Mike Mitchell called this morning. He wants to meet on Monday the 19th to discuss virtues of meet and confer. It is going away.

Dr. Thor has not responded but I will ask again.

On Tue, Feb 6, 2018 at 10:34 AM, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

A cursory review looks acceptable. I’m certainly not any expert on these types of documents. As long as you are comfortable that we are not tying the administration’s hands in any way, I’m good with it. I don’t want to return to anything that simulates CPD.

Thank You

Laurin
On Mon, Jan 29, 2018 at 6:34 PM, Linda Thor <linda.thor@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

I do want to point out that the presidents and the vice chancellors are peers. All report directly to the chancellor. The VCHR is one member of CEC; it makes no sense to me that one member of CEC can have veto power over 13 others.

Linda

On Mon, Jan 29, 2018 at 5:39 PM, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

I agree with the Chancellor’s comments. I have not heard any negative comments from anyone. It seems clear that the existing councils are sufficient to provide adequate opportunity for communication. I believe that we have met the intent of the resolution.

Authority must be delegated to VC’s. We are too big to consolidate too much decision making at the top. I don’t have any problem with a VC having veto power over the CEC. We must empower staff to grow as they fulfill their duties. A VC is an extension of the Chancellor and should be competent to act on the Chancellors behalf in most situations in their assigned purview.

As long as there is a method for input from employees or communities of interest, which there is, we have met the intent of the resolution.

Laurin
Subject: Re: Process for new employee policy development-Draft

Thank you, Dr. Thor, for taking the time to review and provide comments. I appreciate your feedback. It is a process similar to what we currently do for the development or modification of administrative regulations with the addition of steps for Board approval.

Regarding a single employee submitting a proposal: we believe that proposals should be vetted through a leadership council so that we do not have proposals that may serve only an individual's interest but we could reconsider that if the Board chooses to broaden who can submit a proposal.

Regarding the communities of interest: after several hours of productive discussion, the ad-hoc group did not recommend forming employee groups again because we could not identify a clear purpose for having them. Most felt that existing councils could provide opportunities for dialogue and professional development. We have incorporated existing councils in the process for policy input.

Mr. Hendrix, do you have comments about any of this?

Thanks

MARIA HARPER-MARINICK, PH.D.
MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Chancellor
2411 West 14th Street
Phone (480) 731-8108 | Fax (480) 731-8120 | Cell (480) 364-6744
maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu
www.maricopa.edu

On Mon, Jan 29, 2018 at 3:38 PM, Linda Thor <linda.thor@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Chancellor,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this draft. I have made comments and suggestions which are tracked in the attached draft.

Generally, the process strikes me as very bureaucratic although I recognize that this many steps are probably necessary. I am concerned that there does not appear to be a mechanism for an employee or group of employees to submit a proposal--only executives can do that. I also think that too much veto power is given to the Vice Chancellor of HR. That person should not be able to override the CEC. Only the Chancellor or Board should have that power.

I also note that this draft addresses only one piece of the September 18 resolution. Will
you also be bringing forward a proposal to respond to this bullet from the resolution:

"A structure reflecting various employee communities of interest based on occupational category and aligned with the federal regulatory agencies referenced above for purposes of appropriate occupational grouping and efficiencies in annual reporting. Such a structure should be designed to draw out the best thinking of employees and to allow the District to benefit from identifying employees' common interests, allowing employees to share knowledge and work together to solve problems"

A structure that addresses this bullet might provide the mechanism by which groups of employees can propose new policies or policy changes.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks!

On Fri, Jan 26, 2018 at 4:40 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domain.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Mr. Hendrix and Dr. Thor,

Please take a look at the attached draft and let me know if you have questions. I intend to send the draft to the ad-hoc task force I had convened and then with Board approval share with all employees.

Thank you

MARIA HARPER-MARINICK, PH.D.
MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Chancellor
2411 West 14th Street
Phone (480) 731-8108 | Fax (480) 731-8120 | Cell (480) 364-6744
maria.harper@domain.maricopa.edu
www.maricopa.edu
Yes. Absolutely!

Sent from Hendrix Control Center

On Aug 20, 2017, at 3:01 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Also, I will tell Bliss and Haase that they have no more than 3 minutes, ok with you?

---

On Sun, Aug 20, 2017 at 2:48 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Thank you, Mr. Hendrix, I do not need to join you in your meetings. You will like Ms. Haase. She is a professional, nice, and very committed adjunct faculty member.

I will reach out to them about their presentations.

I fully agree with your goals, and will do my part to make sure people continue to be civil. I have used that word plus "respect" in every speech I have given in the last 2 weeks. And most people are glad to hear that this is the direction we want to take.

I agree that perhaps we should consider a session about "shared" or "participatory" governance so that we reach a level of comfort for all Board members. There is nothing in accreditation that mandates shared governance or meet & confer.

Here is the language directly from the HLC site:

5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.

3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

---

On Sun, Aug 20, 2017 at 2:26 PM, Laurin Hendrix <laurin@cox.net> wrote:

I am meeting with Mike in hopes of reaching out to him to help keep the meeting civil. My meeting with Gail is unrelated. I am just meeting with her because I have never met her before. As far as I know, I am not meeting with Chris at all. If you recommend a different path, I am open to suggestions. Everyone has a right to express their opinion but our board meetings need to be civil and respectful. I intend to do whatever it takes to stop the disparaging attacks on individuals and on the administration at our board meetings.

I don't think that it would hurt for both of us to communicate with them. The only signal that I intend to send to Mike is that I would like to see civility and respect at our meetings. I initiated the meeting and asked for five minutes. As for Gail, I don't have any agenda for our meeting.

If you would like to be included in either or both of these meetings, we can modify the schedule to facilitate your schedule. I have a meeting on Monday unrelated to the district at noon. Other than that, my schedule is flexible.

The employee groups are creating their own challenges. I have received emails from board members wanting to discuss shared governance vs meet and confer, how both affect accreditation, and how they are addressed in the policy manuals. I am not familiar enough with this issue to even respond to the emails at this time.
Sent from Hendrix Control Center

On Aug 20, 2017, at 1:39 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Mr. Hendrix,

I was going to send a note to Bliss and Haase but I understand that you are meeting with them and perhaps Mitchell on Monday morning. I do not want to convey conflicting messages. Since you are reaching out to them, I imagine about the same topic, do you see a need for me to send a note too?

Thanks

---

On Fri, Aug 18, 2017 at 12:39 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

I will communicate with them myself to make sure they understand the expectations, and keep it short. After the meeting you held with Bliss and Mitchell, it would be quite unwise for any of them to use their privilege to make disparaging comments. I hope I am not wrong.

Thanks

---

On Fri, Aug 18, 2017 at 11:20 AM, Laurin Hendrix <laurin.hendrix@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

As much as I abhor the thought of another public flogging, I agree with Dr. Thor that our best path is to allow both of them time to speak. I am going to ask Mr. La Sota for any ideas that he may have to limit unprofessional comments or the airing of inappropriate personnel matters at the meeting. I am not going to be receptive to disparaging comments about co-workers.

Laurin

---

From: Maria Harper-Marinick [mailto:maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2017 6:57 PM
To: Laurin Hendrix <laurin.hendrix@domail.maricopa.edu>; Laurin Hendrix <laurin@cox.net>; Linda Thor <linda.thor@domail.maricopa.edu>
Subject: Fwd: Reports at August 22 Governing Board Meeting

Please emails below. Would you allow her to speak? The president of the Adjunct faculty has also asked for time. I want to make it clear to them that it is at your discretion.

Thanks

---

Gloria Smith

Date: Thu, Aug 17, 2017 at 4:23 PM
FYI. Here is the request from Kris Bliss to speak at next Tuesday's meeting.

Gloria

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Kris Bliss <kristina.bliss@mesacc.edu>
Date: Thu, Aug 17, 2017 at 7:35 AM
Subject: Re: Reports at August 22 Governing Board Meeting
To: Gloria Smith <gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu>

I will be reporting at the meeting next week. Will send my content as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Kris Bliss
Classified Staff Council President
Director of Support and Retention Programs
http://www.mesacc.edu/children/
http://www.mesacc.edu/student-life
(p) 480-784-0746 (f) 480-844-3253

On Mon, Jul 31, 2017 at 2:57 PM, Gloria Smith <gloria.smith@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Please let me know if you plan to present at the August 22 GB Meeting. If so, please provide me with a copy of your script and/or Powerpoint in advance of the meeting. PowerPoint presentations need to be loaded in advance of the meeting.

Thanks.

Gloria
I will take another look to see how we can strengthen that point. Thanks for taking the time on Sunday to do this.

On Sun, Sep 10, 2017 at 8:29 PM, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

I’m good with the resolution. I wouldn’t mind making it a little stronger with less emphasis on the employee group input but I’m good with it. I’ll be very pleased to see CPD and CSC go away. Those are two big steps.

Thank You.

Usually, the effective date is the day of the vote. So, it could be that way. Yes, we have enough policies to maintain business going. Some things would be easier than others of course. We do not need until July 2018. We can start the work immediately and possibly have a date of Feb or March to bring forward.

It was drafted by General Counsel, reviewed by VC HR and myself. No one else has reviewed it because I wanted to make sure you had an opportunity to review and provide your feedback to ensure we move in a manner that aligns with your expected outcomes. I was planning to share with Dr Thor but not only we have your feedback.

Thanks
On Sun, Sep 10, 2017 at 7:34 PM, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

> Are we better to go with October 01 or just make it effective immediately upon board vote? It would seem like sooner is better.

I assume that you are comfortable that there is adequate policy in place that we can default to, once we make this vote, that will function adequately until the July date for the new policy?

Has anyone reviewed this yet?

This is going to be a huge step forward.

Laurin

From: Maria Harper-Marinick [mailto:maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Sunday, September 10, 2017 6:30 PM
To: Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net>
Subject: Draft-Confidential

Mr. Hendrix,

As requested, draft included. Drafted by legal with input from HR. I edited a few things for clarity already.

Thanks
A Budget and Finance Committee Meeting, a Regular Meeting, and Executive Session of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board were scheduled to be held beginning at 5:00 p.m. at the District Support Services Center, 2411 West 14th Street, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to ARS §38-431.07, notice having been duly given.

GOVERNING BOARD
Alfredo Gutierrez, President
Linda Thor, Secretary
Johanna Haver, Member
Jean McGrath, Member
Dana Saar, Member
Tracy Livingston, Member
Absent: Laurin Hendrix, Member

ADMINISTRATION
Maria Harper-Marinick
Barbara Basel for LaCoya Shelton
Paul Dale, Interim EVC & Provost
Gaye Murphy
Mary Lou Mosely for Paul Dale (PVC)
Edward Kelty
Christina Schultz
Chris Bustamante
Bill Guerriero
Steven Gonzales
Jan Gehler
Chris Haines
Terry Leyba-Ruiz
Ernie Lara
Shari Olson
Sasan Poureetezadi
Maggie McConnell, Legal

CALL TO ORDER OF BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
Committee Chair Dr. Linda Thor called the Budget and Finance Committee Meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. Dr. Thor announced there was one item on the agenda, which was a review of the 2017-18 Budget.

Vice Chancellor of Business Services Gaye Murphy provided detailed information regarding the following topics (a detailed PowerPoint presentation is included with these minutes which includes the information provided):

- Projected Resources (property taxes from new construction, no tuition increase, internal reallocation, SRP)
- Potential Additional Expenditures (mandatory and high priority expenditures, employee compensation/benefits)
- Details of the FY2017-18 Proposed Budget (breakdown of funds)
- Proposed FY2017-18 Reallocations and Uses
- Operating and Capital Highlights
- Maricopa Tuition Rates (between 2007 thru 2017)
- Property Tax Perspective
- FY2017-18 Budget Adoption Schedule

Discussion Points:
- Changes in enrollment; No new money in capital; How much has to do with enrollment decline?
• What adjustments have been made to the budget due to the decline in enrollment? Response: Enrollment is a self-funding process. Tuition loss is easy to calculate.

• Are we doing something to turn decline around? Response: Strengthen outreach and recruitment services. We need to attract students and also maintain students by helping them be successful.

• $31 million could be available with tuition increase.

• Discussion about Fund Balance. We have unrestricted resources of $400 million. These are reserved for specific purposes and bonding purposes. We have a good cushion to weather the storm.

• At a future meeting we need to look at a future bond or alternative. Property tax increase? Contingency transfer?

• FTSE has been primary focus on budget allocations. Should it be based on needs? Is there any further discussion to base it on need? New revenue plus internal reallocation cuts and increases need to be considered. Look at actual need and see if we are meeting obligations.

• Have a tax increase only for a need. We need to know what needs are. We have a very tight budget but we have choices. Need to rethink marketing efforts. Need to look into targeted populations program. Ask Presidents to give us their needs.

• Calculate what 2% tax levy would generate. Ask colleges to make recommendations on their needs. Need to relook at reallocation process.

• Special meeting of four hours should be held to discuss tax increase possibility, colleges needs, etc. We can slip on timeline but not by much.

Concluding remarks: It was decided to explore holding a four-hour special meeting on a Saturday to discuss budgetary issues.

The Budget and Finance Committee Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.
Ms. Ybarra and Mr. Ruano explained that the Office of Student Life and Leadership provides an environment which fosters the social, academic and professional growth and development of the student. It serves over 400 students, faculty/staff and community member on a weekly basis. The campus serves over 20 active clubs and organizations and they have sponsored over 82 programs this academic year. The EMCC Summer Success Institute was launched in July 2016 with 33 participants. The Institute provides first year students with a jumpstart to their college experience. Through engaging and dynamic experiences, students learn how to successfully navigate the college environment. The Institute consists of four 3-hour sessions held in July. Areas of focus include campus resources, team building, communication skills, classroom etiquette, academic success strategies, diversity, leadership development, and life skills. Upcoming events will include a student success fair, a one-day student conference, the Hermanas Conference, a Women’s Conference, Student Appreciation Day, and Graduation.

COLLEGE REPORTS

There were no reports.

EMERITUS, AWARDS, AND RECOGNITION

There was one presentation. This included one award for Patricia McIntyre from Phoenix College. Interim President Chris Haines approached the podium to present the award.

CITIZEN’S INTERIM

Two citizens came forward. They were Delbert Ray Sr. representing the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community who came forward to encourage the Board to approve the Cloud Song Project on the agenda this evening. Many members of their Indian Community have attended Scottsdale Community College and have successfully gone on to other options. Mr. Ray praised President Jan Gehler for her efforts to create a cultural center that will help with new economic ventures to support their tribes and provide self-sufficiency for their community.

Mr. Mark Hiegel representing the Scottsdale Chamber of Commerce came forward next to praise Scottsdale Community College for always providing a competitive edge. He expressed his support for the Cloud Song Center Project which will help keep kids coming to SCC. It provides an opportunity to go on to other Arizona universities. The new building will allow outreach and showcasing of former students.

CHANCELLOR REPORT

Transformation Task Force Update

The Chancellor requested that Darcy Renfro, Chancellor Chief of Staff, come forward to provide an overview of the Ad-Hoc Transformation Task Force Process. Ms. Renfro’s presentation included the following information:

- Outreach & Communication
- Public Website Information
- Design Principles
  - Focus on student success as primary driver of system stability and success
  - Empower system to be more agile and responsive to workforce and employer needs
  - Incentivize enhanced use of resources, efficiency and collaboration
Deploy an agile leadership structure to enhance community connections

- Values
  - Data-driven decisions
  - Full consideration of benefits and drawbacks of all proposed changes
  - Transparency and inclusiveness
- Task Force Charter
- Proposed Timeline and Process Outreach and Communication

Ms. Renfro reported that the Task Force had kicked off a very aggressive set of meetings last week. The task force included twenty members and these members would be broken down into subcommittees to break up the work. The plan at this point calls for a plan to be presented on April 24.

Update on Enrollment Management:
The Chancellor then requested that Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Dr. Paul Dale provide a report on Enrollment. His presentation included the following:

- Enrollment statistics from 2000 – 2014/15 – Projections through 2025 both at two-year and four-year institutions
- Statistics on Greater Phoenix Unemployment to MCCCD Enrollment during years 2005-2015
- MCCCD FTSE Minus Recession Years
- Student Access – Existing Pipelines
- Student Enrollment Management Plan (SEM)
- Student Communication – Customer Relationship Management (CRM)
- New Student Admissions Application
- Flexible Start Dates
- Some College No Degree Campaign
- Web Redesign and Structure
- Strategic Commitments
- Student Retention

BOARD PRESIDENT REPORT

President Gutierrez announce the following committee assignments:

- Mrs. Jean McGrath – Maricopa Foundation Member for the year 2017
- Mr. Laurin Hendrix and Dr. Linda Thor – Audit and Finance Committee for 2017
- Mr. Alfredo Gutierrez – Arizona Association of District Governing Boards

APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Board President Gutierrez requested a motion to approve the Order of the Agenda.

MOTION

Motion 10466
Board Member Tracy Livingston requested that item 11.2, Approve Authorization by Governing Board of the President’s Involvement in the General Counsel Search, be pulled for discussion. Board Member Dana Saar requested that item 11.3, Approve Resolution Regarding Governing Board Fiduciary Responsibilities, be pulled for discussion.
Board Secretary Thor made a motion to approve the Order of the Agenda with the exception of Items 11.2 and 11.3 which would be discussed separately. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

The following items were included on the Consent Agenda:


11.1. APPROVE EMERITUS DISTINCTION – PHOENIX COLLEGE (PC) – PATRICIA MCINTYRE - it is recommended that the Governing Board award Emeritus Distinction to Patricia McIntyre for her meritorious contributions to the students of the Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD).

11.2. APPROVE AUTHORIZATION BY GOVERNING BOARD OF THE PRESIDENT’S INVOLVEMENT IN THE GENERAL COUNSEL SEARCH - it is recommended that the Governing Board authorize the Governing Board President to initiate and complete a search for a general counsel in concert with the Chancellor and with the assistance of the Human Resources and Legal Services Departments. PULLED FOR DISCUSSION

11.3. APPROVE RESOLUTION REGARDING GOVERNING BOARD FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITIES - it is recommended that the Governing Board adopt the following resolution: The Governing Board’s fiduciary responsibilities are to monitor and steward the District and each of the colleges. Those responsibilities include speaking with the Chancellor, Presidents, Faculty, and all staff as we feel appropriate. Everyone employed by the District is authorized to speak freely and responsibly to Board members individually and in our formal sessions. PULLED FOR DISCUSSION

12.1 APPROVE TITLE I LEA GRANT 2017 – TITLE I LEA - adopt the annual Title I Grant allocation for GateWay Early College High School (GWECHS) in the amount of $114,885.25.

12.2 APPROVE AGREEMENT FOR DUAL ENROLLMENT WITH CHARTER SCHOOLS - authorize entry into an agreement on behalf of its college with the charter schools listed below for its dual enrollment program.

12.3 APPROVE STUDENT HEALTH ASSESSMENT DISTRICT-WIDE - accept the grant of $15,000 from the Maricopa County Department of Public Health. The grant was made to the Maricopa County Community College District to implement the Healthy Maricopa District-wide and Wellness Assessment and develop a School Health Improvement Plan. The goal is to design an organizational model that has a holistic approach to well-being. The grant term is from March 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018.

12.4 APPROVE MCCCD PROPOSITION 301 FISCAL YEAR 2017-2018 ANNUAL PLAN - approve the MCCCD Proposition 301 Fiscal Year 2017-
2018 Annual Plan. The plan was completed in accordance with the amended Arizona Revised Statutes, section 15-1472.

12.5 APPROVE CURRICULUM - It is recommended that the proposals be approved as submitted.

13.1 APPROVE SALE OF A PORTION OF LAND TO CITY OF LEGENDALE FOR A NEW BUS STOP – GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE - approve the sale of a portion of the District property located at the southeast corner of Glendale Community College to the City of Glendale for a new bus stop. The offered purchase price for the 400 square foot parcel is $1,102.00.

13.2. APPROVE LEASE OF SUITE D103 AT RIO SOUTHERN TO PING HE AND YAHUI WANG DBA SZECHWAN NOODLE - authorize the lease of the Suite D103 (1,315 SF) located at Rio Salado College – Southern, 3330 South Price Rd., Tempe, AZ 85252 to Ping He and Yahui Wang (Szechwan). The lease term begins on March 1, 2017 and is for 60 months with an option to extend the lease for another 60 months. The monthly rate will be $931.46 or $8.50 per SF, triple net, for the first 12 months with annual 3% increases. The rate for the extension period will be market rate at that time. Additionally, an amount of $274.00 per month will be charged for maintenance of common areas. A standard reimbursement of $1.50 per SF per year will be allowed for tenant to complete tenant improvements prior to occupying the premises.

MOTION

Motion 10467
Board Member Saar moved for approval of the Consent Agenda as amended (Items 11.2 & 11.3 pulled for discussion). Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

11.2. APPROVE AUTHORIZATION BY GOVERNING BOARD OF THE PRESIDENT’S INVOLVEMENT IN THE GENERAL COUNSEL SEARCH - it is recommended that the Governing Board authorize the Governing Board President to initiate and complete a search for a general counsel in concert with the Chancellor and with the assistance of the Human Resources and Legal Services Departments.

Discussion:
Board Member Tracy Livingston commented that she knew this was a necessary task which should have two board members. The item as it read “that the Governing Board should authorize the Governing Board President to initiate and complete a search for a general counsel in concert with the Chancellor and with the assistance of the Human Resources and Legal Services Departments.” Mrs. Livingston indicated that the Chancellor needed to do this on her own. President Gutierrez responded that historically two board members are on this committee and they then recommend the candidates to the Chancellor and Board Chair. Mrs. Livingston challenged the action item in that she felt it gave the Board Chair too much power and did not mention the two board members who would be serving. It was recommended that this item be amended to read: It is recommended that the Governing Board authorize two board members -- who volunteer and not be appointed -- to initiate the process of forming a search committee in concert with the Chancellor and the assistance of the Human Resources and Legal Services Departments to
initiate and complete the search for a general counsel. (Board Members Livingston and Haver volunteered to serve.)

MOTION

Motion 10468
Board Member Livingston moved for approval of the Item 11.2. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

11.3. APPROVE RESOLUTION REGARDING GOVERNING BOARD FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITIES - it is recommended that the Governing Board adopt the following resolution: The Governing Board's fiduciary responsibilities are to monitor and steward the District and each of the colleges. Those responsibilities include speaking with the Chancellor, Presidents, Faculty and all staff as we feel appropriate. Everyone employed by the District is authorized to speak freely and responsibly to Board members individually and in our formal sessions.

Discussion:
Board Member Saar commented that in the actual document there are a lot of “whereas”, however, the Limitations state that it is up to the Board to monitor the Chancellor’s performance. In order to do this, it is up to the Board to be able to speak freely to staff and the community. This resolution will give the Board the freedom to go out to the community and campuses to do this. President Gutierrez repeated that the resolution stressed the ability for everyone employed to be able to speak freely, responsibly, and openly.

MOTION

Motion 10469
Board Member Saar moved for approval of the Item 11.3. Board Secretary Thor seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

14.1 APPROVE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT – PHOENIX COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBER - authorize the Chancellor or her designee to prepare and execute documents necessary to resolve a claim of age discrimination asserted by former Phoenix College faculty member Dr. Barry Weingart, for a lump sum amount of $110,000 in accordance with the terms presented to and discussed with the Governing Board in an email dated February 3, 2017, and to make the disbursements required by the terms of the agreement.

MOTION

Motion 10470
Board Secretary Thor moved for approval of the Item 14.1. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

15.1 APPROVE AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR INSURANCE BROKERAGE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT SERVICES – approve the award of a contract of insurance and risk management consultant services to Aon Risk Solutions for the period of March 1, 2017 to February 28, 2018 with an additional four one-year options available for a total contract period not to exceed five years.

MOTION

Motion 10471
Board Secretary Thor moved for approval of the Item 15.1. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).
15.2 APPROVE FINAL GURANTEED MAXIMUM PRICE (GMP) CONTRACT AMENDMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE CLOUD SONG CENTER AT SCOTTSDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE — approve a second Contract Amendment to an existing Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Agreement in the amount of Eleven Million One Hundred Thirty-Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty-Eight Dollars and no/100ths ($11,136,858.00) to Okland Construction for the construction of the New Cloud Song Center project at Scottsdale Community College

MOTION

Motion 10472
Board Secretary Thor moved for approval of the Item 15.2. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

15.3 APPROVE CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL FOR REMODELING GILA HALL AT CHANDLER-GILBERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE – PECOS CAMPUS — provide Conceptual Approval for remodeling Gila Hall at the Chandler-Gilbert Community College - Pecos Campus with a Total Project Budget of $500,000.

MOTION

Motion 10473
Board Member Saar moved for approval of the Item 15.3. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

15.4 APPROVE PROPOSED COURSE FEE CHANGES FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 BUDGET — approve the varied course fee changes detailed on the attached submitted as an action item. These changes relate to course fees at several colleges across the district, detailed by college.

MOTION

Motion 10474
Board Member Saar moved for approval of the Item 15.4. Board Member Haver seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

15.5 APPROVE TUITION & FEES FISCAL YEAR 2017-18 — recommendations were made to the Chancellor through the District’s budget development process. The Chancellor has considered the potential impact on Maricopa Community College and the Governing Board member’s comments and therefore recommends no increase in the current county resident tuition rate of $86.00 per credit hour. Full time students taking 30 credit hours will continue to pay $2,580 annually. Attached is the Proposed FY 2017-18 Tuition and Fee schedule, submitted as an action to the Governing Board. Action on the proposal is requested at the February Governing Board meeting in order to ensure that any approved changes are implemented in the Student Information System prior to the start of registration for the Fall 2017 semester.

MOTION

Motion 10475
Board Member Saar moved for approval of the Item 15.5. Board Secretary Thor seconded. Motion passed 6-0 (Mr. Hendrix not in attendance).

INFORMATION ITEMS

16.1 APPROVE PROPOSED DELETION: GOVERNING BOARD POLICY 1.3 DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION – In preparation for the adoption of revised Board Policy language, it is recommended that the Governing Board delete existing Board Policy 1.3 Development Education as Amended October 22, 2013, Motion No. 10112.
16.2 APPROVE PROPOSED CHANGES: GOVERNING BOARD POLICY 1.3
DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION — adopt the proposed policy revisions that
have been submitted as a result of discussions at the August 9, September
13, October 11, November 8, 2016, and January 10, 2017, Policy
Committee Meetings, all dedicated to the topic of Developmental
Education. Upon adoption, the revised policy changes shall replace
preceding Board Policy 1.3 language and become effective for the 2017
Monitoring Cycle.

17.1 REVIEW PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2017-18 BUDGET — Attached for
review is the Proposed FY 2017-18 Budget. The General Fund, Current
Auxiliary Fund, Current Restricted Fund, and Plant Fund total $1.4 billion.
The public hearing and final adoption of the proposed budget is scheduled
in March 28, 2017.

18.1 REVIEW EMPLOYMENTS (REGULAR, SHORT-TERM, AND SPECIALLY
FUNDED) (JANUARY, 2017) AND SEPARATIONS (JANUARY
2017) — During this time period, there were 69 hires and 47 separations. Mrs. McGrath
asked for an accounting of why there were increases in hirings when the
number of students were decreasing.

19.1 REVIEW BUDGET ANALYSIS REPORT, FUND 1 — GENERAL
UNRESTRICTED FUND, FOR THE SEVEN MONTHS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2016 - Expenditure analysis indicates 47.3% of the budget has been
expended this year as compared to 47.3% expended at this same point last
year. 26.4% of the budget remained unexpended or unencumbered
compared to 23.2% in the prior year. Revenue analysis indicated that
64.6% of the budgeted revenue has been recognized as compared to 63.6%
in the prior year. The projected fund balance will increase by ~$3.2M this
fiscal year and the projected ending fund balance for June 2017 is
$174.7M. The District should meet its financial stability requirements.

Series C (2009), Series D (2011) and Series 2013 2004 Capital Development
Plan Summary As of December 31, 2016- Attached is a Statement of GO
Bond Projects as of December 31, 2016, related to the issuance of the 2004
General Obligation Bonds authorized by the voters on November 2, 2004
(Series A, B, C, D and 2013). Also included is the 2004 Capital Development
Plan Summary as of December 31, 2016. Detailed documentation is
maintained by the office of the Associate Vice Chancellor of Business
Services & Controller. As of December 31, 2016, $894.3 million, representing approximately 94% of proceeds from the Series A, Series B,
Series C, Series D and Series 2013 issuances of the 2004 bond have been
expended and $57.0 million remains available. Bond proceeds are invested
until expended.

FACULTY EXECUTIVE
COUNCIL (FEC)

There was no report.

CLASSIFIED STAFF COUNCIL
REPORT

Kris Bliss, President of the Classified Staff Council, provided the following
comments:
President Gutierrez, Governing Board members, Chancellor Harper-Marinick, members of CEC and guests. I am presenting on behalf of the Classified Staff Council.

Thank you Governing Board members for the resolution you passed earlier this evening providing clarification that you are welcoming feedback from employees in open session. It provides me the ability and wherewithal to comfortably speak about the matter I am here to present. Chancellor Harper-Marinick, thank you for inviting feedback at the State of the District and the upcoming town halls, and for reiterating the values you hold – inclusion, transparency, accountability, and respect for other people.

While we have been attempting to work with Administration directly to resolve problems, we very much appreciate your invitation to communicate with you directly, particularly as some concerns have developed regarding our working relationship with Administration. We, the Classified Staff Council, and I as their representative, welcome this opportunity to address those concerns in an effort to assist you in your duties to monitor and steward.

The framework for tonight’s report is a statement found in the District’s Strategic Commitments document: “As an employer, Maricopa County Community Colleges embraces an organizational culture committed to supporting, developing and growing its most tangible and valuable asset: the employees who make up its diverse and talented workforce. These strategic commitments will be achieved in a culture of collaboration, conversation, and communication focused on increasing employee diversity/inclusion, satisfaction, growth and performance having a positive impact on both the workplace and our communities.”

Unfortunately, we have identified a pattern of behavior that appears to be inconsistent with these Strategic Commitments, and we wish to bring these concerns to your attention in the hope that they may be amicably resolved through a recommitment to the culture of collaboration and mutual respect. We would appreciate your leadership and direction in that regard.

As you are aware, the Classified Staff Council is a relatively new structure, and significant efforts were made to develop that structure, write a constitution and bylaws governing the role and procedures of the Council. These governing documents make clear the elected members of the Council are responsible for presenting the interests of employees in the District’s system of shared governance. As such, it is essential that the Council is able to communicate freely and openly with the employees whose interests it is charged with representing.

In some of the upcoming slides, you will see copies of emails that are affecting our ability to abide by our constitution and represent employees. Due to the parameters of power point, they will be hard to read for the audience, however I have provided full size copies of the documents to the Governing Board.

This slide, as mentioned earlier, Governing Board, you can access this on page 8 of your packet, is an email exchange between Kristy Warfield, CSC Communications Officer and Special Projects Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, Megan Tormey. The VCHR has delegated
the oversight of the Special Projects Assistant. This exchange is regarding the CSC Officer distribution list, which is one of the primary methods of communication with the CSC Officers regarding the business of the Council. In 2016, when the new Classified Staff Council was formed and the Officers were elected, one task was to create an email distribution list to provide for effective internal communication between, with and among the Officers and constituents. The Special Projects Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of HR created this list, and unbeknownst to us, she had the ability to monitor the communications between and among the officers and constituents. We discovered this in October 2016, when the Special Projects Assistant replied to an email that was sent to the officer distribution list. In the past, with former employee groups, HR was never an owner or manager of email distribution lists, nor in receipt of any emails from said lists. The ability to monitor communications that the Council Officers reasonably believed to be confidential creates distrust, rather than the organizational culture of collaboration, conversation, and communication to which the District aspires. Moreover, although we have requested that the Special Projects Assistant transfer exclusive ownership of the distribution list to the Officers so that she does not have access, she has yet to do so. She has failed to acknowledge our concerns about the chilling effect her access has on effective communication between and among the officers, and has claimed, incorrectly, that her role in administering the list is necessary to maintain continuity.

Similarly, the Special Projects Assistant has attempted to assert control over the discretionary decisions that are provided to the Classified Staff Council, by the Constitution and Bylaws, to the elected Council members. One of my responsibilities under the Classified Staff Council Constitution and Bylaws is to identify individuals to represent Classified Staff perspectives on a variety of District committees. Beginning in December 2016, the Special Projects Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of HR directed me to remove a properly appointed individual from a committee on the grounds that the individual was not an elected member of the Council. The Constitution and Bylaws do not require Classified Staff committee representatives to be elected representatives of the Classified Staff Council; there are many reasons why it might be more effective or efficient for a particular committee to be staffed by someone who is not also serving on the Council. More importantly, the Constitution and Bylaws do not give administration representatives any say in the Classified Staff Council’s decisions regarding who to appoint to committees, much less the authority to control those decisions. I therefore declined to rescind the appointment. After more than two months of repeated strong disagreement, the Special Projects Assistant ordered me to remove this duly appointed representative. Although she reconsidered and rescinded that order shortly thereafter, the fact that she spent nearly three months attempting to assert authority she did not possess, going so far as to frame her direction as an order with which I would have to comply or face discipline for insubordination, seriously undermines the relationship of trust and mutual respect that is essential to the shared governance system we have adopted. The Division of Human Resources created this Classified Staff Council to ensure that employee voice was heard and respected, but their behavior has not conveyed a commitment to those principles.

The last matter involves what appears to be tampering with the content and signatures of a written agreement entered into by then current
employee group leaders and the Administration as highlighted by the next several slides. In 2015, employee group leaders entered into a voluntary MOU with Administration to develop a RIF policy for all classified staff. As you can see, in version 1, the signatures of the employee group leaders are dated February 2015. After significant delay, the Vice Chancellor of HR signed the document four months later in June 2015 and added some strikeouts to the negotiated language.

In October 2015, the new employee group leaders requested a clean copy of the MOU be created and signed by the current leaders. This document, shown here as version 2, was created and signed by all parties and the VCHR February 26th 2016. Our understanding was this new agreed to and signed MOU would be uploaded and become a part of the Staff Policy Manual effective upon signature of VCHR as confirmed to in an email to all then current employee group leaders in March 2016.

Recently, a document referred to here as version 3, was discovered online and apparently has been incorporated into the Staff Policy Manual as Appendix F. As you can see, the date is from 2015 and yet some of the language is from the document I identify as version 2, the document signed in 2016. None of the employee group leaders signed the document presented here, yet their signatures and dates, which match those affixed to Version 1 that they signed in 2015, appear with it as though they signed and agreed to Version 3. It appears as though some effort was made to cut and paste signatures from one document to the other, but the language on which the signatures were affixed is not the language that the signers actually reviewed and therefore ratified. When this matter was discovered earlier this month, February 2017, I, as CSC President, asked for an explanation by DOHR, but I have yet to receive one. This is a serious matter, and the lack of explanation or corrective action is very troubling.

All three of these examples raise serious concerns regarding HR’s commitment to work productively and respectfully with the Council members who have been charged with providing employee input into the District’s system of shared governance. If employees are Maricopa’s “most tangible and valuable asset,” as this Board’s Strategic Plan indicates, then conduct that seeks to monitor and control their representatives, ignores their input, and violates the District’s commitments to them, risks devaluing this asset and destroying the culture of collaboration we have worked so hard to build.

I hope what I have shown tonight gives the Governing Board pause and conviction that these actions and behaviors need to be looked into with much greater depth and independence by someone not beholden to the internal administrative power structure. And in the meantime, I ask that you take whatever interim steps you believe necessary and appropriate to make your strategic commitments to protect your employee assets from this mismanagement. Staff morale, engagement, support, and respect are critical to achieve student success.

We, as CSC representatives and Officers, entered into this venture this year with the expressed intention that HR would be our partner and that things would be better than before. We entered this relationship believing in
good faith, and we remain willing to act in good faith – but we need to see that good faith taking place on both sides of this relationship.

Adjunct Faculty Association President Gail Haase provided the following comments:

Last Saturday, The AFA, along with the Maricopa Center for Learning and Instruction, hosted L.E.A.D. the Learning and Engagement Adjunct Development Conference at South Mountain. This was the first time we have been at South and it turned out to be an ideal venue. We would like to thank South for graciously hosting us. It was not easy—they are a very busy place on Saturdays. They also gave us a very generous supply of swag, and there was something for everyone. I think that contributed a great deal to the energized climate of the conference.

For the first time, a past member of the board was our keynote speaker. Doyle Burke brought a well-organized explanation of institutional knowledge to the adjuncts and it was very well received. He explained some of the changes in growth, in funding, and future strategic planning. The adjuncts responded very well to his warm style, and they also asked questions that were really heartfelt, such as how to navigate and do your job well during a period of change and polarization. He talked about shifting demographics and systemic changes. It was gratifying to see how strongly the audience responded to Mr. Burke’s presentation.

Because adjuncts are actually only connected by email, we built some social time into the conference. At the close, we hosted a mocktail hour, and had adjuncts sit with their school reps, but with a twist. This time, the tables were arranged in the proposed regions. This turned out very positively as they spontaneously discussed becoming a region. The exchange was intriguing as they talked about their school’s respective climate, and speculated as to what it might mean to become a region.

At this conference, the videographers from Mesa’s Media Team were there to capture video on the benefits of professional development. They will create a video from this that will be used to promote professional development for adjuncts. Because adjuncts come from so many different disciplines and backgrounds, there are many sets of needs. Programs such as Adjunct Academy or Institute at Gateway and EDGE at Paradise, have paved the way. Now schools, such as Phoenix and South are participating and building similar programs and all have a vision for growing. The Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) are kicking off Spring Training, which is a major element of their program called CTL Near You, which emphasizes that adjuncts can take any of the professional classes offered at any CTL in the district.

So right now, there are many excellent training opportunities available. There are many more needs to address. Part of the mission of the adjunct district-wide Faculty Development Team has been to embrace the challenge of communicating and incentivizing these opportunities.

I would also like to give a shout out to Maricopa Center for Learning and Instruction. This team, especially Stephanie Williams and Don Jensen-Bobadilla, works very hard to help adjuncts, whether with our events or
with Adjunct Faculty Professional Growth. The AFA appreciates the support of the district through MCLI.

19. GOVERNING BOARD REPORTS

Mr. Hendrix was not in attendance.

Mr. Saar indicated that this had been the seventh year he had been able to attend the NLS in D.C., it is now a totally different environment. He spent time with the Department of Labor where he learned about different ways to take advantage of funding from them.

Mrs. Haver commented she had been able to attend the Black History event at PVC where they had enjoyed gospel music and great food.

Dr. Thor reported that it had been an extremely busy month. She visited all ten colleges and noted that each college was unique. All visits were structured differently and each college was blessed with very knowledgeable employees. She also had had briefings by all the division at the District Office. In addition, she presented to a community group at Sun City Grand. She attended the Asian Lunar Year banquet sponsored by the Asian Pacific Employee Group. Early in the month she attend the National Legislative summit in Washington D.C. where they were able to meet with members of the congressional delegation and were able to advocate for the importance of Pell Grants and DACA students.

Mrs. McGrath also attended PVC’s Black History event and very much enjoyed it.

Mr. Gutierrez commented he had also attended the Asian Pacific and PVC events. In addition, he also attended a MakerSpace Presentation and found it very compelling.

Mrs. Livingston had an opportunity to be at CPAC in DC the week following the ACCT NLS conference.

20. External Community Reports

Mr. Gutierrez announced he was the new representative for AADGB and would be attending the next board meeting on March 9.

There was no report for ASBA.

Mr. Saar reported that four board members travelled to Washington, D.C. in February for the ACCT National Legislative Summit and would be attending the national conference in September.

21-27. Establishment of Next Meeting Dates, Times and Places

President Gutierrez announced the following future meetings.

- March 14, 2017, 4:00 p.m., Policy Committee, GB Room
- March 14, 2017, 5:00 p.m., Agenda Review, GB Room
- March 14, 2017, 6:00 p.m., Executive or Work Session, GB Room
- March 28, 2017, 5:00 p.m., Budget & Finance Committee, GB Rm
- March 28, 2017, 6:30 p.m., Regular Board Meeting, GB Room
March 28, 2017, 6:30 p.m., Executive Session and Special Board Meeting

ADJOURNMENT

President Gutierrez adjourned the regular board meeting at 8:20 p.m. and board members proceeded to go into Executive Session.

Dr. Linda M. Thor
Governing Board Secretary
Critique deserves low mark

11 messages

John Schampel <john.schampel@phoenixcollege.edu>                        Sat, May 5, 2018 at 3:01 PM
Reply-To: john.schampel@phoenixcollege.edu
To: DL-FAC-ALL <dl-fac-all@memo.maricopa.edu>

Faculty colleagues:

Please see email below from Governing Board member Johanna Haver, below.

Also, for your reference:


https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/op-ed/2018/05/05/mcccd-governing-board-wrong-meet-confer/569833002/

BTW, my last name is spelled “Schampel.”

Best,
John

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu>
Date: Saturday, May 5, 2018
Subject: Critique deserves low mark
To: DL-BOARD <dl-board@memo.maricopa.edu>, John Schampel <john.schampel@pcmail.maricopa.edu>, Jeff Darbut <jeffrey.darbut@mesacc.edu>, LaCoya Shelton-Johnson <lac2050789@domail.maricopa.edu>

It strikes me as unbelievably unfair that John Shampel was allowed to write a critique of my column in the Arizona Republic - after my column had appeared only at the Azcentral.com website. From all indications, John Shampel is an excellent biology teacher but, for some reason, was assigned a task for which he has limited ability. Surely, an MCCCD English instructor who is skilled in writing could have been found among the faculty association's members to write a piece more cohesive and fact-based. The only meaningful parts of the entire manuscript are the quotations at the end by former chancellor Paul Elsner and board member Linda Thor.

--

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board

--

John Schampel - Residential Faculty
Biosciences Department - Phoenix College
Faculty Association President Elect
Dalby Building Rm 212
Mr. Gutierrez and members of the Governing Board - It is one of my jobs to ensure that you don't violate the Open Meeting Law. While our whistleblower procedures are set forth in an administrative regulation (Administrative Regulation 6.20 - https://chancellor.maricopa.edu/public-stewardship/governance/administrative-regulations/6-board-resources/6.20-whistleblower-protection), which are generally the purview of the Chancellor, the whistleblower regulation is one that was adopted by the Governing Board. It would also need to be revised by the Governing Board.

I previously provided you with a copy of Attorney General Opinion No. 105-004, relating to elected boards' communications via e-mail. Among the statements made in that opinion is the following: "Thus, an e-mail from a board member to enough other members to constitute a quorum the proposes legal action would be a meeting with the law, even if there is only a one-way communication, and no other board members replay to the e-mail."

Given that quote, my legal advice is to cease communicating on this issue via e-mail, or even communicating verbally among a quorum of you.

As I noted in a March 15th e-mail to three of you through which I sent you a draft of my response to Mr. Barton to review, state law permits the Governing Board to retain authority over any whistleblower claim despite what AR 6.20 says. (See statutory language specified in the draft letter.) Given that there is a neutral, easily available process, as well as the historical lack of any use of this procedure among employees, I don’t see from a legal standpoint the need for the Board's immediate attention to this matter. The Governing Board may wish to consider fixing the regulation to match, for instance, what the Arizona Board of Regents specifies. (See the procedures at: https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-914-Protection%20of%20Employees%20from%20Reprisal%20for%20Whistleblowing.pdf) Note that Governing Board could adopt a procedure like that in the Board of Regents policy by resolution to address any any immediate particular case without changing the administrative regulation. I believe that our process for changing an administrative regulation requires a comment period, which would take some time. Mr. Saar and Ms, Toney are the experts on that.

I also reiterate the concern, in the interest of preserving Governing Board independence in any deliberations, that I raised on March 15th about hearing a comment by a Governing Board member on March 14th that there appears to be a possible claim against the Chancellor right around the corner (or something to that effect). I would again caution the Governing Board not to react based on rumors.

Thank you, and please let me know if you have any questions.

Maggie

On Mon, Apr 3, 2017 at 3:23 PM, Alfredo Gutierrez <alf2163405@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

   Chancellor,
   You seem to have misread the comments. I did not assume the veracity or any comments made by CSC. I am simply commenting on the policies regarding anyone claiming whistleblower status. I believe this policy should be reviewed as should other policies regarding grievances by employees. I will continue to speak out on policy and I hope that the Board reviews such policies without commenting on any allegations that have been made. I will await the final report to comment on the substance of any allegations and I encourage all Board members to do likewise.
On Apr 3, 2017, at 3:06 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Dear Chair Gutierrez and members of the Board,

Please do not reply all to this message.

Given the comments made below, I must submit a response. As requested at the Board meeting on 3/28, I have asked our General Counsel to share the Powerpoint presentation, the comments from Ms. Bliss, and anything else of pertinence with our investigator, Ms. Rayna Jones. As I also mentioned to the Board Chair and the Board Secretary on 3/28, some of the allegations made are based on incorrect information and comments taken out of context. In the interest of fairness and until the investigator has looked at this matter and presented her legal opinion, I would appreciate if the comments made at the Board meeting were not assumed to be correct especially as they relate to actions taken by me as Chancellor. I do not take accusations lightly, and already had agreed that the allegations needed to be included in the scope of work of the investigator for fair and objective assessment. Ms. Darcy Renfro was in the meeting I had with the CSC officers and can provide additional information if the Board so desires.

Respectfully,
Maria Harper-Marinick

On Mon, Apr 3, 2017 at 9:39 AM, Alfredo Gutierrez <alf2163405@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

> On Apr 3, 2017, at 9:35 AM, Alfredo Gutierrez <alfredo.gutierrez602@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Fellow Governing Board Members:
>
> The recent appearance of Classified Staff representatives at Governing Board meetings have been disturbing. I have been contemplating, as have many of you, the causes for such expressions before the board. I believe that in part our policies regarding whistle blowers and frankly our overall policies for complaints and appeals by employees should be reconsidered.
>
> Specifically as to our whistleblowers protection and the testimony of the CSC representatives: The representative of CSC met all the criteria of a whistleblower as prescribed in ARS 38-532(B). The first appearance by a
CSC representative was on February 28th. On the March 3, 2017 the CSC representative appeared once more, made more disturbing assertions and quoted two lines allegedly spoken by the Chancellor on March 1st, 2017.

> Between the two appearances by the CSA representative the Board received a letter from an attorney, James Barton, on the 7th of March, 2017. In that letter he stated that his firm had been retained by “several Maricopa Community College District employees…” who were concerned about their protections as whistleblowers. Mr. Barton goes on to state that when a complaint is against the Chancellor “the process is fatally flawed.” He asks that the Board “revise the policy with a sense of urgency…”

> Our response, prepared professionally and accurately by our acting General Counsel, states that “the MCCD Governing Board retains the authority itself to hold a hearing and decide personnel matters…” She goes on to state that “practically speaking the Legal Services Department is not aware of any instance in which an employee claim has required the impaneling of a committee as specified in AR 6.20”

> Our response concludes that “particularly in light of the historical lack of employee usage of the actual procedure…” we do not find any reason to make changes especially on an immediate basis. It appears that there was an immediate issue that may have been known to Mr. Barton.

> Our response to Mr. Barton is dated March 20th. The meeting with the Chancellor where the quotes in question were alleged to be made was on March 1st. The appearance by the CSC representative before the Board when she disclosed the alleged quotes to us was on March 28th.

> I have not spoken to anyone from CSC regarding this matter, I have never met or spoken to Mr. Barton, and I do not know if the CSC representatives were amongst the “several employees” who retained Mr. Barton. It does seem entirely plausible to me that based on our response and our policies that appearing before the Board was in keeping with our policies and followed the guidance we offered in our response.

> Alfredo
I do understand that paid family leave is a benefit that has become more available as the number, Importance and the power of women in the workforce has grown. Increasingly it is seen as an important benefit to offer in order to remain competitive. Indeed over the past 30 years the status of women and the expectation of both employers and employees have evolved dramatically in mostly a very positive direction. Today even the Trump Administration is a champion of a national family leave requirement. Ivanka Trump, the president’s daughter and senior advisor is currently lobbying the Senate on behalf of the administration for family leave. Here are a couple of articles that describe her efforts:


Ms. Haver I agree with you on adjunct faculty as well. We should make those salaries more competitive…and Dana I do agree that ultimately this is an administrative matter (as is greater equity for adjuncts) but a little nudge from those of us who see these items as important won’t hurt.

Alfredo

On Oct 25, 2017, at 9:30 AM, Johanna Haver
<johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

<johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:
In my 32 years of teaching, which included both Phoenix Union HS District and Avondale Schools, no one in either district received paid maternity leave nor expected it. A person could take up to two years unpaid leave and not lose his or her place on the seniority list. - which was a reasonable option that didn't cost anything.

Ms. Gilger and her husband should have planned for this and socked away some money. We pay everyone well in this district - except of course the adjuncts. If maternity leave is so important to anyone, that person has the right to seek employment elsewhere. I suggest we raise the salaries of adjuncts before adding new benefits for fulltime employees.

Johanna

On Tue, Oct 24, 2017 at 1:59 PM, Alfredo Gutierrez
Chancellor,

I am appreciative that Ms. Gilger’s specific concerns will be addressed but I believe the course of action you propose ignores the larger question. We are a major public institution. Our fellow institutions, ASU and the U of A, have a maternity leave program. We should initiate discussions on adopting such a policy. It seems to me to be particularly outdated to ask a young woman to take a disability leave to give birth. Childbirth is not disability. I do hope that President Hendrix will appoint a sub committee of the Board to explore the adoption of a maternity leave program.

Alfredo

On Oct 12, 2017, at 1:23 PM, Lauren Gilger <lgilger@kjzz.org> wrote:

Board members Hendrix, Thor, Gutierrez, Haver, Livingston, McGrath and Saar,

Please see the attached letter about the maternity leave policies at the District.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Lauren Gilger

--
Lauren Gilger
Host/Producer, Original Productions
KJZZ News
(480) 774-8271

<MCCCD Board Letter.docx>
Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
I am as well. On a side note, we need to be careful about communicating to all board members about a specific topic. We don’t want to violate the open meeting laws.

From: Jean McGrath [mailto:jean.mcgrath@domail.maricopa.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2017 3:43 PM
To: Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu>
Cc: DL-BOARD <dl-board@memo.maricopa.edu>
Subject: Re: Letter re: Maternity Leave at MCCCD

I am in full agreement with Ms. Haver.

Jean

On Wed, Oct 25, 2017 at 9:30 AM, Johanna Haver <johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

In my 32 years of teaching, which included both Phoenix Union HS District and Avondale Schools, no one in either district received paid maternity leave nor expected it. A person could take up to two years unpaid leave and not lose his or her place on the seniority list. - which was a reasonable option that didn't cost anything.

Ms. Gilger and her husband should have planned for this and socked away some money. We pay everyone well in this district - except of course the adjuncts. If maternity leave is so important to anyone, that person has the right to seek employment elsewhere. I suggest we raise the salaries of adjuncts before adding new benefits for fulltime employees.

Johanna

On Tue, Oct 24, 2017 at 1:59 PM, Alfredo Gutierrez <alfredo.gutierrez@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Chancellor,

I am appreciative that Ms. Gilger’s specific concerns will be addressed but I believe the course of action you propose ignores the larger question. We are a major public institution. Our fellow institutions, ASU and the U of A, have a maternity leave program. We should initiate discussions on adopting such a policy. It seems to me to be particularly outdated to ask a young woman to take a disability leave to give birth. Childbirth is not disability. I do hope that President Hendrix will appoint a sub committee of the Board to explore the
adoption of a maternity leave program.

Alfredo

On Oct 12, 2017, at 1:23 PM, Lauren Gilger <lgilger@kjzz.org> wrote:

Board members Hendrix, Thor, Gutierrez, Haver, Livingston, McGrath and Saar,

Please see the attached letter about the maternity leave policies at the District.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Lauren Gilger

--
Lauren Gilger
Host/Producer, Original Productions
KJZZ News
(480) 774-8271

<MCCCD Board Letter.docx>

--

Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
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Johanna Haver: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | johanna.haver@domail.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
Jean McGrath: Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281
phone | (480) 731-8889 • fax | (480) 731-8120
email | jean.mcgrath@domain.maricopa.edu
website | https://administration.maricopa.edu/governing-board
To: Donald M. Peters, Esq.
Miller, LaSota & Peters
722 East Osborn Road, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85014

Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes (“A.R.S.”) §15-253(B), you submitted for review your opinion to the president of the Washington Elementary School District (“District”) Governing Board (“Board”) regarding electronic mail (“e-mail”) communications to and from members of the Board and Arizona’s Open Meeting Law (“OML”).

This Opinion revises your analysis to set forth some parameters regarding e-mail to and from members of a public body and is intended to provide guidance to public bodies throughout the State that are subject to the OML. See Ariz. Att’y Gen. Op. I98-006 at 2, n.2.
Question Presented

What are the circumstances under which the OML permits e-mail to and from members of a public body?

Summary Answer

Board members must ensure that the board’s business is conducted at public meetings and may not use e-mail to circumvent the OML requirements. When members of the public body are parties to an exchange of e-mail communications that involve discussions, deliberations or taking legal action by a quorum of the public body concerning a matter that may foreseeably come before the public body for action, the communications constitute a meeting through technological devices under the OML. While some one-way communications from one board member to enough members to constitute a quorum would not violate the OML, an e-mail by a member of a public body to other members of the public body that proposes legal action would constitute a violation of the OML.

Analysis

The OML is intended to open the conduct of government business to public scrutiny and prevent public bodies from making decisions in secret. See Karol v. Bd. of Educ. Trs., 122 Ariz. 95, 97, 593 P.2d 649, 651 (1979). “[A]ny person or entity charged with the interpretation [of the OML] shall construe any provision [of the OML] in favor of open and public meetings.” A.R.S. § 38-431.09. In addition, devices used to circumvent the OML and its purposes violate the OML and will subject the members of
the public body and others to sanctions. See e.g. Ariz. Att’y. Gen. Ops. I99-022, n. 7; I75-7. These principles guide the analysis of the use of e-mails by members of a public body. E-mail communications to or from members of the public body are analyzed like any other form of communication, written or verbal, in person or through technological means.

A. An Exchange of E-mails Can Constitute a Meeting.

1. A Meeting Can Occur Through Serial Communications between a Quorum of the Members of the Public Body.

All meetings of public bodies must comply with the OML. The OML defines a “meeting” as:

the gathering, in person or through technological devices, of a quorum of members of a public body at which they discuss, propose or take legal action, including any deliberations by a quorum with respect to such action.

A.R.S. § 38-431(4).

The OML does not specifically address whether all members of the body must participate simultaneously to constitute a “gathering” or meeting. However, the requirement that the OML be construed in favor of open and public meetings leads to the conclusion that simultaneous interaction is not required for a “meeting” or “gathering”

1 A.R.S. § 38-431-.07 (A) provides for penalties for violating the OML against not only members of the public body, but also against “[a person] who knowingly aids, agrees to aid or attempts to aid another person in violating [the OML].”

2 A “public body” subject to the OML includes:
the legislature, all boards and commissions of this state or political subdivisions, all multimember governing bodies of departments, agencies, institutions and instrumentalities of the state or political subdivisions, including without limitation all corporations and other instrumentalities whose boards of directors are appointed or elected by the state or political subdivisions. Public body includes all quasi-judicial bodies and all standing, special or advisory committees or subcommittees of, or appointed by, such public body.

A.R.S. § 38-431(6).
within the OML. “Public officials may not circumvent public discussion by splintering
the quorum and having separate or serial discussions. . . . Splintering the quorum can be
done by meeting in person, by telephone, electronically, or through other means to
discuss a topic that is or may be presented to the public body for a decision.” Arizona
Agency Handbook § 7.5.2. (Ariz. Att’y Gen. 2001) Thus, even if communications on a
particular subject between members of a public body do not take place at the same time
or place, the communications can nonetheless constitute a “meeting.” See Del Papa v.
Board of Regents, 114 Nev. 388, 393, 956 P. 2d 770, 774 (1998) (rejecting the argument
that a meeting did not occur because the board members were not together at the same
time and place); Roberts v. City of Palmdale, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 330, 337, 853 P. 2d 496,
503 (1993) (“[A] concerted plan to engage in collective deliberation on public business
through a series of letters or telephone calls passing from one member of the governing
body to the next would violate the open meeting requirement.”)

2. Discussion, Proposals and Deliberations Among a Quorum of a Public Body Must
Occur at a Public Meeting.

A “meeting” includes four types of activities by a quorum of the members of the
public body: discussing legal action, proposing legal action, taking legal action, and
deliberating “with respect to such action[s].” A.R.S. § 38-431(4). Three of these
activities necessarily involve more than a one-way exchange between a quorum of
members of a public body.

---

3 Like the OML, Nevada’s open meeting law defines a “meeting” as a gathering of a quorum of members

4 This Office declines to follow Beck v. Shelton, 267 Va. 482, 491, 593 S.E. 2d 195, 199 (2004) because of
differences between Arizona’s law and Virginia’s. In Beck, the court concluded that “the term [‘assemble’]
inhently entails the quality of simultaneity.” Further, the court observed that “[w]hile such simultaneity
may be present when e-mail technology is used in a ‘chat room’ or as ‘instant messaging,’ it is not present
For example, the ordinary meaning of the word “discuss” suggests that a
discussion of possible legal action requires more than a one-way communication. See
*Webster’s II New College Dictionary* 385 (1994) (defining “discuss” as “to speak
together about.”) Likewise, the term “deliberations” requires some collective activity.
of Supervisors*, 69 Cal. Rptr. 480, 485 (App. 1968) (reversed on other grounds).
“Deliberations” and “discussions” involve an exchange between members of the public
body, which denotes more than unilateral activity. See Ariz. Att’y Gen. Op. 175-8;
*Webster’s* at 390 (“exchange” means “to take or give up for another”; "to give up one
thing for another"; "to provide in return for something of equal value." ) Finally, “taking
legal action” in the context of the OML requires a "collective decision, commitment or
promise” by a majority of the members of a public body. A.R.S. § 38-431(3); Ariz. Att’y

Unlike discussions and deliberations, the word “propose” does not imply or
require collective action. Webster’s defines “propose” as “to put forward for
consideration, discussion, or adoption.” *Webster’s II New College Dictionary* at 944. A
single board member may “propose” legal action by recommending a course of action for
the board to consider. For example, the statement, “Councilperson Smith was admitted to
the hospital last night” is not a proposal, but “We should install a crosswalk at First and
Main” is a proposal. Thus, an e-mail from a board member to enough other members to
constitute a quorum that *proposes* legal action would be a meeting within the OML, even

---

when e-mail is used as the functional equivalent of letter communication by ordinary mail, courier, or
facsimile transmission.” *Id.*, 267 Va. at 490, 593 S.E. 2d at 199.
if there is only a one-way communication, and no other board members reply to the e-mail.  

3. **An Exchange of Facts, as Well as Opinions, Among a Quorum of Members of a Public Body Constitutes a Meeting within the OML, if it is Reasonably Foreseeable that the Topic May Come Before the Public Body for Action in the Future.**

Arizona’s OML does not distinguish between communication of facts or opinions. An exchange of facts, as well as opinion, may constitute deliberations under the OML. See Ariz. Att'y Gen. Ops. 197-012, 179-4; 175-8. The term “deliberations” as used in A.R.S. § 38-431 means "any exchange of facts that relate to a matter which foreseeably might require some final action . . .." Ariz. Att’y Gen. Op. 175-78; see also Sacramento Newspaper Guild, 69 Cal. Rptr. at 485 (deliberation connotes not only collective discussion, but also the collective acquisition and exchange of facts preliminary to the final decision).

Of course, the OML applies only to an exchange of facts or opinions if it is foreseeable that the topic may come before the public body for action. See *Valencia v. Cata*, 126 Ariz. 555, 556-57, 617 P.2d 63, 64-5 (App. 1980); Ariz. Att'y Gen. Op. 75-8. The scope of what may foreseeably come before the public body for action is determined

---

5 It might be argued that because the definition of meeting refers to a gathering of a quorum at which they discuss, propose or take legal action, the definition only applies to proposals made by a quorum or circumstances in which more than one person actually makes a proposal. That interpretation, however, is inconsistent with the ordinary meaning of the word “propose” and with the process for proposing legal action for consideration by public bodies. It is also contrary to the directive that the OML be construed broadly to achieve its purposes.

6 Unlike Arizona, some states permit exchanges of information among a quorum of a public body outside of public meetings. See Fla. AGO 2001-20, 2001 WL 276605 (Fla. A.G.) (“[C]ommunication of information, when it does not result in the exchange of council members’ comments or responses on subjects requiring council action, does not constitute a meeting subject to [Florida’s sunshine law]). As in many other states, Florida’s open meeting law is known as its “sunshine law.”
by the statutes or ordinances that establish the powers and duties of the body. See Ariz. Att'y Gen. Op. I00-009.

4. Applying OML Principles to E-mail.

Few reported decisions discuss when the use of e-mail violates a state’s open meeting law. In Wood v. Battle Ground School District, 107 Wash. App. 550, 564, 27 P. 3d 1208, 1217 (2001), the Washington Court of Appeals held that the exchange of e-mail messages may constitute a meeting within Washington’s Open Public Meetings Act. While the court held that “the mere use or passive receipt of e-mail does not automatically constitute a ‘meeting’,” it concluded that the plaintiff established a prima facie case of “meeting” by e-mails because the members of the school board exchanged e-mails about a matter, copying at least a quorum and sometimes all of the other members. The court said, “[T]he active exchange of information and opinions in these e-mails, as opposed to the mere passive receipt of information, suggests a collective intent to deliberate and/or to discuss Board business.” 107 Wash. App. at 566, 27 P. 3d at 1218.

Although the Washington Open Public Meetings Act is not identical to the OML, like the OML, it broadly defines “meeting” and “action,” and includes the directive that the law be liberally construed in favor of open and public meetings. 107 Wash. App. at 562, 27 P. 3d at 1216. The holding of the court in Wood and its attendant analysis are, therefore, persuasive.

The available case law and Arizona’s statutory language indicate that a one-way communication by one board member to other members that form a quorum, with no further exchanges between members, is not a per se violation of the OML. Additional facts and circumstances must be evaluated to determine if the communication is being
used to circumvent the OML. A communication that proposes legal action to a quorum of the board would, however, violate the OML, even if there is no exchange among the members concerning the proposal. In addition, passive receipt of information from a member of the staff, with nothing more, does not violate the OML. See Roberts, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d at 337, 853 P. 2d at 503 (receipt of a legal opinion by members of a public body does not result in a meeting.); Frazer v. Dixon Unified Sch. Dist., 18 Cal. App. 4th 781, 797, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641, 657 (1993) (passive receipt by board members of information from school district staff is not a violation of the open meeting law).7

There are risks whenever board members send e-mails to a quorum of other board members. Even if the first e-mail does not violate the open meeting law, if enough board members to constitute a quorum respond to the e-mail, there may be a violation of the OML. In addition, a quorum of the members might independently e-mail other board members on the same subject, without knowing that fellow board members are also doing so. This exchange of e-mails might result in discussion or deliberations by a quorum that could violate the OML. Because of these potential problems, I strongly recommend that board members communicate with a quorum about board business at open public meetings, not through e-mails.

B. Hypotheticals Illustrating the Use of E-mail.

The analysis of the OML and e-mail is theoretically no different than analyzing other types of communications. To provide additional guidance, this Opinion will address

---

7 This office has also opined that, in the context of a Call to the Public, passive receipt of information does not constitute a meeting. Ariz. Att’y Gen. Op. 199-006.
OML applications to specific factual scenarios.8

a. E-mail discussions between less than a quorum of the members that are forwarded to a quorum by a board member or at the direction of a board member would violate the OML.

b. If a staff member or a member of the public e-mails a quorum of members of the public body, and there are no further e-mails among board members, there is no OML violation.

c. Board member A on a five-member board may not e-mail board members B and C on a particular subject within the scope of the board’s responsibilities and include what other board members D and E have previously communicated to board member A. This e-mail would be part of a chain of improper serial communications between a quorum on a subject for potential legal action.

d. A board member may e-mail staff and a quorum of the board proposing that a matter be placed on a future agenda. Proposing that the board have the opportunity to consider a subject at a future public meeting, without more, does not propose legal action, and, therefore, would not violate the OML.

e. An e-mail from the superintendent of the school district to a quorum of the board members would not violate the OML. However, if board members reply to the superintendent, they must not send copies to enough other members to constitute a quorum. Similarly, the superintendent must not forward replies to the other board members.

f. One board member on a three-member board may e-mail a unilateral communication to another board member concerning facts or opinions relating to board business, but board members may not respond to the e-mail because an exchange between two members would be a discussion by a quorum.

g. A board member may copy other board members on an e-mailed response to a constituent inquiry without violating the OML because this unilateral communication would not constitute discussions, deliberations or taking legal action by a quorum of the board members.

h. An e-mail request by a board member to staff for specific information does not violate the OML, even if the other board members are copied on the e-mail. The superintendent may reply to all without violating the OML as long as that response does not communicate opinions of other board members. However, if board members reply in a communication that includes a quorum, that would constitute a discussion or deliberation and therefore violate the OML.

---

8 These hypotheticals assume that the e-mails are not sent by board members or at a board member’s direction with the purpose of circumventing the OML and that any unilateral communications do not propose legal action.
i. A board member may use e-mail to send an article, report or other factual information to the other board members or to the superintendent or staff member with a request to include this type of document in the board's agenda packet. The agenda packet may be distributed to board members via e-mail. Board members may not discuss the factual information with a quorum of the board through e-mail.

C. Measures to Help Ensure that the Public Body Conducts Its Business in Public.

Although it is not legally required, I recommend that any e-mail include a notice advising board members of potential OML consequences of responding to the e-mail. Possible language for a notice for e-mails from the superintendent or staff is as follows:

To ensure compliance with the Open Meeting Law, recipients of this message should not forward it to other members of the public body. Members of the public body may reply to this message, but they should not send a copy of the reply to other members.

Language for e-mails from board members could be the following:

To ensure compliance with the Open Meeting Law, recipients of this message should not forward it to other board members and board members should not reply to this message.

Although the OML does not require the above notice, such notification may serve as a helpful reminder to board members that they should not discuss or deliberate through e-mail.

It is also important to remember that e-mail among board members implicates the public records law, as well as the OML. E-mails that board members or staff generate pertaining to the business of the public body are public records. See Star Publ’g Co. v. Pima County Attorney’s Office, 181 Ariz. 432, 891 P.2d 899 (App. 1994); see also Arizona Agency Handbook § 6.2.1.1 (Ariz. Att’y Gen. 2001). Therefore, the e-mails must be preserved according to a records retention program and generally be made available
for public inspection. A.R.S. §§ 39-121, 41-1436. Although the OML focuses on e-mails involving a quorum of the members of the public body, the public records law applies to any e-mail communication between board members or board members and staff. Public bodies might consider maintaining a file that is available for public inspection and contains any e-mails sent to and from board members. Ready access to this type of information helps ensure compliance with the legislative mandates favoring open government.

I encourage all public bodies to educate board members and staff concerning the parameters of the OML and the public records law to ensure compliance with these laws. E-mail is a useful technological tool, but it must be used in a manner that follows the OML’s mandate that all public bodies propose legal action, discuss, deliberate, and make decisions in public.
Conclusion

E-mail communications among a quorum of the board are subject to the same restrictions that apply to all other forms of communications among a quorum of the board. E-mails exchanged among a quorum of a board that involve discussions, deliberations or taking legal action on matters that may reasonably be expected to come before the board constitute a meeting through technological means. While some unilateral e-mail communications from a board member to a quorum would not violate the OML, a board member may not propose legal action in an e-mail. Finally, a quorum of the board cannot use e-mail as a device to circumvent the requirements in the OML.

Terry Goddard
Attorney General
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Understood, let me deal with it.

Sent from my phone

On Feb 10, 2018 1:53 PM, "Laurin Hendrix" <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

I emailed Dr. Thor and told her that we were going to move forward with the new agenda review process. We seem to have support for it and I don’t want to detract from that support.

I had asked Dr. Thor to meet to discuss the agenda. I didn’t necessarily mean that the meeting needed to occur prior to moving forward with the agenda distribution. I’d like to have a discussion with her about how best to deal with the discomfort amongst the faculty association. The FA is comfortable with her. I want to move forward with eliminating meet and confer as soon as possible but I don’t agree that the FA has reason for the distress that they are expressing. Control will be shifted to the administration, where it belongs, but the faculty will continue to have adequate opportunities to give input. I’m hoping to get Dr. Thor on board with the concept and discuss how to best keep the peace with the faculty. The elimination of meet and confer is going to happen. Everyone (board members, faculty, admin) needs to get on board and support the new process, whatever that ends up being.

The last email that I received from Ms. Cooper indicated that we needed to first read the meet and confer issue in Feb and vote in March. If that is necessary, I’m fine with it but if we can go straight to the vote, that would be my preference. I don’t want to give anyone fodder for a lawsuit but, at the same time, I want to move forward diligently.

Laurin
Seeking clarity after I thought about your request again. Our plan, after discussions with McGrath and you, Mr. Hendrix, was to send the entire packet electronically to all members of the Board 2 weeks before the meeting (would be sent next Tuesday), give you 1 week or so for review and questions, and then get it ready for posting 24 hours ahead of the meeting in accordance with the law. Would you like us to do something different? Are you asking to meet and discuss before it is sent to the rest of the Board?

Thank you
On Fri, Feb 9, 2018 at 5:02 PM, Maria Harper-Marinick <maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Of course, Dr. Thor. I am not available for lunch because Rep Livingston has asked me to meet with him at 12:30 but I can meet after that, at 1:15 in my office. That would give us 45 minutes. Would that work? We could continue after the workshop if needed and if you are available.

Thanks

MARIA HARPER-MARINICK, PH.D.
MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Chancellor

2411 West 14th Street
Phone (480) 731-8108 | Fax (480) 731-8120 | Cell (480) 364-6744
maria.harper@domail.maricopa.edu
www.maricopa.edu

On Fri, Feb 9, 2018 at 4:37 PM, Linda Thor <linda.thor@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:

Chancellor,

Mr. Hendrix and I would like to meet with you to review the February 27 agenda. Are you available before the Feb. 20 workshop? We could meet in your office at 1 p.m. or if you prefer, we could meet for lunch at noon or 12:15. Please let us know what works for you. Thanks!

Dr. Linda M. Thor
Governing Board Member

2411 West 14th Street, Tempe AZ 85281

phone | 480-731-8889 (messages); 480-226-9176 (cell)

email | linda.thor@domain.maricopa.edu

website | https://www.maricopa.edu
4.5 Board Meetings

Board meetings will be conducted in adherence with these operational policies:

1. Meetings
   A. Regular - The Board will normally meet on the fourth Tuesday of each month in the Governing Board Room of the District Support Services Center. Meetings may be held at sites throughout the District. The times for each meeting will be posted at least 24 hours prior to the meeting date.
   B. Special Meetings - Special meetings are called only when it is necessary for the Board to conduct business of an immediate and unanticipated nature, with circumstances that require its attention before the next regularly scheduled Board meeting. A special meeting may be called by the President of the Board, or upon request of a majority of the Board’s members.
   C. Strategic Conversations, Work Sessions, and Community Forums - The Board will participate in meetings that are designed to discuss specific issues or topics and to gather community input regarding the Maricopa County Community College District. Opportunities will be presented either as Strategic Conversations, Work Sessions, or Community Forums and will be held on a date established by the Board. Such meetings will either be held at the District Office or at community sites within the District. The time and location for such meetings will be posted at least 24 hours prior to the established date.
   D. Executive Sessions – In compliance with Arizona Revised Statute §38-431.03, meetings may be called in order for the Board to discuss its position and instruct its attorney regarding matters of pending or contemplated litigation.

2. Organization of the Board
   A. Organization of the Board

      The Governing Board will conduct its annual organizational meeting at the first meeting in January. At least every January of even-numbered years, the Board shall elect a President and Secretary. These officers shall serve at the pleasure of a majority of the members of the Board. Officers of the Board shall serve a term of two (2) consecutive years or a shorter time as the Board shall determine prior to each officer's election. The Secretary will fulfill the duties of the chair in the absence of the President.

      Additionally, and after any election, the President shall appoint Board members to represent the Board in community organizations as needed.

   B. Conduct of Elections

      The Board shall conduct an election for President first, followed by an election for Secretary. Nominations shall be made for each office. A member may nominate him or herself. Nominations do not require a second. A board member must accept the nomination in order to be considered as a candidate for a board officer. After nominations are completed, each candidate shall have the option to make a three-minute presentation to the board. Following candidate presentations to the board, each board member shall publicly cast one vote. Votes may only be cast for board members who have been nominated and who have accepted that nomination. Board officers shall be selected by a majority vote of the members of the Board. Officers shall assume office immediately upon election, and shall hold the office until a successor is elected.

      There are no limits on the number of terms that a board member may serve as an officer.

      A board officer who has completed his or her elected term of office is deemed to have vacated that officer position, unless the member is re-elected to the governing board.
In the event that an officer does not complete his/her term as a board officer due to a voluntary resignation as an officer or involuntary termination by the board, a special meeting will be called to fill that position. The newly elected officer shall serve the balance of the existing term of office.

3. Agenda
The agenda and meeting materials shall be prepared by the Assistant to the Governing Board, as guided by the President and the Chancellor, and delivered to the Board Members approximately four days prior to the regular meeting date.

4. Rules of Action
   A. Quorum
      i. A minimum of four members shall constitute a quorum and shall be necessary to conduct business.
      ii. Approval of an action item requires affirmative votes from the majority of the quorum.
   B. Consideration of Policy Matters
      The Board will consider proposed new or revised policy twice, first as an informational item; then as a recommendation for approval. Upon a majority vote, the policy will be incorporated into the Board’s policies.
   C. Rules of Order
      The Board will establish its own rules of order, subject to the following:
      i. Items on the meeting agenda that require action shall be placed before the entire Board through a motion made by one of the Board Members. A second to the motion shall be required.
      ii. Appropriate discussion of the item shall be determined by the Board President who shall call for the vote. All discussion by Board Members shall be allowed on any item; however, discussion shall cease upon a motion approved by no fewer than six Board Members to call immediately for the question.
      iii. Any motion may be amended, tabled, discussed, etc. A Board Member may move to amend a pending motion. A motion to amend may seek to add or strike words of the pending motion, or substitute a different motion on the same subject for the one before the Board. When a motion to amend has been moved and seconded, the Board President shall re-state the motion in order that the members of the Board may know what is before them. Discussion on a motion shall be confined to the merits of the proposed amendment.

5. Public Attendance and Discussion
   A. Citizens Interim—The Board will set aside a portion of each agenda to hear from citizens regarding items of general concern.
      i. The Board President will, at his/her discretion call on each speaker permitting up to 5 minutes for the speaker’s remarks.
      ii. The total number of speakers addressing a particular subject will be limited to no more than 9.
      iii. The Board President may waive the limitations provided in items Ai and Aii.
   B. Action or Informational Agenda Items
      i. The Board President may, at his/her discretion recognize a member of the audience to question or speak on a specific item on the agenda.
      ii. The provisions set forth in paragraphs Ai-iii shall apply.
   C. Presenting concerns to the Board and the free expression of ideas should be communicated with decorum and respect. Uncivil or disorderly conduct is not permitted. The use of derisive or insulting epithets, or the direction of remarks that defame, attack, or harass an individual may serve as cause for the Board’s President to direct that the speaker immediately conclude his or her remarks.

AMENDED January 23, 2018, Motion No. 10541
AMENDED May 26, 2015, Motion No. 10304
AMENDED December 9, 2014, Motion No. 10263
AMENDED February 22, 2011, Motion No. 9781, 9782
Mr. Hendrix,

You do not need a FOIA request. I gave the resolution to the FA. Agenda review under the old process made the items public at the same time the Board received them. Nothing in the new process states that the agenda under review is confidential. Based on email messages, texts and phone calls I have received, the faculty is very frightened, demoralized and feels devalued. The fact that first read of the policy is scheduled for this Tuesday with a vote one week later only reinforces those feelings for them.

On Sun, Feb 18, 2018 at 7:11 PM, Laurin Hendrix <laurinh@cox.net> wrote:

A board member shared the initial draft of the resolution with the FA. We revised it shortly thereafter. It had to be a board member that shared it. It is my understanding that no one other than board members, the chancellor, and our general counsel had the initial draft. It was shared with the FA before I had even opened my email. This is reminiscent of the suspicious footnote in the CSC investigation. I’d like to know which board member made the effort to fan the flames of the current controversy. Based upon the time that the email had to have been opened in order to get it to the FA so rapidly, more than half of the board members can be eliminated. Is the identity of the board member that shared this document something that might be discovered without a FOIA request?

This issue has been blown way out of proportion with exaggeration and misinformation in an attempt to create fear among the faculty members. This does not benefit the district, the faculty, or the students. The board member that contributed to this false and misleading controversy must be identified.

Laurin
Yes, thank you, Dr. Thor. Disappointed that so much misinformation is being communicated.

On Sun, Feb 18, 2018 at 2:24 PM, Linda Thor <linda.thor@domail.maricopa.edu> wrote:
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SECTION A: GENERAL OVERVIEW
Administration and Addresses

MCCCD Governing Board & District Administration: 2411 W 14th Street – Tempe, AZ 85281 | Ph. (480) 731-8000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Board Members</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Laurin Hendrix</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Johanna Haver</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Augustine Bartning</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Tracy Livingston</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>At-Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jean McGrath</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dana Saar</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Linda Thor</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>At-Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Leadership

Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick, Chancellor
Dr. Karla Fisher, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
Ms. Darcy Renfro, Chief of Staff
Mr. Elliott Hibbs, Chief Operating Officer
Ms. LaCoya Shelton, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Mr. Edward Kelty, Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Services
Ms. Leslie Cooper, General Counsel
Ms. Christina Schultz, President & CEO MCCCD Foundation

College Leadership & Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. William Guerriero, Interim President</th>
<th>Dr. Steven Gonzales, President</th>
<th>Dr. Teresa Leyba-Ruiz, President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert Community College</td>
<td>Gateway Community College</td>
<td>Glendale Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2626 E. Pecos Road</td>
<td>108 N. 40th Street</td>
<td>6000 W. Olive Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, AZ 85225</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85034</td>
<td>Glendale, AZ 85034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. (480) 732-7000</td>
<td>Ph. (602) 286-8000</td>
<td>Ph. (623)-845-3012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Ernie Lara, President</th>
<th>Mr. Sasan Pourreetzadi, Interim President</th>
<th>Dr. Paul Dale, President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estrella Mt. Community College</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>Paradise Valley Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 N. Dysart Road</td>
<td>1833 W. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>18401 N. 32nd Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avondale, AZ 85392</td>
<td>Mesa, AZ 85202</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. (623) 935-8000</td>
<td>Ph. (480) 461-7000</td>
<td>Ph. (602) 787-6500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Christina Haines, Interim President</th>
<th>Dr. Chris Bustamante, President</th>
<th>Dr. Jan Gehler, President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix College</td>
<td>Rio Salado College</td>
<td>Scottsdale Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202 W. Thomas Rd.</td>
<td>2323 W 14th Street</td>
<td>9000 E. Chaparral Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85013</td>
<td>Tempe, AZ 85281</td>
<td>Scottsdale, AZ 85256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. (602) 285-7500</td>
<td>Ph. (480) 517-8540</td>
<td>Ph. (480) 423-6000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Shari Olson, President</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Mt. Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7050 S. 24th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. (602) 343-8000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map of Maricopa Community Colleges

The map below shows the location of the ten colleges within the Maricopa County Community College District and satellite locations where educational programs are provided to the community.
Vision and Mission

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.

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

The Maricopa Community Colleges are committed to:

- 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 freedom to have an open exchange of ideas for the common good
- RESPONSIBILITY - We value responsibility and 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.
Introduction
The Maricopa District is one of the largest community college systems in the nation and is the largest public higher education institution in Arizona; larger even than all three public universities combined. In FY2018-19, the District will continue to build on its long history of services to the community.

As of December 15, 2017, the ten colleges and three skill centers that comprise the Maricopa Community Colleges, offer the following: 2,032 Academic courses, 5,926 Occupational courses, 884 Occupational programs, 9 Associate degrees and 28 Academic Certificates (AC).

The Maricopa County Community College District (the District) is financially sound for the next three years. The District strives to maximize the resources entrusted to us by the taxpayers and students. Maricopa Transformation initiatives will require additional resources during its early years, as we develop new approaches to better serve our students and increase student retention, which will lead to more graduates. However, future decisions will need to be made to ensure long-term stability related to capital expenditure, since all of our G.O. Bonds resources will be spent.

Overview of Proposed Budget

This proposed budget compares the estimated revenue and expenditures from FY17-18 with the Proposed FY18-19 Budget. This provides a base for future budgeted expenditure and revenue comparisons.

Throughout the budget process, the District evaluates the ability to sustain approved initiatives in the future.

Future Budget Plan
The Transformation initiated last year includes recommendation that a budget process be developed that supports and promotes organizational performance around the following questions:

- Are we allocating funds appropriately among our colleges to obtain the best outcomes?
- Are revenues sufficient to fund critical education and support services now and in the future?

A study is underway to help answer these questions. The following will be used for future budget planning:

- Fairness and Equity Study – plus analyze study results and develop adjustment methods as needed
- Adequacy Study
- Increased college involvement around budgeting for initiatives and outcomes

Budget Prep Assumptions
The following assumptions have been used in building the FY18-19 budget:

- Conservative property tax valuation growth (1%);
- Conservative new construction growth (2%);
- FTSE count constant for FY18-19 – beginning with FY19-20, FTSE is estimated to grow by 1% due to implementation of transformation initiatives;
- General Fund expenditure growth includes required or previously agreed upon additions; and
- No re-allocation of funds held by colleges for FY18-19 (except for enrollment changes).
Fund Balances
Balances are estimated revenue plus balances carried forward from prior year, minus estimated expenditures. At Maricopa, we categorize funding as unrestricted or restricted.

Unrestricted Funds
Unrestricted funds are those that can be allocated for different purposes, they include:

- **General Fund** (Fund 1) – the largest and main operating fund for the Maricopa Community Colleges. The General Fund accounts for unrestricted resources that will be expended in the current year for operating purposes such as instruction, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, operation/maintenance of plant, plus scholarships.

- **Auxiliary Fund** (Fund 2) – includes revenues and expenditures that support a variety of self-supporting activities, including contract training, the three Skill Centers under Gateway, non-credit instruction, and food services.

- **Plant/Bond Fund** (Fund 7) – MCCCD’s capital fund. The major sources of revenue are from the voter approved 2004 General Obligation Bonds Program and transfer from the General Fund. For Budgeting purposes, G.O. Bond funds are considered unrestricted as they can be directed or redirected in accordance with the needs of the District. For financial reporting, G.O. Bond funds are considered externally restricted in accordance with accounting standards.

- **Quasi Endowment Fund** – (Fund 6) – Medical insurance reserves

Estimated balances for the Unrestricted Funds are shown below.

**Estimated Balances Comparison**
**Unrestricted Funds**
(In Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$179.7</td>
<td>$173.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Fund</td>
<td>$115.3</td>
<td>$112.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant/Bond Fund</td>
<td>$168.1</td>
<td>$118.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi Endowment Fund</td>
<td>$33.2</td>
<td>$33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$496.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$437.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Restricted Funds
Restricted funds account for all externally restricted activity such as grants, bond debt service and student financial aid and include:

- **Restricted** (Fund 3) – revenue sources include federal, state and local funds for grants or contracts and federal financial aid;
- **Proposition 301** – a statewide November 2000 referendum that raised sales taxes for education (community colleges are required to use the funds for workforce development and training);
- **Debt Service** (Fund 8) – payments of interest and principal for General Obligation bonds purchased for the 2004 Capital Bond Program; and
- **Quasi Endowment Fund** (Fund 6) – portion of Worker’s Compensation reserves required by the Industrial Commission.

Estimated balances for the restricted funds are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Fund</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Fund--Other</td>
<td>$ 2.9</td>
<td>$ 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Fund--301</td>
<td>$ 28.7</td>
<td>$ 24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>$ 74.2</td>
<td>$ 76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi Endowment Fund</td>
<td>$ 3.7</td>
<td>$ 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 109.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 107.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grand total balances appear to be significant. It is misleading, however, to focus on just total balances available and not consider what these balances represent and why they are needed, as explained below.
Fund Balance for Allocation

Although the grand total fund balance for FY19 is estimated at $545.1 million, the restricted portion must be removed since their use is limited. This leaves $437.9 million.

Some revenue will not be received, such as student bad debt and uncollected tax levy, so $6.8 million is removed to recognize these losses. In addition, some of the fund balance should be held for claims ($5m), financial stability ($54.7m), college operating and auxiliary reserves ($84m), college capital projects ($58.6m) and districtwide (primarily college) projects ($60.3m) that have already been committed for future use.

In addition, to maintain a strong financial position, adjustments are proposed prior to allocating balances, including:

- Increase the General Fund reserves for financial stability from 8% to 10% to simplify accounting for reserves and to adequately provide for emergency or other unplanned needs (extra $13.7 million)
- Retain sufficient funds to meet 3rd year capital needs ($25.8m)
- Implement capital fund reserves to insure ability to address unpredictable capital emergency needs ($25m)

This leaves an estimated balance of about $104 million available for possible allocation after all of these adjustments.

### Estimated Balances for June 30, 2019
As of April 10, 2018 (in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Fund Balances</th>
<th>Less Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Net Unrestricted Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$545.1</td>
<td>$ (107.2)</td>
<td>$ 437.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less:
- GF - Financial Stability $ (54.7)
- GF - Std Bad Debt, Uncollected Tax Levy $ (6.8)
- GF - Claim Reserve $ (5.0)
- College:
  - GF - College Reserve $ (23.9)
  - Auxiliary Fund - Colleges $ (60.1)
  - Capital Fund - College Projects $ (58.6)
  - District Wide: Capital Fund $ (60.3)

### Proposed Adjustments
- Raise GF Reserves from 8% to 10% $ (13.7)
- Provide for 3rd-Year Capital Needs $ (25.8)
- Capital Fund Reserve (New) $ (25.0) $ (333.9)

**Ending Balance - Available for Allocation** $ 104.0

Some cautions to be noted regarding possible allocation of the ending balance:

- The ending balance should be used for one time funding only or to ensure funds for ongoing costs are held for future expenditures;
- Annual revenue growth from property tax, tuition and fees only average $9-$10 million/year in recent years. This is insufficient to cover large expenditure commitments;
- Funding to meet 3-yr capital needs (total estimate $204m) is short by $26 m; no source for future needs. Portion of balances needs to be available to ensure capital needs can be met;
- Transformation requires continuing investment; and
- Operating costs will continue to increase (technology licenses, updated systems, health insurance, ASRS).
Required and Recommended Budget Items.
Discussion of allocation should recognize that there are required and recommended items for consideration.

The **Required** FY19 budget items include:

- **Fund Operating Cost needs**: Arizona State Retirement, Lab Loading and Employee Manual costs;
- **Fund Transformation needs**: how we improve and help students achieve greater success.

The following **recommended** budget items were approved by the Governing Board on May 1, 2018 and are included in the FY18-19 Proposed Budget:

- **Technology Updates & Operations**: technology is the backbone of the organization, so it is important that we stay up-to-date and are able to deliver quality support for our systems;
- **Increase General Fund Reserves**: from 8% to 10%
- **Fund Course Equipment from the General Fund**: this will help lower some course fees for students
- **Facilities Maintenance/Capital Needs**: need to maintain facilities and ensure equipment is refreshed;
- **Establish Capital Reserve and approach to Fund Future Capital Needs**: without future bonds, a new, cost-effective strategy to meet our future capital needs is required;
- **Transfer Majority of Quasi Endowment Fund Balance to General Fund**;
- **Address Faculty and Staff compensation**: we must ensure competitive wages, salaries and benefits are paid to retain and attract qualified Faculty and staff;
- **Reduce Tuition**: send positive message to current and potential students while promote diversity at all our colleges

Executive Budget Summary

- The Proposed FY18-19 Resources of $1.65 billion includes Quasi Endowment funds as well as ALL of the estimated fund balances available for each fund group. All funds are shown in Section B Budget Summaries.

- The General Fund Resources total for FY18-19 is $861.9 million, an increase of $12.8 million (+1.5%) compared to the estimated resources of FY17-18.

- The Auxiliary Fund totals $178.25 million, a decrease of about $3 million (-1.7%), compared to the estimated actual resources in FY17-18.

- The Restricted Fund totals $231.37 million; an increase of about $0.7 million (+0.3%) compared to the FY17-18 estimated resources.

- The Unexpended Plant Fund totals $184.2 million for FY18-19; a decrease of $12.9 million compared to the estimated resources for FY17-18. This includes $6 million proposed primary tax rate increase of $0.015, which is pending approval by the Governing Board.

- The FY18-19 Debt Service totals $158.4 million, an increase of $0.5 million over the FY17-18 estimated actuals.

- Maintenance of the District’s financial stability policy, which requires balance of 8% General Fund revenues; the proposed increase to 10% was approved by Governing Board on May 1, 2018.
• The District’s colleges have flexibility to reallocate budgets and to use new allocations to meet high priority needs and accomplish goals to continue to better serve the community.

General Fund
Revenues

Property Taxes:
The amount of additional property taxes from new construction is projected to remain fairly level for two-to-three years with slow recovery thereafter. Based on the 2017 Maricopa County Assessor’s valuations, property tax levy from new construction property will decrease from $10.1 million for FY17-18 to $9.87 million for FY18-19. This is far below the $18.2 million from new construction received in FY2009.

Effective 2015, the voter-approved Proposition 117, alters the calculation of property tax. For 2015 both the Primary and the Secondary tax rates are calculated based on the same assessed valuation -- the Limited Property valuation (see the Appendix -Historic Property Assessment.) Proposition 117 also capped the growth of a property’s limited property value at no more than 5% per year. This new law does not affect the total amount of property tax collections, but rather the redistribution of the tax obligation among property owners.

For FY18-19, it is proposed that the primary tax would be increased by $0.0150 per $100 assessment (1.3%) for capital needs, for a revised rate of $1.1708 per $100 Assessed Valuation; this is pending approval of the Governing Board. An estimated $6 million will be generated by increasing primary tax rate from $1.1558 to $1.1708. This proposed rate is still lower than the FY17-18 primary rate of $1.1956 per $100 assessment.

Tuition and Fees:
The Governing Board approved tuition and fee rates at its February 27, 2018 meeting. After further discussion and review of the District’s resources, it was recommended to consider reducing the resident tuition rate. It is contemplated that the lower tuition rate will provide a positive message to students and the community; making college more affordable to students, thereby increasing student retention rate, and increasing student racial and ethnic mix. A tuition reduction of $1 to $85 per credit hour is estimated to decrease tuition revenue by $2.3 million, and the estimated revenue has been adjusted to reflect this decrease. The tuition reduction of $1/credit was approved by the Governing Board on May 1, 2018. Consequently, an in-county full-time student will pay $2,550 annually based on 30 credits/year, a decrease of $30 from the current annual tuition rate of $2,580.

The Arizona Constitution mandates the provision of higher education "as nearly free as possible" and tuition for Maricopa Community Colleges remains below the national average of public two-year institutions. Students attending Maricopa Colleges prior to transferring to a baccalaureate granting institution should expect to pay tuition at about 20-25 percent of Arizona’s public four-year institutions.

State Aid:
In FY2015-16, the Arizona Legislature changed state law to disallow State Aid funding for Maricopa and Pima County Community College Districts. The last State Aid in FY14-15 received was $8.8 million, which included $7.4 million of Operation and $1.4 million of STEM funding. Overall, Maricopa has lost over $68.7 Million in Operating
State Aid since FY2007-08 and $11 million in Capital State Aid. In FY2017, the State Legislature reversed the decision and restored Maricopa into the State Aid funding formula. For FY18-19, Maricopa submitted a request of $11.1 million for STEM formula funding in accordance with the statutory formula.

**Reallocation:**

Over the past few years, the District has relied on the reallocation of existing resources to help compensate for the cuts in State Aid and limited growth in other resources. To adapt to revenue losses and to reallocate for emerging needs, the District reduced operational budgets four times prior to FY2013-14 for an annualized total reduction of $35 million. Since the State of Arizona suspended the Capital State Aid formula funding, colleges often transfer funding from the General Fund or Auxiliary Funds for capital expenditures.

**Fund Balance -Recommended Use**

Starting with the FY2018-19 Budget, the entire estimated Fund Balance amount will be included in the report as resources. These recommended uses of the FY19 estimated General Fund balance were approved by the Governing Board on May 1, 2018:

- **Tuition Rate reduction** - reduction of $1 per credit to $85 per credit (cost estimated to be $2.3m); the revenue was adjusted to a lower amount and reduced the fund balance available;

- **Employee Pay:**
  a. **Load hour rate increase** –increase from $872/credit hour to $925/credit hour;
  b. **Stipend for Faculty/Staff** –one-time stipend of $750 for all staff classified as full time employees (excluding executives) who have been with the District during all of 2018;
  c. **Hourly Employees** –increase rate of pay for hourly employees by $0.25/hour;

- **Reserves** –increasing amount from 8% to 10% (extra $13.7m);

- **Update Technology Licenses/Operations**–$5.97 m for license costs and required updates, plus funds to retain and hire qualified technology staff;

- **Course fee Equipment** –$2m annually for course fee equipment from General fund starting in FY19-20;

- **Transformation** –$14m for FY18-19 to provide academic case managers, a call center, a data warehouse and tools to improve student retention and experiences.

**Auxiliary Fund**

The Auxiliary Fund includes contract training and other substantially self-supporting activities, such as the skill centers, non-credit instruction, course fees, and food services. The estimated FY18-19 budget for Auxiliary totals $178.25 million in resources. Section B provides a summary of all Auxiliary funds.
Restricted Fund (Fund 3)
The Restricted Fund (excluding Debt Service and Prop 301) FY18-19 budget is $191.5 million; the Proposition 301 proposed budget for FY18-19 is almost $40 million, which include $28.8 million in previous allocations.

Proposition 301
The Governor recently signed into law a bill passed to extend Proposition 301 for another 20 years. The Work Force Development Office will work with the colleges to develop a plan for FY19 and a 5-year plan to maximize the benefits of these fund balances. Strategies to be examined include:

- Workforce Faculty/Employees;
- Workforce Equipment needs;
- Workforce Information System Development
- MCOR Fund Commitment (Rio)
- Possible capital uses

Capital (Plant) Fund
The Unexpended Plant Fund is $184 million for FY18-19. New evaluation of facilities will help District and the colleges prioritize where capital funds are most needed. Since we cannot rely on State funding, and bond resources are being consumed, there is a need to find a source for future capital needs.

Life without the Bond – Note:

- As total tax rate declines from bonds being paid off, shift the planned reduction from secondary levy to primary tax levy to fund future capital need.
- Capital needs to maintain facilities and refresh capital equipment remains.
- Areas of student growth and modernization will require significant remodeling and even construction of new buildings.
- Proposed strategy: as secondary rate declines shift rate to the primary levy to fund capital needs in the future and possibly forego bonds, but still allow total property tax levy to decline.

The chart below shows the effect of retaining a small portion of the tax levy decline in the future for maintenance and other capital needs.
## Scenario for Capital Funding

Historic Tax Rates for FY 2014 through FY 2019 and Est. Tax Rates through FY2028

MCCCD Property Tax Rates per $100 of Assessed Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Adjusted for Capital</th>
<th>Adjusted Tax Rate</th>
<th>Capital Revenue (in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$0.7752</td>
<td>$0.1634</td>
<td>$0.9386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$0.7246</td>
<td>$0.1598</td>
<td>$0.8844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$0.7926</td>
<td>$0.1802</td>
<td>$0.9728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$1.0123</td>
<td>$0.1959</td>
<td>$1.2082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$1.1563</td>
<td>$0.2215</td>
<td>$1.3778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$1.2896</td>
<td>$0.2459</td>
<td>$1.5355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$1.2824</td>
<td>$0.2363</td>
<td>$1.5187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$1.2628</td>
<td>$0.2312</td>
<td>$1.4940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>$1.2376</td>
<td>$0.2275</td>
<td>$1.4651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017-18</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.1956</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.2140</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.4096</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$1.1558</td>
<td>$0.2046</td>
<td>$1.3604</td>
<td>$0.0150</td>
<td>$1.3754</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>$1.1221</td>
<td>$0.1783</td>
<td>$1.3005</td>
<td>$0.0217</td>
<td>$1.3222</td>
<td>$8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>$1.0894</td>
<td>$0.1738</td>
<td>$1.2632</td>
<td>$0.0212</td>
<td>$1.2844</td>
<td>$8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>$1.0577</td>
<td>$0.1263</td>
<td>$1.1840</td>
<td>$0.0587</td>
<td>$1.2427</td>
<td>$24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td>$1.0269</td>
<td>$0.1166</td>
<td>$1.1435</td>
<td>$0.0534</td>
<td>$1.1969</td>
<td>$26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td>$0.9970</td>
<td>$0.0697</td>
<td>$1.0667</td>
<td>$0.1003</td>
<td>$1.1670</td>
<td>$45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-25</td>
<td>$0.9680</td>
<td>$0.0677</td>
<td>$1.0356</td>
<td>$0.1023</td>
<td>$1.1379</td>
<td>$46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-26</td>
<td>$0.9124</td>
<td>$0.0278</td>
<td>$0.9403</td>
<td>$0.1422</td>
<td>$1.0825</td>
<td>$58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-27</td>
<td>$0.9124</td>
<td>$0.0270</td>
<td>$0.9395</td>
<td>$0.1430</td>
<td>$1.0825</td>
<td>$58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027-28</td>
<td>$0.8858</td>
<td>$0.0000</td>
<td>$0.8858</td>
<td>$0.1700</td>
<td>$1.0558</td>
<td>$69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For FY19, the total tax rate would have been $1.3604 per $100 of assessed valuation, with $1.1558 of this as primary. As highlighted in yellow above, an increase of $0.0150 would increase the primary rate to $1.1708 and the total tax rate to $1.3754 per $100 assessed valuation. This is still a reduction in the total tax rate from the current year’s rate of $1.4096. This $0.0150 rate increase would raise an estimated $6.1 million for FY19 for capital purposes, and more in the future if this approach is continued as reflected in the scenario above.
## All Funds Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17-18 Est Actual Resources</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed Budget Resources</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>% Total FY17-18</th>
<th>% Total FY18-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund 1</td>
<td>General Operating</td>
<td>$849,109,935</td>
<td>$861,926,431</td>
<td>$12,816,496</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 2</td>
<td>Current Auxiliary</td>
<td>181,237,630</td>
<td>178,245,975</td>
<td>(2,991,655)</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 3</td>
<td>Current Restricted</td>
<td>230,675,452</td>
<td>231,370,945</td>
<td>695,493</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 6</td>
<td>Quasi Endowment</td>
<td>36,899,939</td>
<td>36,899,939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 7</td>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>197,112,408</td>
<td>184,202,395</td>
<td>(12,910,013)</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 8</td>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>157,934,338</td>
<td>158,382,988</td>
<td>448,650</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,652,969,702</td>
<td>$1,651,028,673</td>
<td>$(1,941,029)</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison FY18 Est Actual vs FY19 Budget

- **Fund 1** General Operating: $849.1 million vs $861.9 million, increase of $12.8 million (1.5%)
- **Fund 2** Current Auxiliary: $181.2 million vs $178.2 million, decrease of $3 million (-1.7%)
- **Fund 3** Current Restricted: $230.7 million vs $231.4 million, increase of $0.7 million (0.3%)
- **Fund 6** Quasi Endowment: $36.9 million vs $36.9 million, no change (0.0%)
- **Fund 7** Plant: $197.1 million vs $184.2 million, decrease of $12.9 million (-6.5%)
- **Fund 8** Debt Service: $157.9 million vs $158.4 million, increase of $0.5 million (0.3%)

**Total:** $1,653.0 million vs $1,651.0 million, decrease of $2.0 million (-0.1%)
### Section B: Budget Summaries

**May 22, 2018**

**FY18-19 Proposed Budget**

#### FY18-19 Proposed Revenue and Expenditures All Funds Budget Summary -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>UNRESTRICTED FUND</th>
<th>RESTRICTED FUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund Fund 1</td>
<td>Auxiliary Fund 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$465,211,720</td>
<td>$6,063,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Lieu Tax, SRP</td>
<td>8,624,797</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriations/Other State</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Tax Support:</strong></td>
<td>$475,838,512</td>
<td>$6,063,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Tuition</td>
<td>$182,700,000</td>
<td>4,215,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Tuition</td>
<td>15,413,302</td>
<td>9,609,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-District Tuition</td>
<td>256,527</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees (Course fees, Other fees)</td>
<td>4,593,128</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Credit/ Special Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Tuition/Fees:</strong></td>
<td>$202,710,000</td>
<td>36,497,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,601,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income &amp; Other</td>
<td>1,774,307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service/Auxiliary Programs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,541,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore Operations</td>
<td>1,880,588</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,596,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Rev:</strong></td>
<td>$3,664,895</td>
<td>14,838,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total On-Going Revenues</td>
<td>$682,211,408</td>
<td>51,355,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,609,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues with Transfers:</strong></td>
<td>$682,211,408</td>
<td>62,945,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; DD Fund Balance</td>
<td>$23,490,890</td>
<td>54,453,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-Wide Fund Balance</td>
<td>156,224,133</td>
<td>60,847,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bond Carryforward</td>
<td>1,890,588</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balance:</strong></td>
<td>$179,715,023</td>
<td>115,300,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources:</strong></td>
<td>$861,926,431</td>
<td>176,245,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserves:</strong></td>
<td>$105,208,333</td>
<td>22,036,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Funds:</strong></td>
<td>$1,142,134,764</td>
<td>298,282,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Reserves & Designation under Quasi Endowment fund is considered Restricted Fund as it is required by the Industrial Commission for Worker’s Compensation reserve.*
### All Funds FTE Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fund 1</th>
<th>Fund 2</th>
<th>Fund 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Faculty</td>
<td>1,441.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1,481.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive (CEC)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>2,957.7</td>
<td>298.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>3,275.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Positions (FTE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,416.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>299.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,774.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fund 1</th>
<th>Fund 2</th>
<th>Fund 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Faculty</td>
<td>1,457.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1,472.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive (CEC)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>2,925.7</td>
<td>316.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3,243.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Positions (FTE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,398.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>316.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,731.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fund 1</th>
<th>Fund 2</th>
<th>Fund 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Faculty</td>
<td>(15.2)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive (CEC)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>(17.7)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Positions (FTE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>(16.7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fund 1</th>
<th>Fund 2</th>
<th>Fund 3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Faculty</td>
<td>(1.04%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>160.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive (CEC)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>989.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budgeted Positions (FTE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>249.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Fund Summaries

### GENERAL FUND REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Revenue</th>
<th>FY17-18 Estimated</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Supported:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Levy</td>
<td>$453,423,109</td>
<td>$457,339,611</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>$3,916,502</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax - New Construction</td>
<td>$9,872,109</td>
<td>$9,872,109</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Lieu Tax (SRP)</td>
<td>$9,065,516</td>
<td>$8,624,792</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>$(440,724)</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Property Tax + SRP</strong></td>
<td>$462,488,625</td>
<td>$475,836,512</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>$13,347,887</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Tuition</td>
<td>$185,000,000</td>
<td>$182,700,000</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>$(2,300,000)</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Tuition</td>
<td>$15,160,346</td>
<td>$15,160,346</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-District Tuition</td>
<td>$302,202</td>
<td>$256,527</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$(45,675)</td>
<td>-15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>$4,593,128</td>
<td>$4,593,128</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Tuition &amp; Fees</strong></td>
<td>$205,055,676</td>
<td>$202,710,001</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>$(2,345,675)</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Other</td>
<td>$1,733,386</td>
<td>$1,774,307</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>$40,921</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore Operations</td>
<td>$1,890,588</td>
<td>$1,890,588</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Interest/Other</strong></td>
<td>$3,623,974</td>
<td>$3,664,895</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$(2,304,754)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Anticipated Revenue w/o CF</strong></td>
<td>$671,168,275</td>
<td>$682,211,408</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>$11,043,133</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$177,941,660</td>
<td>$179,715,023</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>$1,773,363</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Anticipated Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$849,109,935</td>
<td>$861,926,431</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$12,816,496</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE SUMMARY BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Description</th>
<th>FY17-18 Estimated</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix College</td>
<td>$60,350,170</td>
<td>$59,977,123</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
<td>$(373,047)</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale College</td>
<td>$85,592,816</td>
<td>$83,372,389</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>$(2,220,427)</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GateWay College</td>
<td>$36,309,089</td>
<td>$35,539,749</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>$(769,340)</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa College</td>
<td>$100,430,288</td>
<td>$99,267,375</td>
<td>13.53%</td>
<td>$(1,162,913)</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale College</td>
<td>$53,317,627</td>
<td>$53,214,414</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
<td>$(103,213)</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Salado College</td>
<td>$60,448,724</td>
<td>$63,701,556</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
<td>$3,252,832</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mountain College</td>
<td>$27,570,422</td>
<td>$27,430,035</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>$(140,386)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert College</td>
<td>$55,025,264</td>
<td>$53,947,562</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>$(1,077,702)</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Valley College</td>
<td>$40,965,339</td>
<td>$40,643,363</td>
<td>5.54%</td>
<td>$(321,976)</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrella Mountain College</td>
<td>$39,451,852</td>
<td>$38,258,599</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>$(1,193,253)</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Office</td>
<td>$67,510,822</td>
<td>$68,325,729</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
<td>$814,907</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-wide</td>
<td>$42,422,500</td>
<td>$76,307,676</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>$33,885,176</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Carryforward</td>
<td>$23,940,574</td>
<td>$23,940,574</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Budget Recommendations</td>
<td>$9,790,676</td>
<td>$9,790,676</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure by College</strong></td>
<td>$669,394,912</td>
<td>$733,716,820</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$64,321,908</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Estimated Ending Fund Balance: $179,715,023
  - $ (51,505,412) -28.7%
- Reserves & Designations: $(94,530,671)
  - $ (80,208,333) -15.2%
- Capital Reserve: $25,000,000
  - N/A
- Fund Available for Allocations: $179,715,023
  - $(156,713,745) -87.2%
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## Multi-year General Fund Financial Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Estimated Actual</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td>FY18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Primary Tax Levy (1% NAV Appreciation starting FY20)</td>
<td>$453,423,109</td>
<td>$457,339,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Primary Tax Levy - from New Construction (2 % NAV incrs)</td>
<td>9,872,109</td>
<td>9,269,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SRP in-Lieu (0% NAV Appreciation)</td>
<td>9,065,516</td>
<td>8,624,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total Primary Tax Levy &amp; SRP in-Lieu</td>
<td>462,488,625</td>
<td>475,836,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resident Tuition</td>
<td>185,000,000</td>
<td>182,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Out of County (Greenlee &amp; Apache)</td>
<td>302,202</td>
<td>256,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other Fees (Registration, transcripts, others)</td>
<td>4,593,128</td>
<td>4,593,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Total Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>205,055,676</td>
<td>202,710,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Interest Income &amp; Other</td>
<td>1,733,386</td>
<td>1,774,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bookstore Operation</td>
<td>1,890,588</td>
<td>1,890,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Enterprise Operation, MCOR, Campus Works, etc.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Total Other Revenue</td>
<td>3,623,974</td>
<td>3,664,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Total Anticipated Revenue w/o Fund Balance</td>
<td>$671,168,275</td>
<td>$682,211,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Projected Beg. Fund Balance</td>
<td>$177,941,660</td>
<td>$179,715,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Total Projected Resources</td>
<td>$849,109,935</td>
<td>$861,926,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- Primary Tax Levy - 1% NAV Appreciation starting FY20
- Primary Tax Levy - from New Construction - 2 % Appreciation annually
- SRP in-Lieu - 0% of NAV Appreciation starting FY20
- Resident Tuition: flat enrollment for FY19, and small increase (1%) in projected FTSE starting FY20. Each year includes additional 10% FTSE contingency
- Effective FY19, the proposed budget would include the full amount of Beginning Fund Balance. Amount may increase or decrease depending
- Starting FY19 remove $900K Gov. Board Contingency from on-going Contingency Function, and add it to Reserve for Fund Balance/Financial Stability
- Instruction (Exp By Fund) - FY19 Includes $7.2 million of faculty lab load incrs., and reduction of $2.6 mil for the cost moving 24 faculty FTE from Gen Fund to Prop 301
### Estimated Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Actual</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 36. Est. Required/Approved Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. ASRS Rate Increase From 11.5% to 11.8%, then 0.1% increments annually</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>985,488</td>
<td>986,473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Empl. Manual (Anniversaries (FY19 only) and Education)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>505,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Employee’s Health Care Cost Increases (6% Incr/yr, Eff. FY21)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Operating Cost for G.O. Bond Funded Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Campus Works (FY19 to FY21 only, one-time Fund) (Inst. Suppres)</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Maricopa’s Transformation Implementation, permanent effect FY21-22 (Inst. Suppt)</td>
<td>13,991,341</td>
<td>12,550,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Operating &amp; Maintenance Cost for Technology Increases (Inst. Supprt)</td>
<td>5,967,926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Adjunct Faculty &amp; Overload Rate Increase from $572 to $592/load hr (Instruction)</td>
<td>4,852,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Full-time Employees - Stipend $750/Employee (Inst. Suppt)</td>
<td>4,122,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Part-time Employees rate increase of $0.25/hr (permanent) (Inst. Suppt)</td>
<td>864,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Course Equipment Replacement @$2.0 mil/yr set aside.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Total Projected Required/Approved Expenditures $</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,299,150</td>
<td>17,135,488</td>
<td>19,991,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Subtotal - Approved/Required Expenditures</td>
<td>669,394,912</td>
<td>709,776,246</td>
<td>706,267,643</td>
<td>716,209,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Est. Fund Balance After Approved Allocation/Expenditures</td>
<td>179,715,023</td>
<td>152,150,185</td>
<td>172,084,231</td>
<td>159,890,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Less Reserves &amp; Designations (Contingency Function):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Financial Stability - 8% FY18; 10% starting in FY19</td>
<td>53,693,462</td>
<td>68,401,641</td>
<td>69,295,573</td>
<td>70,401,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Allowance for Student Bad Debt</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Reserve for Potential Claims (Claim Loss Reserve)</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Est. College &amp; DO Prior Year Carryforward @3.5%</td>
<td>23,490,890</td>
<td>23,940,574</td>
<td>24,253,450</td>
<td>24,640,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Uncollected Tax Levy Contingency @0.8%</td>
<td>3,806,692</td>
<td>3,877,981</td>
<td>3,951,641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Capital Reserve &amp; 3rd-Yr Need</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Total Designations &amp; Reserves</td>
<td>85,184,352</td>
<td>129,154,907</td>
<td>130,427,004</td>
<td>131,993,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Balance (net of Reserves) Available for Allocation</td>
<td>94,530,671</td>
<td>23,001,278</td>
<td>41,657,227</td>
<td>27,896,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Recommended Other Uses of Fund by Fiscal Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Operating &amp; Maintenance Cost for Technology Increases</td>
<td>4,530,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Employee Compensation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Total Recommended Other Uses of Fund</td>
<td>4,530,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Total Expenditures, Carryforward, and Recommendations</td>
<td>669,394,912</td>
<td>733,716,820</td>
<td>735,051,093</td>
<td>741,849,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Uncommitted Fund Balance</td>
<td>94,530,671</td>
<td>23,001,278</td>
<td>37,127,227</td>
<td>26,896,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Transfer from Quasi Endowment Fund (Health Spending &amp; Workman Comp Reserve)</td>
<td>33,245,963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Revised Uncommitted Fund Balance Including Quasi Endowment transfer</td>
<td>56,247,241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

38. FY18-19 ASRS Rate Increase already included in the Proposed Exp. By Function in FY18-19. For total cost of $985,000. For future years, it is projected to increase by 0.1% annually.

39. Employee Manual: Anniversaries and Education Increases for FY18-19 already included in FY18-19 Proposed Budget by Function - $807,000 starting in FY19-20, estimated $500K for Education Increases for Faculty & Staff. This amount then will be added to Exp. by Funct. under Institutional Support.

40. Employee’s Health Care Cost is estimated to Increase by 6% annually ($4 million). Funding will be needed starting FY21. Any increases above 6% could be shared by employees or benefit lowered.


42. Increase Fin. Stability Reserve from 8% to 10% Beginning FY2019. The new Financial Stability of 10% inclusive of $900,000 Gov. Brd Contingency.

43. Part of Year End Balance includes Colleges & DO Carryforward.

44. Move uncollected Tax Levy Contingency from Expenditures budget to Reserve & Designations.

45. $33.6 million will be transferred from Quasi Endowment fund set aside for health care and workman compensation claims. The current health spending account has sufficient fund to cover 3 to 4 months of claims.
### GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURE BY COLLEGE & FUNCTION (FY18-19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>GW</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>27,049,187</td>
<td>41,337,830</td>
<td>16,716,607</td>
<td>45,808,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>5,478,757</td>
<td>14,319,604</td>
<td>2,962,938</td>
<td>12,802,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>7,174,409</td>
<td>11,282,043</td>
<td>5,866,874</td>
<td>14,701,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>11,144,708</td>
<td>4,830,457</td>
<td>5,250,508</td>
<td>13,521,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Maintenance</td>
<td>7,150,555</td>
<td>9,854,604</td>
<td>3,941,958</td>
<td>10,864,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>281,427</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Assistance</td>
<td>1,698,080</td>
<td>1,747,851</td>
<td>800,864</td>
<td>1,569,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Functions</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,977,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,372,389</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,539,749</strong></td>
<td><strong>99,267,375</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>CG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>27,837,224</td>
<td>25,105,929</td>
<td>10,842,493</td>
<td>26,039,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>5,618,529</td>
<td>14,551,399</td>
<td>4,710,054</td>
<td>5,112,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>6,626,265</td>
<td>7,641,855</td>
<td>3,902,128</td>
<td>6,393,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>5,428,335</td>
<td>12,409,568</td>
<td>3,554,994</td>
<td>8,883,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Maintenance</td>
<td>6,911,566</td>
<td>2,190,219</td>
<td>3,812,683</td>
<td>6,740,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>10,783</td>
<td>641,458</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>206,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Assistance</td>
<td>781,712</td>
<td>1,161,128</td>
<td>607,683</td>
<td>571,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Functions</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,214,414</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,701,556</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,430,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,947,562</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>PV</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>DSTWD</th>
<th>FY18-19 Total District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>23,922,254</td>
<td>18,997,176</td>
<td>28,528</td>
<td>17,615,412</td>
<td>281,300,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>3,334,623</td>
<td>6,471,601</td>
<td>6,353,195</td>
<td>1,958,500</td>
<td>83,673,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>4,382,901</td>
<td>4,678,961</td>
<td>6,211,246</td>
<td>4,314,770</td>
<td>83,176,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>3,923,411</td>
<td>3,677,796</td>
<td>51,589,220</td>
<td>51,509,029</td>
<td>175,723,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Maintenance</td>
<td>4,532,965</td>
<td>3,898,682</td>
<td>2,958,690</td>
<td>429,638</td>
<td>63,286,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,184,850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,325,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Assistance</td>
<td>547,209</td>
<td>534,383</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,271,003</td>
<td>20,290,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/College Carryforward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,940,574</td>
<td>23,940,574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Functions</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,643,363</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,258,599</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,325,729</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,038,926</strong></td>
<td><strong>733,716,820</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURE BY UNIT & ACCOUNT (FY18-19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>GW</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>36,755,540</td>
<td>56,151,240</td>
<td>22,330,736</td>
<td>63,210,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>10,603,123</td>
<td>17,042,339</td>
<td>6,880,476</td>
<td>19,190,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>3,263,115</td>
<td>2,176,555</td>
<td>2,294,030</td>
<td>7,172,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>1,211,750</td>
<td>1,594,458</td>
<td>541,066</td>
<td>1,610,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charges</td>
<td>434,913</td>
<td>726,736</td>
<td>383,146</td>
<td>979,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>2,413,500</td>
<td>2,575,989</td>
<td>1,334,784</td>
<td>2,515,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>174,260</td>
<td>219,497</td>
<td>110,459</td>
<td>545,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>1,517,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,702,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Awards</td>
<td>1,569,090</td>
<td>1,675,870</td>
<td>806,264</td>
<td>1,600,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debt/Carryforward</td>
<td>411,100</td>
<td>280,478</td>
<td>704,322</td>
<td>503,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers/Pending Allocation</td>
<td>1,623,732</td>
<td>929,227</td>
<td>154,466</td>
<td>236,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,977,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>$83,372,389</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,539,749</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99,267,375</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>CG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>33,814,796</td>
<td>34,416,654</td>
<td>17,125,044</td>
<td>34,984,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>10,377,199</td>
<td>9,820,877</td>
<td>5,398,412</td>
<td>10,246,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>2,900,851</td>
<td>14,428,415</td>
<td>1,126,884</td>
<td>2,412,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>1,342,776</td>
<td>460,503</td>
<td>423,302</td>
<td>969,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charges</td>
<td>453,684</td>
<td>366,800</td>
<td>257,450</td>
<td>447,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>1,590,878</td>
<td>1,293,369</td>
<td>937,599</td>
<td>1,835,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>56,492</td>
<td>181,147</td>
<td>130,317</td>
<td>153,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Awards</td>
<td>803,012</td>
<td>1,211,128</td>
<td>609,783</td>
<td>572,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debt/Carryforward</td>
<td>314,160</td>
<td>1,399,752</td>
<td>64,031</td>
<td>65,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers/Pending Allocation</td>
<td>1,560,566</td>
<td>122,911</td>
<td>1,277,213</td>
<td>2,221,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,214,414</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63,701,556</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,430,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,947,562</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PV</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>DSTWD *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>26,625,509</td>
<td>25,407,222</td>
<td>41,108,585</td>
<td>4,932,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>7,795,606</td>
<td>7,531,727</td>
<td>13,817,551</td>
<td>1,071,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>1,395,516</td>
<td>538,215</td>
<td>5,421,449</td>
<td>21,266,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>995,157</td>
<td>242,426</td>
<td>713,834</td>
<td>153,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charges</td>
<td>285,610</td>
<td>131,561</td>
<td>1,074,929</td>
<td>4,084,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>1,752,584</td>
<td>945,787</td>
<td>1,163,216</td>
<td>2,472,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>111,358</td>
<td>51,097</td>
<td>917,563</td>
<td>2,166,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Awards</td>
<td>1,032,509</td>
<td>550,954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,271,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debt/Carryforward</td>
<td>278,525</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>224,705</td>
<td>27,326,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers/Pending Allocation</td>
<td>370,989</td>
<td>2,859,610</td>
<td>3,807,397</td>
<td>36,293,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,643,363</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,258,599</strong></td>
<td><strong>$68,325,729</strong></td>
<td><strong>$110,038,926</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY18-19 Total District**
### General Fund Comparison of FY18 Estimated Actual with FY19 Proposed by Function

#### ALL COLLEGES/DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>FY17-18 Estimated Actual</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$282,099,118</td>
<td>$281,300,138</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>$798,980</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>83,561,042</td>
<td>83,673,744</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>112,702</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>79,954,415</td>
<td>83,176,965</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>3,222,550</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>135,929,042</td>
<td>175,723,435</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>39,794,393</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Maintenance</td>
<td>63,246,959</td>
<td>63,286,129</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>39,170</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>4,520,279</td>
<td>2,325,198</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>(2,195,081)</td>
<td>-48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Assistance</td>
<td>20,084,057</td>
<td>20,290,637</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>206,580</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,940,574</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>23,940,574</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY17-18 Estimated Actual</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$669,394,912</td>
<td>$733,716,820</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$64,321,908</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Fund Comparison of FY18 Estimated Actual with FY19 Proposed by Account

#### ALL COLLEGES/DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17-18 Estimated Actual</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>$396,387,084</td>
<td>$396,862,207</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>475,123</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>118,945,885</td>
<td>119,776,091</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>830,206</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>68,463,291</td>
<td>64,396,505</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>(4,066,786)</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>9,038,245</td>
<td>10,258,877</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1,220,632</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charges</td>
<td>10,062,654</td>
<td>9,626,882</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>(435,772)</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>18,600,097</td>
<td>20,830,430</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2,230,333</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>6,008,696</td>
<td>4,817,794</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>(1,190,902)</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>5,912,309</td>
<td>3,414,427</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>(2,497,882)</td>
<td>-42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Awards</td>
<td>14,864,697</td>
<td>20,702,837</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5,838,140</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debt/Carryforward</td>
<td>1,657,541</td>
<td>31,573,354</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>29,915,813</td>
<td>1804.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers/Pending Allocation</td>
<td>19,454,413</td>
<td>51,457,416</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>32,003,003</td>
<td>164.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY17-18 Estimated Actual</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$669,394,912</td>
<td>$733,716,820</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$64,321,908</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Fund - Budgeted Position Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17-18 Adopted</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Faculty</td>
<td>1,457.0</td>
<td>1,441.8</td>
<td>(15.2)</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive (CEC)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>2,925.7</td>
<td>2,957.7</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Budgeted Positions**
4,398.7 4,416.5 17.8 0.4%

**Significant Staffing (FTE or Full-time equivalent) Changes for FY18-19 by College:**

- **FACULTY**: net reduction of 15.2 FTE are described below.
  - Consider adding 10 Faculty positions to create fairness among colleges.
  - 2 Physical Sciences Faculty (1.8 FTE) added by Mesa due to increased demand and higher enrollment in Engineering, Healthcare and STEM.
  - 1 new Counseling Faculty position Faculty position was added at Paradise Valley.
  - 24 positions will be moved from colleges in Fund 110 to Prop 301.
  - 4 Faculty positions eliminated at Scottsdale due to declining enrollments

- **EXECUTIVE (CEC)**: net addition of 1 FTE
  - The Legal Counsel position at the District Office was changed from Classified Staff to CEC

- **CLASSIFIED STAFF**: net increase of 32 positions are described below.
  - Phoenix: 1 vacant Lab Tech position was eliminated, but a financial literacy position for student success was added, resulting in no net change.
  - Gateway: 1 Learning Center position formerly funded by grants/other sources was permanently added to the General Fund.
  - Mesa: The following positions were added: 4 Instructional support positions (Coord Performing Arts Facilities, Admin Asst., Photo Ceramic Lab Tech, Student Svcs Specialist); 3 Student Svcs Specialist for Enrollment; and 3 Administrative staff (Mgr. College Employee Services; Coord HR Services, Network Admin). The net result is an increase of 10 Classified FTE’s at Mesa.
  - Scottsdale: 2 vacant positions were eliminated and 3 positions were added at Scottsdale: Instructional Design position, Recruitment, VP Student Affairs and partial funding of an Audiovisual Technician. The net change is an increase of 1 FTE.
  - Rio Salado: The following 9 positions were added at Rio Salado: Coordinator Dual Enrollment for more support at high schools; Student Services Specialist for Veterans students at new West Valley Military Center; Student Services Specialist in Developmental Education; Asst. Director Information Technology for business continuity and disaster recovery; Network Administrator and Systems Applications Analyst for out-of-state initiative needs; and a Police Officer to provide security at various Rio locations. In addition, several positions were upgraded from 0.75 to 1.0 FTE, bringing the net increase to 9 Classified FTE’s for Rio Salado.
- South Mt: Several positions were eliminated due to declining enrollment and two new positions were added from the Student Success allocation (Student Orientation Mgr. and Customer Relations Mgr.). The net result was a decrease of 2 Classified staff FTE.

- Chandler-Gilbert: The following positions were formerly among a pool of One-year only (OYO) to supplement staffing levels; since the need persisted, Chandler identified funding to make them permanent: Library Assistant; Student Services Specialist, Student Services Specialist in Veterans, Dual Enrollment Specialists. A Police Officer position was added to correct an error from the prior year’s budget. The net result is an increase of 5 classified staff for Chandler-Gilbert.

- Paradise Valley: 5 Student Services Specialists were added at Paradise Valley.

- Estrella Mt: 5 Classified Staff were added for instructional support due to higher enrollment at the college (Client Support Analyst; Business System Analyst, Coordinator. Student Services, Coordinator Grants, Lead Custodian).

- District: 2 positions were eliminated and reallocated for other needs.

These changes result in a Grand Total net increase of 17.8 FTE in the General Fund for FY18-19.
## Auxiliary Funds

### Auxiliary Fund Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>FY17-18 Est.</th>
<th>FY17-18 Actual</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Donations</td>
<td>$1,563,588</td>
<td>$1,601,250</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>$37,662</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition/Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Tuition</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$4,215,156</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$15,156</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State &amp; Non-resident Dist.Learning</td>
<td>$5,633,452</td>
<td>$9,609,291</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>$3,975,839</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Fees</td>
<td>$14,663,181</td>
<td>$12,245,707</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>$(2,417,474)</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Credit</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$6,028,537</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$3,828,537</td>
<td>174.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>$2,910,121</td>
<td>$4,398,735</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>$1,488,614</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Tuition &amp; Fees</strong></td>
<td>$29,606,754</td>
<td>$36,497,426</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>$6,890,672</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Operations</td>
<td>$4,541,071</td>
<td>$4,541,071</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Other Revenues</td>
<td>$6,339,497</td>
<td>$8,596,225</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$2,256,728</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$42,150,910</td>
<td>$51,335,972</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>$9,185,062</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trfs from Gen Fund</td>
<td>$10,513,999</td>
<td>$11,609,743</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>$1,095,744</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance (FB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Fund Balance</td>
<td>$55,321,327</td>
<td>$54,453,032</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>$(688,295)</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/District-Wide Fund Balance</td>
<td>$73,251,394</td>
<td>$60,847,228</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>$(12,404,166)</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Transfers &amp; Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$139,086,720</td>
<td>$126,910,003</td>
<td>(12,176,717)</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources including Transfr &amp; FB</strong></td>
<td>$181,237,630</td>
<td>$178,245,975</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$(2,991,655)</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Auxiliary Fund Expenditure Summary by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures by Unit</th>
<th>FY17-18 Est.</th>
<th>FY17-18 Actual</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix College</td>
<td>$4,384,969</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>$(334,969)</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale College</td>
<td>$3,110,340</td>
<td>$3,368,001</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$257,661</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GateWay College</td>
<td>$2,013,563</td>
<td>$4,657,371</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>$2,643,808</td>
<td>131.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Extended Campus (formerly Skill Ctrs)</td>
<td>$11,731,291</td>
<td>$12,827,431</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>$1,096,140</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa College</td>
<td>$6,457,202</td>
<td>$7,147,152</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$689,950</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale College</td>
<td>$3,162,785</td>
<td>$4,711,870</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>$1,549,085</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Salado College</td>
<td>$15,494,595</td>
<td>$15,497,467</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>$2,872</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mountain College</td>
<td>$808,302</td>
<td>$954,875</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$146,573</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert College</td>
<td>$2,409,402</td>
<td>$2,307,747</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$(101,655)</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Valley College</td>
<td>$1,327,630</td>
<td>$1,688,758</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>$361,128</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrella Mountain College</td>
<td>$1,096,658</td>
<td>$2,418,573</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>$1,321,915</td>
<td>120.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa Corporate College</td>
<td>$1,536,467</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$(1,536,467)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal College Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$53,533,204</td>
<td>$59,629,245</td>
<td>6,096,041</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Office/District Wide</td>
<td>$12,404,166</td>
<td>$6,030,000</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>$(6,374,166)</td>
<td>-51.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Auxiliary Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$65,937,370</td>
<td>$65,659,245</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$(278,125)</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Carryforward/Contingency</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Fund Balance</td>
<td>$54,453,032</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(54,453,032)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW Fund Balance</td>
<td>$60,847,228</td>
<td>$54,817,228</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$(6,030,000)</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balance/Carryforward</strong></td>
<td>$115,300,260</td>
<td>$54,817,228</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$(60,483,032)</td>
<td>-52.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reserves</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Reserve &amp; 3-Yr Need - New Eff. FY19)</td>
<td>$19,736,515</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Uncommitted Fund Balance</td>
<td>$32,780,713</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant Changes for the Auxiliary Funds for FY18-19

As shown above, the FY18-19 projected revenues for the Auxiliary budget is about $3 million less than the estimated FY17-18 revenues, primarily in non-resident and non-credit tuition/fees.

Course fee funds have been used in the past for equipment/capital purchases related to courses, as shown in the chart below. However, beginning in FY19-20 all course-related equipment purchases will be made through the General Fund instead of from course fees (Fund 250). The Governing Board approved this plan on May 1, 2018.

![Capital Purchases from Fund 250](chart)

Auxiliary Fund Budgeted Position Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17-18 Adopted</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive (CEC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>316.0</td>
<td>298.3</td>
<td>(17.8)</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgeted Positions (FTE)</td>
<td>316.0</td>
<td>299.3</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Changes for Auxiliary for FY18-19

The Total FTE for Auxiliary Fund for FY18-19, decreased by 16.8 FTE’s – primarily at Rio Salado College.
## Restricted (Fund 3) Summary

### RESTRICTED FUND REVENUE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Revenue</th>
<th>FY17-18 Estimated</th>
<th>FY17-18 Actual</th>
<th>FY18-19 Projected</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$16,260,677</td>
<td>$16,151,127</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>$(109,550)</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$9,025,523</td>
<td>$9,277,280</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$251,757</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 301 (see Prop 301 Schedule)</td>
<td>$36,049,130</td>
<td>$39,919,061</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>$3,869,931</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Local Govt. Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>$12,013,893</td>
<td>$13,385,678</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>$1,371,785</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grants and Contracts</strong></td>
<td>$73,349,223</td>
<td>$78,733,146</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>$5,383,923</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Student Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-Study (FWS)</td>
<td>$2,507,931</td>
<td>$3,031,139</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$523,208</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. Sup. Ed. Opp. Grant (FSEOG)</td>
<td>$3,016,882</td>
<td>$2,555,780</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>$(461,102)</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grants</td>
<td>$136,514,713</td>
<td>$136,398,040</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>$(116,673)</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Student Aid - LEAP</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans from Gen Fund for LEAP Matching</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>$6,697,682</td>
<td>$6,607,016</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>$(90,666)</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td>$149,537,208</td>
<td>$149,391,975</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>$(145,233)</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Restricted Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Overhead</td>
<td>$368,149</td>
<td>$368,238</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$7,420,872</td>
<td>$2,877,586</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>$(4,543,286)</td>
<td>-61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Restricted Activities</strong></td>
<td>$7,789,021</td>
<td>$3,245,824</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$(4,543,197)</td>
<td>-58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Restricted Resources</strong></td>
<td>$230,675,452</td>
<td>$231,370,945</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$695,493</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures by Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures by Unit</th>
<th>FY17-18 Estimated</th>
<th>FY17-18 Actual</th>
<th>FY18-19 Projected</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix College</td>
<td>$23,972,986</td>
<td>$24,145,455</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>$172,469</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale College</td>
<td>$32,550,161</td>
<td>$33,484,964</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>$934,803</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway College</td>
<td>$12,617,040</td>
<td>$12,474,284</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>$(142,756)</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa College</td>
<td>$32,761,508</td>
<td>$33,306,061</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>$544,553</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale College</td>
<td>$11,286,685</td>
<td>$11,254,014</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>$(32,671)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Salado College</td>
<td>$27,513,625</td>
<td>$28,090,813</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>$577,188</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mountain College</td>
<td>$9,748,004</td>
<td>$10,335,835</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$587,831</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert College</td>
<td>$14,333,363</td>
<td>$13,502,900</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>$(830,463)</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Valley College</td>
<td>$9,724,155</td>
<td>$8,403,316</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>$(1,320,839)</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrella Mountain College</td>
<td>$19,577,123</td>
<td>$19,891,926</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>$314,803</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Centers</td>
<td>$521,411</td>
<td>$892,994</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$371,583</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Office/District-Wide</td>
<td>$4,443,358</td>
<td>$8,358,319</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>$3,914,961</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Restricted Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$199,049,419</td>
<td>$204,140,881</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$5,091,462</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant Budget Changes for FY18-19

The FY18-19 Proposed Fund 3 Resources Budget without Prop 301 is about $3 million less than the estimated amount for FY17-18. This is primarily due to a reduction in the fund balance.

Restricted Fund Budgeted Position Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY17-18 Adopted</th>
<th>FY18-19 Proposed</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Faculty</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>160.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1001.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgeted Positions (FTE)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>250.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Changes for Restricted for FY18-19

The increase of 24 Faculty is related to Prop 301; the 18 classified staff is due to the inclusion of grant-funded staff.
Proposition 301 Revenue & Expenditure

Proposition 301 is a statewide referendum approved by voters in November 2000 that raised sales taxes for education. Community colleges are required to use the funds for workforce development and training. The Department of Revenue started collecting an additional 0.6% sales tax beginning June 1, 2001, as a result of the referendum. The money is first to be used to pay the annual debt service on outstanding School Facilities Revenue Bonds. Three percent of the remaining money is allocated to the Community College Districts based on the latest available Audited FTSE figures.

The Maricopa Community Colleges anticipates receiving $11.15 million in Proposition 301 sales tax revenues for FY18-19 to support workforce development initiatives.

MCCD utilizes $1.9 million for the costs of 15 faculty currently in Fund 320. An additional 24 other workforce development Faculty positions may be moved from the General Fund to Fund 320 in FY18-19 utilizing $2.6 million in Prop 301 support. Four million dollars has been allocated to College Workforce Initiatives at individual colleges in areas such as aerospace and aviation, bioscience and biotechnology, business and financial services, health care, teacher education, public safety and homeland security, career pipeline development, apprenticeships/internships and retraining, response to local workforce needs and sustainability and green technologies. Two million per year is reserved for MCOR support beginning in FY18 through FY21. Fund balance is in reserve to address capital shortages or rapid response to workforce needs. Plans are underway to identify workforce programs most in need of support and development. A long term plan will be created in coming months to build strong workforce development programs, facilities and classroom equipment so students can graduate or be certified to meet the business and industry needs of our communities, our county and our state.

Prop 301 Budget Projection
FY17-18 Vs. FY2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Estimated Actual FY17-18</th>
<th>Proposed Budget FY18-19</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$ 10,774,859</td>
<td>$ 11,145,614</td>
<td>$ 370,755</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Revenue</td>
<td>$ 10,799,859</td>
<td>$ 11,170,614</td>
<td>$ 370,755</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>25,249,271</td>
<td>28,748,447</td>
<td>3,499,176</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources</td>
<td>$ 36,049,130</td>
<td>$ 39,919,061</td>
<td>$ 3,869,931</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Allocations/Expenditures                |                        |                        |                     |                |
| Workforce Initiatives (TBD)*            | $ 1,926,433            | $ 4,451,770            | $ 2,525,337         | 131.1%         |
| SBDC                                    | 315,000                | 315,000                | 0.0%                |                |
| GPEC Dues                               | 50,000                 | 50,000                 | 0.0%                |                |
| College Workforce Programs & Equipment  | 3,238,795              | 7,821,092              | 4,582,297           | 141.5%         |
| Workforce Information Systems           | 282,100                | 351,135                | 69,035              | 24.5%          |
| MCOR (4-yr support, FY18 to FY21)       | 1,488,355              | 2,000,000              | 511,645             | 34.4%          |
| Total Expenditures                      | $ 7,300,683            | $ 14,988,997           | $ 7,688,314         | 105%           |

Total Ending Fund Balance                | $ 28,748,447            | $ 24,930,064            | $(3,818,383)        | -13%           |
## Plant Fund Revenue & Expenditure Summary

### Unexpended Plant Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Levy</strong></td>
<td>$6,063,485</td>
<td>$6,366,659</td>
<td>$6,557,659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance &amp; Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from General Fund</td>
<td>$13,787,717</td>
<td>$10,075,290</td>
<td>$10,075,290</td>
<td>$10,099,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Fund Balance</td>
<td>$76,574,428</td>
<td>$75,516,874</td>
<td>$58,584,726</td>
<td>$1,326,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/District-Wide Fund Balance</td>
<td>$67,944,865</td>
<td>$66,147,410</td>
<td>$66,313,485</td>
<td>$56,680,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. O Bond Fund Balance</td>
<td>$38,805,398</td>
<td>$26,399,336</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$183,324,691</td>
<td>$168,063,620</td>
<td>$124,898,211</td>
<td>$58,006,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources with Transfers</strong></td>
<td>$197,112,408</td>
<td>$184,202,395</td>
<td>$141,340,160</td>
<td>$74,663,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Actual Projection FY18-19 to FY20-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Expenditures</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Remodels</td>
<td>$20,867,917</td>
<td>$13,088,000</td>
<td>$35,519,000</td>
<td>$10,400,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Capital Expenditures (Non-Construction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>$1,688,877</td>
<td>$6,101,760</td>
<td>$7,550,800</td>
<td>$6,726,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Instructional</td>
<td>$3,731,435</td>
<td>$9,779,277</td>
<td>$11,858,475</td>
<td>$16,026,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Improvements</td>
<td>$963,104</td>
<td>$12,654,147</td>
<td>$12,405,392</td>
<td>$13,523,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal College Capital Needs</strong></td>
<td>$27,251,333</td>
<td>$41,623,184</td>
<td>$67,333,667</td>
<td>$46,677,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DW Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW College Safety</td>
<td>$461,724</td>
<td>$12,742,000</td>
<td>$11,060,800</td>
<td>$9,545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>$1,335,731</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal College Capital Needs</strong></td>
<td>$1,797,455</td>
<td>$17,681,000</td>
<td>$15,999,800</td>
<td>$14,644,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES/NEEDS</strong></td>
<td>$29,048,788</td>
<td>$59,304,184</td>
<td>$83,333,467</td>
<td>$61,321,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Ending Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE FUND BALANCE</th>
<th>FY17-18 $101,916,210</th>
<th>FY18-19 $58,584,726</th>
<th>FY19-20 $1,326,349</th>
<th>FY20-21 $(35,252,127)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT-WIDE FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>FY17-18 $66,147,410</td>
<td>FY18-19 $60,250,000</td>
<td>FY19-20 $50,313,685</td>
<td>FY20-20 $42,036,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL RESERVE FROM PROPERTY TAX LEVY</td>
<td>FY17-18 -</td>
<td>FY18-19 $6,063,485</td>
<td>FY19-20 $6,366,659</td>
<td>FY20-20 $6,557,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTED ENDING FUND BALANCE**

|                | FY17-18 $168,063,620 | FY18-19 $124,898,211 | FY19-20 $58,006,693 | FY20-20 $13,341,876 |

---
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Debt Service- Revenue & Expenditure Summary

### Debt Service & G.O. Bonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Estimated Actual FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Tax Levy/SRP in lieu Tax (Ends FY27)</td>
<td>$83,494,925</td>
<td>$84,220,525</td>
<td>$75,567,725</td>
<td>$75,809,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance - Debt Service</td>
<td>$74,439,413</td>
<td>$74,162,463</td>
<td>$76,255,263</td>
<td>$68,976,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources - Debt Service</strong></td>
<td>$157,934,338</td>
<td>$158,382,988</td>
<td>$151,822,988</td>
<td>$144,785,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Estimated Actual FY17-18</th>
<th>FY18-19</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. O. Bond Debt Service P&amp;I (July Pmt)</td>
<td>$74,439,413</td>
<td>$74,162,463</td>
<td>$76,255,263</td>
<td>$68,976,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bond Debt Service - Interest (January Pmt)</td>
<td>$9,332,463</td>
<td>$7,965,263</td>
<td>$6,591,363</td>
<td>$5,229,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Debt Service Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$83,771,876</td>
<td>$82,127,725</td>
<td>$82,846,625</td>
<td>$74,205,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Reserves & Designations         | $76,255,263              | $68,976,363 | $70,579,563 |
| Estimated Ending Balance - Carryforward | $74,162,463              | $76,255,263 | $68,976,363 | $70,579,563 |
### SCHEDULE A – Summary of Budget Data

**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES**  
**BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019**  
**SUMMARY OF BUDGET DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. CURRENT GENERAL AND PLANT FUNDS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current General Fund</td>
<td>$733,716,820</td>
<td>$733,181,797</td>
<td>$535,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended Plant Fund</td>
<td>59,304,184</td>
<td>88,214,883</td>
<td>(28,910,699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement of Indebtedness Plant Fund</td>
<td>82,127,725</td>
<td>157,934,338</td>
<td>(75,806,613)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$875,148,729</td>
<td>$979,331,018</td>
<td>(104,182,289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Expenditures Per Full-Time Student Equivalent (FTSE):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current General Fund</td>
<td>$10,386 /FTSE</td>
<td>$10,563 /FTSE</td>
<td>(177) /FTSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended Plant Fund</td>
<td>$839 /FTSE</td>
<td>$1,271 /FTSE</td>
<td>(431) /FTSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected FTSE Count</td>
<td>70,643</td>
<td>69,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. TOTAL ALL FUNDS ESTIMATED PERSONNEL COMPENSATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Salaries and Hourly Costs</td>
<td>$417,060,717</td>
<td>$415,331,458</td>
<td>$1,729,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Costs</td>
<td>40,799,442</td>
<td>39,220,748</td>
<td>1,578,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Costs</td>
<td>52,742,250</td>
<td>52,315,541</td>
<td>426,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Benefit Costs</td>
<td>34,080,240</td>
<td>33,871,469</td>
<td>208,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$544,682,649</td>
<td>$540,739,216</td>
<td>3,943,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. SUMMARY OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PROPERTY TAX LEVIES AND RATES</th>
<th>(See NOTE)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Amount Levied:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Tax Levy</td>
<td>$473,275,205</td>
<td>$457,339,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Tax Levy *</td>
<td>84,220,525</td>
<td>83,494,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LEVY</strong></td>
<td>$557,495,730</td>
<td>$540,834,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Rates Per $100 Net Assessed Valuation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Tax Rate</td>
<td>$1.1708</td>
<td>$1.1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.2046</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RATE</strong></td>
<td>$1.3754</td>
<td>$1.4096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE PRIMARY PROPERTY TAX LEVY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019 PURSUANT TO A.R.S. §42-17051</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$532,212,278</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. AMOUNT RECEIVED FROM PRIMARY PROPERTY TAXES IN FISCAL YEAR 2018 IN EXCESS OF THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE AMOUNT AS CALCULATED PURSUANT TO A.R.S. §42-17051</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Salt River Project In-Lieu FY18-19 = $1,550,682; FY17-18 = $1,622,891

**NOTE:** The 2018 Budget includes allocations of all funds rather than estimated expenditures; whereas, the 2019 Budget is based on estimated actual expenditures. As a result, the year to year budget "expenditures" is not truly comparable.
### Section C: Legal Budget

**May 22, 2018**

**FY18-19 Proposed Budget**

---

**SCHEDULE B – Resources**

**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

**MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

**FISCAL YEAR 2019**

**RESOURCES –**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Beginning Balances-July 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>General Fund</strong></th>
<th><strong>Restricted Fund</strong></th>
<th><strong>Auxiliary Fund</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unexpended Plant Fund</strong></th>
<th><strong>Retirement of Indebtedness Fund</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other Funds</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total All Funds 2018</strong></th>
<th><strong>% Increase/Decrease</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>$28,748,447</td>
<td>26,399,336</td>
<td>74,162,463</td>
<td>129,310,246</td>
<td>$144,099,413</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>$144,099,413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>179,715,023</td>
<td>2,877,586</td>
<td>115,300,260</td>
<td>141,664,284</td>
<td>36,899,939</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>36,899,939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Beginning Balances</strong></td>
<td><strong>179,715,023</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,626,033</strong></td>
<td><strong>115,300,260</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,063,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,899,939</strong></td>
<td><strong>605,767,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>637,423,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenues and Other Inflows**

**Student Tuition and Fees**

- General Tuition: $182,700,000, 26% increase to $201,349,821
- Out-of-District Tuition: $256,527, 15.1% decrease to $21,941,838
- Out-of-State Tuition: $15,160,346, 1.9% increase to $15,319,283
- Student Fees: $4,593,128, 0.4% increase to $4,688,551

**State Appropriations**

- Maintenance Support: $6,063,485
- Property Taxes
  - Primary Tax Levy: $467,211,720, 3.5% increase to $473,275,205
  - Secondary Tax Levy: $82,597,634
- Gifts, Grants, and Contracts: $188,206,060, 0.7% increase to $189,807,310
- Sales and Services: $2,640,392, 25.6% decrease to $2,075,585
- Investment Income: $1,000,000, 560% increase to $1,125,000
- State Shared Sales Tax: $11,145,614, 9.2% decrease to $10,202,859
- Other Revenues: $11,289,687, 58.2% increase to $18,848,493

**Total Revenues/Other Inflows:** $682,211,408, 2.6% decrease to $663,423,912

**Transfers**

- Transfers In: $11,609,743, 37.2% increase to $21,685,033
- Transfers Out: $10,075,290

**Total Transfers:** $11,609,743, 37.2% increase to $21,685,033

**Less Reserves:**

- Financial Stability: $(68,401,641)
- Allowance for Uncollectable: $(70,701,641)
- Property Taxes: $(3,806,692)
- Health Spending/Workers’ Comp Reserve: $(3,653,976)
- Enrollment Growth/Retention: $(17,062,300)
- Gifts, Grants, & Student Aid: $(2,300,000)
- SSI/SSE/Safety/Other: $(41,475,204)
- College Priority Initiatives: $(69,584,726)
- Capital Master Planning: $(5,000,000)
- Future Initiatives: $(46,710,777)
- Student Bad Debt: $(3,000,000)
- Other Future Capital Projects: $(60,250,000)
- Capital Reserve & 3rd-Yr Need: $(50,800,000)
- Reserves for Potential Claims/Contingency: $(104,256,541)

**Total Resources Available for the Budget Year:** $733,716,829, 9.5% increase to $836,340,204

---
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### SCHEDULE C – Expenditures and Other Outflows

**MARICOPA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES**  
**BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019**  
**EXPENDITURES AND OTHER OUTFLOWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT FUNDS</th>
<th>PLANT FUNDS</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>Restricted Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Fund</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources Available for the Budget Year (from Schedule B)</strong></td>
<td>$ 733,716,820</td>
<td>$ 204,140,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures/Other Outflows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>281,300,138</td>
<td>$ 12,694,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>2,325,198</td>
<td>19,215,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>83,673,744</td>
<td>11,275,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>83,176,965</td>
<td>4,043,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support (Admin.)</td>
<td>175,723,435</td>
<td>2,827,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation/Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>63,286,129</td>
<td>245,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>20,290,637</td>
<td>153,838,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service - General Obligation Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Carryfwd. &amp; Pending Alloc.</td>
<td>23,940,574</td>
<td>57,769,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures and Other Outflows</strong></td>
<td>$ 733,716,820</td>
<td>$ 204,140,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Budget
FY2018-19

SECTION D: APPENDIX
### Student Enrollment

#### Historic Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>21,392</td>
<td>19,525</td>
<td>19,008</td>
<td>17,804</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>17,101</td>
<td>17,101</td>
<td>17,101</td>
<td>17,101</td>
<td>17,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>32,962</td>
<td>32,854</td>
<td>30,926</td>
<td>29,306</td>
<td>27,947</td>
<td>27,263</td>
<td>26,446</td>
<td>25,785</td>
<td>24,934</td>
<td>24,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GateWay</td>
<td>13,266</td>
<td>11,674</td>
<td>10,962</td>
<td>10,444</td>
<td>9,592</td>
<td>8,495</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>7,777</td>
<td>7,777</td>
<td>7,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>41,836</td>
<td>40,070</td>
<td>38,602</td>
<td>36,054</td>
<td>33,238</td>
<td>30,770</td>
<td>30,154</td>
<td>28,844</td>
<td>29,094</td>
<td>29,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>17,702</td>
<td>17,474</td>
<td>16,527</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>14,770</td>
<td>14,023</td>
<td>13,391</td>
<td>12,922</td>
<td>12,922</td>
<td>12,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Salado</td>
<td>57,746</td>
<td>56,031</td>
<td>52,685</td>
<td>48,333</td>
<td>46,836</td>
<td>45,317</td>
<td>43,882</td>
<td>44,496</td>
<td>44,996</td>
<td>44,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mountain</td>
<td>10,186</td>
<td>8,027</td>
<td>7,338</td>
<td>6,801</td>
<td>6,159</td>
<td>5,772</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>5,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert</td>
<td>17,938</td>
<td>19,611</td>
<td>19,791</td>
<td>19,297</td>
<td>19,040</td>
<td>19,402</td>
<td>19,114</td>
<td>18,734</td>
<td>18,734</td>
<td>18,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Valley</td>
<td>16,046</td>
<td>15,246</td>
<td>14,380</td>
<td>13,198</td>
<td>12,586</td>
<td>12,334</td>
<td>12,334</td>
<td>12,334</td>
<td>12,334</td>
<td>12,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrella Mountain</td>
<td>12,612</td>
<td>12,508</td>
<td>12,475</td>
<td>13,009</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td>13,276</td>
<td>13,276</td>
<td>13,276</td>
<td>13,276</td>
<td>13,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa Skill Center</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Skill Center</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE/GED/ESL</td>
<td>11,264</td>
<td>11,128</td>
<td>12,297</td>
<td>11,244</td>
<td>10,310</td>
<td>10,003</td>
<td>9,589</td>
<td>9,589</td>
<td>9,589</td>
<td>9,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>13,560</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td>14,045</td>
<td>12,925</td>
<td>12,062</td>
<td>11,464</td>
<td>10,733</td>
<td>10,733</td>
<td>10,733</td>
<td>10,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>255,246</td>
<td>246,164</td>
<td>237,947</td>
<td>226,379</td>
<td>215,300</td>
<td>206,034</td>
<td>201,918</td>
<td>198,945</td>
<td>198,440</td>
<td>198,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Full-Time Student Equivalent (FTSE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>7,576</td>
<td>7,137</td>
<td>7,001</td>
<td>6,977</td>
<td>6,753</td>
<td>6,621</td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>6,453</td>
<td>6,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>12,777</td>
<td>12,728</td>
<td>12,473</td>
<td>12,326</td>
<td>11,799</td>
<td>11,229</td>
<td>10,966</td>
<td>10,637</td>
<td>10,371</td>
<td>10,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GateWay</td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>2,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>16,059</td>
<td>15,363</td>
<td>14,709</td>
<td>13,845</td>
<td>13,148</td>
<td>12,317</td>
<td>12,023</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>6,397</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>6,030</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>5,053</td>
<td>4,825</td>
<td>4,666</td>
<td>4,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Salado</td>
<td>14,378</td>
<td>14,363</td>
<td>13,815</td>
<td>12,584</td>
<td>12,194</td>
<td>11,518</td>
<td>11,736</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mountain</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>2,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert</td>
<td>7,206</td>
<td>7,830</td>
<td>8,047</td>
<td>7,936</td>
<td>7,894</td>
<td>7,828</td>
<td>7,968</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>7,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Valley</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>5,109</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>4,641</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>4,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrella Mountain</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>4,709</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>5,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>81,736</td>
<td>80,228</td>
<td>78,419</td>
<td>75,797</td>
<td>73,587</td>
<td>70,070</td>
<td>69,880</td>
<td>68,739</td>
<td>68,504</td>
<td>68,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTSE</td>
<td>84,544</td>
<td>83,024</td>
<td>81,218</td>
<td>78,454</td>
<td>76,150</td>
<td>74,919</td>
<td>72,075</td>
<td>70,878</td>
<td>70,643</td>
<td>70,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Columns may not add due to rounding. Headcount reflects credit courses only.*
Historic Tuition & Fees

The FY18-19 tuition rate for Maricopa reflects a decrease from $86 to $85 per credit hour that was approved by the Governing Board on May 1, 2018. The Annual cost is based on 30 credit hours per Academic year.

### MCCCD Historic Tuition & Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Tuition/ Credit</th>
<th>Annual Cost *</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease Dollars</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>$71.00</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>$71.00</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>$2,280</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>$2,280</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>$81.00</td>
<td>$2,430</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>$84.00</td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>$84.00</td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017-18</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018-19</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
<td>(30.00)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below shows Maricopa’s tuition over a 10-year time period, as well as compared with the Public 2-yr National Average, Western state institutions and Arizona State University. Locally Maricopa is a bargain compared to Arizona State University (ASU), where their tuition exceeds $10,000 per year.

### Tuition Comparison for Local, National, and WICHE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>MARICOPA Annual</th>
<th>MARICOPA Percent</th>
<th>NATL. AVG. Annual</th>
<th>NATL. AVG. Percent</th>
<th>WICHE AVG. Annual</th>
<th>WICHE AVG. Percent</th>
<th>AZ STATE Annual</th>
<th>AZ STATE Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$2,870</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$2,648</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>$6,840</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>$2,130</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$3,030</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>$2,847</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>$8,844</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>$2,280</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>$3,170</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>$3,119</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>$9,716</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>$2,280</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$3,310</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>$3,319</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>$9,720</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>$2,430</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>$3,340</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>$3,424</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>$10,002</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>$3,370</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>$3,495</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>$10,157</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$3,460</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>$3,559</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>$10,478</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>$3,694</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>$10,640</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017-18</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$3,570</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$3,838</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>$10,792</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018-19</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>$3,639</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>$3,960</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>$10,792</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Average 2-yr from "Trends in College Pricing 2017"; ASU and WICHE from WICHE 2017-18 Tuition & Fees report
FY18-19: ASU, National Avg, and WICHE 2yr resident tuition are estimated.
**Property Tax**

**Historic Property Assessment**

The chart and table below show the history of assessed valuation of property in Maricopa County. This valuation is a factor in determining the primary and secondary tax levies of the Maricopa Community Colleges. The net assessment values had declined for several years due to the economy. **NOTE:** Effective 2015 the voters of Arizona passed Proposition 117, which amended the Constitution of Arizona to establish a single limited property value as the bases for determining all property tax. Consequently, the Primary Net Assessed Value is used to calculate both the Primary and Secondary taxes.

### Historic Assessed Valuation - Maricopa County 2008 through 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Yr</th>
<th>Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>PRIMARY Increase / (Decrease)</th>
<th>SECONDARY Increase / (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>44,881,602,698</td>
<td>5,951,335,148</td>
<td>58,303,635,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>49,679,450,134</td>
<td>4,797,847,436</td>
<td>57,984,051,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>46,842,818,990</td>
<td>(2,836,631,144)</td>
<td>49,662,543,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>38,492,098,635</td>
<td>(8,350,720,355)</td>
<td>38,760,296,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>34,263,842,274</td>
<td>(4,228,256,361)</td>
<td>34,400,455,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>31,996,204,979</td>
<td>(2,267,637,295)</td>
<td>32,229,006,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>33,519,795,354</td>
<td>1,523,590,375</td>
<td>35,079,646,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015*</td>
<td>34,623,670,323</td>
<td>1,103,874,969</td>
<td>34,623,670,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>36,135,494,474</td>
<td>1,511,824,151</td>
<td>36,135,494,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>38,251,891,249</td>
<td>2,116,396,775</td>
<td>38,251,891,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Effective 2015 Secondary and Primary Assessed Valuation are the same
Historic Property Tax Rates

The chart and table below provide historic information on the primary and secondary property tax rates for the Maricopa Community Colleges. FY2018-19 primary rate include the proposed tax rate increase by 0.015 per $100 to be moved to the Plant Fund for capital expenditures; this is pending approval by the Governing Board.

**MCCCD Property Tax Rates per $100 of Assessed Valuation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>$0.7752</td>
<td>$0.1634</td>
<td>$0.9386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$0.7246</td>
<td>$0.1598</td>
<td>$0.8844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$0.7926</td>
<td>$0.1802</td>
<td>$0.9728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$1.0123</td>
<td>$0.1959</td>
<td>$1.2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$1.1563</td>
<td>$0.2215</td>
<td>$1.3778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$1.2896</td>
<td>$0.2459</td>
<td>$1.5355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$1.2824</td>
<td>$0.2363</td>
<td>$1.5187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$1.2628</td>
<td>$0.2312</td>
<td>$1.4940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$1.2376</td>
<td>$0.2275</td>
<td>$1.4651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$1.1956</td>
<td>$0.2140</td>
<td>$1.4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY19 Proposed</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.1708</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.2046</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.3754</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property taxes represent a major source of support for the general operations and capital needs of the Maricopa Community Colleges. The following illustrates the property tax that owners of homes with varying assessed valuations may expect to pay in FY18-19, based on the proposed rate with the $0.0150 increase as shown above.

**FY18-19 PROPOSED PROPERTY TAXES FOR VARIOUS HOME VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approx. Value for Tax</th>
<th>$50,000</th>
<th>$100,000</th>
<th>$150,000</th>
<th>$200,000</th>
<th>$250,000</th>
<th>$300,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Ratio @ 10%</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 18-19 Tax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Tax</td>
<td>$1.1708</td>
<td>$58.54</td>
<td>$117.08</td>
<td>$175.62</td>
<td>$234.16</td>
<td>$292.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Tax</td>
<td>$0.2046</td>
<td>$10.23</td>
<td>$20.46</td>
<td>$30.69</td>
<td>$40.92</td>
<td>$51.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Tax</strong></td>
<td>$1.3754</td>
<td>$68.77</td>
<td>$137.54</td>
<td>$206.31</td>
<td>$275.08</td>
<td>$343.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated Tax Rates and Assessed Valuation

In 1980, Arizona citizens amended the State Constitution and capped primary property tax revenue increases from existing property to 2% per year. This is an additional means of limiting tax increases to small marginal amounts. With the exception of FY09-10, F10-11, FY12-13, FY15-16 and FY16-17, the Maricopa Governing Board has approved an increase on property tax revenues. The Constitution permits the Governing Board to levy the unused capacity from the past. The following chart shows the proposed levy and the potential tax rates for primary and secondary taxes for FY18-19. This information is based on recent assessment valuation from Maricopa County Assessor’s office. The Salt River Project Centrally Assessed Valuation (CAV) for 2018 was lower compared to prior year.

### MARICOPA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

**PROPOSED TAX RATES AND LEVIES for FY 2018-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAXIMUM LEVY AND TAX RATE CALCULATIONS (for comparative purposes)</th>
<th>PROPOSED PRIMARY TAX LEVY AND RATE CALCULATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Line 1 increased by 2% $520,954,037</td>
<td>10. Primary Tax Rate FY 2017-18 $1.1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Current Assessed Value of Last Year’s Property $39,567,420,208</td>
<td>11. Line 9 increased by 1.3% $463,254,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Line 3 divided by 100 $395,674,202</td>
<td>12. Proposed Primary Tax Rate FY18-19 (line 11/line 4) $1.1708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maximum Tax Rate FY 2018-19 (Line 2 / Line 4) $1.3166</td>
<td>13. Proposed Primary Tax Levy (line 7 x line 12) $473,275,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Current Assessed Value divided by 100 $404,232,342</td>
<td>SRP In-lieu Tax Amount FY 2018-19 $8,624,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Maximum Levy Amount FY18-19 (Line 7 X Line 5) $532,212,278</td>
<td>Total Primary Levy &amp; In-lieu FY 2018-19 $481,899,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SALT RIVER PROJECT CENTRALLY ASSESSED VALUATION (CAV)**

- SRP CAV at 2017 Values * $758,239,862
- SRP CAV at 2018 Values ** $736,858,000
- SRP CAV at 2017 Values / 100 ** $7,366,580
- SRP In-lieu Tax Amount FY 2018-19 Est $8,624,792

* 2017 SRP CAV Actual received March 14, 2017
** 2018 SRP CAV received March 12, 2018

### SECONDARY TAX LEVY AND RATE CALCULATIONS

- Current Assessed Valuation for 2018 $40,423,232,423
- Est. SRP Current Assessed Valuation for 2018 $736,658,000
- Total to calculate Secondary Tax Rate/Levy Amts $41,159,890,423
- Levy Amount Needed (G.O. Bond Principal/Interest) $82,713,190
- SRP In-lieu Needed (G.O. Bond Principal/Interest) $1,507,335
- Total Secondary Levy & In-Lieu FY2016-17 $84,220,525

### COMBINED TAX RATES FOR FY 2018-19 (PER $100 OF ASSESSED VALUATION)

- Primary Levy Rate - with 1.3% increase $1.1708
- Secondary Levy Rate using Primary Assessed Value $0.2046
- Combined Levy Rate FY18-19 $1.3754
## Expenditure Limitation Report Worksheet

Annual Budgeted Expenditure Limitation Report Worksheet  
Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Total Budgeted Expenditures</th>
<th>General Oper.</th>
<th>Auxiliary Enter.</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
<th>Ret. of Debt</th>
<th>Quasi Endowment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 733,716,820</td>
<td>$ 123,428,747</td>
<td>$ 204,140,881</td>
<td>$ 59,304,184</td>
<td>$ 82,127,725</td>
<td>$ 33,245,963</td>
<td>$ 1,235,964,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Less Exclusions Claimed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond Proceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Requirements on Bonded Indebtedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends, Interest And Gains on Sale of Securities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore/Auxiliary Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants And Aid From Federal Gov't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Aid, Contributions or Gifts from Private Agency, Organization or Individual Except Those Amounts Received in Lieu of Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition And Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monies Received A.R.S. 15-1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Years Carry-Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Exclusions Claimed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| C. Budgeted Exp. Subject to Limitation | $ 464,052,073 | - | - | - | - | - | - | $ 464,052,073 |

| D. Expenditure Limitation Fiscal Year 2018-19 | - | - | - | - | - | - | $ 464,052,073 |

| Unused (Overcommitted) Legal Limit | 0 |
Proposed Budget
FY2018-19

SECTION E: GLOSSARY
**Academic Support**
A functional category of expenditures reflective of support services for instructional programs and academic functions such as funding for learning centers, libraries, and honor programs.

**Account Codes (formerly Object Code)**
Expenditures are budgeted and accounted for by object code categories to detail the use of funds. Revenues also are budgeted in object codes to distinguish different types of resources.

**Communications and Utilities**
All costs related to telephone, postage, electricity, water, sewer, etc. are charged to communications and utilities object code.

**Contingency, Scholarships, Misc, Transfers:**
The contingency, miscellaneous and transfers object code includes reserve, holding and transfers accounts. Examples are: a contingency for taxes that are budgeted but not collected; a basic contingency for unexpected needs as prioritized by the Governing Board; allocations for the Enrollment Growth Funding program reserved to help fund additional courses for increased student enrollment; funds for incremental costs from capital development facilities; a reserve for insurance costs, college carryforward and student scholarships.

**Contractual Services**
Expenditures such as funding for professional services, advertising, marketing, etc. are budgeted in the contractual services object code series. Additionally, the cost of teaching services and course development for concurrent enrollment as well as employer-sponsored programs may be charged to this object code.

**Course Fees**
Course fees are budgeted in the Auxiliary Fund. They cover the cost of materials for credit courses that rely on special equipment or supplementary materials.

**Employee Benefits**
These object codes account for the employee paid costs of employee health insurance, District retirement contributions, social security and Medicare, life insurance, worker’s compensation, etc.

**Enrollment Growth Funding**
A formula based funding allocation based on full time student equivalent (FTSE) growth. Effective FY2010-11 Budget, funding were distributed to the colleges based on estimated growth at the rate of $2,130 per FTSE.

**Expenditure Limitation**
This is a provision of the State Constitution and Arizona Revised Statutes that limits the expenditure of local tax revenues (e.g. primary property taxes and State Aid). The limitation is set by the Economic Estimates Commission (EEC) by applying growth in enrollment (FTSE) and inflation over a base budget year.

**Fixed Charges**
Expenditures for facilities rentals, etc. are budgeted in fixed charges object code.

**Food Service**
This Auxiliary Fund division includes revenues and expenditures from directly operated food service operations.
Full-time Student Equivalents (FTSE)
A calculated estimate of enrollment, based on credit hours divided by 30 (the number of credits in a year that is considered to be full-time). In the case of Skill Center or ABE/GED students, clock hours are used and divided by 640.

Functional Categories
To ensure comparability and standardization in the presentation of financial information, all colleges and units are required to budget and account for the expenditure of funds by functional categories.

General Institutional Support
A functional expense category that includes expenses for the day-to-day operational and general administrative support of the institution such as safety, security, insurance, software licensing and computer repair, mail and copy services, etc.

Headcount
The number of students enrolled in classes. Headcount may be duplicated or unduplicated.

In-Lieu Taxes (SRP)
In-lieu tax refers to a levy imposed as an alternate for another tax. Salt River Project is a political subdivision of the State of Arizona, so they are exempt from property tax. However, in accordance with Arizona law, the SRP District makes voluntary contributions each year to the State of Arizona, school districts, cities, counties, towns and other political subdivisions of the State of Arizona, for which property taxes are levied and within whose boundaries SRP has property included in its electric system. The amount paid is computed on the same basis as ad valorem taxes paid by a private utility corporation.

Institutional Support
This is a functional category of expenditures to identify cost related to management, business and human resources operations, and planning of the organization. Examples include office of the president, fiscal operations, human resources offices, information technology staff and legal services.

Instruction
This is a functional category of expenditures accounting for instructional activities. An example is salaries and wages of faculty and supplies and other department chairs.

Non Credit/Special Interest Courses
These are fees that support the costs of these course offerings. This is an Auxiliary Fund division.

Object Codes (now Account Code)
Expenditures are budgeted and accounted for by object code categories to detail the use of funds. Revenues also are budgeted in object codes to distinguish different types of resources.

Operations/Maintenance
A functional category of expenditures allocated for the operation and maintenance of the physical plant, such as utility costs and staff responsible for the maintenance of buildings and grounds for all units.
Other Auxiliary Programs

The activities of this Auxiliary Fund division are supported by several sources including interest on cash balances and facility rentals. Expenditures are for such purposes as scholarships, rental costs, faculty training (Lodestar), campus security training, and revenue bond repayment costs.

Public Services

A functional category of expenditures that account for non-instructional services of benefit to the community; examples include public lectures, and community service programs.

Salaries and Wages

Compensation provided to all regular Governing Board approved faculty and staff, while the temporary staff budget is recorded in salaries and wages account codes.

State Aid

The State of Arizona provides financial support to community college districts based on formulas that are set in statute. These formulas largely are based on enrollment levels. The formulas use the most recent audited full-time student equivalents; hence, state aid is provided for enrollment growth that occurred two years before the fiscal year under development. Currently Maricopa Community College District does not received State Aid.

Student Services

A functional category of expenditures reflective of support services provided to students, such as counseling, testing, admissions, student financial aid, and career development.

Supplies & Materials

The cost of classroom and office supplies and materials, software, audiovisual aids, etc. is budgeted in supplies and materials object code.

Tax Levy Limit

This is a provision of the Arizona State Constitution and statute that limits growth in taxes on existing property.

Travel

Travel related object codes include mileage, in and out of state travel, registration, hotels, airfare, etc.