

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
(subject to approval at the next Regular Governing Board meeting)  
**COCHISE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD**  
**SPECIAL WORK SESSION**

**Tuesday, September 11, 2012**  
**Cochise College Douglas Campus**  
**4:30 p.m.**

**1. GENERAL FUNCTIONS**

**1.01 Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Guy at 4:32 p.m.

**Board Members Present:**

Mrs. Jan Guy  
Mrs. Jane Strain  
Mr. David DiPeso  
Dr. John Eaton

**Board Members Absent**

Mr. Don Hudgins

**2. New Business**

**2.01 Arizona Community College Coordinating Council**

Dr. Rottweiler provided the Board with a handout containing information on the proposed Arizona Community College Coordinating Council. He stated that it has become very apparent to the President's Council that they have little or no consistent, positive, representation at the capitol, in the governor's mansion, or with other entities and agencies. The presidents have put together a proposed model for an Arizona Community College Coordinating Council, which mirrors, as proposed, the League of Cities and Towns. Overview - "The Arizona Community College Coordinating Council is the public representative of Arizona's ten independent community college districts. As sovereign political subdivisions, the community colleges form the Council to have a single representative – a single face, a single voice – for the community colleges to the public, the media, the state education community, and state-level elected officials." The ten governing boards will appoint a Board of Presidents who then manages over the entire group. There has been discussion around hiring a president, preferably a retired community college CEO/president who understands community colleges and who can effectively and candidly communicate with the community college presidents. He added that the group will not affect sovereignty, as it will have no legal authority. The group would also work with a vice president/administrative director, who would help coordinate the President's Council meetings, CBO meetings, and AADGB meetings, keeping them all on 'the same page' and moving in the same direction. In time, this body would also assume some lobbying responsibilities, as well as some responsibilities directed to reporting to the state. This is currently contracted out to Pima and Maricopa.

Dr. Rottweiler went on to say that there would be a fee for membership, based on FTSE; estimated at a total cost of \$250,000 - \$300,000 a year. Currently, the President's

Council is funded at about \$184,000, which includes the contract for state reporting, as well as lobbying services. Dr. Rottweiler is supportive of the model, and believes some real benefits are included, adding that the colleges get all of the strengths of it without having any authority over any of the districts. Mrs. Guy stated that is key, and that it can't morph into some iteration of a state board. She voiced some concerns around past endeavors in areas similar to this. Dr. Rottweiler assured her that this council will not morph into a state board as it is not a state entity.

Dr. Rottweiler directed the Board's attention to the last page of the handout where they would find a possible sequence of events, coming from the President's Council. The program was endorsed in August, and was to be taken for discussion to the Boards in September. The Board's feedback will be taken to the October ACCPC meeting. Previous pages include the rationale and structure, literally following the League of Cities and Towns model. Dr. Rottweiler then shared feedback from colleagues in other districts.

Discussion followed around membership dues (based on FTSE), positions held in the council and duties of those who hold the positions, as well as payment associated with the positions.

Mrs. Guy inquired as to where this entity would be housed; Dr. Rottweiler stated the location would be in Maricopa County.

In conclusion, Dr. Rottweiler stated he needed a general consensus of whether or not the Board feels this is something that should move forward. He encouraged the Board to take the information home and review it, and then get back to him with any feedback they may wish to provide. He will plan take the information to the September President's Council. The Board offered no opposition to the continuation of discussions.

## **2.02 Payroll Issues and Changes**

Dr. Rottweiler provided the Board with a handout and stated that we have some historical issues that we need to work our way through. Currently, we pay on 26 pay periods – paying our employees every two weeks. The computer bases that on 260 work days per year, but if you look at the calendar, there is no such thing as 260 work days. Actually, the calendar shows that 261 days is the average; some years there are 262 and some years there are 260. We base ours on 260 work days. This means that, for some of our employees with deferred pays (10 month employees spread out over 12 months), to get them into their 26 pay periods, we fall a day behind every year. We had a number of employees this year, when they began their FY13 contract that actually had to start receiving their pay in June. Otherwise, they would have gone one pay period without a paycheck, which isn't very employee friendly. There are some different ways around this, with one being to just keep doing the 26 pay periods, and once every 7 – 10 years we could do 27 pay periods. As it stands now, we are pre-paying employees before they work, which statutorily, is probably not proper. If they leave the college before this pre-pay catches up, in theory, they owe the college money (we have not had issues with this). Dr. Rottweiler explained what he would like to do and then seek the Board's approval. This has been discussed by the administrative team and with payroll, and they would like to set-up a three year transitional period, that moves the college away from 26 pay periods and into 24 pay periods. Currently, two months out of the year employees get a 'third' paycheck, but, under the 24 pay period plan, employees would not receive those extra paychecks, but would receive more money in their paychecks. Dr. Rottweiler referred to the 10.5 month deferred employees in the

handout, showing that these employees, in FY2013, were pre-paid the first pay period in order to get them onto the schedule. In looking at the 11-month staff and counselors, it showed that in order for them to get onto the schedule, they had to start getting paid for this fiscal year, in June. The proposal being brought to the Board is for every type of employee (10.5 month, 11 month and counselors, normal academic faculty, and non-deferment). Dr. Rottweiler is proposing to present to the employees in October that we will continue the same this year, in 2014 move to 27 pay periods, and then in 2015, move everyone on to 24 pay periods from there on out. He stated this will be explained to all the college employees, making them feel as comfortable as he can; however, he knows there will be some initial concerns. The Board was in agreement that being paid twice a month makes more sense.

### **2.03 Case Statement for the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Major Gift Campaign**

Dr. Rottweiler provided the Board an initial case statement that Denise Merkel, Director, Cochise College Foundation, has been working on with Cummings-Eaton, our consultants, related to the college's 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. He requested the Board review the document and let him know if the projects included are acceptable, and which could then be taken into the feasibility study. Included in the document is the major gifts campaign, comprised of the Nursing and Health Occupations Expansion (Sierra Vista Campus) at \$8M, the Career and Technical Education Complex (Sierra Vista Campus) at \$5M, and Student Life Enhancements (Douglas Campus) at \$3M, with the total cost being \$16M. Also included are the arguments on why it is believed these are needed. It has been estimated, at least for the discussion of a feasibility study, the college contribute \$5M (in fund reserves) towards the completion of that, and a donor request of approximately \$4M. We would ask that the feasibility study see if we could raise \$8M for this project. The group would then meet with 50 individuals of high means and influence, and see if there is an agreement. They may come back and say definitely, there's a great chance, or this is a 'no go'. They may revisit it and say that \$8M can't be raised, but maybe \$6M could be raised; it provides the opportunity for more discussion. Dr. Rottweiler wanted to make the Board aware of this and invited their feedback and/or ideas. He would like to do the feasibility first, and then come back and ask for formal Board action to begin a major gift campaign. Mrs. Guy stated that, hopefully, the feasibility study will provide a sense of what is in the community and what we can reasonably expect from the community in the way of support. We know that it is currently a very trying time economically in the country, but it's nice to have professionals surveying what might be available to us in the campaign. She added that she is optimistic, and that maybe we could even 'up' the goal. We will see.

Dr. Rottweiler made the Board aware of a letter he received from the daughters of George Spikes, consistent with Board policy, requesting some naming opportunities, mentioning the generosity of the Spikes family as it relates to that. He has contacted the family and asked if he could slow this down a bit in light of the fact that we're getting ready for the college's 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. She was agreeable to the request and was pleased that the request was being considered.

Dr. Rottweiler also provided the Board with information regarding the Eco Lab on the Sierra Vista campus. He has had discussions with the Arizona Community Foundation, and will meet with the county manager and the board of supervisors regarding some potential funding options for that facility. It is not part of the overall plan for the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary, but he thinks it could be funded out of some foundation money as well as some other places.

Cochise College Regular Governing Board meeting  
Tuesday, September 11, 2012

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

Mrs. Guy adjourned the work session at 5:31 p.m.

**NO ACTIONS WERE TAKEN DURING THIS WORK SESSION.**

Respectfully Submitted:

---

Ms. Loretta Mountjoy, Executive Administrative Assistant, Office of the President

---

Mrs. Jane Strain, Secretary of the Governing Board