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Similar to many other community colleges around the nation, the institutional history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College had not been adequately documented. This study identifies and documents significant activities and historical events in the college’s inception, formation, and development through 2005.

The study benefits current and future faculty, staff, and administrators of the college, as well as contributes to the larger body of knowledge about community colleges which may benefit faculty, staff, and administrators of any college. In addition to including a brief history of community colleges in the United States, the study includes a history of the Maricopa County Community College District, a literature review, and an in-depth case study of the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College.

The study uses a multimethod approach to answer the “how” and “why” questions about the college history. Purposeful sampling techniques were used to identify 33 individuals who were interviewed as part of this research, including the founding administrators, faculty, and staff, as well as Governing Board members, and District
administrators. The researcher used historical documents coupled with comments from interviews to explain and put into context key events in the college history.

The researcher provides a detailed theoretical framework and shows how data collection and analysis were guided by recognized models of inquiry. Thus, the reader can determine whether and how the findings might apply to a different college, a different setting, a different timeframe, or various other circumstances.

For the research problem and each subproblem at least one and sometimes more sample-specific findings and conclusions are presented. The following topics are addressed: inception; formation; growth and development; key people; college operations, including programs and services, students, employees, finances, and land, facilities and equipment; problems and challenges; and successes and accomplishments.

The study concludes with a series of recommendations for putting the research results to immediate and practical use, as well as with recommendations for additional research related to Chandler-Gilbert Community College and the Maricopa County Community College District.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Background

In 1985, Chandler-Gilbert Education Center, operating as a satellite of a neighboring college, opened with an enrollment of a few hundred students. By 2004-2005, Chandler-Gilbert Community College (CGCC) served more than 12,000 students annually. Its programs in service-learning and learning communities were nationally recognized. The aviation and information technology programs were considered regional powerhouses for the southwestern United States. In less than 20 years, a college that began in one little pink building across from a dairy had grown into a comprehensive college with three locations (Felnagle, 2000).

As of this research, only a handful of the early employees remain at the college. The community leaders, college administrators, and faculty who were responsible for the formation of the college are, for the most part, retired. Collectively, these employees and community members have made a significant contribution to the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix, Arizona, establishing the signature institution of higher education for the communities of Chandler, Gilbert, and Queen Creek. Individually, they busied themselves in the daily activities of starting a college with little time for reflection or documentation of what was being accomplished. As founding employee after employee left the college, their contributions were celebrated, often with dozens of employees gathering to share stories of what had been accomplished over the years. But little of the information about milestones, achievements, and challenges was captured in writing.
In the first decades of the college’s existence, college employees had so immersed themselves in the work to be accomplished, that few pieces of college history were collected and catalogued. There were no existing policies for college archives (S. Peabody, personal communication, March 18, 2005), a phenomenon not exclusive to CGCC (R. P. Pedersen, 2000). There had not been an annual college report, and with the exception of a few paragraphs in the college catalog ("Catalog and student handbook 2004-2005," 2004), there was no written history of the college. In the spring of 2002, upon the retirement of the founding college Provost and President, Arnette Scott Ward, current employees published a document called *Legacy: Chandler-Gilbert Community College President’s Report, 1985-2002* and a videotape to capture historical moments. During the process of putting those materials together, there were numerous people in old photographs who could not be identified. College documents that had been published over the years had conflicting dates for major events, and much of the history of the college was leaving with the departure of the founding Provost and first President. Many questions remained unanswered and undocumented. What led to the founding of the college? How did the college get its name? How was the location across from a dairy and surrounded by agricultural fields determined? Why were the buildings painted such unusual colors? Did the community have specific ideas about what programs the college should offer and, if so, were they offered? What were the stories behind the key people who founded the college? How were the decisions made to pursue certain programs such as aviation and service-learning, both rather unusual at the time in community colleges?
Purpose of the Study

In the 2001-2002 academic year, while preparing for the retirement events for the founding Provost and then President, there was recognition of the need to establish a system for collecting and documenting important activities and events for the future, that is, to develop a college archival system. That system has now been developed so that from this point forward, important documents, pictures, and videotapes will be maintained (S. Peabody, personal communication, March 18, 2005). However, there was also a desire to not lose the history of the early years, that is, to reconstruct that which had not been documented. Several employees, including the researcher, pledged to go back and document the past.

Unfortunately, during the initial years of developing the college, little effort was made to capture the history. In fact, early documents describing the college are in relatively short supply. There were the traditional college catalogs and class schedules, but they describe what courses were offered, not “why” they were offered. For example, in the 1985 class schedule, aviation courses appear for the first time and by 1988 the college had made a commitment to offer a certificate and degree program in Aircraft Maintenance Technology ("Proposed certificate and A.A.S. degree program, aircraft maintenance technology, MCC/Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center," 1988). However, there is little explanation of what factors led to that decision. An aviation program requires substantial financial investment as well as administrative commitment. It would seem unusual for a small college with no administrators or faculty familiar with the aviation industry and with little collective experience in any occupational programs, for that matter, to commit to such a major undertaking.
To complicate matters, although early college documents attempted to be as accurate as possible, there were several documents with conflicting information about key historical events and activities. A need to reconcile these discrepancies and accurately document this information was evident.

Much can be learned from knowing and understanding the past. Promises were made to the community, some of which were fulfilled, while others remain to be fulfilled. Successful programs were developed. Surely, current employees would want to understand the history of those programs and the factors that led to those successes. Of course, there were problems and challenges as well. Certainly, there were pearls of wisdom to be gleaned from that which was not successful.

The stories about the early years form a rich history and should not be lost. There are stories about the founding of the college, the rationale for directions taken, the struggles and joys of early employees, the choices about programs, the building of facilities, and the students and their successes.

Reflection about the past is a powerful tool for improving the future. This case study begins to document and track the college’s history with an eye to applying the lessons of the past to the planning for the future. Civil rights activist Malcolm X claimed, “Of all our studies, history is best qualified to reward our research” (*Excerpt from a speech to the Organization of Afro-American Unity*, 1964, p. 1). He posited that the past provides the lessons from which the future can be built.

And so the value in this research lies not just in its documentation of the activities of the past. No doubt, it is important not to lose the history of the growing communities of the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix and their local college, of the colorful
personalities involved, and of the rationale behind certain decisions and choices, but it is also important that this story contributes to the building of the future.

Statement of the Problem

The institutional history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College has not been adequately documented. This is not unusual among community colleges given that many do not maintain college archives (Weiger, 1999).

In this case, the opportunity exists for rectifying the problem. At some institutions, founding staff members have passed away or are unable to be located. On the contrary, many of the founding administrators, and faculty and staff of Chandler-Gilbert Community College are still alive and able to help recreate the institutional history.

This research study will identify and document significant activities and historical events in the college’s developmental years, as well as collect stories from the integral people about the early years of the college and commit them to writing.

Research Problems

The primary research problem for this study will be to identify and describe the major events, people, and issues that form the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College from its inception through 2005.

Five secondary problems or subproblems have been identified.
1. Inception, formation and growth: Identify timeframes and describe the significant activities and historical events in the inception, formation, and growth stages of the college’s development.

2. Key people and organizations: Identify the key people and the organizations who influenced the early stages of college development.

3. College operations: Compile and document key facts and figures about the college during these years related to programs and services, students, employees, finances, and land, facilities and equipment.

4. Problems and challenges: Describe the primary problems and challenges that were faced in the early years of college development.

5. Successes and accomplishments: Describe the major successes and accomplishments of the college.

**Definition of Terms**

A number of terms are used throughout the document. These terms are defined so that readers have a common frame of reference.

**Accreditation:** Accreditation is a status granted by a non-governmental regional accrediting body following evaluation of an institution “in terms of its mission and the agency’s standards or criteria” (Higher Learning Commission, 2004, p. 1). The institutional evaluation includes the formal educational activities as well as “governance and administration, financial stability, admissions and student personnel services, institutional resources, student academic achievement, institutional effectiveness, and relationships with constituencies inside and outside the institution” (Higher Learning

**Adjunct faculty**: Faculty who teach on a part-time basis for a college are considered adjunct faculty. In the Maricopa Community Colleges adjunct faculty may carry up to nine load hours per term, whereas full-time (residential) faculty carry fifteen load hours per term and have a variety of other duties. Other distinguishing features of adjunct faculty are that they typically do not receive the same set of benefits as full-time faculty and do not have private offices on campuses. At Chandler-Gilbert Community College, adjunct faculty are typically working professionals who teach one or two courses for the college per semester.

**Administration**: Within the Maricopa County Community College District, at the college level, the administration refers to the college President, the Vice Presidents, and the Deans. At the district level, this refers to the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellors, and the Associate Vice Chancellors.

**Administrative services**: Those departments and services that provide support for aspects of college operations are considered administrative services. Examples include facilities services, financial operations, strategic planning, marketing and public relations, institutional research, grants and development, and personnel services.

**Academic support services**: Those departments and services that provide direct support to faculty and students are considered academic support services. Examples include library, tutoring and learning centers, computer labs, and the curriculum office.

**Accessibility**: Accessibility can refer to multiple dimensions of a student’s ability to attend college, such as travel time or distance, admissions requirements, or financial
hardships. Vaughan explains that the mission of community colleges includes “a commitment to open access in its admissions policies and to fair and equal treatment of all students. Access is achieved by maintaining a low tuition rate and offering program choices …” and by “having a college within commuting distance of most residents and giving students choices in what they study” and, once the student is enrolled, by providing “support services, including counseling, academic advising, and financial aid, helping to ensure that every student has the opportunity to succeed academically” (Vaughan, 2000, p. 4).

**Affordability:** Affordability refers to the combined effect of tuition rate, grant and loan availability, and other expenses associated with attending college. “Affordability refers to the actual expenses incurred net of the discounting provided by grant aid and the loan repayment subsidies” (Altbach, Gumport, & Johnstone, 2001, p. 156).

**Articulation:** Articulation “is the processes and procedures that support students transfer between education institutions. Articulation connects several different types of organizations, and can take place between any of the following: universities/colleges, community colleges/districts, skill centers, high schools, etc. Maricopa articulation occurs with various partners, both public and private, across state and national boundaries” (Hogan, 2004b).

**Associate degree:** An academic degree conferred by a community college after a specified course of study has been completed.

**Chandler, City of:** Chandler is a city in the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix, Arizona. Chandler was first incorporated on February 16, 1920, by Dr. A. J.
Chandler. The city, which had approximately 30,000 residents in 1980, had a population exceeding 200,000 in 2002 (Chandler's history, 2004).

**Classroom research:** Classroom research, as defined by Chandler-Gilbert Community College, is the systematic evaluation of learning by college faculty within the classroom setting. Assessment instruments are created, administered, and analyzed by the teachers themselves. The goal is to continuously monitor student learning and adjust teaching according to student needs. This constant evaluation process also helps students reflect on what they have learned and how they have learned it ("Catalog and student handbook 2004-2005," 2004).

**Collaborative learning:** In collaborative learning, faculty facilitate small groups of students who work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning. The premise is that when students talk about the subject and interact with each other, they become active rather than passive learners. Thus, their achievement as well as their cognitive and social development improves ("Catalog and student handbook 2004-2005," 2004).

**Community college:** A community college is “defined as a regionally accredited institution of higher education that offers the associate degree as its highest degree” (Vaughan, 2000, p. 2). Several different names have been used over time for these colleges including junior colleges. The American Association of Community Colleges refers to them as “centers of educational opportunity,” “an American invention that put publicly funded higher education at close-to-home facilities, beginning nearly 100 years ago,” and “inclusive institutions that welcome all who desire to learn, regardless of
wealth, heritage, or previous academic experience” (AACC, 2004, p. 1). Describing the changing terminology, higher education historians Cohen and Brawer explain:

During the 1950s and 1960s, the term junior college was applied more often to the lower-division branches of private universities and to two-year colleges supported by churches or organized independently, while community college came gradually to be used for the comprehensive, publicly supported institutions. By the 1970s, the term community college was usually applied to both types. … We define the community college as any institution regionally accredited to award the associate in arts or the associate in science as its highest degree. That definition includes the comprehensive two-year college as well as many technical institutes, both public and private. It eliminates many of the publicly supported area vocational schools and adult education centers and most of the proprietary business and trade colleges that are accredited by the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools but not by the regional accrediting associations. (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, pp. 4-5)

Curriculum: A written plan that outlines a course or program by delineating the skills and concepts taught and evaluated is called curriculum. Within the Maricopa Community Colleges, the elements of curriculum for a course include the course prefix/subject, the course number, the course title, the credit hours, the course description, the prerequisites and corequisites, the course competencies, and the content outline (Hogan, 2004a).
**Division:** A division is part of the organizational structure of the college whereby related academic disciplines are grouped together and the faculty and staff in those disciplines form a workgroup. For example, the Language and Humanities Division includes faculty in English, English as a second language, foreign language, humanities, philosophy, religious studies, and other areas; the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division includes psychology, sociology, economics, history, anthropology, political science, teacher education, and more.

**Equity:** Vaughan (2000) speaks of access and equity as complimentary concepts. “Open access and equity mean that men and women from all ethnic and economic backgrounds can afford to attend the community college and no one is discriminated against in any academic program or services offered by the college.” He adds that equity means “removing artificial barriers to access for those traditionally unserved by higher education” (p. 4).

**Ethnic minority:** For the purposes of this research, ethnic minority refers to a person who classifies themselves as African American, Asian Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Native American, or mixed race.

**Faculty:** The term “faculty” generally refers to college teachers or instructors. However, not all faculty teach. For example, there are faculty counselors and faculty librarians who are considered “service” faculty. Service faculty provide academic support services. Full-time faculty members are generally referred to as “residential faculty” and part-time faculty are generally referred to as “adjunct faculty.”

**Full-time student equivalent:** Calculation of full-time student equivalents (FTSE) is based on the requirements of state law and used as a basis for budget allocations. The
assumption is that a full-time student will take 15 credits in the fall and another 15 credits in the spring, totaling 30 credits for the academic year. The number of credit hours taken at a college over the course of a year divided by 30 will yield the annual FTSE.

Gilbert, Town of: Located in the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix and Maricopa County, the Town of Gilbert was homesteaded in 1891 and incorporated in 1920. As one of the fastest growing communities in Arizona, Gilbert had a 410% population increase between 1980 and 1991 (The Gilbert community, 2004). In 2003, the population was 138,000 (Census, 2004).

Higley: Often mistakenly thought of as a town, Higley is not a municipality but a school district.

Higley Unified School District: The Higley Unified School District serves students from Gilbert and Queen Creek as well as the unincorporated county area. The District unified in 1999 and now serves students in grades K-12 (Our history, 2004).

Hispanic: A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture is called Hispanic (Definition of hispanic, 2004). The U.S. Census does not define Hispanic as a race but rather as a culture whereby individuals categorize themselves as either “of Hispanic origin” or “not of Hispanic origin” (Frequently asked questions, 2003). People of Hispanic origin may be of any race including white, black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, or some other race. “In the federal statistical system ethnic origin is considered to be a separate concept from race” (Yax, 2000, p. 1).
**Hybrid classes**: For the purposes of this study, when the researcher uses this term it means that a class is taught partially in person and partially at a distance. Most faculty at Chandler-Gilbert Community College who are teaching hybrid classes use various forms of electronic communications to hold class virtually or on-line.

**Learning communities**: Two or more classes connected through content, ideas, or activities to form a learning community are sometimes called “block” courses, “linked” courses or “interdisciplinary” studies. Students explore a common theme, examining relationships between different ideas and subjects. Often these courses are team-taught by college faculty ("Catalog and student handbook 2004-2005," 2004).

**Maricopa County Community College District**: The Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD) is a community college system that serves residents of Maricopa County in the State of Arizona. This District includes 10 independently accredited community colleges—Chandler-Gilbert Community College, Estrella Mountain Community College, GateWay Community College, Glendale Community College, Mesa Community College, Paradise Valley Community College, Phoenix College, Rio Salado College, Scottsdale Community College, and South Mountain Community College—and a District Support Services Center, which is often called the District Office. Throughout the document several terms are used interchangeably to describe MCCCD including the Maricopa Community Colleges and the Maricopa system.

**Mesa, City of**: The City of Mesa is located 15 miles east of Phoenix in the East Valley and has an area of 128 square miles. In 2003, the population exceeded 430,000 people, making it the third largest city in Arizona (About Mesa, 2003).
Open enrollment or open door institution: Community colleges are often called “open enrollment” or “open door” institutions because all community members have access to them, whether they have completed a high school diploma or not. Laura Rendon, a professor at California State University at Long Beach, explained the open enrollment concept in her paper, *Fulfilling the Promise of Access and Opportunity: Collaborative Community Colleges for the 21st Century*. Community colleges are “based on the ideal of democracy” and “viewed as vehicles of access and opportunity” (Rendon, 2000, p. 1). She says that the open door institutions provide ethnic and racial minorities, first-generation college students, low-income students, and others “with the opportunity to pursue postsecondary education, to initiate transfer coursework leading to the baccalaureate degree, and to enroll in occupational programs that equip them with high-level skills needed to enter a fast-growing technological workforce” (Rendon, 2000, p. 1).

Program: A program is a series of courses that leads to either a certificate or an associate degree, although sometimes a series of courses to prepare for transfer to a university is also referred to as a program. Also, the term “program” is sometimes used to refer to a set of services or activities in which students or faculty are involved such as the “service-learning program” or the “faculty development program.”

Program of study: A program of study is a document that identifies a student’s certificate, degree, or transfer goal and then lists the courses needed for completion of that goal.

Residential faculty: Residential or full-time faculty teach as their primary role within community colleges. The Residential Faculty Policy (RFP) for the Maricopa
Community Colleges says they will typically teach 15-16 load hours per term, hold at least five office hours per week, and provide other service to the college.

**Service area**: Service area refers to the geographic area that a community college is charged with serving. In describing the nature of community colleges, Vaughan explains that “a college is committed to serving the needs of a designated geographic area, often called the college’s service area or service region” (Vaughan, 2000, p. 6).

**Southeast Valley**: The Southeast Valley refers to the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix and for this paper includes the cities, towns, and areas of Chandler, Gilbert, Queen Creek, Chandler Heights, Sun Lakes, and parts of unincorporated Maricopa County, as well as portions of Tempe and Mesa. The borders of this area are considered to be the U.S. 60 (the Superstition Freeway) on the north, the I-10 freeway on the west, and the Maricopa County borders on the east and south.

**Service-learning**: CGCC’s definition of service-learning was developed by Marybeth Mason and Maria Hesse in 1992. “Service-learning combines community service with academic instruction, focusing on critical thinking and problem solving, values clarification, social and personal development, and civic and community responsibility. Classes engaged in service-learning provide meaningful services to the community while making the curriculum more relevant to students’ lives” ("Catalog and student handbook 2004-2005," 2004, p. 4).

**State Board of Directors for Community Colleges**: The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges was the governmental entity responsible for coordinating the State of Arizona’s community college districts (*State Board coordinates Arizona community colleges*, 1999). Although the State Board of Directors for Community
Colleges was disbanded by the Arizona State Legislature in 2002, the Board was involved in the establishment and oversight of all of the current Maricopa Community Colleges. There were 17 board members, 15 of whom were appointed by the Governor to represent their counties for seven-year terms. One member was a representative from the Arizona Board of Regents and one member was from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Significant duties of the State Board included oversight of tuition and fees, certification of teachers in community colleges, and owning and leasing land for colleges (*State Board coordinates Arizona community colleges*, 1999).

**Student services:** For the purposes of this research document, student services includes those non-teaching departments that serve students with a variety of enrollment, retention, and personal development activities. For Chandler-Gilbert Community College that includes the departments of Admissions and Records, Advisement, Financial Aid, Student Life (student leadership and student activities), International Student Services, Disabled Student Services, the Vice President of Student Affairs Office, and others. The terms “student services” and “student affairs” are often used synonymously.

**Sun Lakes:** Sun Lakes is an active adult community with country club amenities located near Chandler, Arizona. This 3,500 acre resort community was developed by Robson Communities and has more than 16,000 residents (*Sun Lakes Arizona*, 2006).

**Queen Creek, Town of:** The Town of Queen Creek was incorporated in 1989 and lies south and east of Chandler and Gilbert on the Maricopa County border. According to U.S. Census figures, the population had grown to 4,316 at the end of April 2000. The Town’s web site indicates that in 2004, population had expanded to more than 14,500 residents (*Town of Queen Creek*, 2003).
Abbreviations Used

**AACC**: American Association of Community Colleges.

**AACJC**: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. The name changed to the American Association of Community Colleges in 1992.

**AAC&U**: The Association of American Colleges and Universities.

**AAHE**: American Association of Higher Education.

**ABOR**: Arizona Board of Regents.

**ACCA**: Arizona Community College Association.

**ACCPC**: Arizona Community College Presidents’ Council.

**ASU**: Arizona State University.

**CAO**: Chief Academic Officer. Generally refers to the person responsible for the academic programs of the college. Within the Maricopa Colleges, this person was typically given the title of Dean of Instruction, until 2005 when the title changed to Vice President of Academic Affairs.

**CCSSE**: Community College Survey of Student Engagement.

**CEO**: Chief Executive Officer. Generally refers to the person responsible for all aspects of the institution. Presently within the Maricopa Community Colleges, this person is generally given the title of College President. At the District level, the CEO is called the Chancellor.

**CFO**: Chief Financial Officer. Generally refers to the person responsible for the financial operations of the college. Within the Maricopa Community Colleges, this person typically has broader responsibilities than the financial affairs of the college, often
also overseeing facilities, marketing and public relations, institutional research, and other areas. Until 2005, within the Maricopa Community Colleges, the title given to this position was Dean of Administrative Services, and then changed to Vice President of Administrative Services.

CGCC: Chandler-Gilbert Community College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

CGCCC: Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center. A name used during 1987-1992 while the college was an extension of Mesa Community College and not yet independently accredited.

CGEC: Chandler-Gilbert Education Center or Chandler/Gilbert Education Center. An early name for the college used during the years 1985-1987 when it was an extension of Mesa Community College.

CIO: Chief Information Officer. Generally refers to the person responsible for the information technology or computer operations of the college. Within the Maricopa Community Colleges, as of 2005, the title given to this position is Director of Information Technologies.

CSAO: Chief Student Affairs Officer. Generally refers to the person responsible for the student services and student issues of a college. Within the Maricopa Community Colleges, this person was commonly given the title of Dean of Student Services or Dean of Student Development until 2005 when the title changed to Vice President of Student Affairs.

EMCC: Estrella Mountain Community College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.
ESL: English as a Second Language.

FAA: Federal Aviation Administration

FIPSE: Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education.

FTSE: Full-time student equivalent.

GCC: Glendale Community College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

GI Bill: GI stands for “government issue.” The GI Bill of Rights was enacted as the Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944, whereby veterans would receive support for tuition, books, and living expenses to attend college (Vaughan, 2000).

GSF: Gross square feet.

GWCC: GateWay Community College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

HLC: The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) is an independent corporation that holds membership in the North Central Association (NCA) of Colleges and Schools regional accreditation agency.

MAG: Maricopa Association of Governments.

MAT: An employee organization representing the Management, Administrative and Technical (MAT) employees of the Maricopa County Community College District.

MCC: Mesa Community College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

MCCCD: A shortened and often used abbreviation for the Maricopa Community College District. Technically, MCCCD is the correct abbreviation.

MCCCD: Maricopa County Community College District.

MTC: Maricopa Technical College, later renamed GateWay Community College.
NAU: Northern Arizona University.

NCA: The North Central Association (NCA) of Colleges and Schools is a regional accreditation agency. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of NCA has offices in Chicago, Illinois, and accredits degree-granting institutions of higher education.

PC: Phoenix College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

PSA: An employee organization, the Professional Staff Association (PSA) represents the secretarial, clerical, and other staff employees of the Maricopa County Community College District.

PUHS: Phoenix Union High School.

PVCC: Paradise Valley Community College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

RSC: Rio Salado College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

SCC: Scottsdale Community College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

SMCC: South Mountain Community College, one of the ten Maricopa Community Colleges.

TPAD: Tech Prep/Associate Degree, where “tech prep” means technical preparation.

**Limitations**

Limitations of the study are those items which may threaten the internal validity or skew the results. Limitations may also include items over which the researcher has
little control. The following items related to the interviewing process were beyond this researcher’s control:

1. Accurate and/or complete recollections of events and activities as 20 years have passed since some of the events and activities that people were recalling in their interviews.

2. Important information that interviewees may have withheld from the researcher during interviews.

3. Subjectivity of individual respondent’s comments.

To lessen the influence of these factors, the researcher determined what questions would be asked and provided those questions, along with some background information about the study, to interviewees in advance of the scheduled interview.

Portions of the data gathered through interviews were anecdotal and should not be generalized as pertaining to all institutions. Also, given that interviewees were faculty and staff of Chandler-Gilbert Community College or the Maricopa County Community College District or Governing Board members of the District, their perspectives were academic in nature.

Another limitation pertains to this particular researcher, who has worked at the college being studied since 1987. There may be a tendency for this researcher to seek out answers that support his/her preconceived notions and thus bias the interview data.

However, the researcher has used multiple sources of information including personal interviews; written documentation, such as board minutes, college newsletters, catalogs, class schedules, and other marketing publications; as well as interviews by the
respondents taken by other interviewers. Thus, every effort has been made to crosscheck information and limit the influence of the factors noted.

**Delimitations**

This case study represents a narrative history and is not an attempt to evaluate or compare. The results of this study should not be construed to imply that the “lessons” are applicable to other developing colleges or schools.

The study was conducted more than 20 years after the initial discussions about the formation of the college. The conditions of those days and of the present should not be generalized to other time periods since conditions may change and be quite different from what they were then and what they might be in the future (Dereshiwsky, 1998).

Also, not all events, activities, and people can be covered, or covered in equal depth. The study is also delimited by the sources of information that were available such as print documents and access to such documents and interviewees.

**Assumptions**

There were certain assumptions made in undertaking this study including that interviewees/respondents possessed the knowledge, ability, and desire to respond accurately and completely.

It was also assumed that documents used were authentic and that the documents were representative of the college and the time period studied.

This study is about CGCC and the findings may be helpful to others, but they cannot necessarily be generalized to other colleges.
Significance of the Study

This study will benefit current and future faculty, staff, and administrators of Chandler-Gilbert Community College. By documenting the history of the college, employees can develop an understanding of issues and events of the past and therefore consider how they might influence the future. They may gain insight into the driving forces for past challenges and successes and use that knowledge to explain present policy and programs and to give shape and meaning to current experience.

In addition, the study has significance because it contributes to the larger knowledge base of higher education leaders across the country. The history of community colleges, individually and collectively, has not been well documented as compared with other segments of higher education. “Books on higher education published from the turn of the century, when the first community colleges appeared, through the 1980’s rarely gave even a nod to the community college; one searches in vain for a reference to them in indexes” (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 35). In more recent years, leaders in higher education have realized the lack of adequate documentation and the need to preserve the history of community colleges. An article, “Maintaining a Historical Perspective,” in Community College Week stated, “… many founding administrators, presidents and trustees still are alive and able to help ‘recreate’ their institutions’ histories. But several have died in recent years, taking their stories with them. As one of the largest single groups of college founders in American higher education history continues to age, some experts fear important chapters in the history of two-year institutions could go unwritten and unrecoverable” (Weiger, 1999, p. 1). Dr. Terry
O’Banion, former president of the League for Innovation in the Community College, encourages colleges to chronicle their past saying, “A lot of material will be forever lost to schools who don’t have a mindset to preserve” (Weiger, 1999, p. 1). This study directly addresses this concern for this specific college.

Additionally, the methodology of the study has particular significance as few oral histories have been collected on community colleges. Describing a book written on the oral history of Florida Community College at Jacksonville, Lois Myers explains that “in the late 1980s, Gentry [the book’s author] discovered that of thirty United States colleges and universities with oral history collections on the history of the schools themselves, none was a community college” (Myers, 1992, p. 1). Myers described the significance of the collection of recorded interviews and transcripts to historians of education:

Historians of education will appreciate the personal reactions to funding, space, and management problems created by the phenomenal growth of the community college from modest beginnings and a small student body to a widespread campus system serving many thousands of students with diverse goals and needs. Anyone familiar with academic life will appreciate recollections of working on a shoestring budget, accommodating to limited space in temporary buildings, and scrambling to meet accreditation requirements. (Myers, 1992, p. 1)

Although Myers was describing the development of a community college on the other side of the country, it is reminiscent of CGCC’s development and of the value of the collection of these stories to historians.
From a broader perspective, there is significance in studying this individual college because of the contribution made to the understanding of the national community college system.

In 1950, Bogue deplored the lack of attention paid to the junior colleges, saying that he had examined twenty-seven authoritative histories of American education and found only superficial treatment of junior colleges or none at all. Rudolph’s major history of the higher education curriculum, published in 1977, gave them a scant two pages. Pascarella and Terenzini’s massive review, *How College Affects Students* (1991), offered little more. (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 35)

Dr. Arthur M. Cohen is a historian of higher education at the University of California, Los Angeles. He said that “it’s rare to find something for community colleges, unless someone happened to do a history as a dissertation” and added that “contemporary material could be strung together to develop a history of the movement as a whole” (Weiger, 1999, p. 2). This study could contribute to that body of knowledge.

From the perspective of the communities of Chandler, Gilbert, and Queen Creek in the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix, Arizona, this history of their signature higher education institution will contribute to the broader history of these communities, documenting what exists and how it came to be.

The study has significance for multiple audiences who have an interest in understanding history with an eye to applying its lessons to the contemporary world as well as to help anticipate and predict the future.
Summary

This chapter provided an overview of this project including the purpose, the statement of the problem, research problems, definition of terms, limitations and delimitations, and the significance of the study.

The next chapter, Chapter Two, discusses the literature relevant to the history of community colleges in the United States, the Maricopa County Community College District, and Chandler-Gilbert Community College.

Chapter Three describes the research design and data collection procedures. The data analysis procedures are explained in detail, including a description of how the population was selected for interviews and how the documents were selected for study. The structure of interviews is described and issues of reliability and validity are addressed.

Chapter Four presents the findings and results for each of the research questions.

Chapter Five is a summary of the first four chapters. It also contains the researcher’s conclusions, recommendations for future studies, and implications of the study.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

This chapter will provide a review of the literature related to the history of community colleges nationally, the founding and development of the Maricopa County Community College District and its 10 colleges, and the founding and development of one of those 10, Chandler-Gilbert Community College.

Community Colleges

Community colleges play a unique role in American higher education. They were influenced by a wide array of forces such as “the rapid expansion of the public high school after 1890, calls for the reform of American education by university leaders and scholars early in the 20th century, the GI Bill, the baby boom, business and industry’s demand for trained workers” (Vaughan, 2000, p. 1), the civil rights movement, federal student aid programs, and myriad new federal laws.

From its earliest days, the United States has had outstanding colleges and universities, so what factors led to the development of community colleges as opposed to simply expanding the existing university systems? Many educators in the 19th and early 20th centuries, for various reasons, wanted the universities to abandon their freshman and sophomore classes and relegate that duty to another set of institutions, to be called junior colleges. Higher education historians Cohen and Brawer explained:

Proposals that the junior college should relieve the university of the burden of providing general education for young people were made in 1851 by Henry Tappan, president of the University of Michigan; in 1859
by William Mitchell, a University of Georgia trustee; and in 1869 by William Folwell, president of the University of Minnesota. All insisted that the universities would not become true research and professional development centers until they relinquished their lower-division preparatory work. Other educators—such as William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago; Edmund J. James of the University of Illinois; Stanford’s president, David Starr Jordan; and University of California professor and member of the State Board of Education Alexis Lange—suggested emulating the system followed in European universities and secondary schools. That is, the universities would be responsible for the higher-order scholarship, while the lower schools would provide general and vocational education to students through age nineteen or twenty. Harper also contended that the weaker four-year colleges might better become junior colleges rather than wasting money by doing superficial work. (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, pp. 6-7)

Several community colleges began in the early 1900s either as an outgrowth of a secondary school system or as an appendage of a university wanting to unburden itself from the general education program for younger students.

Cohen and Brawer (2003) indicate that the State of California played a major role in the development of community colleges in the western United States when in 1907 it authorized high schools to offer classes in grades 13 and 14. In many California communities, especially those located far from a state university, high schools had already begun this practice. These developing colleges were often supported by
universities. “Fresno Junior College was opened due to strong support of public education and the support from the University of California and Stanford University” (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004, p. 3). California’s groundbreaking 1907 law, coupled with other amendments, provided a model for enabling legislation that other states pursued (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 18).

Community colleges took several organizational forms, having been influenced by both high schools and universities. For example, in 1927 in California, 16 colleges organized as an extension of a local secondary school, six were units of state colleges, and nine operated as separate junior college districts (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

As other states grappled with the need to promote higher education, junior colleges began to appear around America with more than 300 founded by 1925 (see Appendix A). During this timeframe, “the Phoenix Union High School District launched its junior college program in 1920—the same junior college program that is the direct ancestor of today’s Maricopa District” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 17).

Although each state’s emphasis varied somewhat, junior college functions usually included academic transfer preparation, vocational-technical education, continuing education, developmental education, and community service. “In 1936, Hollinshead wrote that ‘the junior college should be a community college, meeting community needs’ (p. 111), providing adult education and educational, recreational, and vocational activities and placing its cultural facilities at the disposal of the community” (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 20). Slowly, the name of these new institutions changed to reflect a broadened perspective. “The term junior college was generally applied to lower-division branches of private universities and to two-year colleges supported by churches or organized
independently, while community college came gradually to be used for the comprehensive, publicly supported institutions” (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 4).

Nationally by 1930, 450 junior colleges existed in various parts of the United States (see Appendix A).

With support from university leaders, a series of landmark events, legislation, and publications provided for the further development of the community college system. “The report of the Educational Policies Commission followed by the GI Bill and the Truman Report provided a basis for community college growth and thereby the groundwork for the concerns expressed later by President Eisenhower’s Committee on Education Beyond the High School” (Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattsheck, & Suppiger, 1994, p. 274).

Diane Ravitch, historian of American education, observed the GI Bill’s lasting effect was the notion that all Americans ought to have access to a college education (Ravitch, 1983). In his book, The American School, historian Joel Spring (2001) noted that “7.8 million veterans received some form of postsecondary education” as a result of the GI Bill (Spring, 2001, p. 361). Community colleges were an accessible and affordable method of providing mass education to veterans as well as to the population at large.

The number of community colleges nearly doubled in the 25 years from 1925 to 1950 to a total of 648 (see Appendix A). Many community colleges were independent two-year institutions while others were public institutions.

In the summer of 1946, the American Council on Education held a conference to discuss the doubling of enrollments on college campuses following World War II and the
passage of the GI Bill, as well as other issues. “In response to the council’s requests, President Truman appointed the President’s Commission on Higher Education in July 1946” (Ravitch, 1983, p. 15). Ravitch explained:

The thesis of the report was that, with the advance of science, technology and industrialization, more and more students would seek higher education to prepare them for effective participation in contemporary society. Institutions of higher education should welcome this expansion, remove all barriers to its progress, and change in whatever ways were necessary to meet the diverse needs of students. A vastly expanded network of postsecondary institutions, the commission believed, would promote international understanding, the solution of social problems, general education for individual development, vocational education for occupational development, and a fuller realization of democratic living. (Ravitch, 1983, p. 16)

Arthur Levine, President of Teachers College at Columbia University, described the extraordinary vision of the Truman Commission in addressing access to higher education as a national priority:

The Truman Commission report was a radical departure from all that came before it. In a nation that was male dominated, segregated, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic, with deep pockets of urban and rural poverty, the report called for the end of barriers to higher education based on race, gender, religion, income, and geographic location. In a country in which less than 10% of the college-age population was attending higher education
institutions, the Truman Commission said a majority of Americans was capable of enrolling. In a time in which the United States had barely crossed the border between elite and mass access to college, the Truman Commission required nothing less than tuition-free, universal access to college. (Quigley & Bailey, 2003, pp. xi-xii)

The Commission recommended that states plan for the rapid expansion of two-year community colleges which would “fit into the community life as the high school had done” (Ravitch, 1983, p. 16).

The GI Bill and the Truman Commission also led to the development of more career or occupational programs at community colleges. “As the veterans returned from war, they created a greater demand for noncollegiate vocational courses than for traditional transfer courses. The community colleges moved to fill the need for this vocational/technical type of curriculum” (Hittman, 1999, p. 410).

States began to examine these national reports and trends and seek ways to implement the democratic educational commitments. As a result, the 1950s and 1960s were growth years for community colleges. And as more Americans attended college, the federal government responded with a variety of aid to colleges and students.

So many colleges were cropping up in communities around the nation that in 1954 the Teachers College at Columbia developed a list of guidelines, including a list of questions to be answered (see Appendix B) when a community was considering the establishment of a community college (Quigley & Bailey, 2003). Although this researcher could not find evidence that officials in Phoenix were aware of these guidelines, many of the factors mentioned, including an adequate population of potential
students, existence of enabling legislation, provisions for state aid, and existence of individuals to provide leadership, were important considerations in the development of the Maricopa County Community College District in 1962.

The State of Arizona established a public college system in 1960. “The Arizona legislature created a state board of directors for junior colleges and authorized it to establish a two-year college system. The board could place a college in any area that had the potential to provide at least 320 students. It chose college sites, established standards, and purchased property” (Witt et al., 1994, p. 218).

Arizona and other states expanded their community college systems rapidly in the 1960s and 1970s. The Maricopa County Community College District started by obtaining already existing Phoenix College, then founded Mesa Community College, Glendale Community College, Maricopa Technical College, and Scottsdale Community College in quick succession (Felnagle, 2000).

Nationally, in addition to the passage of the GI Bill, a combination of other factors such as the baby boom, the demand for skilled workers in business and industry, and the civil rights movement were also influencing changes in higher education. Whereas, initially community colleges were focused on offering the first two years of university preparation, they evolved to simultaneously offer career and occupational programs. “The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and subsequent amendments in 1968 and 1972 greatly increased the federal funds available for career education, thereby encouraging the community colleges to alter their mission to include a greater emphasis on vocational training” (Hittman, 1999, p. 411; see also, Cohen & Brawer, 2003;
Vaughan, 2000). The population of students also became more diverse as the breadth of programs expanded.

In response to addressing access and equity in higher education, several key pieces of legislation were passed in the 1960s and 1970s that encouraged high school graduates as well as working adults to pursue a college degree. “The Higher Education Act of 1965 and subsequent legislation at the national level made it possible for virtually anyone who could establish the need to receive financial assistance to attend college” (Vaughan, 2000, p. 4).

Pell grants and student loans enabled thousands of students to pursue a college degree and a great number of those students came to community colleges. The book *Foundations of American Higher Education* explained:

Amendments to the Higher Education Act in 1972 established the Basic Educational Opportunities Grant (BEOG, later renamed “Pell Grants” for Senator Claiborne Pell) and the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae). The amendments were designed to increase middle income and economically disadvantaged students’ accessibility to higher education. (Hittman, 1999, p. 411)

Higher education historians Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer indicate that by the mid-1970s, community colleges “enrolled 34 percent of all students in U.S. higher education” (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 31).

By the late 1970s, into the 1980s and 1990s, additional shifts in national trends were affecting higher education and particularly community colleges that were positioned to respond directly to the needs of their local communities. Community college leaders
reached out to untapped sectors of the community. They championed “the kind of community renewal once sought by Jane Addams through Hull House” (R. T. Pedersen, 1997, p. 500). In doing so, the characteristics of the student population began to change as described by Witt and colleagues:

> These outreach efforts brought a massive increase in part-time credit enrollment, which nearly tripled between 1970 and 1990. Many part-timers were older students, taking only one or two courses. By 1990 the average age of two-year college students had risen to twenty-eight, and more than half of all students were over twenty-four years of age (American Association of Community Colleges, 1990). (Witt et al., 1994, p. 262)

Cohen defines the contemporary era of higher education as stretching from 1976 to 1998. He says that although fewer additional colleges were built in this timeframe, “colleges accommodated the 33 percent increase in enrollment by adding buildings, extending instructional hours, providing classes in rented space off-campus, opening branch centers, and employing additional part-time faculty” (Cohen, 1998, p. 313).

Additional major programs were funded nationally, such as Tech Prep, which attempted to create pathways for high school students to seamlessly integrate their high school occupational program into a community college degree, as described below:

> An innovation developed and promoted heavily by AACJC president Dale Parnell, TPAD [tech-prep/associate degree] formed the centerpiece for his book *The Neglected Majority* (1985). These “2+2” degree programs linked two-year colleges and feeder high schools, with students beginning
a program in their junior year of high school and continuing through a corresponding two-year program leading to an associate degree at the community college. (Witt et al., 1994, p. 264)

As the nation prepared for the last decade of the 20th century, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, which in 1992 changed its name to the American Association of Community Colleges (*Significant historical events in the development of the public community college*, 2004), undertook a massive study of the status of community colleges. The goal of the Association’s Futures Commission, as described below, was to identify issues and present recommendations for the next phase of community college development:

In 1986 the AACJC Board approved Parnell’s recommendation that the Association create the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges and appointed nineteen community college and university leaders, government officials, and lay citizens to the prestigious commission. The commission was charged with examining the status of America’s community colleges and plotting a course for their future development. U.S. Senator Nancy Kassebaum served as honorary chair, and Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, served as chair. The commission carried out its mission over an eighteen month period, holding open hearings throughout the nation and involving thousands of citizens and representatives of colleges. (Witt et al., 1994, p. 270)
To pursue the recommendations of the Futures Commission, AACJC went to the Kellogg Foundation with a request for funding. The Foundation provided a $1.8 million grant to fund the Beacon Colleges Program. “The project’s five-year strategy was to select twenty-five Beacon Colleges that had already begun to implement the recommendations of the Futures Commission and give them direct financial assistance to conduct exemplary programs suggested by the commission’s research” (Witt et al., 1994, p. 270). These colleges, in turn, helped other colleges in developing and implementing innovative and responsive programs and services.

In the first 100 years since community colleges had begun, they had grown from a handful of schools to more than 1,100 institutions across the country. They had expanded their mission from a focus on providing the first two years of university studies to providing a variety of general education, university transfer, workforce development, continuing education, and industry training programs, as well as supporting other community needs. The colleges tended to be deeply influenced by local leaders who had formed them and by the nature of the communities they served, as noted below:

Through an examination of primary sources such as local school records, newspaper reports, community histories, state surveys, and dissertations, he [R. T. Pederson, a historian of higher education] attributes the development of the early public community colleges to local community conditions and interests. Frequently operating in high school facilities, the colleges were local institutions, and much civic pride surrounded their development. (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 11)
Such was the case with the development of a college in Phoenix, Arizona, which would evolve into one of the largest community college districts in the country.

The Maricopa County Community College District

The former president and CEO of the American Association of Community Colleges, David Pierce, described the Maricopa County Community College District as “a cutting-edge institution that is national in its vision and progressive in its thinking and programs” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 9). Pierce acknowledged, however, that Maricopa was not always held in high regard in its own communities and around the country. Richard Felnagle, a faculty member and historian of MCCCD, said, “The behavior of its board sometimes involved ethics that were marginal at best. Its CEOs, though competent, were not always viewed as visionary leaders. Its faculty was partisan and occasionally fractious, going so far as to threaten to strike during one particularly frustrating period. And the community seemed occasionally to question whether it needed the District at all” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 9).

The District, which had been developed by local leaders with much pride and anticipation, had some tumultuous years and eventually transformed itself from a relatively unknown community college system to a nationally recognized beacon of excellence.

To understand the Maricopa Community Colleges today, one must understand the founding and early history of the Maricopa District, as well as the colleges which make up the District. Three publications contributed significantly to the documentation of the development of the Maricopa Colleges.
First, the early history of the Maricopa District is captured in a doctoral dissertation by Rosejean Clifford Hinsdale, completed in September of 1973. Hinsdale cited two previous studies directly related to MCCCD. Mabel Hughes Blue wrote a history of Phoenix College in 1948, covering the years 1920-1948, for a master’s degree thesis at Arizona State College, now called Arizona State University. Mildred Bulpitt, for which Bulpitt Auditorium at Phoenix College is named, wrote about the evening program at Phoenix College in her doctoral dissertation for Arizona State University in 1970. Hinsdale uses these two documents, as well as Governing Board minutes, personal interviews, and other District documents to write a history of the first decade of the District’s operations as an unpublished work (Hinsdale, 1973).

Second, Richard Felnagle, an English faculty member at Mesa Community College, wrote the first published work on MCCCD’s history in 2000. Maricopa’s Community Colleges: The Turbulent Evolution of an Education Giant chronicled the District’s history, focusing on the founding of each of the 10 colleges, which comprise the District. His book was the culmination of the “History Project,” whereby MCCCD Chancellor Paul Elsner, nearing retirement, commissioned Felnagle “to write the District’s official history” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 5).

Felnagle and the History Project’s steering committee used three unpublished works, including those of Mabel Hughes Blue and Mildred Bulpitt, along with one written by John Prince, District CEO from 1967-1976, about E. W. Montgomery, who was Superintendent of Phoenix Union High School District and the first president of Phoenix College from 1925-1953, prior to the founding of the Maricopa County Community College District. Felnagle relied heavily on Hinsdale’s “encyclopedia
history of the Maricopa District’s first ten years” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 7). In addition, Felnagle and his assistant interviewed nearly a 100 employees, students, and community members over a three-year period.

Third, *A Tribute to the History and Hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges* was published in 2002 by the District’s marketing and public relations department. It was produced under the direction of Dr. Fred Gaskin, Chancellor from 2000-2003. In addition to providing a brief history of each college, this document provides a comparative perspective from earlier years to the present on various topics such as student enrollment, finances, employees, and other topics (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002).

In a broader search of the literature on community colleges the Maricopa system is mentioned infrequently until the 1990s when a variety of articles featured information about its programs and services. Within Arizona, the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges produced a booklet, *The 25th Anniversary of the Community Colleges of Arizona* (1987), that confirms most of the dates and facts as told by Hinsdale and later Felnagle.

A variety of MCCCD college-specific documents including college histories, self-studies, class materials from the community college teacher certification course, college web sites, and news articles were also reviewed.

Just as had been the case in numerous communities around the country, Phoenix’s community college was driven by the vision of civic leaders who saw the development of a college as essential to the economic development and stature of the area. As noted below, B.F. McFall was instrumental in this effort:
One of the early pioneers of education in Phoenix, Mr. B. F. McFall, knew that a city’s future success is measured by its educational system. A progressive citizen, Mr. McFall instigated, in the year 1910, the idea of a junior college in the Salt River Valley. … It was not until ten years later, however, that this college was established as a department of the Phoenix Union High School. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 21)

Over a period of 10 years with support from McFall and other community leaders, Phoenix Union High School developed a college-preparatory curriculum, then began offering post-secondary courses, and eventually started a junior college program. Many factors played into the development, not the least of which was the decision of the United States to enter the war in Europe and the changes that occurred in Phoenix as a result of the service men and women returning from the war (Felnagle, 2000).

When the junior college program began at Phoenix Union High School in 1920, students were the same age as traditional university students and the curriculum paralleled that of the first two years at the University of Arizona, where the students would eventually transfer. In 1929, there were 384 students enrolled with an average age of 19.7 for freshman and 20.8 for sophomores (Felnagle, 2000).

Elements of Phoenix Junior College were significantly different than the Maricopa Community Colleges of today. “In 1939, Phoenix Junior College could easily have been mistaken for a small, elite, four-year liberal arts school with all the trimmings: fraternities, sororities, and varsity athletics” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 39). World War II, the return of hundreds of veterans to school under the GI Bill, and the emergence of business
and industry forces in the Phoenix metropolitan area, similar to that in all parts of the country, would change the nature of the city as well as its community college system.

The GI Bill enabled many returning veterans to attend college. The result was almost immediate in Phoenix where student enrollment grew from 339 day students in fall 1944 to 1084 day students in fall 1946 (Felnagle, 2000, p. 41).

Early community colleges were not of the mind that their role was to “provide access to higher education for academically underprepared students,” but rather they were trying to provide coursework that was standardized to the university curriculum for those students who were not likely to be within easy distance of a university (R. T. Pedersen, 1997, p. 506). Such was the case with Phoenix College that worked to make its coursework and selection of students as rigorous as that of the University of Arizona (Felnagle, 2000).

The high school’s junior college program quickly became independently accredited by the North Central Association. Thus, Phoenix Junior College emerged as a separate institution. Look magazine considered Phoenix Junior College among the best junior colleges in America in 1946 (Felnagle, 2000).

As was the case in many spots around the country, multiple elements of Phoenix College and ultimately the Maricopa Community College system, had vestiges of the secondary school system, such as teacher certification standards monitored by state and local governing boards. At the same time, community colleges were part of the higher education system offering the first two years of the university’s curriculum. In addition to monitoring quality, universities also saw the need to monitor colleges to exercise some degree of control over these entities that might eventually compete for state funding and
community support. Pedersen explains the unique blend that high school and university cultures created:

Where the junior college might well have become an integral department of the high school, university accreditation standards ensured that junior college faculty would be set apart from high school teachers by their traditional academic credentials, their lighter teaching loads, and their collegial governance, making possible the partial replication of the collegiate culture within the context of a small city high school. (R. T. Pedersen, 1997, p. 507)

In 1958, the Arizona Legislature appropriated $30,000 to survey higher education needs in the state. Maricopa County was the business and industry center for the state and at its core was Phoenix, the state capital and largest city in Arizona. The population of Maricopa County was 580,000. The economy was based in the “five C’s: cotton, cattle, climate, citrus, and copper” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 23) but was quickly diversifying to include tourism, manufacturing, trade, distribution, and other service industries (Hinsdale, 1973). The economic development of the county and the state was dependent upon the ability to provide a trained workforce. A study committee was designated and their conclusions were:

After a year, the study committee recommended the establishment of a state community college system to assist the universities and state college to educate youth in fast-growing Arizona. Accordingly, the Legislature set up, through Senate Bill 32, a state community college board in 1960 and passed laws enabling the creation of community college districts
supported in part by county and in part by state funds. Senator E. Blodwin Thode from Casa Grande, long a supporter of the community college movement, introduced the measure. Prime movers in getting the measure through the Legislature were Representatives Arthur B. Schellenberg, Thomas M. Knoles, Jr., and Polly Rosenbaum. (Puyear, 1987, p. 4)

The report detailed the projected growth of Arizona’s population, and the implications for high school and college enrollments. The report also noted:

The needs of Arizona business and industry for trained manpower do not require in the instances of many occupations that students complete a four-year curriculum in order to be prepared for initial employment. It has already been noted that sixty percent of the workers required for the labor force in 1961 can be equipped for employment through training two years or less in length. The institution which has been developed in the United States over the past half century, to perform the dual functions of giving occupational training and the beginning two years of university and college preparation is the public junior college. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 54)

Although the report presented convincing evidence of the need for a strong community college system, the community college bill did not pass in 1959 as intended, but did pass in 1960. There was initially strong opposition from the University of Arizona (U of A) in Tucson who feared that the junior college system would further erode the university system enrollment, financing, and power, as Arizona State University (ASU) in Tempe had done when formed a few years earlier. However, when the legislature met in 1960, “the university wars had been largely forgotten, and the
junior college bill finally passed both houses on March 26, 1960, [with an effective date of July 1, 1961 (Hinsdale, 1973)]. The heart of the legislation, which remains in effect almost unchanged today, allows each county to set up its own junior college system with its own governing board” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 55). Maricopa’s colleges dominated state enrollments. In the book America’s Community Colleges: The First Century, Robert Hannelly, the first chief executive officer of Phoenix College, was cited:

The original plan provided significant state funding to allow enrollment growth. With the new legislation, enrollment grew quickly. By the decade’s end [1960-1969] Arizona’s ten public colleges had an enrollment of 35,000 students. More than three-quarters of these students attended the four colleges of the Maricopa Junior College District…. (Witt et al., 1994, p. 218)

The local community college districts were overseen by a State Board that was composed of one representative from each county, a member of the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR), and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The universities were not directly represented on the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges, although there was an ABOR representative. Legislators decided that it was best for community colleges to be allowed to pursue their own path without oversight by the state universities (Felnagle, 2000).

John Prince, formerly of Phoenix College, became the first executive director of the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges in 1960. The counties of Yuma, Cochise, and Pinal created their own community college districts in 1961. Maricopa County was not far behind, passing enabling legislation to form a junior college district in
1962 with a vote of 90,000 to 40,000. “When formed in 1962, the Maricopa County Community College District was the third multicollege district to be formed in the United States” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 7).

The local county Governing Board and the State Board each had particular duties. Local boards had responsibility for determining curriculum, hiring faculty and staff, setting salaries, determining budgets, hiring architects and contractors, and more. However, each of these duties had a level of oversight by the State Board which approved curriculum throughout the state, certified all community college teachers in the state, approved each district’s annual budget, approved final sites for new colleges and held the title to the land, and approved facilities plans before construction took place (Hinsdale, 1973; see, also, Felnagle, 2000).

The State Board of Community Colleges was dissolved by the state legislature in 2002, leaving the local boards as the holders of land and with the final approvals for budget, curriculum, hiring and salaries, and other items. There is no longer a state office of teacher certification for community colleges. “The State of Arizona no longer requires a certificate to teach at the community college level. However, the State has asked each County to establish its own minimum qualifications” (Human resources: Faculty positions, 2004, p. 1). The Maricopa County Community College District posts its teacher hiring qualifications on its web site, along with other information that is now under the purview of the local District Governing Board.

Funding for community colleges was outlined in an Arizona junior college bill passed in 1960. Two primary sources of funding were identified: the state was to pay for
half of the funding based on enrollment of full-time student equivalents (FTSE), and the other half was to be paid for from county property taxes (Felnagle, 2000, p. 55).

The first Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board was appointed by the county superintendent of schools, John Barry, as the Maricopa District was an outgrowth of the secondary education system. Five members of the board were appointed: Robert Jaap was Vice President of First National Bank of Arizona, Dr. Robert Easley was a physician from Glendale, W. James (Jim) Miller was the treasurer for the Del Webb Corporation, Dr. C. Lester Hogan was a research scientist and General Manager at Motorola, and Dwight Patterson was a native Arizonan with a multimillion dollar ranching and farming establishment. Following their initial term of office, appointed members were to run for office. Their terms would be staggered (Hinsdale, 1973; see, also, Felnagle, 2000). The first meeting of the MCCCDD Governing Board was on December 12, 1962, in the Kiva Club at the Westward Ho Hotel in Phoenix. Robert Jaap was elected board president and Dwight Patterson was elected secretary (Hinsdale, 1973; see also, Felnagle, 2000).

Phoenix College became the first institution in Maricopa County’s new public college system. An election on December 4, 1962, in the Phoenix Union High School District determined by a vote of 805 to 59 that Phoenix College would be integrated into the county system (Hinsdale, 1973). Robert Hannelly, dean of Phoenix College, reported to the new Governing Board, that enrollment in the daytime program had grown to 3400 students while 3700 were enrolled in the evening college. In addition to university transfer programs, several two-year courses of study were available and one-third of the students were enrolled in such programs (Felnagle, 2000, p. 59).
The Phoenix Union High School (PUHS) District had a considerable investment in Phoenix College, which they had nurtured since 1920. To recover their investment, they arranged to sell the college facilities to the newly elected junior college Governing Board. “On January 8, 1963, voters within PUHS District were asked to authorize the sale of Phoenix College. The voters assented and the price tag was set at $2.5 million” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 59).

The new board was anxious to extend college services to more residents of the county and resolved that additional extension sites begin offering classes under the supervision of Phoenix College.

Meanwhile, before the MCCCD Governing Board was even selected, the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges commissioned a consulting firm to conduct a survey and make recommendations about where additional community colleges ought to be located, what vocational programs should be offered, and how additional colleges should be organized. Felnagle suggested that because the consulting firm was composed primarily of university faculty, multiple recommendations were made to protect nearby ASU in Tempe. For example, each college was to have the words “junior college” in its title, although Phoenix College did not. Each college was to limit enrollment to 2,000 students, although Phoenix College enrollment already exceeded 7,000 students. Teachers were not to be referred to as “faculty” but as instructors without academic rank. Athletic programs and fraternities and sororities were discouraged. These elements would have created an institution that would nearly replicate a university environment, so the consultants recommended parameters that were “designed to keep the new junior colleges from encroaching on the state universities’ turf” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 60).
According to Felnagle (2000), a key element of the consultant’s document, *Junior Colleges for Maricopa County* published in January 1963, is the set of recommendations about future community college locations which has determined where community colleges are located in the Phoenix metropolitan area today. “To pay for these new colleges, the survey recommended a $20 million bond election be held in 1963 to (1) purchase Phoenix College, (2) build colleges on sites 2, 3, and 4, (3) buy sites 5 and 6, and (4) construct a County Administration Center” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 61). The Board did not accept the recommendation for a $20 million bond, but scaled the amount down to $9.5 million and then later raised it to $9.75 million to purchase Phoenix College from the Phoenix Union High School District and buy sites 2, 3 and 4. They planned for the extensions sites to accommodate 1,400 students each.

Despite concerns that there was not adequate publicity about the proposed bond election, and there was no one willing to chair a citizens’ committee, the Board moved forward with the election, presumably with the thought that the overwhelming support for the creation of the District would translate to “yes” votes for the bond election. On May 7, 1963, voters rejected the bond. This first major setback left the Board unsure of how to proceed with plans for expansion (Hinsdale, 1973; see, also, Felnagle, 2000).

The Board arranged for a temporary rental agreement with Phoenix Union High School (PUHS) District for Phoenix College (PC). The pressing need was to locate air conditioned space for the PC summer session that year. The Board made arrangements with PUHS District to use Camelback High School during the summer of 1963 (Hinsdale, 1973).
Additional space would be needed for the fall of 1963 and for future expansion. With no bond money available, the Board secured rental space for PC students at Temple Beth Israel. Additional rentals were made at the Jewish Community Center, at 17th Avenue and Maryland, and at 15th Street and Camelback to serve the north and west areas of the county. A building in Mesa was rented to serve the southeast county (Hinsdale, 1973). “In fall 1963, Phoenix College enrolled 8,873 students, exceeding expectations by over 2,000. The Mesa extension enrolled 319 students and the two North Phoenix sites had 619 combined. Enrollment only one year later grew to 12,512—an increase of almost 50%” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 11).

Meanwhile, the new Board was establishing precedents regarding District organization. The PUHS District had handled most of the District’s finances up until this point, and the junior college Board determined that it needed to separate its financial affairs from the high school. In February 1963, the Board hired a business manager, Robert Taylor, who had previously served at PUHS. Felnagle contends that by not hiring a District President (now called a Chancellor) and having that person, in turn, hire his or her own staff, the Board set a precedent for interfering with District administrative operations that would cause difficulties in years to come (Felnagle, 2000).

At a future meeting in April, 1963, they hired Robert Hannelly as President of the new District, and also asked that he simultaneously continue to serve as Dean of Phoenix College. According to Felnagle:

Hannelly should have put his foot down. Serving as Phoenix College’s dean, overseeing three extension campuses, and planning two new
colleges was more work than one person should reasonably be expected to do. Also, the board’s refusal to set Hannelly’s salary at that time was an insult. They took for granted that he would do whatever they told him to do and that he would accept whatever salary they offered. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 63)

As the first District chief executive officer (CEO), Hannelly (Figure 1) brought experience with the North Central Association, which the Board hoped would ease the initial accreditation of Phoenix College as a separate entity from the PUHS District accreditation, as well as future extensions which would initially fall under the Phoenix College accreditation. Dr. Robert Hannelly was described by Robert Jaap of the Governing Board, as “the greatest asset” the Board had. “His knowledge of the talent needed and available to staff the District headquarters and the growing college [Phoenix College] and his standing with his faculty, students, and community made his eventual selection as President of the District inevitable” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 40).

![Figure 1. Dr. Robert Hannelly, first President of the Maricopa Junior College District.](image)
Hannelly began planning for future growth and established a community college district distinct from its high school origins:

In 1963, the District inherited the forty-three year history of Phoenix College, which had developed an exceptional educational experience for students by operating in tandem with the needs of its community. Also in 1963, Phoenix College established three extensions, one in Mesa and two in North Phoenix. All three offered courses and programs similar to those available at Phoenix College, considering the ‘Greater Phoenix community’ as one entity. (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 11)

In 1963, Phoenix College had 120 faculty. They all indicated a desire to continue employment with the newly formed Maricopa District. Finding qualified teachers for the proposed expansion sites was a major concern of the Board because at a ratio of one teacher for 25 students, they would need 180 teachers by 1964 (Hinsdale, 1973). As it turned out, the combination of a good climate, opportunities for professional growth in a new district, and other amenities drew plenty of interested applicants, and “approximately five applications were received for every opening” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 54).

Relationships with faculty were steady and the faculty were allowed to have a committee to provide advice to the Board regarding salaries (Hinsdale, 1973). By 1966, employee policies included working conditions as well as salary scales (Hinsdale, 1973). A District report in 1966 indicated that the starting salary for a teacher with a master’s degree but no experience was $5,900. Eleven increments (now called steps) of $394 each
allowed the top of the scale to be $10,124. For every additional 12 credits of graduate work, there was an increase of $200, up to $800 maximum. Those with a doctoral degree earned $1,200 more (Hinsdale, 1973). Five years later in 1970-71, “the base for a master’s degree was set at $7,665 and the top for a doctorate at $15,642” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 193).

In 1964, the Board decided to try to find and build permanent facilities for the extension sites to serve residents in the West and East Valley. “Sites, it had been agreed, should be approximately 100 acres and the radius from which students should be drawn should not exceed thirty minutes driving time” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 45).

Another bond election was set for May 2, 1964. The goal was to purchase Phoenix Junior College from the Phoenix Union High School District and build campuses in Glendale and Mesa. “The amount was determined to be $4.8 million, roughly half of the previous bond request. Apparently the Board was concerned that the newspapers would not support a larger figure” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 70). Therefore, they planned to purchase the college facilities from PUHS and scaled back plans to purchase additional sites:

Phoenix College was to be purchased from the Phoenix Union High School District for the agreed upon $2,500,000. Of the balance of the bond issue, $1.08 million was to be used to purchase sites, and the rest would cover the cost of site improvements, remodeling of existing facilities, and furnishing and equipping the buildings. (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 62)
The Glendale and Mesa sites became independent institutions focused on meeting the needs of a growing population of students in the West Valley and East Valley, respectively. On July 1, 1965, the Governing Board changed the name of the Mesa Extension to Mesa Community College, and combined the Camelback and Glendale Extensions to form Glendale Community College, thus establishing a multiple college district (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004, p. 6). A Dean was hired to provide leadership for each independent institution. The precedent of establishing independent institutions tied together within one district is described below:

This diversification into separate communities—separated by geography, student needs and population factors—continues to this day, though the many are brought into one through the central planning of the District in order to take advantage of economies of scale and to ensure the highest level of diverse offerings. What’s good for the county is good for the colleges—E Pluribus Unum. (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 11)

Interestingly, although the District was still called the Maricopa County Junior College District, these new colleges followed a national trend and were called “community colleges” to recognize the more comprehensive nature of the institutions. Phoenix College had dropped the word “junior” from its name in 1947 but did not use the word “community” in its name. The new West Valley college was called Glendale Community College and the new East Valley college was called Mesa Community College (Felnagle, 2000).
The Maricopa District would create six new colleges in rapid pace from 1965 to 1980. Added to the District’s founding college, Phoenix College (PC), were Mesa Community College (MCC), Glendale Community College (GCC), Maricopa Technical College (MTC) which was later renamed GateWay Community College (GWCC), Scottsdale Community College (SCC), Rio Salado College (RSC), and South Mountain Community College (SMCC).

Because the colleges had the same entrance requirements as the university for many years, there were no “developmental” courses for students not yet ready for college work. The development of such courses serve as an example of the broadening mission of the community colleges. In 1966, three Glendale faculty experimented with “a basic education program (combining speech, reading and English)” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 121). Enrollment grew from 75 students in the first year (1967-67) to 120 students in the second year (1967-68). Developmental education is now seen as a major function of community colleges nationally, as explained in *The Community College Story*:

> It is not possible to describe the students who require developmental courses in simple terms. Some of the brightest students enrolling in a community college may need precollege courses before enrolling in a degree program. For example, someone who has been out of the job market and without formal schooling for 10 years and who wishes to enroll in a community college nursing program may need precollege courses in mathematics or science. Students who may not have acquired basic skills because of language barriers, a learning disability, or other learning impediments brought on by various life circumstances may need
courses in English, writing, or math. In general, it is the community college perspective that society cannot afford to leave anyone behind, and that developmental education is a critical part of the commitment to access, student success, and community building. (Vaughan, 2000, pp. 10-11)

Maricopa Community Colleges’ developmental education programs included pre-college level courses in writing, reading, mathematics, language acquisition, and study skills.

In addition to expanding developmental programs, the District expanded vocational and technical programs. In 1966, Irwin Spector, the District Director of Research, presented a report to the Governing Board outlining the program offerings within the Maricopa Colleges. Spector indicated that there were “twenty semiprofessional programs, twenty-seven university-parallel programs, and five general programs” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 93), whereas only three years earlier there had been only eight occupational programs.

Graduate surveys and freshman surveys helped the District gain a better understanding of the students’ needs. Students at PC in 1965 indicated they selected PC because of “low cost and accessibility” (Hinsdale, 1973). Eighty percent of students indicated they anticipated working either part-time or full-time. Affordable, accessible quality education continued to resonate with students and it remained a major district-wide marketing theme.

As PC became more crowded, the District Office staff who had administrative offices on campus moved to off-site rented facilities. In 1966, “the District offices
moved to larger, and less expensive, quarters at 300 E. Camelback Road. Here the cost was $3.15 per square foot with all utilities but water being paid by the lessee” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 91).

In 1965 and 1966, there was pressure from community groups to plan for a campus in Scottsdale and consultants recommended development of a fourth campus “between 64th and 68th Streets with Oak Street as the northern and McDowell Road as the southern boundaries” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 89). However, a December 1966 offer by the Broadway-Hale Stores, Inc., to use the former Korrick’s department store at First Street and Washington in central Phoenix provided an economical way to expand to accommodate growing enrollment, albeit in a different location (Hinsdale, 1973; see also, Felnagle, 2000).

During these first five years (1962-1967), the Governing Board set several patterns that posed problems for the District in later years. Ignoring earlier recommendations from consultants to discourage athletics programs, the Board proceeded to develop intercollegiate athletics programs at each of the three colleges within the District. The Board’s continued focus on athletics, including direct involvement in the selection of coaches, became a contributing factor to problems that would occur years later. Furthermore, the Board was directly involved in day-to-day district and college management and operations to the point where the North Central Association visiting team chastised the MCCCD Governing Board in their 1967 report:

The members of the governing board are able men, highly respected in the community, and sincerely dedicated to the welfare of the colleges.

Unfortunately, they appear relatively inexperienced in board operation in
an enterprise of this size. As a consequence, they have drifted into procedures which are dangerous and have already resulted in reduced efficiency and loss of faculty morale. If they persist, a loss of public confidence is probable. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 86)

The NCA team accredited Phoenix College separately from PUHS, as well as the Glendale and Mesa extensions, but recommended that a consultant be hired to “assist the board in developing more acceptable procedures” and to more clearly define the scope and functions for the Board, the District CEO, and the college CEOs (Felnagle, 2000, p. 86; see, also, Hinsdale, 1973).

In 1967, Robert Hannelly retired and John Prince (Figure 2) became District President with a tenure lasting from 1967-1976. Prince had been English faculty at Phoenix College, Chair of the PC evening program, Director of the State Board for Community Colleges, and the Executive Dean of Glendale Community College, before becoming District President.

Figure 2. John Prince, District President, 1967-1976.
Prince immediately renamed college CEOs as “executive deans and vice presidents, a change which reinforced their subordination” to the District President and CEO (Felnagle, 2000, p. 91). Unlike Hannelly who was known for being a hands-off administrator allowing the deans to run the colleges with little direct intervention, “Under Prince, the campus deans were no longer autonomous administrators; they would report directly to the President of the District ” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 91).

By the end of the 1967-68 academic year, student enrollment in the District’s three colleges (PC, MCC, and GCC) exceeded 20,000.

In spring of 1967 “it was agreed by the Board that a comprehensive community college was to be established in the Scottsdale area as soon as funds became available” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 127). However, several major challenges associated with funding, organizing facilities and equipment, and staffing would cause the opening of SCC to be delayed until 1970. Meanwhile, the department store in downtown Phoenix would provide space for the District to expand, but with a different programmatic emphasis.

Also in 1967, a community leader spoke to the Board about the need for increased “educational opportunity” in South Phoenix (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 124). However, with other colleges in the works, it would be a few years before a college in South Phoenix would be considered.

As a state, Arizona was growing. Community colleges were developing, not just in Maricopa County, but around the state. A forerunner of today’s Arizona Community College Presidents’ Council (ACCPC) was formed in 1968 to respond to the need for communication and coordination among the various colleges. A new organization called the State Council of the Arizona State Board of Directors for Junior Colleges included the
District President and the Executive Dean of each two-year college in the state. Meetings were scheduled four times a year (Hinsdale, 1973).

The nature of the student body was changing throughout the country as well as in Arizona and in Maricopa County. Older and more diverse students had different needs than the traditional-aged and university-oriented student populations of the past. With increased numbers of veterans attending the colleges, the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and the Arizona 1960 “enabling legislation [that] explicitly defined occupational education as part of the mission for the junior colleges” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 91), there was increased pressure to offer career and technical programs. This was not a focus of the three existing colleges.

The Board was under increasing pressure to establish new colleges in Scottsdale and South Phoenix to allow better geographical access for students, but simultaneously there was a need to develop a different sort of college which would address the changes in student demographics with job training programs. In September 1968, the District established Maricopa Technical College, later renamed to GateWay Community College, “… to emphasize occupational programs for students throughout the county” (Lesson I: History of the Community College, 2004, p. 6).

Tentatively named the “Urban Campus” in 1967, the District’s fourth college was soon named Maricopa Technical College (MTC) to emphasize its unique focus on vocational/technical programs, as described by Hinsdale:

The curricula for Maricopa Technical College were approved by the District in May [1968] and by the state board in June. Occupational programs of study, 32 different ones and ranging from one to three
semesters in duration, were to be offered. Certificates of proficiency would be awarded upon completion, but the student would have the option of selecting to complete the additional courses required for an associate in arts degree. (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 146)

The Broadway-Hale Stores, which had provided use of the Korrick’s store at a reasonable cost, became the first home for MTC. The former department store’s basement served as the library and housed technical services, the main floor was the information center with a reception area and waiting room, the bookstore was in the mezzanine along with manager’s offices, and the second floor had 10-12 classrooms and a large lecture room (Hinsdale, 1973).

Maricopa Technical College opened its doors to students in September 1968 (Puyear, 1987). “Formal dedication took place on October 21 [1968] with an open house and a tour” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 136). Dr. Spector also continued to serve as the District Vice-President for semiprofessional and technical education while getting Maricopa Tech underway (Felnagle, 2000).

While the other colleges were dealing with a largely day-time population of high school graduates, the new downtown college “would attempt to serve primarily those individuals who have left high school and are more than 19 years of age or graduated from high school” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 93).

The District administration, which had initially been at Phoenix College and then at rented off-campus facilities, now was co-located with MTC on the sixth floor of Korrick’s. Later, in 1976, the District Office and MTC were also co-located at the present site of the GateWay Community College campus at 40th Street and Washington.
As MTC was being established, possible sites for a campus in Scottsdale were also being pursued, as detailed by Hinsdale:

The Pima Tribal Council was willing to sign a 99-year lease at one percent of the land value ($6,000 per acre) for 160 acres on the Salt River Indian Reservation (northeast corner of Pima and Chaparral Roads). The lease would have a release clause to enable the District to return 40 of the 160 acres if they were not needed. (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 107)

During this timeframe, the national scene was marked by the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Movement, and campus unrest. In 1968, the MCCCD Board adopted a “Statement of Rights and Responsibilities of Students” that addressed, among other things, potential rioting. The State Board was also concerned about civil disorder and charged each county’s elected Board to ensure that no one interfere with a student’s pursuit of education and that, when necessary, local law enforcement be brought to a campus to “restore stability of peace and security” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 131).

Anti-establishment feelings among students were displayed in the Maricopa District in 1969, but without any serious incidents. At MCC, the American flag was flown with black streamers, but was later removed upon administrative request. At PC, a controversial ASU professor who was an outspoken critic of the Vietnam War, Morris Starsky, spoke to students and faculty, but there was no rioting (Felnagle, 2002).

During this tumultuous period of time nationally and locally, establishing a college in Scottsdale became a priority along with the opening of MTC. Facilities planning would need to be considered if Scottsdale Community College (SCC) was to open as scheduled in 1970. In the meantime, in 1968-69, afternoon and evening classes
were made available in rented facilities. “For 1969-70, the Board agreed to study the feasibility of day classes and to begin the appointment of the permanent staff” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 137). The first phase of SCC’s building program would include a “gym and physical education facility, the first phase of the library, a science-nursing complex, the student union, the technology building, and the mechanical plant” (Hinsdale, 1973, pp. 137-138). As the Northeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix expanded its population, “Scottsdale Community College opened for day and evening students in September of 1970” (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004, p. 6).

Initially there was little marketing or paid advertising to make students aware of programs and services across the District. By 1970, outreach efforts were made to encourage more minority students to attend college by sending direct mail and hosting special events (Hinsdale, 1973). Student enrollment continued to grow at the Maricopa Community Colleges.

By 1970, only a decade after passage of the Arizona junior college bill, Maricopa County had five colleges serving more than 26,000 students (headcount) with more than 18,000 full-time student equivalents (FTSE) (Hinsdale, 1973).

As student enrollment grew, there was a need to expand the teaching ranks. The concept of adjunct faculty in MCCC was introduced by Irwin Spector in 1970:

The idea was to supplement the regular faculty with visiting faculty who were employed on a continuing basis at evening division rates. A greater community involvement would be achieved and professional people, Arizona State University graduate students, retired and semi-retired people could be used. (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 195)
In accordance with Arizona House Bill 126 in June 1971, the District renamed itself a “community college” instead of a “junior college” district (Hinsdale, 1973; see, also, Felnagle, 2000). “The colleges, all but Maricopa Technical College, were to include the word ‘community’ in their titles, but special note was made that Phoenix Community College would continue to be known as Phoenix College” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 210).

From the District’s inception in 1962 through 1971, there had been tremendous growth as well as numerous changes in the student population and the types of programs offered at the colleges. The District faculty, staff, and administration also grew. The increase in the number of occupational programs necessitated hiring a coordinator of occupational education at the district level in 1971. Two more district managers were added in 1972 with Dr. Helena Howe becoming “assistant to the [District] President for legal and developmental services” and Carl Squires becoming “associate vice-president” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 226).

“As the District grew, so did the distance between the upper and lower echelons. Communication was no longer a simple matter. With five campuses [PC, MCC, GCC, MTC, and SCC] and a District Office, the fact that employee relationships became strained was not unexpected” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 226).

The secretarial and clerical staff formed an organization in 1971 and expressed “discontent” with some of their working conditions (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 227). They formed a new MCCCD organization called the Association of Clerical Employees, a forerunner of today’s Professional Staff Association (PSA). At the time, they had become increasingly concerned about reductions in their vacation time and other elements of their working conditions, so they hired a lawyer to express their concerns to
The proposed changes in their vacation time and working conditions which the clerical employees had found so objectionable were passed in spite of their protests” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 238). Later in her dissertation, Hinsdale refers to the situation in more graphic language referencing a “threatened revolt,” “grievances,” and “protests” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 238). From the association’s formation, the professional staff became a more recognizable and organized group and their input was regularly solicited in District decisions.

Student demographics had changed. On average, they were older and more vocal, and they wanted more direct input into college decisions. In previous years, students had been allowed considerable discretion in the use of student activity fee monies, nominal fees charged to cover campus activities and services. As college enrollments grew, fee budgets grew, and college administrators assumed more direct control of the use of student activity fees. Students objected to the loss of power over these funds. Furthermore, with more nontraditional students attending the colleges, they grew angry about the amount of money spent on athletics programs which were geared towards traditional college-aged students. It was announced in 1971 that Scottsdale Community College, less than a year old at the time, was approved to start an athletics program with golf and tennis to begin in the spring of 1972 and basketball and baseball to be added in the following year (Hinsdale, 1973). These were contributing factors to student disruptions at SCC the following year over control of finances.

MTC earned independent NCA accreditation in 1971 (Hinsdale, 1973). Because the other Maricopa Colleges were primarily focused on university transfer education, there was tension between the faculty at Maricopa Tech and faculty of the other colleges
who saw technical education as detracting from their status. A former MTC instructor and later one of the administrative team, Dr. Tom Garneski, said that faculty from the other colleges “mocked us” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 97), implying that somehow they had second-class programs. This surprisingly elitist attitude for community college faculty would surface again when other changes in the nature of curriculum and course delivery systems were made with the founding of Rio Salado College.

Meanwhile, each college was becoming increasingly independent to the point where the Governing Board in 1971 specifically instructed representatives from each college to “represent Maricopa County with a united front” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 233). A young organization was under the strain of many changes. However, the growth would continue to stretch District resources and the unrest with students and employees was just beginning. By 1972, 10 years after the formation of the District, Maricopa County’s population had grown from 769,000 in 1962 to 1,175,000. The District enrollment was 8,942 in 1962 and 33,572 in 1972 (Hinsdale, 1973).

The precincts or segments of the county from which the five-person Governing Board was elected experienced population shifts during this period. So the precinct lines (or districts within the county) were redrawn by the Maricopa County Election Department to allow for a more even distribution of population and more equitable regional representation on the Board. “Results were that one community college was in each of the districts” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 241).

Jeremy Butler, who had become a member of the Governing Board in 1968, was re-elected to the Board in 1972 and proposed that perhaps a student and a faculty member be allowed to sit on the Board. A compromise allowed for increased student and faculty
voice through a “Representative’s Row,” whereby reserved seating was provided at the Governing Board meetings for the District Faculty Association President, the college faculty presidents, and the student body presidents (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 242).

The pressure to consider further service to the outlying regions of the county continued. It was suggested in 1972 that the Board consider starting a satellite campus of MCC in Chandler. The Glendale area on the west side of Phoenix was also expected to grow significantly (Hinsdale, 1973).

At Scottsdale Community College a variety of factors led to the now famous Artichoke Rebellion which started in 1971 and continued into 1972. The students wanted to exert greater influence over the use of student activities fees and they were opposed to prioritizing athletics over other items. Once it was clear that the administration, supported by the District President and the Governing Board, were going to start the athletics program anyway, students voted on a mascot and school colors that they thought would discourage athletes from participating. Whereas most colleges had dramatic colors and a strong mascot like a bear, a bulldog, or an eagle, the student-approved SCC mascot was the Artichoke and the colors were pink and white. The administration determined that the development of athletic teams would continue to be a priority and SCC teams would be called Drovers and the colors would be blue and white. Roger Brooks, SCC student body president at the time, was furious that the administration had not honored the students’ wishes. Felnagle concludes that the tumultuous times at Scottsdale were indicative of the changing student body in community colleges and of their needs to be given “an active voice in determining the District’s future direction” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 115).
Brooks ran for and was elected to the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board in 1974 on the platform that the Board needed serious reform. Although his seat was to begin in January 1975, he was allowed by the County School Superintendent, who fills vacancies on the community college Board, to begin in November to finish the remainder of Jim Miller’s term (Felnagle, 2000).

As SCC’s student body president in 1972, Brooks had “proposed adding to the Board two students from each of the five campuses,” thus tripling the size of the Board and weighting the voting heavily in favor of students (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 259). He used a letter from Senator Fred Harris, a democrat from Oklahoma, as support for his position. Harris favored student representation on college boards. Brooks’ proposal was ultimately not accepted by the Board (Hinsdale, 1973).

Brooks was angry over District President John Prince’s handling of the Artichoke Rebellion (this was the term coined to describe the student protests over the athletic program and the naming of the artichoke as the college mascot) at SCC and as an elected Board member he could and would make life difficult for Prince. In Richard Felnagle’s history of the Maricopa District, he says that John Prince’s daughter described how Brooks managed to obtain the office directly across from Prince and watched him nearly every day for two years (Felnagle, 2000). Bill Berry, who served as CEO of Phoenix College from 1971 to 1989, is quoted as saying, “It was a terrible, terrible time in the District. Everybody became apprehensive about themselves and their positions” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 127).

When another Board member, Paul Wright, announced that he would not run for reelection, Brooks found someone to run for the vacancy. Bob Robertson had been
student body President at Glendale Community College in 1971 when Roger Brooks was student body President at Scottsdale Community College in the same year. Robertson, who worked at Western Electric, was elected and served on the Board from 1976 to 1981 (Felnagle, 2000).

Another change in the Board occurred when Dwight Patterson, who had served from the founding of the District, left to accept a position on the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) in November of 1975. Ross Farnsworth, a developer from Mesa, was appointed to complete Patterson’s term. As the membership of the Governing Board changed, John Prince, District CEO stopped attending meetings of the Board, presumably because of lack of support. Brooks called for his resignation and eventually the Board decided to remove Prince from his position in August 1976 (Felnagle, 2000).

“Effective August 16 [1976], Al Flowers became the District’s acting president” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 131). Flowers (Figure 3), who had previously been the Executive Vice President for business services, served in this interim capacity for over a year, until 1977. He had been praised in his previous role for the increases in efficiency that he and his staff had been able to implement (Hinsdale, 1973). He had several difficult agendas to tackle—another accreditation visit was scheduled in February of 1977, a bond was needed to expand and repair facilities, and the District would need to mount a search for a new President. The Board did not backfill the position that Flowers held in business services, but rather asked him to fulfill both roles. According to Felnagle, the Board was asking too much, especially given the tensions that existed. “Al Flowers should have said no. The whole District was suffocating in an atmosphere of contention and mistrust” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 133). To assist him, Flowers appointed Walt Morrison, a popular
faculty member from Mesa Community College who had also served as President of the District Faculty Executive Council (FEC), as the District’s Vice President for Educational Services (Felnagle, 2000).

Figure 3. Al Flowers, District business manager, 1966-1978, and acting District President, 1976-1977.

The general bond election that Flowers wanted to push through was put on hold when it became clear that the District lacked enough public support to pass it. However, the District proceeded with at least a few pressing facilities projects:

The District administration had been leasing office space in five different buildings at three different locations once moving out of the Korrick’s building. In July [1976], the District finalized plans to acquire a warehouse and offices located at 3910 East Washington—the site that would eventually become home to Maricopa Tech (later renamed GateWay Community College). The acquisition of the East Washington
site saved the District about $676,000 in lease payments over a ten-year period. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 134)

Despite not being able to pass a bond election, Flowers and others worked out a plan to sell revenue bonds to fund the construction of four performing arts centers at Phoenix, Glendale, Mesa, and Scottsdale colleges. Incoming yearly revenues from the District’s student fees, food services, and bookstores would provide the money with which to repay the bonds.

Flowers was able to manage the finances, but had less success managing the Board. Members of the elected Board were still involved in day-to-day management decisions and “[Roger] Brooks regularly threatened to fire anyone who opposed him on any level” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 134).

The North Central Association (NCA) accreditation team visited in February of 1976 and was clearly disappointed in the District’s state of affairs. Many of the recommendations of the 1967 accreditation report had not been addressed to their satisfaction, as described in the accreditation team report:

It is difficult for members of the evaluation team to understand why a substantial number of the concerns which exist today were reported by earlier North Central Association teams which visited the District in 1967. It would have seemed that over a ten-year period of time such concerns could have been addressed and resolved. Much of the great potential of one of the largest community college districts in the nation appears to have been dissipated as a result of the failure of the Governing Board to address seriously those important issues. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 138)
NCA cited as significant issues the lack of policies to guide decision-making and
the lack of clarity in Governing Board and administrative roles and responsibilities. The
visiting team noted multiple instances of Board interference in day-to-day operations of
the District and the colleges. Further, they indicated that there was confusion with
management and staff lines of authority and other pervasive problems. The outcome of
the visit was an embarrassment for the District and the colleges. Rather than receiving
the typical 10-year renewal of accreditation, the colleges each received a six-year
renewal, with required focus visits to monitor progress every two years (Felnagle, 2000).

Flowers had been serving in an interim capacity as District President during this
time. Following the accreditation visit, the Board determined that they needed to proceed
with hiring a permanent leader for the District. Several Board members felt that it would
be advantageous to hold an open discussion at a Board meeting about who should serve
as the next CEO, advocating that perhaps Al Flowers ought to be appointed permanently
in that capacity. They were surprised by the negative audience reaction. Some felt that
there needed to be an open search to hire the best candidate, while others expressed
concern that equal opportunity be extended to minority candidates. Flowers stayed in the
position temporarily and eventually returned to his position in charge of District finances
(Felnagle, 2000).

As the search began for a new District CEO, the Board decided to change the
titles of the District President and the college Executive Deans. As of their March 8,
1977, Board meeting the District CEO would be called the “Chancellor” and college
CEOs were titled “ Presidents” (Felnagle, 2000).
Also, in 1977, the District Office moved to the new location it had purchased in 1976 at 3910 East Washington, the current location of GateWay Community College.

Despite the difficulties the District was experiencing, the competition for the position of Chancellor was intense with 160 applicants. Seven finalists included Dr. William Berry, President of Phoenix College; Dr. Alfredo de los Santos, Jr., Director of Institutional Planning at the Southwestern Educational Development Laboratory in El Paso, Texas; Dr. Laurence Lauth, President of Wutheville Community College in Virginia; Dr. Omar Scheidt, President of Cypress College in California; Dr. Konnilyn Feig, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Maine at Portland; Dr. Jan LeCroy, Vice Chancellor of the Dallas County Community College system; and Dr. Paul Elsner, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services of the Peralta Community College District in Oakland, California. After further consideration, Elsner, LeCroy, and Feig were studied in more depth, including having three Governing Board members (Brooks, Robertson, and Butler) visit their colleges (Felnagle, 2000).

At the August 13, 1977, meeting of the Governing Board Dr. Paul Elsner was offered the opportunity to lead the Maricopa District and after contract details were agreed upon, he was named Chancellor on August 16, 1977 (Felnagle, 2000, p. 141). Felnagle interviewed Jeremy Butler about his recollections on why Elsner was chosen:

We were looking for—I think actually it was Roger Brooks who kept after this and said—we were looking for somebody who would be a healer, someone who could bring together the disruptive forces that had affected Scottsdale and the whole District there for several years. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 141)
As Elsner (Figure 4) took over the reins in 1977, there were five colleges (PC, MCC, GCC, MTC, and SCC) serving approximately 50,000 students annually. A professor of education from ASU, Dick Richardson, commented that Elsner “inherited a very traditional, not very distinguished community college district that had a very ingrown administration, a very ingrown faculty, and not a reputation for much excellence in very many places” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 145).

![Figure 4. Dr. Paul Elsner, Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community College District, 1977-1999.](image)

Elsner immediately began reorganization of the District’s strategic planning, human resources policies, and decision-making structures. He was attuned to the growth that would occur in the Phoenix metropolitan area and wanted to use demographic data to drive decision-making. He began implementing employee development programs, and he commissioned two landmark personnel studies that resulted in reorganization of the District management and staff structures. In direct contrast to Prince’s leadership style of
centralizing control of the colleges, Elsner decentralized decision-making, making the colleges more autonomous (Felnagle, 2000).

Dr. Elsner grew to be one of the most well-known and respected community college leaders in the nation, but his first years in Maricopa were marked by conflict. Upset faculty demanded that the Board address the concerns expressed in the NCA report about Board interference with campus operations, Board behavior toward employees, and lack of adherence to open meeting laws. Furthermore, local media had become aware of problems with Roger Brooks’ travel expenses and claims for reimbursement (Felnagle, 2000).

Brooks had been unemployed since becoming a Board member. As his own financial situation worsened, he suggested that Board positions, which were volunteer posts, be paid offices. That proposal was not accepted by other Board members. “Hitchcock remembers that Brooks even went so far as to pressure people at the District to loan him money” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 149).

On November 25, 1977, Brooks was arrested. He was accused of embezzling public funds and submitting a false claim for reimbursement to the District. Brooks tried to explain to the court that the claim was related to travel expenses for a trip to San Diego over the Labor Day weekend, saying he was on a business meeting with administrators and student leaders at San Diego City College. His girlfriend, Ardath W. Maturo, testified for the prosecution that Brooks paid her airfare and hotel bill, and covered entertainment expenses for her and her daughter (Felnagle, 2000).

Brooks was found guilty of illegal use of public funds on May 2, 1978. The judge imposed a sentence on June 27 that included 12 weekends in jail, five years probation,
$1,500 restitution for legal costs and no further cohabitation with anyone other than his wife (Felnagle, 2000). Brooks was also removed from office.

The trial dominated the community news. Multiple articles detailed the internal operations of Maricopa, describing the behavior of Board members and the growing tension among employees and the administration. In addition to the turmoil caused by the Brooks incident, some of Paul Elsner’s ideas were disturbing to employees. Because funding for the District was determined by enrollment, Elsner made the pronouncement at his first faculty convocation, “FTSE is the name of the game” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 153). The faculty interpreted the statement to mean that quality teaching and learning were not important, only enrollment was important.

Elsner was also advocating for a new college within the District. The concept of a “college without walls” was proposed by the Chancellor in March of 1978 (Puyear, 1987, p. 13). Felnagle describes the faculty reaction to Elsner’s ideas:

Faculty at that time saw him as a ruthless outsider more interested in boosting enrollment than in maintaining quality education. Only five months on the job, Elsner stunned everyone by creating Rio Salado Community College, a school that would have no campus and no full-time faculty. A month later, the governing board surprised Elsner by announcing the creation of yet another college (South Mountain Community College), and Elsner endorsed the plan even though his own demographic experts tried to talk him out of it. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 15)

There had long been talk about establishing a college in the south Phoenix area to address the needs of minority populations. Bob Martinez had been elected to the
Governing Board with the support of community leaders who advocated for this. He approached Elsner almost immediately upon assuming office in January 1978. Elsner felt that there was not a sufficient number of feeder high schools for the proposed new college and that, without a bond, there would be insufficient resources to fund the venture (Felnagle, 2000).

Furthermore, Elsner had been studying the significant number of off-site courses and programs offered by the District around the county. Non-traditional options such as television courses had been offered but were not well coordinated. There was confusion surrounding which college had responsibility for those areas of the county that did not have a nearby college. MTC had been offering on-site business and industry training at Intel and Motorola, among others. Colleges had begun offering outreach programs without communicating and coordinating with one another. He reasoned that by coordinating these efforts the District could increase efficiency, grow enrollment and thus increase FTSE funding, and provide greater service to the community. The costs to the District were to be approximately $2 million for renting office space for the new non-traditional college, instead of the $60 million it would take to begin a new campus (Felnagle, 2000).

Walt Morrison, former faculty association President and Vice Chancellor for academics, was appointed as Rio Salado College’s founding President at the Board meeting, March 14, 1978. “Rio Salado College, a college without walls, enrolled its first class of students in August 1978” (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004, p. 6). By the end of the year, more than 14,000 students were enrolled in at least one credit or noncredit class at Rio Salado Community College.
The administration and faculty of Maricopa Tech were “outraged” at the development of Rio Salado Community College as they felt this development would have a “catastrophic effect” on their college’s enrollment (Felnagle, 2000, p. 157). The resentment about Rio would build in the coming year.

Although initially Rio Salado was housed in South Phoenix, residents of the area pressured Board member Bob Martinez for a physical campus. When a new campus in South Phoenix was proposed at a well-attended Board meeting, Elsner did not object. Despite his reservations, he already had considerable challenges as the faculty were, thus far, not supportive of his ideas. The Board voted to proceed with a south Phoenix campus (Felnagle, 2000).

According to a study Elsner had commissioned called *Long Range Master Plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000*, Maricopa Tech and the proposed South Phoenix college overlapped service areas and would not have as significant a need for a full college in the immediate future as other areas of the county.

The *Long Range Master Plan for the Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000* recommended that SMCC establish a sister campus relationship with MTCC (now called GateWay Community College). The rationale was that:

1. both campuses will draw from the same area,
2. South Mountain could provide the academic programs which MTCC does not have; MTCC could provide the vocational/technical programs which South Mountain should not duplicate,
3. shuttle bus service could be provided between the two which would allow them jointly to provide full services which neither
alone could afford to initiate or sustain. *(Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000, 1978, p. 43)*

The report proposed that the next campuses should be built, in priority order, on the west side of metropolitan Phoenix near Litchfield and Goodyear in 1990, in the Southeast Valley in 1995, and in North Phoenix in 2000 *(Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000, 1978)*. These sites would eventually be established, but in the opposite order. Leaders in the South Phoenix community felt that their community ought to be the first to have a full-service campus by citing the large minority student population to be served. Political pressure was brought to bear on Chancellor Elsner and the Governing Board to be responsive to their request. A budget was finally established for initial facilities *(Felnagle, 2000)*.

Dr. Raul Cardenas, who had been the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at the University of California Berkeley, was selected as the first college President for the South Phoenix college. He was appointed in 1979, long before the college opened, to help participate in the development of the college and to develop community support which would be needed to “sell” the concept to the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges, who presumably would have questioned the need *(Felnagle, 2000)*. Cardenas, a Hispanic man, became the first ethnic minority to become President of one of the Maricopa Community Colleges.

In the meantime, the more senior faculty in the District began to question the quality of the education at Rio Salado Community College, which eventually changed its name to Rio Salado College (RSC). Rio was unique with MCCCDD and in Arizona:
Rio was only one of seven institutions of this type in the nation. Never meant to be a place, Rio Salado Community College was instead a system, a new educational concept, taking college education beyond the walls of a campus to people in homes, military bases, hospital beds, prisons, shopping malls, libraries, workplaces…. (*A vision becomes reality: The Rio report 1978-1988*, 1988, p. 3)

RSC used many adjunct faculty which was disturbing to the full-time residential faculty. Rio attempted to answer the internal critics, but then external critics added to the growing sense that Rio was not offering programs at the same level of quality to which Maricopa and the state universities had grown accustomed. A review by ASU’s philosophy chair was unfavorable, concluding that some courses should not have been offered and that “credentials of five of the instructors were suspect” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 170). A November 20, 1978, article in the *Arizona Republic* newspaper stated that the curriculum fell short of accepted standards. Another *Republic* article on December 18, 1978, calls Rio “the much maligned stepchild” of the Maricopa District and stated that there were “longstanding district ills” that have developed into a “cold war” between the faculty and the administration (Felnagle, 2000, p. 171).

The Board meeting of April 24, 1979, marked a major turning point in Maricopa’s history according to Felnagle. Faculty members, primarily from GCC, were reportedly planning a verbal assault on the Board about Rio. They had appeared at previous meetings making “angry speeches” and circulating petitions for Rio to be closed, but on this evening they were met with a surprise as dozens of supporters of Rio spoke to the college’s efficacy (Felnagle, 2000, p. 172). An article in the *Mesa Tribune* newspaper on
April 25, 1979, described the “three-hour parade of Rio Salado supporters, including senior citizens, handicapped persons and part-time teachers” that praised the college (Felnagle, 2000, p. 173). Although criticism of Rio did not disappear, it was never as fierce from that point forward. Many faculty had been present to hear the community’s support for Rio, and it was clear that the Board would not disband a college that was serving such a diverse and needy cross-section of the community.

By October 1979, just over a year after Rio’s start up, Walt Morrison resigned. Paul Elsner attributed this to “burnout and exhaustion, which is pretty common for college presidents who start up institutions,” but others recall that Walt was “let go” and he returned to teaching at Mesa Community College (Felnagle, 2000, p. 175). Lionel Martinez, Rio’s Dean of Instruction, was appointed as interim President until Myrna Harrison was hired in 1980 (A vision becomes reality: The Rio report 1978-1988, 1988).

Two landmark studies changed the structure of management and staff within Maricopa in Paul Elsner’s early years as Chancellor. The Aschauer Study examined the jobs being performed then recommended job classifications that resulted in a major restructuring of the District staff and administration. The Hay Study followed shortly thereafter and recommended a system for determining employee compensation. The studies were completed and reviewed by the Board in fall of 1979. “The report recommended a total of $98,000 in salary increases and $182,000 in increased fringe benefits for 103 administrators” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 178). News of this potential increase for the administration was not well received by the Board or by faculty.

Meanwhile, Raul Cardenas had been working on the plans for the South Phoenix campus. Since other college districts around Arizona were not able to pass their bond
elections in 1979, it was determined that the Maricopa District would not even attempt a bond election. Using revenue bonds, annual capital allocations, and other sources of funding, a “scaled down” plan proposed $8.4 million (instead of $14.5-16 million) for the land purchase, construction, and equipment to start South Mountain Community College (Felnagle, 2000, p. 178).

Virtually all District resources were to be funneled towards the startup of the new college, which caused additional internal dissention. Dr. Elsner was worried that external audiences might not understand how the District was able to continue to grow and expand with no additional state funding and therefore might have misperceptions about the status of the District’s financial health. He made it clear in announcements that the District would “freeze the operational budget” but could not control the rate of inflation, and, therefore, the tax rate might continue to increase (Felnagle, 2000, p. 179). His goal was to show the public that Maricopa was making every attempt to be a good steward of the public’s tax dollars. At the time, state funding accounted for approximately one-quarter of the District’s revenues, while property taxes accounted for approximately two-thirds. Even the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges responded favorably to Elsner’s fiscally conservative approach (Felnagle, 2000).

However, when the Governing Board approved the Aschauer and Hay study recommendations to increase the pay for administration on March 13, 1979, the faculty became enraged (Felnagle, 2000). Felnagle calls the “Great Faculty Insurrection” of 1979 a defining moment in the District’s history (Felnagle, 2000, p. 13). From their vantage point, the establishment of Rio Salado College was ruining the reputation of the entire District, and the fact that Rio was run almost entirely with adjunct faculty was
threatening. Double-digit inflation was reducing the value of their paychecks, but the administration had just given itself a raise. Elsner was publicly announcing a freeze of the District’s operating budget without an explanation or consultation with them.

Additional colleges were being opened despite decreases in state aid. The faculty were outraged (Felnagle, 2000). On March 24, 1979, the Board meeting was contentious, as described by Felnagle:

More than 250 faculty members wearing red armbands and waving pasteboard signs stormed the District Offices on East Washington. For more than four hours, the faculty demanded the board reject the Chancellor’s budget freeze and raise salaries by 10.5%, which was then the projected inflation rate for the following year. The shouting and fist-waving continued until well after midnight, but in the end, the board members turned their backs on the faculty and voted four to one to adopt the chancellor’s budget freeze. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 14)

The faculty considered a work slow-down, calling in sick, and even a strike, but eventually decided to continue serving students while picketing to develop community support for their cause.

The Chancellor had planned for a 7% pay increase for the faculty, despite their misperceptions that they would receive a minimal increase, and the 7% increase was eventually approved by the Board (Felnagle, 2000).

Felnagle believes that the intense anger was probably not so much a result of the money, for the 7% raise was really more than the faculty had expected to receive. Rather he posits that the series of tumultuous changes over a short period of years, including
tremendous growth in student enrollment, changes in the nature of the student body and
the curriculum, the Artichoke Rebellion and student unrest, the embarrassing NCA
reports, the Board’s interference with college operations, the Roger Brooks situation, the
start of multiple new colleges, the increase in the proportion of classes taught by adjunct
faculty, the changes in leadership, the state legislature’s perceived lack of support for
higher education, and concerns about not having a significant voice in decision-making
had contributed to the stress and caused the reaction (Felnagle, 2000).

Following approval by the Maricopa District Board, the State Board had been
studying the plans for the creation of the South Phoenix college. A study committee
recommended to the State Board that construction of permanent buildings not be allowed
for a period of years, indicating that they were not certain the college would be
successful. Raul Cardenas mobilized community members to attend the March 18, 1979,
State Board meeting where the recommendations were due to be heard. Under pressure
from citizens including some local politicians, the state agreed to allow the development
of the college (Felnagle, 2000).

The two-year focus visit of the NCA accreditation team took place April 9-11,
1979, and faculty worked to show their discontent at Elsner’s leadership. Faculty erected
a plywood headstone at Glendale Community College reading, “Here Lies Quality
Education 1963-1977 Upon the Arrival of Paul Elsner, Chancellor,” (Figure 5) and called
for Elsner’s resignation (Felnagle, 2000, p. 16).
The NCA team, on the other hand, indicated their support for the more data-driven approach to planning that Elsner had instituted. They approved of the efforts being made in community outreach, such as the development of Rio Salado and the South Phoenix college, and they congratulated the Governing Board for their support for several of the Chancellor’s initiatives and adoption of policies on the role of the Board and the administration. The accreditation team also acknowledged the tensions and recommended a “major reexamination of attitudes and perceptions be undertaken so that a common base of shared respect and mutual professional concerns can be reestablished in order to address collectively the major problems facing the District” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 182).

One of the policies that the Governing Board had adopted was a Code of Ethics regarding Board and administrative responsibilities and procedures. It stated that “all requests for materials from District employees for any Board action will be transmitted to the Governing Board through the Chancellor and that Governing Board members will
request information and action through the Chancellor” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 182). Bob Robertson, Roger Brooks’ friend and fellow Board member, in violation of the code, asked a District Office employee for a review of the Chancellor’s travel vouchers.

Elsner was now under fire from many fronts, including the faculty and the Board. Phoenix College faculty had taken out a half-page advertisement in the Arizona Republic newspaper attacking the establishment of Rio Salado and the diversion of funds to build additional colleges. Further newspaper articles included remarks by Board members who criticized Elsner directly (Felnagle, 2000).

As the end of the semester approached, the tensions with faculty dissipated. They seemed resigned to the fact that the changes Elsner was making were inevitable (Felnagle, 2000).

For his part, Elsner was less disturbed by the faculty than the Governing Board, and in particular the Board’s recent breaches in their agreements. At the July 31, 1979, meeting of the Board, Elsner abruptly announced his resignation. He stated that his year and a half in the District had been a high point in his career, but because of continued divisiveness and recent Board actions, he was submitting his resignation. He would stay only until they had selected a new Chancellor. The Board tabled further discussion of the Chancellor’s resignation and the meeting continued, but Board members were clearly surprised at this unexpected development (Felnagle, 2000).

Approximately 20 years later, Felnagle interviewed Elsner about his decision to resign that evening. Elsner indicated that he was exploring other opportunities and that Maricopa had a poor reputation with NCA and other higher education organizations. Board members and others met privately with Elsner off and on over the two-week period
before the August 14, 1979, Board meeting, presumably to encourage his continuation.

At the meeting, the Board confirmed their support for the Code of Ethics they had previously approved. Elsner then withdrew his resignation (Felnagle, 2000). Felnagle believes:

> Elsner had finally made the board admit who was boss. Grant Christensen [former board member] confirms this point of view: “I think that was a turning point in the District and in the relationship of the way the administration and the Board started to function. The Board recognized Paul, and Paul’s authority, and weren’t trying to undercut him but wanted to support him and listen to him.” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 191)

The faculty anger had dissipated and the Board was being supportive, so Elsner continued working on the District’s multiple agendas.

Elsner considered several sites for the South Phoenix campus, eventually deciding on a 104 acre site just north of 24th Street and Baseline. South Mountain Community College (SMCC) held groundbreaking ceremonies on August 22, 1979. Classes were temporarily held at rented facilities while the campus was being constructed (Felnagle, 2000). SMCC then formally opened in the fall of 1980 (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004).

There were several changes in the Governing Board membership in 1980. Linda B. Rosenthal was elected to replace William Schindel. As of the time of this research, Mrs. Rosenthal has served longer than any other member of the Governing Board. Information about Governing Board elections and duties is located in Appendix C, and
the members of the MCCCD Governing Board and their years of service are outlined in Appendix D.

In July of 1980, Bob Robertson decided to not pursue reelection in the November election. “Until the end, Robertson never stopped railing against Elsner” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 195). He advocated for the consolidation of Rio Salado, South Mountain, and Maricopa Tech (GateWay) into one institution. At his last Board meeting he delivered an “angry speech about Elsner’s refusal to consider his ideas” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 195). Dr. Roy Amrein replaced Robertson and served until 1996.

The tension between Maricopa Tech and Rio Salado was not resolved. Norb Breummer, MTC President, felt that Rio had taken nearly half of the MTC enrollment, which had declined from a high of 7,500 students to 3,500 in 1978. But the general decline of downtown Phoenix was also contributing to MTC’s difficulties with enrollment. A Phoenix Gazette article on January 23, 1981, stated, “While mugging and other incidences have been low, officials think the distance between classes and the parking lot can present a menacing aspect of winos, derelicts, and others who frequent downtown after dark” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 197). In December 1979, the Board approved the relocation of MTC to a building at 3910 East Washington Street, where the District administration had already established offices.

Breummer was frustrated with what had happened to MTC, took a sabbatical, and ultimately returned to a faculty contract at SCC. Charles (Chuck) Green was hired as the new President of MTC in 1981. Green was the first African-American college President in the State of Arizona (Felnagle, 2000).
The Governing Board allocated $1.75 million to renovate the on-site facilities near 40th Street and Washington to accommodate MTC, and student enrollment almost immediately began to increase, particularly in the evenings. The newspaper attributed the enrollment increases to the safer environment. As more space was needed, the District purchased an adjacent property, the Aloha Inn Resort at 3901 E. Van Buren for approximately $1.8 million (Felnagle, 2000).

On the national scene, enrollment in community colleges was declining. “In 1980, a study by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education forecast declining enrollments nationally for the remainder of the decade” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 201). However, the metropolitan Phoenix area was continuing to grow with the Maricopa Colleges running against the national trend. Even within the growing State of Arizona, only the Maricopa District established colleges in the 1980s (Crudder, 1997).

One of the most significant problems the Maricopa County Community College District faced was a decline in state funding despite continued increases in enrollment. Up until this point, there had been two primary sources of funding for Arizona’s colleges, state aid and property taxes. For those students who were county residents and who attended during the day, there was a small activity fee but no tuition. The State Board broached the concept of students paying approximately 8% of the cost of their education in the fall of 1979 (Felnagle, 2000).

The amount of tuition initially set would generate only a small amount of revenue, but it appeared that there were two reasons for having students pay tuition: one was related to paying part of the increasing cost of education and the other appeared to be related to the growing sense that students were taking advantage of the state’s permissive
system. An *Arizona Republic* article on August 30, 1979, explains why legislators leaned towards having students pay for a portion, even if a small portion, of the costs:

…legislators’ comments suggest that tuition-free education was being abused by lazy or directionless students. One legislator concluded that forcing students to pay tuition would make them more responsible.

Senator Jeffrey Hill, R-Tucson, vice chairman of the Senate Education Committee, was quoted as saying: “Community colleges have become a haven for veterans who can’t find jobs. They major in GI benefits.”

(Felnagle, 2000, p. 202)

Felnagle explains that this was not an unusual feeling given the “Reagan-era hostility toward anyone receiving public assistance” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 202). Students and faculty within Maricopa opposed the proposed legislation to this effect. As it turned out, the legislature simply cut funding to the community colleges statewide and left the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges with the task of charging tuition to make up for the shortfall. The State Board authorized districts to begin charging tuition as of the fall 1980 term (Felnagle, 2000).

In response, Elsner proposed an initial tuition of $5 per credit hour or approximately $75 per semester for a full-time student. He explained that with more than 7,600 Maricopa students receiving some form of financial aid that it would not hurt those most in need of support. Some of the college presidents did not agree and some of the Board members felt that $5 was too great an increase. At the June 3, 1980, Board meeting MCCCD approved charging tuition for the first time. The rate was set at $3 per credit hour. Because the 1980-81 budget had been established with the assumption of
charging tuition of $5 per credit, the difference was made up by using $500,000 from the student activity fee account to cover basic operating expenditures. Students complained, but the Board passed the modified budget of $56.7 million (Felnagle, 2000). As it turned out enrollment grew the following fall semester despite the tuition increase.

Elsner also proposed a $45 million bond to acquire the land and build the facilities for the next three campuses that had been suggested in a consultant’s report, referred to as the Tadlock Report. The Board approved this idea at their May 7, 1980, meeting with the expectation that it would appear on the November ballot (Felnagle, 2000).

By 1980, the Maricopa County Community College District had more than 60,000 students enrolled in seven colleges, “making the District the largest educational entity in Arizona, about twice the size of ASU, and the third largest system in the country behind Chicago and Los Angeles” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 204). Over half of the students (55%) were women. About 60% of all students attended classes in the evening.

Some members of the community rallied behind a tax reform effort, Proposition 106, at the state level that potentially would have reduced property taxes and limited future increases. Elsner did not want the District bond proposition to be on the same ballot since one of the potential risks was that if the bond failed, the District would not be allowed to fund the same projects using other means. Proposition 106 was defeated in November of 1980. That same fall, enrollment grew and the need for additional colleges seemed more severe than ever, but with no bond on the ballot, the District was at a loss as to how to proceed.

In the spring of 1981, after the legislature announced that they were restructuring state aid to better support community college growth, Elsner announced that the
Southeast Valley would be the first area of metropolitan Phoenix to receive a new college. Mesa Community College was not able to accommodate all of the students who wanted to attend. The state aid was not forthcoming, and the District raised tuition to $5 per credit in 1981, to $11 per credit in 1982 with a cap of $132 for twelve credits of more, and to $14 by 1983 (Felnagle, 2000).

Although a smaller proportion of enrolled students were aiming for university transfer, those who did transfer performed well. In 1983, a study by Dick Richardson and Donald Doucette of ASU showed that community college students who graduated with associate degrees performed as well as students who began at the university. In addition, student grade point averages initially dropped a bit when they transferred but quickly rose to a level that paralleled that of other university students (Felnagle, 2000).

As more and more students looked to the Maricopa Colleges for assistance in achieving their goals, the colleges became more crowded. After reports of severe overcrowding and unmet demand at MCC and GCC, Paul Elsner announced that the District would pursue an ambitious bond campaign for $75 million of capital expansion. Although some complained that a bond would increase property taxes, because the District had steadily decreased property taxes over a five-year period, by asking students to bear more of the cost burden through tuition, the bond passed in September of 1984. It was the largest bond ever passed by a community college system at the time.

MCC’s 1984 accreditation self-study report indicates that there was ongoing tension about the increases in student tuition:

The County Community College District did not require tuition payments from students until the fall of 1980. Budgets had become strained due to
student body increases and declining legislative support and economic inflation. The District imposed a $3.00 per credit hour tuition fee during the fall of 1980. The Governing Board has, since that time, gradually increased tuition to its current level of $14.00 per semester hour. While the tuition increase was made out of necessity, it was generally opposed by the faculty and student body. ("North Central Association accreditation review self study report," 1984, pp. 54-55)

Most of the colleges were growing but Maricopa Tech was struggling with declining enrollments. In 1985, Paul Elsner switched the college presidents of Rio and Maricopa Tech, moving Chuck Green to RSC and moving Myrna Harrison to MTC. The goal was to broaden MTC’s program base to include more than technical programs and expand into areas such as adult literacy, general education, and liberal arts programs.

Harrison felt that the change in program mix necessitated a change in MTC’s name. Initially proposed to be Sky Harbor Community College because of its proximity to the Phoenix Sky Harbor airport, the college determined that it would be safer to rename itself after some other entity when the airport name was under review. According to GateWay’s fifth president, Phil Randolph, who followed Harrison in 1988, the college was eventually named after the GateWay Commerce Park (Felnagle, 2000). Because there were two other Gateway Community Colleges in the nation, the name was spelled just a little differently with a capital “W” in the middle, GateWay.

In 1985, two new campuses were started, not as full-fledged colleges but as extensions of existing colleges. Paradise Valley Education Center (PVEC) was an
extension of Scottsdale Community College and Chandler-Gilbert Education Center (CGEC) was an extension of Mesa Community College.

Many people credit civic leader Beth Koehnemann with the establishment of Paradise Valley Community College fifteen years prior to the date proposed by the Tadlock Study. Phoenix College and Rio Salado had both offered courses in the Paradise Valley area of North Phoenix for years, but students could not earn a full degree without traveling to nearby Phoenix College, in the heart of Phoenix, or Scottsdale Community College (Felnagle, 2000).

Koehnemann and other civic leaders were displeased when the District bought land in the West Valley and Southeast Valley, but not in their area. When in March of 1981, Paul Elsner announced that the next new college would be built in the Chandler area to take pressure off of the quickly growing Mesa Community College, Koehnemann and others wrote letters and held community meetings to draw attention to their part of the valley. She created a committee of community members called the Community College Task Force of the Greater Paradise Valley Community Council that included representatives from numerous organizations. Despite MCCCD planning staff observations that a population base of 170,000 was needed to begin a college in the area (Paradise Valley only had 115,000 at the time), civic leaders contended that they would serve other outlying areas such as Carefree and Cave Creek (Felnagle, 2000).

They presented their data to the MCCCD Governing Board and over time, the Board which had intended to build campuses first in the Southeast Valley and then in the West Valley, acquiesced by agreeing to move forward the timeframe for the building of the college significantly ahead of schedule. Furthermore, due to the strong lobbying of
the citizen’s committee, they secured the lion’s share of the available funding for new colleges with a campus that would be more than double the square footage and nearly triple the construction budget of its sister college that would begin in Chandler at the same time (Felnagle, 2000). Felnagle compared the two new sites saying, “… the Chandler-Gilbert facility was to be only 70,000 square feet and to cost $5.6 million while the new Paradise Valley facility was to be 170,000 square feet, at a cost of $14.5 million” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 21). Only a few years earlier, Elsner had identified the Southeast Valley as a primary area for growth due to overcrowding at MCC, so this was a surprise to many.

An active citizens group in Paradise Valley had lobbied the Governing Board for a campus in their area despite objections from District planning staff that the population base was not sufficient to begin a college there. Grant Christensen, a Governing Board member from 1979-1985 and again from 1989-1994, worked with the Southeast Valley Task Force, a group of citizens from Chandler, Gilbert and other Southeast Valley communities. In an interview with Richard Felnagle, Christensen explained why there was such a disparity in the starting budgets for the two sites:

In Paradise Valley, you had money and you had some influence. And what did you have in Chandler-Gilbert? You had a few farmers. And you didn’t have much money. You didn’t have the surrounding homes and all with the quality in this area that you had up there. (Felnagle, 2000, p. 213)

John Cordova, who had served as an Associate Dean at SCC and the Dean of Instruction at PC, was tapped to lead the new Paradise Valley Education Center that began offering classes in rented facilities at the local Jewish Community Center and
Paradise Valley High School in the summer of 1985. Two major areas of emphasis included the integration of technology into the teaching and learning process and a student development philosophy which stated that all employees could and should contribute to a student’s education. Reminiscent of SCC’s early days, some faculty proposed that PVCC become a more elite school because it served a higher echelon population (Felnagle, 2000).

In July of 1990, Paradise Valley Community College was independently accredited (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004). The Provost who had been reporting to the President of Scottsdale Community College, then became a college President reporting directly to the District Chancellor Paul Elsner.

Meanwhile, Arnette Ward, another internal Maricopa employee, was named to lead the new Chandler-Gilbert Education Center, an extension of Mesa Community College. Ms. Ward had been a counselor and the Dean of Students at MCC, and she became the first African-American female to be a college President in the Maricopa District. She recalled in an interview with Richard Felnagle that the Southeast Valley Task Force, made up of interested citizens, wanted an occupational-technical institution because of their goals for business and industry growth in the area. They also requested a sports program, but the initial construction budget was not sufficient to pursue that option (Felnagle, 2000).

Classes were initially held in rented facilities while the 80-acre campus near the northwest corner of Gilbert and Pecos Roads was under construction. One building was initially built on the south end of a long, thin parcel of land. Ward recalled that the
building was painted pink, much like the historic nearby San Marcos Hotel had been painted years before (Felnagle, 2000).

Chandler-Gilbert Education Center moved to its campus location in Chandler in 1987 after occupying temporary facilities in Chandler for almost two years and was renamed Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center as it transitioned towards becoming a stand-alone college. CGCC received accreditation from NCA in 1992, independent of its parent college MCC (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004).

These two new colleges had started in a different manner than previous colleges. First, they were built in phases with the initial phase consisting of classrooms, faculty offices, administration offices, and limited services. They did not have student centers and athletic facilities like the more traditional Maricopa campuses, but they did have an emphasis on technology and small fitness centers where community members could use tread mills, strength training machines, and other exercise equipment. As extensions of a nearby parent college, they were reliant on the parent institution for support. The Provosts were not selected via a national search, as had been the case for Rio Salado and South Mountain, but rather by an internal search. The Provost position was the same level as a Dean, but the Provosts were automatically appointed as college Presidents when the institutions became independently accredited by NCA. Community task forces had defined areas of emphasis for the colleges and each college was free to respond to the needs of their unique community (Felnagle, 2000).

Estrella Mountain Community College, the tenth Maricopa college, started in 1988 as Estrella Mountain Education Center, an extension of Glendale Community
Homero Lopez, who had been the Director of Institutional Research and then Dean of Instruction at Glendale Community College, became the Provost and eventually President. Lopez assembled a skeletal staff to begin offering classes in local high schools and other rented space. The first phase of construction began in February 1991 and the new facilities were opened in 1992 ("Institutional self-study report 2002," 2002). “The landscaping, the public art, and the thoroughly functional design of all the buildings exude an undeniably corporate ambience” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 235). EMCC was independently accredited in 1996 (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004).

There has been discussion of the District’s organizational structure throughout this review of the history of MCCCD. Appendix E describes the organizational structure of the District, while Appendix F chronicles MCCCD’s chief executive officers or Chancellors. Appendix G provides a chronological listing of the Presidents for each of the 10 Maricopa Community Colleges through the years.

Despite the turmoil of the 1970’s, in the 1980’s and 1990’s, MCCCD grew from an unknown small college system into a position of prominence in higher education. Long-standing MCCCD Governing Board member Linda B. Rosenthal credits Dr. Paul Elsner with Maricopa’s transformation. “There are probably several events over the years that could be considered particularly significant, but certainly none is more significant than the visionary leadership of our longtime chancellor, Dr. Paul Elsner, and the leadership team which he assembled to help manage the District” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 11).

Paul Elsner had been at the helm of the Maricopa District as it doubled the number of colleges, adding Rio Salado, South Mountain, Paradise Valley, Chandler-
Gilbert, and Estrella Mountain over a period of 12 years. The 1990s were glory years for Elsner and the Maricopa Colleges, as enrollments grew and innovations in technology, teaching and learning, and services were promulgated. Partnerships with business and industry expanded, and numerous programs for underage and underprivileged high school students were begun. Articulation agreements with universities allowed university transfer students to transition to a growing number of public and private universities that were glad to have Maricopa graduates. Structures were established for ongoing employee professional development, for policy negotiations with employees, for a system of councils and committees to provide input and feedback, and for systematic budgeting and funding mechanisms. Elsner published a dozen or more articles about innovations in Maricopa during this period. He also contributed to a number of books about community colleges and higher education (Felnagle, 2000).

Financial stability was achieved, which resulted in outstanding financial ratings. The public overwhelmingly approved a capital improvement bond for $386 million in 1994, “the largest bond election ever passed by any community college district to that time” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 19).

By 1996, more than half of ASU’s undergraduate students had attended at least one of the Maricopa Colleges. More than two-thirds of the juniors and seniors at ASU had some Maricopa transfer credits. By 1998, “Maricopa officially became the largest community college district in the United States” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 18). Maricopa’s 10 independently accredited colleges offered nearly 6,500 different courses to more than 220,000 students annually.
Paul Elsner retired on June 30, 1999. Elsner served as the leader of the Maricopa Colleges for more than 20 years, from 1977 to 1999. His prominence is described by Felnagle:

He is nationally acclaimed as a visionary, one of the most honored and respected leaders in all of higher education. Robert Atwell, former president of the American Council on Education, once said, “Dr. Elsner is the superstar of college leaders in this country. What he has done for Maricopa and for all of American higher education has no equal. Maricopa is an absolutely magnificent community college system and is a model for the whole world of education.” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 19)

The Board appointed Dr. Raul Cardenas (Figure 6), then President of Paradise Valley Community College, as acting Chancellor while the search for a new Chancellor began. After one failed search, a second search was undertaken.

In February 2000, the Governing Board announced that Dr. Fred Gaskin (Figure 7) would be selected as the next Chancellor and begin his duties on July 1, 2000. Gaskin had been President of Cerritos College in California since 1993 (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002). Prior to 1993, Dr. Gaskin was Executive Vice President for Regional Operations at Ivy Tech State College in Indianapolis. He also served for eight years as President of Moraine Valley Community College in Palos Hills, Illinois (C. Hughes, personal communication, February 24, 2000).
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*Figure 7. Dr. Fred Gaskin, Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community College District, 2000-2003.*

Gaskin’s tenure was less than three years, 2000-2003, and during that time he focused on teacher education, workforce development programs, and university relations.

“Soon after Gaskin arrived, he created a teacher education initiative in response to the public school teacher shortage” (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa*...
Community Colleges, 2002, p. 45). Course enrollments in teacher education were significantly increased and innovative programs were started, such as Rio Salado’s online Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Preparation program and the collaboration between South Mountain Community College and Phoenix College to establish a charter high school emphasizing teacher education (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002).

Another major area of emphasis for Gaskin was workforce development. He participated in the attraction of the International Genomics Institute to the Phoenix area and positioned the Maricopa Colleges “to train students for employment in the biotechnology industry” as well as encourage faculty to pursue research opportunities (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 45).

Gaskin believed that the change in authority of the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges by the Arizona Legislature in 2002 provided increased opportunities for collaboration among Arizona’s community colleges (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002).

He envisioned a “synergistic relationship” between Arizona State University (ASU) and MCCCD and noted, “Nowhere is there a situation in which two institutions of higher education so dominate a region” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 45). Because students swirl between the institutions and transfer from MCCCD to ASU in large numbers, he wanted to examine the possibilities for shared resources, student services, and some financial and administrative functions. “This collaboration has tremendous potential if we coordinate our higher education missions and avoid redundancies,” said Gaskin (A tribute to the
“In fall 2001, 63% of Arizona State University’s upper-division students took courses at one of the Maricopa Community Colleges” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 14).

During Dr. Gaskin’s tenure, a publication called A Tribute to the History and Hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges was produced in preparation for the proposed bond election in the fall of 2004. It provided a history of MCCC as well as a picture of its current standing:

The Maricopa County Community College District is the largest provider of job training and the largest provider of health care workers in Arizona. The colleges offer 8,632 courses, seven academic associate degrees in Arts, Science, Business and General Studies, 24 Associate in Transfer Partnership degrees, and five Academic Certificates. Certificates of Completion and Associate in Applied Science degrees are awarded in 636 various occupational programs. … In 2001-02, 4,287 degrees were awarded as well as 7,283 occupational certificates. … Finally, the District has developed partnerships with more than 1,000 businesses, government agencies, and non-profit organizations. (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 19)

By 2001-2002, the Maricopa Community Colleges employed 1,280 full-time faculty and 4,233 adjunct faculty. Along with hundreds of professional staff, management and technology professionals, crafts, maintenance, safety and athletic staff, skill center staff, specially funded or short-term employees, and student workers, the
District employed more than 11,000 individual employees (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002). In 2001, more than 18,000 individuals applied for 600 open employment positions “because the Maricopa Community Colleges have a reputation not only as a great place to learn, but a great place to work” (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002, p. 59).

Gaskin was unceremoniously removed from his day-to-day duties by the Governing Board in May 2003 and subsequently fired. The Board cited differences in philosophy and inappropriate workplace behavior as reasons for his departure. Bill Hart of *The Arizona Republic* reported:

> Now the Maricopa County Community College District will likely launch another chancellor search. On June 30 the board unanimously fired Gaskin from his $235,000 post over a long list of complaints from staffers, including that Gaskin routinely stared at women’s bodies and was “abusive,” “arrogant” and “demeaning.” Gaskin has refused to comment on the matter since taking a leave of absence in May. (Hart, 2003b, B2)

One of the most significant elements of Gaskin’s legacy was the number of senior executives who retired or left the Maricopa District and were replaced during his years as Chancellor. In addition to selecting three of the five Vice Chancellors in academic affairs (Anna Solley), student development and community affairs (Steve Helfgot), and human resources (Phil Randolph and then Jose Leyba on an interim basis), he was directly involved in the hiring of six college Presidents at Phoenix College (Corina Gardea), South Mountain Community College (Ken Atwater), Paradise Valley Community
College (Gina Kranitz), GateWay Community College (Eugene Giovannini), Chandler-Gilbert Community College (Maria Hesse), and Glendale Community College (Phil Randolph) (D. Schober, personal communication, August 25, 2006).

In 2003, Rufus Glasper became Acting Chancellor of MCCCD upon Fred Gaskin’s departure. The press reported:

Glasper filled Gaskin’s shoes starting May 12 and at an August 26 governing board meeting, three of the District’s board members voiced support to immediately appoint Glasper as chancellor. But two other board members persuaded their peers to launch an internal search, allowing all of the District’s college presidents and vice chancellors to apply. None of the other eligible candidates put their names in the hat. … Ed Contreras, president of the governing board, said Glasper will still face scrutiny over the coming weeks in public hearings and a private interview with the board before a decision is made at its September 23 meeting. (Searer, 2003, p. 1)

Following an internal MCCCD hiring process that included a series of public interviews and forums, the Governing Board selected Glasper (Figure 8) as the Chancellor in September of 2003. The decision was controversial as reported in the press:

Earlier Tuesday, however, a coalition of Valley Latino groups reaffirmed its opposition to the board’s decision to hold only a quick, local search for Gaskin’s successor. The coalition, whose members blasted a “renegade board that has botched three chancellor searches,” vowed to oppose a $1
billion district bond issue expected to be placed on the November 2004 ballot. Phoenix attorney Danny Ortega, a coalition member, rejected the selection process as a “farse” that was “adverse to the interests of the Hispanic community because of a lack of equal opportunity.” (Hart, 2003a, p. B1)

Figure 8. Dr. Rufus Glasper, Chancellor of the

Maricopa County Community College District, 2003-present.

Glasper came to Maricopa in 1986 as the Director of Finance and held executive-level leadership roles for 17 years before assuming the role of District CEO. During that time, he served as Vice Chancellor of Business Services, and then Executive Vice Chancellor for Human Resources and Administration. As a certified public accountant and certified government financial manager, Glasper was at the helm of Maricopa’s well-targeted strategies and business plans for many years (Vita-Rufus Glasper, Ph.D, CPA, 2005).
Glasper held a special meeting for employees and community leaders on September 21, 2004, to share his vision for the future of the Maricopa Community Colleges. With more than 600 people in attendance, he “engaged the crowd with his commitment to education, his passion for excellence, and his dedication to the people of Maricopa County” (Chesrown, 2004, p. 1). Dr. Glasper outlined 12 ideas in his talk, *Beyond Boundaries*, which focused on accessibility, collaboration and partnerships, education for empowerment, service to community, and student success. ASU President Michael Crow; President of the Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, Valerie Manning; a Maricopa County Supervisor, Mary Rose Wilcox; and Arizona Board of Regents member Ernest Calderon, responded to his comments (Chesrown, 2004).

Glasper’s major agendas include creating a more inclusive environment for students and employees, expanding revenue streams for operations, enhancing partnerships with business and industry, and addressing the continuum from high school to college to university.

His focus on creating a “Maricopa culture of inclusiveness, respect, and engagement” (R. Glasper, personal communication, February 2, 2004) was instrumental in regaining the support of the Hispanic community prior to the bond election which fell early in Glasper’s term as Chancellor. After extensive strategic and financial planning, he led the District to the successful passage of a $951 million bond election in November of 2004 with 76% of the “yes” vote ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006, p. 55).

Examining other possible sources of funding was a critical challenge to which Dr. Glasper asked the Maricopa Foundation to provide leadership. A fundraising arm of the
District, the MCCCD Foundation, was chartered in 1977 by the State of Arizona and was designated as falling within Section 501 (c)(3) of the IRS code. The first balance sheet of the Foundation, dated June 30, 1980, registered assets totaling $4,465.95 of which $1,115.95 was in cash and $3,350 was in land. In 2004, the balance was close to $10 million dollars (A. Halvorson, personal communication, December 14, 2004).

Dollars raised by the Foundation are used primarily for student scholarships, but fundraising was and, as of this research, continues to be a focus of the Chancellor’s Executive Council. With state revenues declining and a desire to keep tuition as low as possible for students, the District is investigating other potential revenue streams. Commercial partnerships, major gifts donations, and naming of buildings or spaces in exchange for significant donations are being researched as possible sources of additional funding.

Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano appointed Dr. Glasper to chair the P-20 Council, “a new council designed to improve education in Arizona, and to ensure more students graduate from high school, succeed in college and are ready for the modern workforce” (R. DeGraw, personal communication, July 25, 2005). The term P-20 stands for preschool through graduate school or lifelong learning.

In 2005-2006, at the time of this research, Chancellor Glasper has councils and committees working on all of his initiatives: Beyond Boundaries, the Fourth Revenue Stream, and P-20.

This chapter began with an overview of the history of the development of community colleges nationally and then provided a history of the Maricopa County Community College District.
Mark David Milliron, then President and CEO for the League for Innovation in the Community Colleges, described the process of Maricopa’s transformation from a one small junior college to “one of America’s largest and arguably best-known community college systems” (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002, p. 5).

It should not surprise us that this journey included contentious conflict, egregious errors, questionable judgment, self-serving strategy and frighteningly blatant ethical lapses. So too, however, do we find beauty: committed service, caring professionals, passionate outcry, energizing vision, and above all, courageous action. (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002, p. 5)

To add context to the study of CGCC, it is helpful to understand the nature of the community colleges that comprise the Maricopa District. What happens at one college can often shape or influence the other colleges.

The District Governing Board has prided itself on treating each of the individual colleges equally, or at least equitably. This is addressed periodically in the literature. For example, in 1970 when the State Board reported that “a better standard of architecture was implied for Scottsdale from the beginning,” the District Board objected. “The [District] Board felt this was misleading as the intent of the Board had always been to treat all areas of the District equally” (Hinsdale, 1973, 187).

Despite the intent of the Board to develop each college within the District equally and equitably, there were different historical influences, fiscal realities, leadership styles, and a variety of factors that resulted in 10 similar, but each somewhat unique, colleges.
There are similarities between all of the Maricopa Community Colleges. For example, they are all governed by the same Governing Board and led by one district-wide Chancellor. They all share a common curriculum and course bank. They all share common employee manuals and student policies.

There are certain characteristics found at several, but not all of the colleges. For example, although all of the colleges have occupational/vocational programs, only GateWay Community College and Estrella Mountain Community College have skill centers, specifically designed to provide short-term training for entry-level positions. All of the colleges have continuing education offerings, some of which focus on senior citizens, but only Rio Salado College and Chandler-Gilbert Community College have stand-alone centers focused on the needs of the mature adult population. All of the colleges work closely with the state universities, but two of the colleges have facilities co-located with Arizona State University campuses (GCC at ASU West and CGCC at ASU’s Polytechnic campus). Several, but not all, of the colleges have police academies, fire science training programs, and other specialized vocational programs. Some, but not all of the colleges, have gymnasiums and athletic fields on campus. And there are multiple other examples of this phenomenon.

There are some elements that are unique to one college. For example, Rio Salado has a unique mission that focuses on nontraditional course delivery systems, mostly through distance learning. GateWay focused almost entirely, until more recent years, on occupational/vocational training. Scottsdale Community College is located on an American Indian reservation. Chandler-Gilbert Community College has residence halls
and housing for students at its Williams Campus. Many of the colleges have one-of-a-kind programs or services for students.

In Richard Felnagle’s book about the history of the Maricopa County Community College District, he explains his decision to “focus primarily on the founding of each of the District’s 10 colleges because starting new colleges has been the District’s most important (and most revealing) function” but he also explains that the “history of the District is the history of those colleges” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 6). This researcher concurred that it would be difficult for readers to gain a full understanding of the history of the Maricopa County Community College District or Chandler-Gilbert Community College without some understanding of the other Maricopa Colleges. Each college has unique features and characteristics that have been influenced by the moment in history in which it was developed, the communities it served, the leadership style of the founding CEO, fiscal constraints, and a variety of factors. Therefore Appendix H provides a brief synopsis of each of the Maricopa Community Colleges, focusing on the founding and those items which the colleges would consider signature programs or unique features.

Appendix I summarizes key points from this section of the document and lists major milestones in the history of the Maricopa County Community College District.

**Chandler-Gilbert Community College**

The purpose of this study is to document the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College (CGCC), the ninth independent college of the Maricopa Community Colleges. In reviewing the literature, two publications previously identified, *A Tribute to the History and Hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges* and *Maricopa’s Community*
Colleges: Turbulent Evolution of an Education Giant, chronicle the history of the Maricopa County Community College District and contain information about CGCC. A review of the literature produced a number of additional books and journal articles which contain information about the college and specifically its programs in service-learning and learning communities.

As early as 1994, CGCC’s service-learning program was gaining national recognition and being recognized in the literature. In the book titled Service Matters: A Sourcebook for Community Service in Higher Education, published by Campus Compact, a national organization of college and university presidents who promote civic engagement, several institutions, including CGCC, are highlighted for placing service-learning in core curriculum courses such as first-year English (Cha & Rothman, 1994).

John Tagg’s book, The Learning Paradigm College (2003), discusses the fundamental shifts that are taking place in higher education, whereby the focus is not just on teaching but on learning. Tagg interviewed CGCC chief student affairs officer Lois Bartholomew, faculty member Marybeth Mason, and this researcher, in preparation for his book. His book described the genesis of service-learning at CGCC:

The college began in 1985 with a faculty interested in innovation and experiential learning. Faculty members began to explore collaborative learning early on, and many teachers and administrators were involved in community service. The college’s service learning program began with a single English class and expanded through voluntary faculty participation. Now well over half of the college’s 75 faculty members have taught a service-learning course, and a variety of options are available to students.
each semester. Over 100 community and nonprofit organizations are available for service-learning opportunities. (Tagg, 2003, p. 172)

The service-learning concept grew in biology through the leadership of biology faculty member Pushpa Ramakrishna. The book *Life, Learning and Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Biology* includes a description of Ramakrishna’s “gardening for humanity” project (Brubaker & Ostroff, 2000, p. 147). As students studied global warming and the greenhouse effect, water pollution, plant and tree diversity, and birds and their migratory patterns, they served at the Town of Gilbert’s water reclamation plant and riparian preserve. “In addition, during their visits to the site, students helped to plant 800 trees that had been donated to the site but needed to be planted. Each group of four to five students planted approximately 25 to 30 trees” (Brubaker & Ostroff, 2000, p. 148).

Barbara Jacoby’s (1996) book, *Service-Learning in Higher Education*, contains multiple references to CGCC. Jacoby provides principles for establishing a service-learning program, guidelines and methods for program implementation, and specific examples from colleges and universities with successful programs. In describing CGCC’s service-learning program, she notes that by way of integrating service into the first-year English courses as well as other introductory courses, many students are exposed to the concept of service to community. She says that in addition to the first-year English courses:

Faculty teaching psychology, biology, education, math, and music courses link class assignments to participation in Into the Streets programs [a national program whereby students go into their communities to serve for
one day]. By providing a breadth of service-learning options, many of them related to the content of introductory courses, the student life staff and faculty offer choices for students that promote involvement and learning. Preparation for Into the Streets programs is provided by individual faculty as part of class time and through campus-wide orientation sessions sponsored by the Office of Student Life prior to the programs. Activities that connect students directly with community members are selected whenever possible. The Into the Streets experiences at Chandler-Gilbert serve as the foundation for students’ longer-term participation in more integrated service-learning courses offered in subsequent semesters. (Jacoby, 1996, p. 124)

Chancellor Paul Elsner contributed his perspective about service-learning and civic engagement in community colleges as part of Thomas Ehrlich’s book on *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education* (2000). “The Maricopa Community Colleges were satisfied and thrilled with Chandler-Gilbert Community College’s virtual wall-to-wall promotion of volunteerism among its students” (Elsner, 2000, p. 218). Elsner cites faculty member Marybeth Mason as “one of the outstanding leaders in the Maricopa Community Colleges” for her work in innovative pedagogies such as service-learning and describes the college-wide effort that Mason helped lead (Elsner, 2000, p. 218).

Another innovative program, learning communities, began being mentioned in the literature in 1999. As part of a FIPSE-funded National Learning Communities Dissemination Project from 1996-1999, CGCC and three other Maricopa Colleges
(GateWay, Glendale, and Paradise Valley) were chosen to participate in this national project to strengthen learning communities. The project’s goals were:

… (1) to support the participating campuses as they more fully established, assessed and evaluated their learning community programs; (2) to disseminate information about the learning community initiatives on these campuses to a national audience; and (3) to feature the experience and knowledge gained by these institutions at a national learning communities conference in the final year of the project (1999).

(MacGregor, 1999, p. ii)

The Dissemination Project published a monograph detailing the growth of learning communities at the selected colleges. The chapter on the Maricopa Colleges described how CGCC started with one learning community led by faculty member Barbara Shovers, which linked developmental reading and English with a student success course. Over the years of the project, additional learning communities were formed at CGCC’s Pecos and Williams campuses, based on “the coordinated studies model” (Rings, Shovers, Skinner, & Siefer, 1999, pp. 43-44). The authors described evaluation results and lessons learned at the four colleges, then concluded there was a “need for leadership and coordination for LCs at the District level” (Rings et al., 1999, p. 49).

Learning communities which developed as a result of that initial effort drew national attention in the National Learning Communities Project, which followed the FIPSE project and was funded in part by a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts (MacGregor, 2003). One in a series of monographs on learning communities, published in conjunction with the American Association of Higher Education, focused on efforts
being made to integrate “two important innovations in undergraduate education,” service-learning and learning communities, and described the work of several successful models to illustrate “the synergy of building upon and integrating the best of both practices” (Eaton, MacGregor, & Schoem, 2003, p. 1).

Chandler-Gilbert Community College was described in *Integrating Learning Communities with Service-Learning* (MacGregor, 2003) as having developed a freshman learning community which:

… connected freshman composition, film and literature, and various computer skills courses to explore a year-long theme, “Creating Community in a Changing World.” This learning community met for two intensive mornings each week, allowing for collaborative learning, flexible projects and computer lab workshops. In addition, the students engaged in a yearlong service-learning relationship with the House of Refuge East, a transitional housing program for homeless families. This firsthand exploration of the issues of homelessness enlarged and expanded students’ understanding of community and raised important questions about their surrounding community’s relationship to and responsibility for homeless families. (Eaton et al., 2003, p. 2)

The monograph devoted a chapter to describing that particular learning community, using many student quotes and reflections (Hesse & Mason, 2003). Maricopa Chancellor Emeritus, Dr. Paul Elsner, describes this learning community as an “academic village” that provides “students a reflective academic context in which they can fully develop their largest capacities as future citizens and leaders” (Elsner, 2000, p. 220).
In another monograph from the National Learning Communities Project, called *Learning Communities in Community Colleges*, additional CGCC learning communities were highlighted. One such community, developed by faculty member Brenda Larson, integrated pre-professional and general education courses in a two-semester sequence for education students. “Aimed at incoming freshmen selecting an education major, the course goals are to help education majors become better prepared for the occupational workplace while they become better democratic citizens by learning through service to their community” (Fogarty et al., 2003, p. 35).

In 2002, the Carnegie Foundation provided a grant to Campus Compact, a national coalition of more than 900 college and university presidents who promote the civic purposes of higher education, to identify, document and disseminate “best practices of civic engagement” and “help campuses achieve broader institutionalization of that engagement” (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, p. 7). In the first phase of this study, site teams visited 13 community colleges that were “exemplars” (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, p. 85) and conducted telephone interviews at an additional six colleges. Chandler-Gilbert Community College was one of the selected 13 colleges and was highlighted based upon its “administrative and academic leadership,” “enabling mechanisms,” and “integrated and complementary engagement activities” (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, p. 90).

The site visit was conducted by Dr. Donna Duffy, a professor of psychology and a Campus Compact engaged scholar with support from Chris Schnick, CGCC English faculty. The study noted that at several colleges, such as CGCC, “community-based work has become such a deep and pervasive part of faculty culture that the administration hardly needs to stress its importance” (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, p. 49). The long-standing
nature of the CGCC service-learning program was attributed to a variety of enabling mechanisms such as the service-learning assistants program whereby students who have done well in at least one service-learning course assist faculty with community placements, paperwork and legal compliance issues, and student tracking. The sophisticated service-learning database, direct classroom support from the Office of Student Life, files of teacher assignments and student reflections, special outreach events such as Into the Streets, and the comprehensive web site were described as additional evidence of enabling mechanisms or supportive infrastructure (Zlotkowski et al., 2004).

In discussing the integrated nature of multiple forms of active learning at CGCC, the book noted, “[p]rograms that combine multiple alternative pedagogies, such as service-learning and learning communities profit from the fact that faculty members already involved in one teaching and learning innovation are more likely to be open to trying other, related strategies” (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, p. 35). The study concluded that learning communities at CGCC often incorporate service-learning and other active learning methods helping to build a sense of community among students and faculty.

Two additional professional publications included information about CGCC. An article in the August/September 2005 edition of the Community College Journal described the rationale for learning communities and provided multiple examples, one of which explained a first-year experience called “Creating Community in a Changing World” at CGCC (Hesse & Mason, 2005, p. 32).

In a recently published book titled Engaging Department: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good, edited by Kevin Kecskes of Portland State University, the history of CGCC’s English
department was chronicled. Pam Davenport and Marybeth Mason, both of CGCC, were asked to co-author a chapter in this book which highlighted:

… concrete examples of departments in which faculty have made the difficult cultural transition from focusing on “my work” to “our work” are described in helpful detail. Moving stories are told of how departments that have learned to work collaboratively then reach out into communities and learn to build relationships that are mutually beneficial. (Kecskes, 2006, p. xiv)

Summary

This chapter has included a brief history of community colleges in the United States, a history of the Maricopa County Community College District, and a literature review of one of the Maricopa Colleges, Chandler-Gilbert Community College, on which this study is focused. This provides background and context for the reader to better understand the research that was conducted at Chandler-Gilbert Community College for the purposes of documenting the history of the college.

After reviewing the literature, the following conclusions were reached:

1. There is a legitimate need for studying the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College.

2. CGCC is mentioned in several published works; however, there is no published work that specifically addresses the history of the college.

3. The books and journals that mention CGCC focus on the service-learning and learning communities programs.
4. Ample documents exist for classifying and organizing historical data about the Maricopa County Community College District, of which Chandler-Gilbert Community College is a part.

5. Although it is possible to determine what the college offered in terms of programs and services, and also who those programs served, it is not clear why certain directions were taken and how decisions were reached.

6. There have been doctoral dissertations written about the history of MCCCD, but no doctoral dissertation of a historical nature has been done regarding CGCC.
Chapter Three: Design and Analysis

This chapter focuses on the methodology for the study. It provides a description of the problem and an overview of the study’s design, including how the research was conducted, what information was collected, how the information was analyzed, and precautions and procedures that were followed to ensure that the problem and subproblems were addressed in an accurate and comprehensive manner.

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to gain an in-depth, contextual understanding of the inception, the founding, and first 20 years of operations at Chandler-Gilbert Community College. This study uses a multimethod approach to answer the “how” and “why” questions about Chandler-Gilbert Community College. Qualitative methodology is used when the researcher seeks interview responses to a variety of questions about the founding of the college and early years of operation. Quantitative methodology is used to collect and analyze extensive documentation on the college to draw conclusions that pertain to the research question and subproblems.

Because of the focus on a single college, the use of a case study was the preferred research strategy (Yin, 1994).

This study will provide a record of the establishment, growth, and development of Chandler-Gilbert Community College, a multiple campus college within a multiple college district, from its inception through its first 20 years.
Restatement of the Problem

The problem is that the institutional history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College has not been adequately documented. Therefore, it is necessary to identify and document significant activities and historical events in the college’s developmental years, as well as to collect stories from the integral people about the early years of the college and commit them to writing.

The primary research problem for this study will be to identify and describe the major events, people, and issues that form the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College (CGCC) through 2005.

Five secondary problems or subproblems have been identified.
1. Inception, formation and growth: Identify timeframes and describe the significant activities and historical events in the inception, formation, and growth stages of the college’s development.
2. Key people and organizations: Identify the key people and the organizations who influenced the early stages of college development.
3. College operations: Compile and document key facts and figures about the college during these years related to programs and services; students; employees; finances; and land, facilities and equipment.
4. Problems and challenges: Describe the primary problems and challenges that were faced in the early years of college development.
5. Successes and accomplishments: Describe the major successes and accomplishments of the college.
Research Design and Procedures

The premise of this study is that the history of the college has not been adequately documented. The unit of analysis is one community college, specifically Chandler-Gilbert Community College, and those individuals who operated and governed the college during its first 20 years.

Multiple research designs were considered by the researcher. Ultimately Robert Yin’s rationale for the use of a case study, as described below, influenced the research design and procedures:

The case study relies on many of the same techniques as a history, but it adds two sources of evidence not usually included in the historian’s repertoire: direct observation and systematic interviewing. Again, although case studies and histories can overlap, the case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence—documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations—beyond what might be available in the conventional historical study. (Yin, 1994, p. 8)

Research Methodology

This study is a case study that examines the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College. There is some misunderstanding surrounding case studies because the process of the study is sometimes confused with the unit of study, in this case a single college which is part of a large multi-college district. For the purposes of this case study,
the goal will be to undertake an intensive, holistic description and analysis of Chandler-Gilbert Community College (Patton, 2001).

Chapter 2 provided an overview of the history of community colleges and specifically the Maricopa County Community College District, as well as a literature review of Chandler-Gilbert Community College. Thus, the reader should have a contextual understanding of the environment in which CGCC exists. A case study of CGCC will provide, as Yin indicates, a variety of evidence such as interviews, artifacts, and documents to fully tell the story of the college’s founding and first 20 years of development.

Key themes will be derived during the research process. “Typically, qualitative research findings are in the form of themes, categories, typologies, concepts, tentative hypothesis, even theory, which have been inductively derived from the data” (Merriam, 1998, p. 8). This research will use qualitative findings from interviews, along with quantitative findings from other sources of information to form themes or categories of the primary activities and historical events related to the history of CGCC.

In addition, data in the form of participants’ statements, citations from documents, and excerpts of audiotapes and videotapes will be included to support the findings of the study (Merriam, 1998).

It is not possible to interview everyone who had a role in the founding of the college or in the first 20 years of the college operations. Therefore, sampling procedures have been used.
Population and Sample

Because of the emphasis on in-depth understanding of the founding and first 20 years of operation for Chandler-Gilbert Community College, issues of population and sample are easily defined for the purposes of this study.

The researcher has chosen to do a case study of Chandler-Gilbert Community College for multiple reasons, not the least of which is the potential for better understanding the current status of the college. So CGCC has been chosen as the singular subject of this historical case study. Michael Quinn Patton explains that “information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research” (Patton, 2001, p. 46). For this research, CGCC is the information-rich case from which there is much to be learned.

Within this case study, there are many individuals, organizational units, and groups that contributed to the college’s founding and the first 20 years of operation. In addition, there are dozens of critical incidents and activities that could be described as part of the history of the college. Therefore, purposeful sampling techniques were used to determine who would be interviewed and what sources of information would be consulted. Michael Patton states that the use of judgment in purposeful sampling, which might have been perceived as a weakness in quantitative studies, is a strength in qualitative studies as the goal is to decide the purpose you want interviewees to serve, and then locate them specifically (Patton, 2001).

Because the purpose of this study is to identify primary activities and historical events surrounding the founding and development of the college, the researcher used the
following criteria to determine which individuals would be interviewed, because they were critical players:

- The individual served as one of the founding administrators of the college, that is, the first person to hold the position of chief executive officer (CEO), chief academic officer (CAO), chief student affairs officer (CSAUO), chief financial officer (CFO), or chief information officer (CIO).
- The individual served as one of the founding faculty of the college, that is, the person was hired before fall of 1987, and served for at least five years during the years 1985-2005.
- The individual served as chief executive officer of the college’s parent institution, Mesa Community College, until CGCC became independent of the parent institution.
- The individual served as chief executive officer of the Maricopa County Community College District for at least five years during the years 1985-2005.
- The individual served as a member of the Governing Board for the Maricopa County Community College District for at least 10 years during the timeframe of 1985-2005.
- The individual had direct responsibility for one or more of the programs that garnered national awards or recognition for the college.
- The individual worked in a full-time capacity at CGCC for at least 18 of the first 20 years of the college’s operation.
Interviewing these players is important because they were deeply involved in or influential in the founding and development of the college. The criteria were presented to the MCCCD Human Resources department and the individuals who met the criteria were identified for the researcher.

The first criterion pertained to individuals who served as one of the founding administrators of the college. Five individuals fit that criteria: (1) Arnette Ward, (2) Andy Bernal, (3) Margaret Hogan, (4) Gil Gonzales, and (5) Maria Hesse. Maria Hesse is the researcher and thus was not interviewed. With the exception of the researcher, none of these individuals worked for CGCC at the time of this study, but all agreed to travel to CGCC for interviews.

The second criterion included individuals who served as one of the founding faculty of the college. There were eight people who met this criteria: (1) Charles “Chuck” Bedal, (2) Alice Conkright, (3) Diane Travers, (4) Sandra Stuebner, (5) Yolanda Penley, (6) Wanda Matthews, (7) Gordon Jesse, and (8) Sidney “Sid” Ford. Three of these individuals had retired but agreed to return to the college for an interview (Bedal, Conkright, and Penley), while one who had retired to Florida (Matthews) agreed to be interviewed by phone. Of the four people who still work at CGCC at the time of this study (Travers, Stuebner, Jesse, and Ford), only one declined to be interviewed, Gordon Jesse, due to summer schedule conflicts. Note that several of the participants asked why Mary Alcon, who is considered one of first faculty members, was not interviewed. The Human Resources department determined that she had not worked at CGCC for at least five years and, therefore, did not meet the criterion.
The third criterion included those individuals who served as chief executive officer of the college’s parent institution, Mesa Community College, until CGCC became independent of the parent institution. Two people met this criterion, Dr. Wallace “Wally” Simpson and Dr. Larry Christiansen, and both agreed to be interviewed. Dr. Simpson, who has retired to Minnesota, agreed to conduct a telephone interview, while Dr. Christiansen agreed to meet at the CGCC Pecos Campus for a videotaped interview.

The fourth criterion included those individuals who served as chief executive officer of the Maricopa County Community College District for at least five years during the years 1985-2005. Only one person met this criterion, Dr. Paul Elsner, Chancellor Emeritus of MCCC. There were three other people who had served as Chancellor overlapping these years including Dr. Raul Cardenas, Dr. Fred Gaskin, and Dr. Rufus Glasper, but none had served for five years.

The fifth criterion related to individuals who served as members of the Governing Board for the Maricopa County Community College District for at least 10 years during the timeframe of 1985-2005. Four Board members met this criteria including Mrs. Linda B. Rosenthal, Dr. Don Campbell, Mr. Ed Contreras, and Ms. Nancy Stein, all of whom came for videotaped interviews.

The sixth criterion included those individuals who had direct responsibility for one or more of the programs that garnered national awards or recognition for the college. Based on a review of the college awards and recognitions and the national literature, the following individuals met the criterion: Marybeth Mason, Duane Oakes, Lois Bartholomew, and Maria Hesse for service-learning; Barbara Shovers, Marybeth Mason and Maria Hesse for learning communities; and John Underwood for aviation. Again, the
researcher was eliminated from consideration. The others with the exception of two (Oakes and Underwood) still work at the college and all agreed to be audio and videotaped.

The last criterion included those individuals who had worked at CGCC for at least 18 of the first 20 years of the college’s operation. Four of the residential faculty members identified under the second criterion also met this last criterion (Travers, Stuebner, Jesse, Ford). This was the largest group of interviewees with 10 additional individuals meeting the criterion: Cathy Urbanski, Victor Navarro, Carolyn Sittner, Sharon Flury, Julie Palinsky, Dr. Ana Jarvis, Dr. Brenda Larson, Dr. Robin McCord, Dr. Larry Miller, and David Weaver.

Consideration was given to interviewing community members as well as those people who are identified above. From that broad population, it would have been difficult to pull a meaningful sample for interviewing. Further, most of the community members would have limited knowledge of internal college operations. However, the notion of interviewing community members about the history of the college is something that could be pursued in future research.

Similar to the challenge of determining how to identify the sample for interviewing, there was another challenge. There are many incidents, events, or activities that could be described as part of the history of the college. In order to address the research problem and subproblems, using judgment, the researcher has determined that certain documents and resources will provide the most detailed and holistic information. Coupled with comments from interviews, the researcher will use historical documents to
explain and put into context key elements of the college history. The following criteria were used to determine which incidents, events, or activities would be included:

- Decisions by the Governing Board which resulted in the formation or further development of CGCC.
- Programs or services that received national or district awards or recognition.
- Expenditures exceeding $1 million such as for land and buildings.

Further, events or activities that were mentioned by three or more interviewees will be included. Interview responses will be used throughout to clarify and enhance understanding of incidents, events, or activities that meet the criteria outlined above.

Instrumentation

An interview guide is provided in Appendix J. The interview questions were reviewed by members of the dissertation committee, the Northern Arizona University Institutional Review Board, and one current and one former employee of Chandler-Gilbert Community College to establish face and content validity. Suggestions for improvement were incorporated. The wording was changed on some items as a result of this review process.

The founding Provost and President of CGCC was instrumental in the development of the interview questions for individual interview sessions. To guard against bias, an open-ended format was used. “A truly open-ended question allows the person being interviewed to select from among that person’s full repertoire of possible responses those that are most salient. … [and] permits those being interviewed to take whatever direction and use whatever words they want to express what they have to say”
(Patton, 2001, p. 354). The interview guide outlines the set of questions used in each of
the individual interviews.

Note that several questions ask interviewees to share a story about the college.
“Cognitive scientists have found that stories are more memorable and better support
learning and understanding than nonstory narratives” (Patton, 2001, p. 196). Stories can
describe relationships, provide the sequence of events, explain cause and effect, and
provide insight into other complex elements of the college’s founding and development.
Patton suggests that qualitative inquiry be used to preserve the stories of organizations, as
is the intent of this researcher (Patton, 2001).

Sources of Information

A variety of primary and secondary sources of information were examined.
Primary sources, such as interviews, were conducted as a part of the study. In addition,
interview transcripts from previous interviews with the same subjects were reviewed.
Monthly MCCCD Governing Board minutes were used as secondary sources.

A number of additional sources of information were examined including:

- Accreditation records, self-study reports, and reports of visitation teams from
  the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association
- College catalogs and class schedules, including the automated student
  information system
- College publications and literature, such as newsletters, brochures, and annual
  reports
- Minutes of college meetings
• Correspondence and institutional memorandums
• Budget reports
• Facilities reports, land conveyance documents, and land purchase documents
• Books and journals
• Published documents from national and state organizations
• Newspaper articles.

Data Collection Procedures

Personal interviews were utilized to provide details unavailable in official records, to give deeper perspective to other sources of information, and to record as many recollections as possible.

Interviews were conducted in the spring and summer of 2005 and 2006 by phone and in person. In-person interviews were conducted at the Chandler-Gilbert Community College Pecos Campus. They varied in length from 45-90 minutes, depending on interviewee responses. With the signed consent of participants, interviews were audio-recorded so that a transcription could be prepared. Most interviews were also video-recorded, if interviewees were available in person and allowed videotaping. The researcher took notes during the interview sessions, and these field notes recorded the date, time, and place of the interview as well as the researcher’s reactions to what was heard and observed.

Each interviewee received an advance letter or electronic message explaining the purpose of the study and identifying timelines for components of the process, such as conducting the interviews and reviewing the transcripts. A follow-up letter or message
one week prior to the interview was also provided to each participant. In that document, the interview questions were provided so that participants would have time to reflect upon those items they might want to mention, given that in some cases, many years had passed since the occurrences being discussed. Participants were told of the researcher’s intent to solicit their validation of the transcribed record of his or her interview.

Transcriptions once mailed to the interviewee for review, included another letter with reminders of process and timeframes. Participants were asked to respond to accuracy as well as make stylistic improvements (Stake, 1995). Pre-stamped and addressed envelopes for returning the transcripts were included with those sent via standard mail. In some cases, the transcriptions were sent and received back via electronic mail.

Interviewees were offered a copy of their own interview transcription, as well as a copy of the summary results of the study. Interviewees were also told that a college web site would be made available publicly so that they could read other participant’s transcriptions and gain access to some of the findings from the study.

Every researcher, regardless of the methods employed and the care taken, brings personal preconceptions and interpretation to the case being studied. This researcher has been a long-time employee of Chandler-Gilbert Community College. Credibility issues obligated the researcher to consider the impact of her own personal and professional background and previous interactions with the interviewees and to monitor the possible influence of those factors on the interview results (Patton, 2001). The researcher believes that a neutral environment was created through care and interest in the participants and to
the college being studied. The interviews were structured and conducted with considerable attention towards this goal.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Multiple methods were used for analysis of the collected data. The primary source of data was in-depth individual interviews. The researcher’s inductive exploration for patterns in the data began with multiple readings of the interview transcriptions. Then software made specifically for qualitative data analysis was utilized. The researcher selected winMAX software, which was made available by the Maricopa Center for Learning and Instruction (MCLI) at the Maricopa District Office.

In addition, related documents as previously described, were also reviewed to assist in establishing background information, to identify themes, and to advance triangulation of the data. The use of multiple methods of data analysis is one form of triangulation, a concept defined below:

Denzin used the term triangulation, a term borrowed from navigation and military strategy, to argue for the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon. The concept of triangulation was based on the assumption that any bias inherent in particular data sources, investigator, and method would be neutralized when used in conjunction with other data sources, investigators, and methods. (Creswell, 1994, p. 174)

Denzin and Lincoln explain that “triangulation” is a term used in connection with data analysis where the researcher uses independent measures and sources to verify
conclusions and reduce threats to validity (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). The researcher has used multiple sources of information, along with multiple personal interviews, to achieve the results.

Using the software, categories were designated, then codes were developed and refined, as patterns were identified. By moving back and forth between the transcriptions, the sources of information, and emerging classification system, the researcher “repeatedly reviewed the meaningfulness and appropriateness of the emergent themes and the placement of data in thematic categories” (Pinchon, 1999, p. 73). The quantitative emphasis looked for “the emergence of meaning from the repetition of phenomenon” while the qualitative emphasis looked for “the emergence of meaning in the single instance” (Stake, 1995, p. 76).

The research problem and each subproblem were then addressed using the synthesized data, linked with illustrative text from the individual interviews (see Table 1) and other sources of information (see Table 2), to produce a history of the college, as it pertained to these themes.

Table 1

*Relationship of Interview Subjects to Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Subjects</th>
<th>Significant activities and historical events</th>
<th>People and organizations</th>
<th>Key facts and figures</th>
<th>Problems and challenges</th>
<th>Successes and accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District CEO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College CEO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College administrators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Relationship of Sources of Information to Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Significant activities and historical events</th>
<th>People and organizations</th>
<th>Key facts and figures</th>
<th>Problems and challenges</th>
<th>Successes and accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board minutes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and District records, minutes and correspondence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation records</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College catalogs and class schedules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, journals and published documents</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trustworthiness

To establish the trustworthiness of the study, multiple steps were taken.

Credibility demonstrates “that the inquiry was conducted in such a manner as to ensure that the subject was accurately identified and described” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 192). The researcher has attempted to pursue an in-depth description of the college, clearly establishing the parameters of the setting, describing the population to be interviewed, and showing the complexities and interrelationships of the data gathered. Triangulation of data sources was used to further insure credibility.

The researcher does not claim that the results of this study are generalizable to other colleges and settings. Readers are asked to carefully examine the degree to which
their situation is similar or dissimilar to the college or setting studied. However, the researcher has provided a detailed theoretical framework and showed how data collection and analysis were guided by recognized models of inquiry. Thus the reader can determine whether and how the findings might apply to a different college, a different setting, a different timeframe, or various other circumstances.

Dependability of the research refers to the degree to which the “researcher attempts to account for changing conditions in the phenomenon chosen for study and changes in the design created by an increasingly refined understanding of the setting” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 194). Replication of this study would be problematic given the complexities of the real world and the changes that will transpire between the time of this study and a replication. However, thorough documentation has been provided about design decisions and the rationale for them. Further, collected data are well-organized and retrievable from the college archives at Chandler-Gilbert Community College. In fact, one of the driving forces behind this research effort was to collect and preserve key information related to the history of the college, and, therefore, it will be available for reanalysis by future researchers.

As mentioned previously, the researcher acknowledges that some degree of subjectivity is inevitable, but the researcher has attempted to remain neutral and to provide detailed documentation of the process and the products of this inquiry. The concept of confirmability stresses the “need to ask whether the findings of the study could be confirmed by another” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 194). Transcripts of the interviews, along with audio- and/or video-taped recordings are available in the CGCC archives. The researcher was able to develop an in-depth understanding of and
connection to the research participants, given her current position at the college, assuring them of the value of their accurate, thoughtful responses. A variety of strategies were used for limiting bias in interpretation, including checking and rechecking the data, cross-checking data through multiple sources, and using techniques recommended by professional researchers.

Summary

This case study of Chandler-Gilbert Community College will use interviews and multiple sources of information to respond to the research problem and subproblems. The research design and methods of analysis were described in detail in this chapter. Precautions have been taken to ensure the credibility of the results.
Chapter Four: Findings and Results

This chapter presents the findings and results of the study and includes several sections, each of which address the research problem.

Introduction

A variety of evidence such as interviews, artifacts, and documents are used in this chapter to fully tell the story of the college’s founding and first 20 years of development. Thirty-three (33) individuals were interviewed in person or by telephone. The individuals who were interviewed were chosen based upon criteria established prior to undertaking the research. Hundreds of documents were reviewed to determine which incidents, events, or activities would be included.

Two appendices may be helpful references relative to this chapter. Appendix K provides a short background on each of the interviewees, while Appendix L lists milestones in the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College.

The next part of this chapter is very lengthy. The researcher has used headers to sequentially identify and address each element of the research statement and subproblems. Each header is followed by a quotation that captures the essence of that section. First, there is a chronological historical overview of Chandler-Gilbert Community College, from its inception (the years prior to 1985), through its formation (approximately 1985-1995) and growth (1995-2005). Then each of the subproblems is addressed, including key people and organizations who were instrumental in the founding of the college; information about programs and services; students; employees; finances;
and land, facilities and equipment. Towards the end of the chapter, there are sections on the primary problems and challenges, as well as the major successes and accomplishments.

Inception

With the increased enrollment at Mesa Community College and the phenomenal growth taking place in the southeast portion of Maricopa County (particularly Chandler and Gilbert) it would seem timely to establish another branch of the Maricopa County Community College District in the Gilbert-Chandler area.

(T. Freestone, personal communication, November 8, 1983)

The early history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College is characterized by planning for a land purchase. It is not until the mid-1980’s that programs and buildings to support them were discussed. Documents such as meeting minutes, news articles, and personal communication can be used to trace the progress.

The Maricopa District had been serving the Chandler area since MCC began in 1963. Students from the Chandler and Gilbert school districts were allowed to register at MCC, assuming they could get there. Hinsdale cites examples of District sponsored skills programs that took place in 1968:

… the District assumed the responsibility for five manpower development training (MDTA) programs in the Chandler area. The adult programs were 100% reimbursable and began in May [1968] to train farm equipment operators, stenographers, cooks, nursing assistants, and electrical appliance repairmen. (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 145)
Chandler Mayor George Nader attended a meeting of the MCCCD Governing Board in 1968 to lobby for the development of a “skill center” in Chandler, and the Board indicated their support of this concept (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 151).

By 1972, the request for a center broadened to request that MCC establish a satellite campus near Chandler (Hinsdale, 1973).

A number of years pass before there was documentation of continued momentum, but there were indications that discussions probably continued. Minutes from a State Board meeting reference that planning in earnest for a land purchase began in 1979. In a short timeframe in March, April, and May of 1981, the land for the potential new college is discussed at the MCCCD Governing Board meeting, reviewed by the State Board, and purchased.

Minutes from the MCCCD Governing Board meeting of March 10, 1981, indicated that Alfredo de los Santos spoke about an action item titled, “A Site for the Southeastern Area of Maricopa County” which was prepared by C. B. Smith with Al Flowers (Smith & Flowers, 1981, p. 1). Flowers proposed that the purchase of a Southeast Valley site be recommended to the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges as “a future location for a branch and possible full service campus to serve the southeastern sector of the District” (Smith & Flowers, 1981, p. 1). The justification noted that “there is essentially only one viable site that meets the criteria, is available, and at an acceptable cost” (Smith & Flowers, 1981, p. 1). The 80-acre site was offered at $15,000 per acre for a total cost of $1,200,000. Board member Grant Christensen agreed but reiterated that the recommendation was contingent upon several items, such as:
…that the site be annexed through the City of Chandler; 2. that the 80 acres will continue to be used for farming purposes under negotiations which Mr. Gade will handle; 3. that there will be egress and ingress to the property from the northeast or the northwest; and 4. that the July 1, 1981 deadline for closing might be too inflexible a date if the condition is that the property has to be annexed by the City of Chandler. ("Governing board minutes, March 10, 1981," p. 7)

The minutes show that the “motion carried 5-0” with these amendments ("Governing board minutes, March 10, 1981," p. 7).

Attachments to the Governing Board action item detail the seven sites that were considered for the college. Site 1 was at the southwest corner of McQueen and Warner Roads where 160 acres were undeveloped. Site 2 was 300 acres at the northwest corner of Ray and Cooper Roads which was owned by the Shumway family. Site 3 was 153 acres at the southeast corner of Cooper and Williams Field Road which was then owned by Design Master Homes. Site 4 was 80 acres of a 240 acre parcel one half mile south of Williams Field Road on the north side of Pecos between Cooper and Gilbert Roads. The cost was $15,000 per acre and the contact listed was attorney Max Killian. Site 5 was 65 acres at the southeast corner of Lindsay and Ray Roads at a cost of $13,500 per acre. Site 6 was 60 acres at the southwest corner of Ray and Cooper Roads at a cost of $30,000 per acre. Site 7 was owned by Jack Whiteman of Empire Manufacturing and ran between Alma School on the west to the canal on the east, then from Ocotillo Road on the north to Chandler Heights Road on the south. Arizona Avenue split that property. The
attachments also say that a budget of $8,000-$10,000 per acre was established three years prior but land costs have risen quickly (Smith & Flowers, 1981).

The attachments also provide criteria used to make a site selection including consideration of long-range viability, accessibility, traffic, utilities, drainage, soil conditions, site-preparation costs, cost per acre, proximity to flight patterns from an active airport, general environment, required acreage, overlap of attendance area with an existing college, and future encroachment. It was determined that:

Sites 1 and 2 were deemed to be too close to the Mesa Community College campus. Site #6 was also too close and also too small. Site #5 could not be assured utilities and Site #3 has since undergone residential and commercial development. Site #4 most favorably meets the criteria and is essentially the only site available in an appropriate location with access to utilities. (Smith & Flowers, 1981, p. 6)

MCCCD Chancellor Paul Elsner recounted his thinking about the land purchase on Pecos Road during an interview in the summer of 2005:

…well a friend of mine, kind of a political advisor, said if you’re going to buy any land out there, go see Ed Robson and Eddie Basha because they know that area more than anybody and that’s why I met with them, way back, real early. I don’t know if we ever talked about this particular site [the CGCC Pecos Campus] at that time, but they generally agreed that you can't miss, because this whole development out here will go all the way out to the San Tan Mountains. Then when I saw the San Tan Freeway on the map and all of the other, … So the general view was that land will not
be available, and if you don’t take it early, and we got our land very cheaply as you probably know. Can you imagine $8,500 [per acre]? I don’t know what we paid for this land, I can’t remember, but it was very low by the market. If we’d have waited three to five years, it would have shot up to $40, $50,000 an acre and then we are way out of the market now, we wouldn’t even come near this land. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Minutes from the State Board meeting on April 25, 1981, indicate that planning for a college site in Chandler began in 1979. An attachment to the meeting minutes states “The State Board, at its meeting of March 17, 1979, ‘approved in concept’ the Maricopa County Community College District’s expansion program” but notes, “they approved the acquisition of unspecified sites for unspecified educational purposes” ("Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges minutes, April 25, 1981," 1981, p. 4). In the meeting minutes, the Chairman of the Facilities Committee for the State Board, Mr. Prochnow, reported that the Facilities Committee and the Facilities Advisory Council had met and “approved Maricopa District’s request to purchase 80 acres located one-half mile south of Williams Field Road on the north side of Pecos Road between Cooper and Gilbert Roads for a future site.” However, some contingencies were noted including “(a) that the property be annexed to the City of Chandler and (b) that ingress and egress to the north side of the property be guaranteed by the seller”("Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges minutes, April 25, 1981," 1981, p. 4).
The land was purchased on July 15, 1981, “according to Title Company papers” (J. Rassbach, personal communication, April 18, 1985); however, the development of the campus did not occur for several more years.

Initially District consultants had suggested that of the proposed three new campus sites around the periphery of the county, the westside campus (which eventually became Estrella Mountain Community College) be developed first, then the southeast campus (which eventually became Chandler-Gilbert Community College) would be developed, and lastly the northside campus (which eventually became Paradise Valley Community College) would be developed. Due to the overcrowding at MCC, Chancellor Elsner surmised the Chandler site ought to be developed first (Felnagle, 2000).

However, at a work session of the MCCCD Governing Board on November 23, 1982, it is noted that “the Community College Task Force of the Paradise Valley Community Council, made a presentation to the Board requesting the establishment of a campus in the Paradise Valley area north of Phoenix” ("Governing board minutes, November 23, 1982," p. 1). The task force chair Beth Koehnemann asked the Board to consider recent growth in north Phoenix and “give Paradise Valley priority over the Chandler and Litchfield Park areas” and other community leaders voiced their support as well, including the past president of the Paradise Valley United Parent Council, the president of the Paradise Valley Principal’s Association, a representative from a hospital, an attorney, and several elected officials ("Governing board minutes, November 23, 1982," p. 2).

Almost a year following the Paradise Valley presentation, community leaders from the Southeast Valley began to realize that they too would need to lobby the Board
regarding their community’s needs. In the fall of 1983, numerous community leaders from Chandler and Gilbert began lobbying the Chancellor and the Board of the Maricopa County Community College District to proceed with the establishment of a branch campus as soon as possible.

Jim Patterson, the Mayor of Chandler at the time, wrote to Chancellor Paul Elsner urging “a very serious look at locating as soon as possible on the site in east Chandler for the possible occupancy of the San Tan Community College.” Patterson cited population figures, saying “the 1980 census count was about 29,000 - today we approximate about 45,000. We are looking for the population to be about 85,000 by 1985 and by 1990 100,000, which is verified by Maricopa Association of Governments studies” (J. Patterson, personal communication, September 2, 1983).

Others also felt that the population of the Southeast Valley warranted the establishment of a branch campus. Tom Freestone, Supervisor, District I, of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors wrote to Patterson, the Mayor of Chandler, stating, “With the increased enrollment at Mesa Community College and the phenomenal growth taking place in the southeast portion of Maricopa County (particularly Chandler and Gilbert), it would seem timely to establish another branch of the Maricopa County Community College District in the Gilbert-Chandler area” (T. Freestone, personal communication, November 8, 1983). L. J. Reed, the Mayor of the Town of Gilbert, wrote to Chancellor Elsner to explain Gilbert’s growth:

According to the 1980 census, we had a population of 5,717. Our current estimated population is 7,000. The Town has recently approved two large housing projects; one with 3,200 living units and the other with 2,600
units. Both of these projects will break ground this January and are projecting a five year build out. In terms of population, these projects alone will add at least 18,000 to 25,000 people. Moreover, many other developers are in various discussion stages with the Town for additional moderate to large developments. (L.J. Reed, personal communication, September 6, 1983)

The Mayor concluded, “We are hopeful that you and the Board will give serious study to opening the new Southeast Valley campus at the earliest possible date” (L.J. Reed, personal communication, September 6, 1983).

Others cited the overcrowding at Mesa Community College as a reason for the establishment of a branch campus. The School Board for the Chandler Unified School District wrote to Maricopa Chancellor Paul Elsner to express:

… concern about the scheduled beginning date of a community college on the proposed site in Chandler. As you are well aware, the Mesa Community College enrollment has grown beyond their ability to serve our students. Approximately 230 of our graduating seniors enroll at the Mesa facility each year and that number is increased by an undetermined but larger group from the adult population. These numbers, plus enrollment from Gilbert School District, the Gilbert community, Queen Creek, Higley, Combs, Chandler Heights and Williams Air Force Base suggest that a real need exists in the area. (A. M. Jacobson, personal communication, September 1, 1983)
The Mayor of Gilbert was also “deeply concerned about the existing overcrowded conditions at Mesa Community College,” noting “Mesa Community College is at its ultimate capacity” (L.J. Reed, personal communication, September 6, 1983).

Newspaper articles from the period, summarized meetings between Chandler residents, the Chancellor and the Mesa Community College (MCC) President Theo Heap. The Chandler Arizonan reported that Dwight Patterson, a Chandler resident and former member of the MCCCD Board, met with Elsner and Heap in a closed door session at MCC. “Heap said the men would be looking at MCC’s enrollment growth and would start planning for a possible campus in the Chandler area—possibly six miles east of the Mesa campus” ("Educators discuss community college for Chandler," 1983, p. 1). Heap added that “We don’t have a bad situation in terms of access (to MCC) … And we still have room to grow on this campus. But it’s a question of how big you think a community college should go” ("Educators discuss community college for Chandler," 1983, p. 1). The newspaper staff reporter stated Elsner had “received letters from the school superintendents, including Chandler Unified School District Superintendent James T. Perry, and the mayors of Chandler and Gilbert” ("Educators discuss community college for Chandler," 1983, p. 1). Heap told the reporter land was purchased on Pecos Road two miles east of Chandler (at that time) and was “originally planned to be used in six or seven years when MCC’s enrollment reached 25,000 students” ("Educators discuss community college for Chandler," 1983, p. 1).

An article published the following day said that Elsner issued a brief statement following that meeting. He stated, “We have decided it would be good to have a board presentation by the communities expressing interest in it” (Weathers, 1983, p. 1). Sunny
Weathers, the reporter, mentions MCC’s 1983 enrollment as being 16,000 and that MCC “cannot continue to accommodate all the students coming from Chandler and Gilbert” (Weathers, 1983, p. 1). Dwight Patterson explained that “the district has always built new colleges no less than 10 miles from existing facilities” (Weathers, 1983, p. 1). The concept of service area will be examined later in this chapter.

By November of the same year the Chandler Chamber of Commerce added another rationale for the quick establishment of the college. Karl S. Cayford, Executive Vice President of the Chandler Chamber, wrote to Chancellor Elsner saying, “At their recent meeting, the Board of Directors of the Chandler Chamber of Commerce enthusiastically endorsed current efforts to establish the Chandler campus and pledged the support of the Chamber of Commerce toward those efforts” (K.S. Cayford, personal communication, November 2, 1983). Their primary interest was support for workforce training programs, as well as the amenities a college would bring, adding to the quality of community life. “Further development of our high technology industry in the area will be affected very positively by the establishment of our own community college. The social and cultural activities generated by a community college would be a definite plus in our community” (K.S. Cayford, personal communication, November 2, 1983).

Community officials continued to push for a faster response from the Maricopa Colleges. A newspaper article published in The Chandler Arizonan (no longer published) on November 21, 1983, quoted Chandler Mayor Jim Patterson saying, “We would like to have them start this branch campus now. They originally planned this for 1988, and now it’s planned for 1986. We’d like to see them start now” (Herrmann, 1983, p. 1). Chandler and Gilbert officials, including Mayor Patterson, Chandler City Manager Hal
Schilling, Gilbert Assistant Town Manager Rich Oesterle, and Gilbert School Board member Don Skousen were scheduled to meet with the MCCCD Governing Board the following Tuesday. “The city representatives were asked to make a formal presentation supporting the need for the school after community college leaders met Sept. 20 to begin discussions about building the campus” (Herrmann, 1983, p. 1).

These developments in the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix parallel the founding of community colleges around the country:

… the driving force behind a new junior college was a city’s civic and commercial leadership. While the motivations of these leaders were complex and varied, the strongest was a desire to establish a community’s commercial and cultural leadership within a large, primarily agricultural region. In these cities, the establishment of a junior college was not an isolated event, but an integral part of a general strategy to achieve regional leadership by replicating the full range of those institutions generally associated with civic life: a comprehensive high school, a library, a hospital, a courthouse, and a college. (R. T. Pedersen, 1997, p. 502)

This researcher believes part of the rationale for seeking the construction of a branch campus at this point in time might also have been the likelihood that the Maricopa County Community College District would hold a bond election to purchase land and construct buildings to support student enrollment growth. James Sossaman, Majority Whip of the Arizona House of Representatives, wrote to the Maricopa Colleges Governing Board to add “support to the efforts of the people of the East Valley, in their attempt to obtain a community college branch campus in the Chandler-Gilbert area. …
As a legislator I am well aware of the funding problems, but encourage you to reserve a part of the available funds as a high priority for the East Side” (J. J. Sossaman, personal communication, November 10, 1983).

At the November 22, 1983, meeting of the Governing Board, a group of community leaders from Chandler and Gilbert lobbied the Chancellor and the Board members to proceed with the establishment of a Southeast Valley site as soon as possible. Community leaders that were present included Dwight Patterson, former MCCCD Board member; James Sossaman, Arizona House of Representatives; Tom Freestone, Maricopa County Board of Supervisors; Ann Marie Jacobson, President of the Chandler Unified School District Governing Board; Karl Cayford, Executive Director of the Chandler Chamber of Commerce; Jim Patterson, Mayor of the City of Chandler; Hal Schilling, Chandler City Manager; Ted Perry, Superintendent of the Chandler Unified School District; Rich Oesterle, Assistant City Manager of the Town of Gilbert; and Don Skousen, Gilbert Unified School District Governing Board ("Governing board minutes, November 22, 1983," pp. 1-2).

Hal Schilling, the Chandler City Manager, spoke to the industrialization of Chandler including the Motorola and Intel plants. Ted Perry, the Chandler Schools Superintendent, stated that “50% of their graduating seniors enroll at Mesa Community College” and they anticipated student enrollment to nearly double from 7,200 to 14,000 within five years ("Governing board minutes, November 22, 1983," p. 2). The Gilbert assistant city manager, Rich Oesterle, said that currently there were 2,012 homes in Gilbert and within another two months construction would begin on another 7,000 homes. Don Skousen from the Gilbert School Board said they anticipated needing two
more high schools in the near future and nearly half of the current Gilbert high school graduates enroll at Mesa Community College. Jim Patterson closed the presentation with a pledge to do anything “within his power to aid in this effort” to develop the college site in the Southeast Valley ("Governing board minutes, November 22, 1983," p. 3).

Don Campbell, a new member of the MCCCD Governing Board at the time, asked if the community leaders felt that an education center would be acceptable, as opposed to a full-service campus. “Mayor Patterson replied they would be willing to start with whatever is available with a view to progressing to a full service campus as growth warrants it” ("Governing board minutes, November 22, 1983," p. 3). Following the presentation Dr. Elsner indicated that he would establish a task force, similar to the one that was established to look at the feasibility of a Paradise Valley campus, for the Southeast Valley request.

At the January 17, 1984, meeting of the MCCCD Governing Board the population projections for the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix were reviewed. The source of the data was the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Approved Population Projections for Maricopa County, 1985-2005. Charts showed that Chandler would increase its population in 1985 to 57,000; in 1995 to 114,000; and in 2005 to 180,000; while Gilbert would increase by 1985 to 16,000; in 1995 to 43,000; and in 2005 to 70,000. It was acknowledged that parts of the population growth are in unincorporated areas of the county and that parts of Chandler and Gilbert were outside of the anticipated service area. Therefore, the total estimated population to be served would be approximately 179,400 by 2005 (Svaco & Day, 1984). Interestingly, at the time of this research in 2005-2006, the self-reported population of Chandler was 240,267 (Chandler
population demographics, 2005) and of Gilbert was 177,400 (Gilbert population characteristics, community profile, 2005).

The task force that Dr. Elsner established was co-chaired by MCCCD Governing Board member Grant Christensen, who was elected from the East Valley portion of the county, and Theo Heap, the former president of Mesa Community College. The group met on May 21, 1984, at Mesa Community College. In attendance were Ron Ballard, Grant Christensen, Mary Day, Dorothy Elledge, Theo Heap, William Holt, Barbara Knox, Milt Lee, Coy Payne, Ted Perry, Clyde Sharp, Don Skousen, Sue Sossaman, Barbara Thelander and Jack Whiteman ("Chandler/Gilbert area task force meeting, May 21, 1984," p. 1).

The meeting was called to order by Grant Christensen, Dr. Wallace Simpson, MCC’s current President was introduced, and then the meeting was turned over to past President of MCC, Theo Heap. He indicated that subcommittees had been asked to convene earlier in the spring and should be prepared to present their reports. Jack Whiteman’s group suggested that “[w]e should avoid the temptation of ‘another’ community college in the tradition of the present existing schools. There is a demonstrated need for a community college in the East Valley area – that is completely oriented to the vocational/technical needs of present and future employment” ("Chandler/Gilbert area task force meeting, May 21, 1984," p. 1). Sue Sossaman chaired the community and cultural services subcommittee which reported that lifelong learning opportunities might be offered in areas such as “Indian culture, mini-farming, water use and information on the CAP [Central Arizona Project]. It was also noted that the East Valley Repertory Theatre is in need of a facility for their productions; a Chandler
Community Choir would probably be formed again if a meeting place could be found” ("Chandler/Gilbert area task force meeting, May 21, 1984," p. 3). Sue Sossaman also noted that she had received “numerous calls” asking if public meetings would be held to discuss what might be offered at the new college, “both academically and culturally” ("Chandler/Gilbert area task force meeting, May 21, 1984," p. 3).

It was agreed that the subcommittee chairs would need to meet again on June 11. In the meantime, Theo Heap would meet with the subcommittee chairs to help prepare their reports for the MCCCD Governing Board. They agreed that the full committee along with “as many people as we can get to attend” should be present at the study session of the Board scheduled for June 26 ("Chandler/Gilbert area task force meeting, May 21, 1984," p. 7).

The task force, which became known as the Southeast Valley Task Force, reported on their work at the June 26, 1984, meeting of the Governing Board. The task force, which had more than 30 members, had been divided into subcommittees including programs and services, vocational/technical programs, and finances ("Governing board minutes, June 26, 1984," p. 2).

Jack Whiteman, Milt Lee, and James Chalmers spoke about vocational/technical programs. Their recommendation was that “any campus in the east valley area be limited to vocational and technical programs” and that the campus “offer non-transferrable certificates in comprehensive technical areas” ("Governing board minutes, June 26, 1984," p. 3). Further, they recommended that “any students wishing a general academic education could attend Mesa Community College” ("Governing board minutes, June 26, 1984," p. 3).
Bill Holt, Sue Sossaman, and Coy Payne spoke about their subcommittee’s recommendations on programs and services concluding with “their consensus that the east valley area would be better served with a comprehensive academic program than a limited technologically oriented program” and that “a strong transfer program and the cultural activities such programs generate are essential to serve the citizens of the area” ("Governing board minutes, June 26, 1984," p. 3). They thought that a full range of programs and services including specifically mentioned items such as “women’s programs, adult programs, and minority programs” should be offered ("Governing board minutes, June 26, 1984," p. 3).

The minutes of the meeting indicate that upon asking for comments from the audience that “several individuals spoke in favor of a comprehensive academic program for the proposed college rather than limiting it to a vocational/technical program” ("Governing board minutes, June 26, 1984," p. 3).

Alton Riggs spoke directly to the Board about adequate financing of the initial facilities, “requesting that the Board consider increasing the amount allocated for an east valley campus from $5 million to $12 million” ("Governing board minutes, June 26, 1984," p. 3).

Dr. Elsner explained how he planned to fund the potential expansion. He proposed “a capital development program in the amount of $149,000,000,” part of which would be funded by a general obligation bond issue of $75,000,000 and the remainder of which would be funded through revenue bonds, state funding to the district, and contingency funds ("Governing board minutes, June 26, 1984," p. 2).
That next fall a successful bond election was passed providing funding for the initial buildings of the Chandler-Gilbert and Paradise Valley educational centers, as well as purchasing land in northeast Mesa and the northwest valley for future expansion (Felnagle, 2000). The Tribune newspaper indicates that funding for facilities construction had been designated specifically for a Chandler/Gilbert site. Staff writer Maren S. Bingham reported in the September 1, 1984, Metro Mesa section:

If approved Sept. 25, about $10 million of the bond issue would fund expansion and remodeling at Mesa Community College, including classroom buildings, a new child care center, a new mechanical plant and remodeling of the student center. Another $3 million would fund construction of the Chandler/Gilbert campus, which would be located on 80 acres the District already owns near Pecos and Gilbert roads. The campus eventually would become a separate, autonomous college. ("1985 Reorganization Update," 1985, p. 25)

Interestingly, the Tadlock Associates, Inc. report that Chancellor Elsner had commissioned recommended that a minimum of $14,500,000 be set aside for the initial development of new campuses. They figured in 1977 dollars to develop a new campus that would eventually be able to support 2,000 day FTSE, would cost approximately $10 million for 200,000 GSF of facilities, $1 million for 80 acres of land at $12,500 per acre, $1 million for site development and contingencies, and $2.5 million for furniture and equipment (Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000, 1978).
Shortly after the successful bond election, Mesa Community College actually began planning for the new extension campus. An editorial in *The Tribune* newspaper on March 6, 1985, spoke about MCC’s plan for meeting the pressures of enrollment growth. “MCC is meeting the growing demand by expanding its physical plant and its course offerings. It also is preparing to open the new Chandler campus, first in a temporary site and later at a new campus in southeast Chandler” ("1985 Reorganization Update," 1985, p. 30). The initial CGCC facility was approximately 62,000 GSF or approximately one-third of what the *Long Range Master Plan* had recommended.

Nationally during this timeframe of 1980 to 1985, there was a decline in the number of community colleges from 1,231 to 1,222 (see Appendix A). However, in metropolitan Phoenix, the population was growing, therefore so was the Maricopa County Community College District.

*Formation*

*When we start institutions it is just like blood.*

*It is so close to us; it is just like a child.*

(A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Following the successful bond election in 1984, Mesa Community College began planning for its expansion in the Southeast Valley.

*Organization and Planning*

On March 2, 1984, 50 leaders from MCC met with college president, Dr. Wallace Simpson, to discuss the state of MCC. This group of employees made recommendations
which resulted in the creation of six task forces. One of those task forces was charged with making recommendations about the administrative structures, including a proposal about the administrative oversight of a center which would eventually become CGCC. Fifteen college-wide objectives were identified to “promote continued success at MCC” and one of those was to “create a task force of appropriate MCC personnel to advise the president on the development of MCC Chandler/Gilbert Extension Campus” (*In transition*, 1984, p. 4). MCC President Wally Simpson remembered, “… there was a task force of faculty and several administrators. Arnette Ward was Dean of Students at MCC at that time and served on that task force” (W. Simpson, June 28, 2006).

In Attachment 2 of that report, a structure was recommended whereby the extension site would have its own “on-site Chief Executive Officer who would serve as a member of the MCC administrative staff. This individual, whose title could be determined later, would report to MCC’s President and be at an administrative level equivalent to that of the resident deans” (*In transition*, 1984, p. 15). Dr. Simpson described the significance of that recommendation, which he accepted:

I know that the recommendation of the task force, as I look back on it, was really very interesting because from its inception the Chandler-Gilbert Extension Center would be under the direction of an on-site chief executive officer. I thought that was rather exceptional, that this task force recommended and I accepted that recommendation. That person then would report to the MCC President and serve as a member of MCC’s administrative staff with an administrative rank or level equivalent to the Dean’s. I think that was a major force in starting out, by putting the focus
on the new campus. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

It was recommended that two directors be hired to support the center’s CEO, one to supervise student and administrative services functions and the other to develop instructional programs and to handle community relations. “Such an approach would allow the campus, when it becomes independent, to move into an administrative structure with a president and two deans. Appropriate coordinators and directors could then be added in response to growth, thereby lending flexibility and perhaps affecting some savings in administrative costs” (In transition, 1984, p. 15).

This report stated that studies of the Southeast Valley indicated that the new campus would become “heavily involved in technical programs” and that “consideration should be given to filling the second position with someone who has a strong background in occupational/technical education” (In transition, 1984, p. 15). The report recommended “that an on-going task force of appropriate academic and occupational faculty be maintained to provide guidance for the instructional program” (In transition, 1984, p. 15). This structure would require close coordination between the extension site faculty and staff and the MCC faculty and staff. The report stated:

Directors and faculty will necessarily have two lines of reporting responsibility while the site operates as an extension. In addition to the obvious line of responsibilities at the local site, all programs, services, and classes will need to be coordinated with the appropriate areas and disciplines on the home campus. This will help to insure quality and
physical compatibility of records, services, and instruction. (In transition, 1984, p. 15)

On the heels of these recommendations, Arnette Ward (Figure 9) was hired as the founding provost of the new educational center. Ms. Ward had served as the chief student affairs officer (CSAO) titled Dean of Students at MCC just prior to her selection to this post. As recounted in an interview held in the summer of 2005, she was aware of the unique opportunity to build a college from the ground up. “I realized there were not too many colleges being built at the time. In fact, I was reminded of that fact by Paul [Elsner], a lot. From the ground, from sand, from everything, that we were building a college, an institution that would last for the duration” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

Figure 9. Arnette Ward, founding Provost of Chandler-Gilbert Education Center, an extension of Mesa Community College.

“Andy Bernal was named an assistant provost, effective March 28 [1985], and Margaret Haddad [last name later changed to Hogan] was approved for the other assistant
provost position, effective July 1” ("Board ok's MCC Seton site, assistant provosts," 1985, p.1). Arnette Ward’s report of the first year, confirms that during the spring of 1985 hiring was a priority. She states that “a provost and two assistant provosts (Figure 10), and one administrative aide were appointed to begin the initial preparations for the Chandler/Gilbert Education Center, an extension to Mesa Community College” (Ward, 1986, p. 6).

![Figure 10. Arnette Ward, Provost (seated, lower left); Andy Bernal, Assistant Provost (standing); and Margaret Hogan, Assistant Provost (seated, right).](image)

Andy Bernal recalled the hectic pace at which they approached their tasks with support from colleagues at Mesa Community College:
… when we first started developing the ed specs [building plans] for the college. We didn’t have any faculty yet; it was just three of us [Arnette, Margaret and Andy]. So we had to enlist the help of the faculty from Mesa Community College to help with the ed specifications. Then also we only had about 30 days to do that in. And at the same time we had to develop a schedule of classes and get the schedule out to the community so that we could generate enrollment for this campus. And at the same time we were doing that, we were remodeling the old Seton High School…. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Margaret Hogan recalled, “Andy and I are fond of talking about this, but we spent more time together than we did with our spouses in those early days. You worked around the clock and you had pizza delivered in so that you could keep going” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

The initial organizational chart for Chandler-Gilbert Education Center (CGEC) showed Provost Arnette Ward reporting to the President of MCC, Wallace Simpson. Under Provost Ward were the two Assistant Provosts, Andy Bernal and Margaret Haddad, whose last name later changed to Hogan. Three faculty members were identified: Mary Alcon Young in business, Charles Bedal in mathematics, and Alice Conkright in English and learning resources. The Provost’s secretary was identified as Cathy Pierce, whose last name later changed to Urbanski, and a marketing and public relations manager was Felice Data (Ward, 1986, p. 14). This small group had multiple tasks to accomplish in the first 12 months including:
Identification of temporary facilities for classrooms and office space, 2.

Purchase of furniture and equipment, 3. Development of the fall class schedule, 4. Appointment of full-time and part-time faculty and staff, 5. Preparing facilities to accommodate the students for the fall program, 6. Recruitment of fall semester enrollment of 500-800 students (200 FTSE), 7. Development of the Master Plan Proposal and the educational specifications for the Center, 8. Development of the goals and objectives for the 1985-1986 school year, 9. Establishing linkages with the Chandler and Gilbert communities, 10. Establishing a campus advisory council to provide community input in the development of the campus. (Ward, 1986, pp. 6-7)

Arnette Ward credited the success in accomplishing these goals to “the outstanding teamwork and efforts of the C/GEC faculty and staff, the commitment and support of President Simpson and the Mesa Community College faculty and staff, and the continued support from the District Office, the sister campuses, and community volunteers” (Ward, 1986, p. 7).

In an MCC report approximately one year after the 1984 In Transition document, a memo from Jean S. Born, MCC Faculty Senate President, spoke to the progress of the task force that was to provide oversight for the CGEC curriculum. “This group was formed with several faculty participants and met with Provost Ward in a planning session. I believe she has met with many of them separately for discussions of particular concerns. Some additional group discussions may be advisable for the advantages gained by the interactions of different viewpoints” ("1985 Reorganization Update," 1985, p. 17).
A priority for some members of the Southeast Valley Task Force had been the establishment of vocational/technical programs, so at the same time that the CGEC curriculum was being established, MCC was working with local school districts to address that angle of programming. “Efforts by the Occupational Dean, Kenneth Schultz, have been successful in creating consortial agreements with the Mesa, Tempe, Chandler and Gilbert School Districts to offer technical programs minimizing duplication and maximizing shared facilities” ("1985 Reorganization Update," 1985, p. 6). Interestingly, the programs established during this timeframe in Chandler and Gilbert were not later turned over to Chandler-Gilbert Community College, but rather retained at Mesa Community College. This presence of Mesa Community College in the new college’s service area would cause strained relations between the two colleges over the years, as detailed later in this chapter.

In the area of continuing education, MCC expanded its efforts for community agencies, retired citizens, and business firms. “An example is a request to Dean Johansen in Continuing Education from Sun Lakes Retirement Village for training and refresher courses in EMT” ("1985 Reorganization Update," 1985, p. 7).

As planning continued, in the 1986-1987 year the CGEC budget was doubled to $1,200,000 to provide for a projected enrollment of 1500 students (300 FTSE). Additional employees included Yolanda Penley, business and computers, Wanda Matthews in reading, Diane Travers in speech communications and Gordon Jesse in theatre, while on the staff side Carolyn Sittner became the fiscal officer and David Coryell became the admissions and records technician (Ward, 1986, p. 15).
Following the 1987-1988 academic year, MCC’s President Wallace “Wally” Simpson accepted a new position as President of Olympic College in Bremerton, Washington. William “Bill” Holt, the former Dean of Instruction at MCC was appointed as interim President and served for several months before a new President, Dr. Larry Christiansen, was selected. The organization chart for 1988 showed that Provost Arnette Ward had a direct reporting relationship to MCC’s interim President William (Bill) Holt ("Strategic plan, 1988-89," 1988, p. 49), and then later to President Christiansen. More information about Drs. Simpson and Christiansen and their leadership at Chandler-Gilbert is provided later in this chapter.

MCC’s strategic plan for 1988-1989 provided only a brief comment about the “MCC Chandler-Gilbert Extension Center” ("Strategic plan, 1988-89," 1988, p. 2). During this timeframe, the staff at Chandler-Gilbert were working on revising the facilities master plan with the architectural firm of Smith, Hinchman & Grylls/Southwest, Inc. The resulting report explained that:

The District plans to submit a bond issue to the voters in 1992 in order to fund construction required on all the campuses as outlined in the Master Plans. Chandler-Gilbert Community College (CGCC) has an existing Master Plan that was completed in 1985. It was based on population projections that have been found to be much lower than actual population growth. The goal of this effort was to revise the existing Master Plan to accommodate the educational requirements of the revised population projected for the Year 2005, while maintaining the organizational and
massing concepts of the original Master Plan. (Slattery, Imirzian, & Maes, 1989, p. 1)

The hiring of employees, structuring of the new organization, and planning for facilities were important in the first two years, but just as important was the establishment of the college culture and educational philosophy. By the end of the first year of operations, the initial employees had an idea about the environment they wanted to create and they documented their aims:

1. To create a caring community and student-centered educational environment; 2. To provide a challenging, creative environment through modern architecture, educational programming and technology; 3. To keep the community informed about and involved in the programs and services of the educational center; 4. To recruit students not normally attracted to college and provide a developmental program and curriculum to meet the variety of needs presented; 5. To encourage student development of goals; to assist with student development of personal, academic and career plans, and to monitor and support their achievement; 6. To provide a system and an environment that encourages student success; 7. To provide students with excellence in teaching and access to learning resources, including hardware and software; 8. To provide a quality academic program leading to associate and baccalaureate degrees; 9. To provide state-of-the-art career training in vocational and technical areas, in response to community needs, and leading to certificates, associate and baccalaureate degrees; 10. To meet the training needs of the high technology industries; 11. To
accommodate adult, life-long educational needs for personal and career development through classes, flexible scheduling, and convenient means for accessing information; 12. To provide service programs of interest to community groups; 13. To provide efficient and timely information and management services for students and the community, using computer systems and telecommunications networks; 14. To provide a comprehensive program of co-curricular activities; 15. To inspire student achievement of excellence in their chosen field and avocational activities.

(Ward, 1986, pp. 4-5)

The next sections of this chapter describe life at the temporary facilities that were used for the first two years of operations, the move onto the Pecos Campus, the transitions that took place in naming the college, the independent accreditation of the college, and the first graduation.

Temporary Facilities, Education Center

The Provost and two Assistant Provosts proposed the use of temporary facilities at the former Seton Catholic High School, located in Chandler at 304 East Chandler Boulevard (also called Williams Field Road) just east of Arizona Avenue. “In order to coordinate the development of the C/G Center, Seton Hall needs to be set up as a kind of beta site. The site will serve as a base of operations for the development team, and a place where faculty, students and community members can be oriented to the project” (Ward, Haddad, & Bernal, 1985, p. 17).
The facility contained four classrooms and a few spaces which could be used as administrative and faculty offices. Governing Board member Linda Rosenthal described Chandler-Gilbert’s first location as “a pretty dismal place” (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005). Andy Bernal, who was the Assistant Provost at the time, recalled:

I have fond memories of being here [the Pecos Campus], but I also have fond memories of being at the Chandler Education Center, because that was a real challenge, a very big challenge to get that place ready because when we first went to look at that place it was burnt out. And this was like in May, and we had to get ready by August, and they had to go in there and renovate this place. And it was very, very difficult. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Enrollment was strong in the first semester and the Arizona Republic reported:

After only five months in existence, the Chandler-Gilbert Education Center already has 1,000 students. “It’s a wonderful surprise,” said Margaret Haddad [Hogan], assistant provost of the budding community college. “We’ve already outgrown the space we’re leasing” at the former Seton High School and Willis Junior High School. (Walsh, 1986)

After several more employees were hired in 1986, there was a need for more space. An abandoned home was rented down the street from the classroom building for faculty offices. “The other thing I remember is that we rented a house down the street from the center, for our faculty, and that there were faculty offices there” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005). Conditions were less than ideal. Sharon Flury,
who was initially hired as an office coordinator for the assistant provosts and then later became the college curriculum coordinator, recalled, “I was one of the employees that started out at the old Seton High School location. I had a table for a desk and a cardboard box for a file and this little itty bitty [Macintosh] computer” (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005). Flury continued:

There were a few of us that had the opportunity to be housed in the faculty offices down the street from Seton. It immediately became apparent why the faculty were never in the faculty offices because it was dreadful. There was some animal that had died either under the floor boards or in the walls and when you walked in in the morning it was an olfactory experience. So there were several of us housed there including both of the assistant provosts. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

The faculty and staff had a wide variety of duties. Sharon Flury explained that in addition to serving as the primary support for two Assistant Provosts, because there was little support for the other managers and faculty, she helped others and they in turn had a broad range of responsibilities. “I actually did more work for Gil Gonzalez who was the Learning Resource Director and worked for the Library, did media services, was expected to run a video camera of all things—wore many different hats. I started doing the payroll audits and shared space with Sandra Stuebner, who was our counselor and psychology instructor” (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

The pace was very hectic. In fact, Andy Bernal recalled that “it was very, very hectic” and “stressful” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005). Gil Gonzales who was the first chief information officer (CIO) for the college confirmed that “we
really did run around with our hair on fire for four or five years” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

Diane Travers, a faculty member who was hired to teach communications in 1986, fondly recalled that the crowded conditions actually worked to create a sense of community:

I remember all of us could meet in one small room. And actually there was a picnic table outside in the parking lot and that was the employee lounge. That was everything, the meeting place, and so it was really nice how we had that small area to network with, to meet with students, to have official or non-official meetings. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

Wanda Matthews, who was hired to teach reading in 1986, described the day-to-day interaction that characterized the temporary site at the former Seton school site and then carried over to the Pecos Campus:

I can go back to the Seton Hall Campus. The temporary headquarters for Chandler had picnic benches, and students and teachers and instructors would congregate and, of course, the Provost, the Assistant Provosts, we would all congregate on these one or two picnic tables and have friendly, lively conversations, either about learning, what was taking place in the classroom, or just life in general, where when we switched over to the main campus, since we didn’t have a student union-type building, the courtyard was the hull of these little friendly chit-chats with students and
with my colleagues. And all of that was really quite exciting. (W. Matthews, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

While classes were being taught at the temporary facilities, the first phase of the facilities master plan was under construction at the Pecos Campus.

Construction of the Pecos Campus

Ken Schultz, MCC Occupational Dean, had had success with construction projects at the Southern and Dobson campus of MCC and therefore was tapped to provide leadership for MCC’s construction projects as a result of the passage of the 1984 bond election. “His success on that construction project placed him in the ‘enviable’ position of being the dean assigned to facilitate and coordinate the construction projects for the total college campus and for Chandler/Gilbert. He created a team and developed a time schedule for educational specifications and for specific assignments for team members” ("1985 Reorganization Update," 1985, p. 12).

Construction was initiated in August of 1986, after Westbrook Construction Company was awarded the contract in July 1986. The Chandler Independent newspaper gloated:

The 1978 predictions by a consultant that a community college wouldn’t be needed in the southeast valley until 1995 seem laughable today as Chandler and Gilbert prepare to break ground Thursday for the new campus of the Chandler-Gilbert Education Center. … Booming growth in the area has surprised planners of the last decade and made their predictions obsolete. (Thomas, 1986, p. 1)
A groundbreaking ceremony was scheduled after site preparations had already begun on Thursday, September 25, 1986, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the campus site (Ward, 1986, p. 8). Some 300 civic officials, townspeople, students, and instructors attended the groundbreaking ceremonies. The theme of the event was “Pioneering a New Beginning,” a tribute to the pioneering roots of the Chandler and Gilbert communities.

The Arizona Republic reported that numerous dignitaries planned to attend including Chandler Mayor Jerry Brooks, Gilbert Mayor L. J. Reed, Chancellor Paul Elsner, and community leader Sue Sossaman. Music was to be provided by the Chandler and Gilbert high school bands and popular local radio personality W. Steven Martin was to be the master of ceremonies. Instead of using standard shovels to scoop the ground, dignitaries and guests would choose among a variety of historical farm implements provided for the occasion by area museums and families ("Ceremony scheduled for education center," 1986).

Paul Elsner remembered the day:

… they had the tent out here and you opened it up for the dedication, and I can remember that day very clearly. Arnette was saying, Gordon [Jesse], where’s Gordon? Because he was supposed to fix the sound system and get it going so she could make a speech and so forth. It was like a hectic day for everybody, and then people kind of ambled in, in pickup trucks and there were guys with cowboy hats and boots on, standing around out there. I didn’t know who they were, but they were obviously ranchers and growers and so forth that were out here, and it was a very different place, I mean it was unbelievable. In fact the wind was going just about the right
direction for the stockyards, or the feeder lot, … sitting out there in that little, cabana-type tent, and people were at card tables and chairs.

We applauded and so forth, and I said this is the start of something, we don’t know what it’s going to be. Can we do it, you know? Can we do it? It really started from some people willing to strike out and do it. And that was one of the days I’ll always remember. It was interesting that when you go to … something down in Phoenix, everybody would have a suit on, and everybody would have their business attire and so forth. The people came out here from work. They just drove in … they didn’t even have a road in here, and they drove right up on the field. The trucks were parked out there. It was dusty, it was Arizona. I think that was a kind of a nice memory to have. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

The campus (Figure 11) was scheduled to be completed in July 1987, and within the same month moving into the buildings would occur so that classes could be offered in the new buildings as of August, 1987 (Ward, 1986, p. 7).
Chandler–Gilbert center to move onto permanent college campus next month

A courtyard in the center of the main building will have landscaping and benches for faculty and students and will be an area for studying and relaxing.

Faculty and staff of the Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center will move onto their new permanent campus next month to get ready for fall classes that begin Aug. 22. The lease expires on the present facility the end of June.

The first phase of the new campus buildings includes 52,000 square feet of instructional space in two separate buildings, plus a physical plant, all located on the 80-acre site on Pecos Road just west of Gilbert. The main building will house the classrooms, laboratories, student services, and a day care center in addition to the administrative offices.

The second phase, which may be built in two parts to speed up its arrival, will include more classrooms, a student center, additions to the physical plant, and a learning resource center.

Unfortunately, the new campus will be too small the day it opens, and plans have already been made to hold classes in Chandler and Gilbert high schools and at nearby Willis Junior High School.

"I'm very pleased to be finally moving onto our new campus," said Provost Annette Ward. "We will be in an overflow mode when we open in August. We're anticipating 2,500 to 3,000 headcount this fall. This will stretch the capability of the facility. Our busiest times will be in the evening, so we plan to hold classes in the local high schools and at Willis Junior High. From 55- to 60 percent of our enrollment will be in the evenings."

Figure 11. MCC Bulletin with feature article about the construction of CGCCC.
Although the facility included 52,000 gross square feet (GSF), it wasn’t large enough to accommodate the anticipated enrollment. “Unfortunately, the new campus will be too small the day it opens, and plans have already been made to hold classes in Chandler and Gilbert high schools and at nearby Willis Junior High School” ("Chandler-Gilbert center to move onto permanent college campus next month," 1987, p. 1).

All classes and employees moved from the former Seton school site onto the new campus in the summer of 1987. The move onto the campus meant that the Chandler-Gilbert Education Center (CGEC) would now become the Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center (CGCCC). It was the end of the temporary facilities and another step towards becoming a college. It was exciting for the employees and the students. Bernal recalled, “… it was a lot of fun and it was also very emotional too because we were under a lot of pressure to get the college started in two years, and we did it in two years” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

Faculty member Alice Conkright remembered the significance of the move: … it was significant when we moved to the [Pecos] campus, of course, in 1987. Before we had been on Chandler Boulevard, in the old Seton High School. Because a lot of new faculty were hired and divisions were formed, the 1987-1988 period was significant just in terms of the increase in size of the college community and because of the new buildings. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

The dedication of the Pecos Campus was held at 9:30am on October 10, 1987, and featured the theme “Pioneering New Horizons” ("Chandler-Gilbert center to move onto permanent college campus next month," 1987, p. 1). The Chandler Independent
newspaper likened the moment to traditional farming harvests but called it “a harvest of the mind” (Riess, 1987, p. 1). Alfredo de los Santos, Jr., who was serving as the Acting Chancellor was quoted saying, “Now we gather here to bear witness to the culmination of great effort to change the land and cultivate it into a place that has a rich and fertile future” (Riess, 1987, p. 1).

Eddie Basha, of Bashas’ grocery stores and a member of the State Board of Education, was the featured speaker for the dedication. Chandler Mayor Jerry Brooks and Gilbert Mayor James Farley joined community leaders, faculty and staff for the festivities (“Basha to be speaker at building dedication," 1987). Basha spoke about the role of community colleges in strengthening the nation. “Basha said the country will recover from its economic losses only when the education system learns more ideas from other nations and adapts them to American society. The community college grew out of recognizing the needs of a changing American society” (Riess, 1987, p. 5). The MCC Bulletin reported that Basha spoke both to the importance of the college offering training and retraining for the community’s workers, as well as offering programs and services that would enhance the community’s quality of life (“Supporters hear Eddie Basha praise new center," 1987).

It was years before much other construction happened around the college. It was a building standing by itself in the fields (Figure 12). Paul Elsner described that phase of the college’s development, “It was like a little miniature, toy college. It was charming; it was fun. It was like we’re here, and we don’t have much, but we’re serious. It was a nice feeling” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005).
The rural environment that Elsner described was described by many others. Andy Bernal commented:

I used to know things by the landmarks—this person’s farm, that person’s farm, this person’s dairy—but I can't find my way around anymore [chuckles], because I have to look at the street signs now, but before there was no street signs. You just knew that that was Cooper Road, you knew this was McQueen Road, you just knew. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2006)

Getting out to the college wasn’t always easy. Alice Conkright, English faculty, and Ana Jarvis, Spanish faculty, recalled that roadways around the college were not paved and that many intersections did not have traffic lights. “Chandler was not built out; Gilbert was not built out. I would often drive out here from Tempe on dirt roads” (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005). Jarvis reminisced, “… I
remember we did not even have [traffic] lights around here” (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2006).

Sandra Stuebner, psychology faculty, remembered conversations where people would call her, certain that they had gone too far or were lost:

I did a lot of hiring of adjunct [faculty]. Everyone always talks about how hard it is to hire adjunct, but I do not think that they have any idea how difficult it was when we had the drive that we had out here. Nobody was living out here. You drove forever. … We would have an interview of an adjunct faculty and they would call from some gas station, still five miles away and say, “Have I passed it? Where am I?” No, keep coming, keep coming. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Sometimes employees encountered obstacles on the way to the college. Stuebner recalled:

I am a city girl. I was raised in Southern California so for me to drive out past all of the farms was really quite pleasant. One day I had to stop my car because they were moving the sheep. And I was just down Pecos [Road] a little ways and I was sitting in my car. And I put the windows down and you could just hear, “Baa, baa” and all of the sheep were going around my car. And I just had to wait. I thought this is different, to say I was late to work because they had to move the sheep. The flies were not always pleasant. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

The sheep stories were also recounted by others. Sharon Flury recounted:
Well, one of my first interesting experiences was being late to work because there were sheep in the road. A herd of sheep, not just a couple of sheep, a whole herd of sheep in the road, and so sometimes it took quite a while to get them where they needed to go so we could get to work. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Librarian Larry Miller remembered:

I mean we had all kinds of excuses from the students when there were sheep blocking the road, and the faculty couldn’t get here and neither could the students. And we got to the point where we accepted that as a reason for being late [laughs], and it was true, they always did; they blocked Pecos. We never could get through, many times a week. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Governor Board member Linda Rosenthal came to the Pecos Campus infrequently, as it wasn’t within the portion of the county from which she was elected, but remembered the experience because of the cows at Seibe Hamstra’s dairy, located across Pecos Road to the south of the college. “The only thing I can remember is coming out here and smelling the cows and wondering how you all lived with that all the time, although you probably got used to it” (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Driving to the campus wasn’t the only time employees encountered animal life. Physics faculty Robin McCord noted:

Well, you know when the campus first opened we were in the middle of nowhere, and so every time they turned over the cotton fields we would
get this influx of mice and rats and snakes. And I mean it was never any problem but they would end up in really odd places. We’d find mice in the bathroom sinks and, yes, I did once find a snake curled up in my desk drawer. But he was sleeping, so it was okay. And when we first opened at night, you’d hear the coyotes singing, so we’ve seen some really interesting transitions. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Employees seemed to weather the challenges with resilience. Many spoke of the feeling of responsibility for starting a college and the pioneering spirit that drove them.

MCC President Wally Simpson recalled:

…the first nucleus of faculty was willing to undertake an adventure. They had some kind of dream about what could happen and that meant a real commitment on their part of time and a flexibility of coming in at all different hours and getting some things prepared in laboratories and classrooms that really were brand new and didn’t have anything there.

(W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Brenda Larson, who started at the college teaching business and personal computers and eventually moved to teaching future teachers and computer information systems, spoke of the camaraderie among employees:

I think on the positive side we all felt like we were in this together, and we were all starting. Even though I wasn’t one of the first faculty I did come when the buildings first opened. And I think there was a sense of
camaraderie. I have never been at a school that kind of started out on the ground floor. (Brenda Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Many felt the chance to be a founding employee of a new college was an opportunity that could not be passed up. Larry Miller, the first librarian at the college, thought, “rarely in your lifetime do you have a chance to build a campus from scratch and, so when the opportunity to transfer came up I absolutely jumped at it (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005).

There was something special about founding something, being the first to embark on a new mission. Wanda Matthews, reading faculty, spoke of being the first advisor to a student organization:

I also am proud that with being a pioneer for Chandler-Gilbert Community College and wanting very much to put us on the map, so to speak, I was the founding advisor for Phi Beta Kappa, international honorary society, and an offshoot of the honors program. (W. Matthews, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

Lois Bartholomew came to the college in 1989 as the CSAO titled the Associate Dean of Student Services. She shared that despite the hectic pace, it was an attractive place to be:

I think the spirit of this college, the original plans for Chandler-Gilbert, just sounded so exciting. And I just wanted to be on the ground floor of this amazing institution, so I was just in the right place at the right time and who would have ever thought my old boss [Arnette Ward] would become a President. So I was glad to come join this. What I consider this
wild group of people who worked 24 hours a day seven days a week. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

There were challenges, to be sure. Sandra Stuebner described that several employees found themselves in positions of significant responsibility fairly early in their careers, without the experience typically required in those positions at other colleges:

I think in the first five years, it was that a really small group of people were trying to run a college. You know, to be a Division Chair one year after you have been hired with no community college background, was not something that typically happens. That was not unusual here, many of us were brand new chairs, and certainly everyone was brand new to Chandler-Gilbert. It reminds me of those old movies, like, “Let’s put on a play! Let’s build a college! Okay! How do we do it, ahhh, I don’t know.” We just did the best we could. We went out there and we were guessing so much and we guessed right most of the time. I think we did okay. It was quite a delight to be in such a small group of people making decisions and building the college from the ground up. So in the first five years I think that was the most significant, and even the first 10 years. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

But experienced or not, employees figured it out and pitched in to do the work and get the tasks accomplished. Assistant Provost Bernal, an administrator, recalled personally running phone lines so that faculty offices were functional. “I had to go to Radio Shack and buy phone lines and telephones so the faculty could have phones. It
was just, you had to do a little bit of everything. You had to put tables together and computers together” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

And the long hours and extended work weeks stretched well into the first several years at the Pecos Campus. Gil Gonzales, then Associate Dean of Learning Resources, recalled keeping very early and very late hours with a colleague, this researcher, Maria Hesse, then Associate Dean of Student Services:

This is the other story I tell, is that there was an associate dean who worked across the hall from me. She would show up at 6:00 in the morning. And then we would wave goodbye to each other at 11:00 every night. And we did that for several years, so Maria Hesse and I spent way too much time at this place. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

The Provost also did whatever it took to keep the college running, anytime of the day or night, as illustrated by this story:

I lived closer to get to the campus, if anything came up, if somebody tried to break in, or whatever, I had to respond. One night the city police called me about a break-in. I told my husband I had to go to the college and asked him to go with me. He said you are not going to the college at three o’clock in the morning. I said, you’re not going to the college, but I’m going to the college [laughing]. Three o’clock in the morning! I called the police, and said I have to come alone. I have to drive. I said I need your help. Can I have a car parked somewhere and when I get to that corner, flash your lights? I’ll start flashing my lights and you flash your
lights. And they did, they did that for two years. Oh, my, I had fun. And so they would call me and ask me if I was alright and I was safe. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Interestingly, in retrospect, most of the employees interviewed recalled these busy times with fondness. The spirit of coming together to accomplish a common task was a priority for employees who appeared to understand that when starting a new venture, people just needed to pitch in to get the job done, without concern for job descriptions and without concern for the number of hours spent. Yolanda Penley was a business faculty member and the first Division Chair for the Business and Computer Information Systems Division. She remembered the spirit of collegiality:

We were such a small group. We did everything. Therefore, there was none of this, “That is not my job” business. You just did it because there was no one else to do it. Whether it was advising or directing people, or teaching or working on committees concerning the construction, we formed a very close bond. There was a lot of collegiality including faculty and administrators…. In the first five years I think the positive thing was the people chosen to lead the college, President, though at that time she was called the Provost, Arnette Ward, and two Assistant Provosts. The three of them, President Ward and Dean Andy Bernal and Dean Margaret Hogan, were very cohesive and they worked very well together. Of course, there was a common goal to establish this school and build the building. There was also a very small, cohesive group of faculty working
hard to establish the college. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Cathy Urbanski, who began as the administrative assistant to Provost Ward and eventually became a member of the computer faculty, summarized the sense of founding something new, of establishing a legacy for future generations, and the sense of collegiality that was created during the early years:

You know I’m so glad that I’m one of the pioneers who opened up the college. I mean that’s one thing that I have never done in my life, and I think I’ll always feel like this is my home. I feel I helped create a family and now we had so many children and grandchildren. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Naming

A look at college documents over the years shows that at various points in its history, the institution was called Chandler-Gilbert Education Center, Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center, and Chandler-Gilbert Community College, sometimes with a slash between the Chandler and Gilbert, and sometimes with a dash between the city names. Other names were also considered such as Southeast Valley Community College and San Tan Community College.

In a State Board of Directors for Community Colleges historical document from 1987, CGCC is identified as Chandler/Gilbert Educational Center and Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center (Puyear, 1987). In the original Master Plan Proposal two variations of the name are used with the only difference being the slash (/) or the dash (-)
between Chandler and Gilbert, Chandler-Gilbert Education Center or Chandler/Gilbert Education Center (Ward et al., 1985). In one document, MCC’s strategic plan for 1988-1989, the Chandler-Gilbert site is referenced three times, and each time slightly differently: “MCC Chandler-Gilbert Extension Center” (p. 2), “Chandler/Gilbert Education Center” (p. 49), and “Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center” (p. 60) (“Strategic plan, 1988-89,” 1988).

Thinking back on that time, Arnette Ward explained the transitions of the college name:

…we were required to be an extension of Mesa Community College which was a good thing. Because you had all kinds of help and the umbrella and the ability to offer things that you just couldn’t offer on your own. And so that explains the Education Center. That was our first title and it was so ambiguous and it drove people crazy because they thought we were something other than a college. And they could go there and buy educational materials or something. And so we didn’t live with that title very long and that name very long. But that explains why we went to Community College Center so that people would understand that we were an institution, still a branch of Mesa Community College. We were able to drop that last C when we got our separate accreditation. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Most Maricopa Community Colleges are located in and associated with one city or location such as Phoenix College, Mesa Community College, Glendale Community College, and Scottsdale Community College. Provost Ward saw the advantages to that:
Initially, Andy, Margaret, and I felt, no, we do not want to be called the Southeast Valley. All of the other campuses are named after the community that they actually serve, which has helped them with ownership, given the community ownership. The difference for us is that we did not have just one city or one town, we had two and a half. Now days we would say three with Queen Creek. We just felt that we could not start the institution, if it was going to become a college one of these days, we did not want the name to change 15 or 20 years from now. If we are going to do something, do it now and try to think ahead to the future. We could not also name the college Chandler. We definitely could not name it Gilbert because it was not in Gilbert. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Some people felt that because the college was near the intersection of Pecos Road and Gilbert Road and that Gilbert Road was the dividing line between the two cities that it should be called Gilbert Community College or Gilbert-Chandler Community College:

There were some people who actually fought for it to still become Gilbert; they wanted it to be Gilbert because we were right at the border at Gilbert Road. That was not a very good argument because we are actually in the City of Chandler; that was all there was to it. We definitely would not have just called it Chandler. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Controversy erupted in the fall of 1986 over the naming of the college.

According to a newspaper article in *The Gazette*: 
A controversy arose, however, when upon Ward’s suggestion the Chandler City Council approved a resolution Nov. 24 and forwarded it to the advisory panel asking that the name become Chandler Community College Center. The act was greeted with criticism from Gilbert officials when they learned of it a week ago. Town manager Kent Cooper called it a “faux pas” that could be “very damaging” to relations between the communities. … The campus’ first buildings are under construction near Pecos and Gilbert roads. The site lies entirely in Chandler, but both communities have worked together for several years to persuade county officials of the need for a community college in the area. Cooper said Gilbert officials had always presumed the college would be named after both communities when the time came to give it an official title. He said Chandler, by adopting the resolution, had reneged on a verbal agreement made in the early 1980s by officials from both communities that the school campus would carry the names of Chandler and Gilbert. After Chandler passed its resolution, Cooper said he was going to have the Gilbert council approve a similar measure, calling for the college to be given a neutral title, such as San Tan or Southeast Valley. And, Gilbert Mayor Reed threatened to return a tie tack embossed with Chandler’s city logo that was given to him by Chandler Mayor Jerry Brooks. (Kull, 1986)

Ultimately, the college advisory panel which had representatives from both Chandler and Gilbert, and chaired by Sue Sossaman, met December 9 and unanimously approved the name of Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center (Kull, 1986). They
planned to pass along their recommendation for the title to the Maricopa County Community College District Board for approval at the January 27, 1987 meeting. Arnette Ward explained:

As I had moved around a bit, in the first stage of taking the position, I found that Gilbert really was feeling like an outcast. They did not feel it was their institution, anyway. They were somewhat upset, because when you have two rival communities, they try to out-do one another and try to out-think one another. Well, the property was County property and Chandler just thought a little bit faster than Gilbert and they annexed only the 80 acres into Chandler. When Gilbert found out about it, I had a problem and it was hard to talk with some people about it. So we decided we will never, ever get away from having both communities named in this situation, so that is how it became Chandler/Gilbert Education Center. We moved on to Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan corroborates that:

Arnette really is responsible for the hyphenated Chandler-Gilbert. Because while it was still being discussed it was thought of more as Chandler, the college for Chandler. And Gilbert was really, you know, kind of in a minor position. But after Arnette got involved in the community out here and met people and got connected, she’s the one who said this has to be Chandler and Gilbert’s college. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)
Assistant Provost Andy Bernal recalled that the alphabetical order of the city names was really a result of their size. He said, “...there was some discussion about whether to say Gilbert-Chandler or Chandler-Gilbert, but I think the reason we went with Chandler-Gilbert is because Chandler was a little bigger city than Gilbert” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

Eventually debates about the name died down and the dual naming situation took on a humorous overtone. Chancellor Paul Elsner recalled:

We had the support of both your mayors, in Gilbert and Chandler, and they actually did end up taking more of a humorous attitude about calling it Chandler-Gilbert, and one of them, I can't remember which, said, well they could’ve called it Gilbert-Chandler, you know! (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

The suggestions for neutral names not based on location, such as Southeast Valley Community College and San Tan Community College, were short-lived. Ward explained:

There were some of the community members of our task force who felt that San Tan, this small mountain range to the southeast, and frankly actually wanted it to be called San Tan, because it would keep the two, at least the two communities from fighting over it and losing friendships over it, political friendships. So that was one of the names that was suggested. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

And the notion of making the name even longer seemed out of the question:
I told Dr. Simpson and Dr. Elsner that, in the end, the best thing I have seen with our sister colleges, those names of colleges that represent the City seem to have a lot more emotional involvement from the community, a lot more support. It is easier for Mesa and others, Glendale. People talk about it more, even away from Arizona others talk about their college. Mesa Community College was part of the City; it is named after the City. Therefore, we should do no less for Gilbert and Chandler. The only thing we could not do was add a third name, city or town, which was Queen Creek, it really would have gone too far at that point. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Most of the naming from that point forward was over the punctuation of the name. This was the first of the Maricopa Colleges to carry the name of two distinct municipalities, so there were no protocols to follow. With the exception of shortening the name from Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center to Chandler-Gilbert Community College, there have been no further name changes. In a newspaper article in The Gazette, the reporter explained:

Ward said that after the official title is bestowed upon the campus, it is expected to undergo at least one more revision in four or five years when it becomes accredited. She said when that happens, the college will end its affiliation with Mesa Community College and drop the word “center.” Until then, it will be a satellite campus of MCC and retain the “center.” (Kull, 1986)
Provost Ward explained with enthusiasm that when that moment came, the name was changed immediately. “When we did get accredited, of course, we popped that little third “C” off and made it Chandler-Gilbert Community College” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

Accreditation

Chancellor Paul Elsner joked that the new college centers, once formed, began “invoking their sovereignty” almost immediately, chafing under the control of their parent college (P. Elsner, June 28, 2005).

MCC President Larry Christiansen had supervised Arnette Ward and the CGCCC for three years before the rush to move towards accreditation began, perhaps spurred by the fact that Paradise Valley Community College had successfully become independent of their parent college, Scottsdale Community College. Dr. Christiansen recalled the specific day the urgency began:

We’d gone through that full planning retreat and we’d set the target date for the Higher Learning Commission visit. And Arnette called me up and she said you have to come down and meet with us. And I said well, and this was on a Thursday, and I said well Arnette, I’m scheduled to meet with you on Monday, couldn’t it wait until Monday. No, no, we need a decision [chuckles]. Well, its 11:00. She said, well, we’re all here at noon. Okay, so I drive from Mesa Community College down and they’re all sitting there and they’re saying we’re going to change the date of the visit. We can't wait. We’re ready. And so they actually moved up their
own targeted date for the NCA visit by at least six or seven months; I believe it was one semester. They actually did it in the fall, rather than the spring. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Chancellor Paul Elsner described that his growth strategy allowed for the centers to have the benefits afforded to accredited institutions, and he knew that the time would come when the centers would feel a sense of urgency about their independence. In an interview in 2005, he recalled the situation in the early 1990s:

…the early transition to starting a campus was very convenient for us, because being attached to Mesa you were able to give Veterans benefits, and Pell grants and work study and loans and all the other things, because you had to wait a while to cycle that stuff through by candidacy…. So we sort of stepped up the process I think, that allowed you to do that, and you all did wonderfully. You were absolutely responsive to building not only your own efficacy and your own sense of definition, but you did it with skill and some diplomacy and tact, because there were some people that were worried about these centers all of a sudden becoming colleges. I frankly never worried about it. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Yolanda Penley, business faculty, chaired the North Central Association (NCA) self-study process and acknowledged “that was a big deal” when it finally happened (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005). She described being chosen to lead the initial accreditation effort:
I served as the Chair of the first NCA [North Central Association accreditation] self-study. Maybe this is a more personal favorite story, but when Arnette called me in she said she had been talking with Andy and Margaret. They wanted me to Chair the NCA, and I was flabbergasted. I had never done anything like that. But they were confident that I had the skills to deal with the faculty because it should be a very faculty-driven effort. Faculty, you know, can be temperamental sometimes and we were still small, I think there were about 19 of us. It was going to be a very intensive thing because there were so few that we were going to have to do a lot of doubling up on jobs, but it is a favorite story because they had such confidence that I could carry this off. I said I would, I was very flattered, but I was also a little afraid. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Despite the anxiousness of CGCC faculty and staff to become independent of their parent college, the faculty and staff bulletin of MCC featured a “salute” to its Chandler-Gilbert Center, as it neared the end of its process for independent accreditation. Up until that time, CGCCC had been accredited by virtue of MCC’s accreditation. “A visitation team from the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools will visit Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center next week as part of the last phase of the accreditation process, that will make the center a new community college. Chandler-Gilbert currently operates as an extension of MCC” ("C-G to get preliminary accreditation report Oct. 30," 1991, p. 1).
Arnette Ward described the thrill of having Chancellor Paul Elsner and MCC President Larry Christiansen present for the team report:

I sat there and I could not believe the things they were saying about us. I knew I felt good about Chandler-Gilbert, but when the team said it… I look at it still now; I look at the video quite often. We really out-did ourselves … That was really the absolute highlight. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Larry Christiansen recalled the visit and specifically that exit interview. In speaking about non-employees who had significantly influenced CGCC, he credited the NCA team chair Dr. Vernon Crawley with setting the stage for the future of the college:

The other person that I would put on that list [of non-employees who significantly influenced the college] is the current President of Moraine Valley who was your Chair of your NCA team, … a very distinguished African-American gentleman, … [Vernon Crawley]. He said during his exit interview, and in the report from the first accreditation… he helped shape a wonderful vision. I think he helped shape some of the thinking of the senior leaders here. In some ways gave them that new shot in the arm, because for so many of them, I think as an observer, that it was kind of like the finish line, this accreditation piece, and they were going to be waving a checkered flag, while he brought them to the renewal of the fact that this is simply the green flag. This is when you now move into this new arena, and I really think he did a masterful job. I remember the way
that he shaped his comments in the report he wrote coming off of the NCA visit. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

But nonetheless, it was a memorable milestone for many employees who had worked hard to achieve independence as a college. Sharon Flury recounted:

I recall getting our accreditation in 1992. There was dancing in the streets. So that was an exciting event. For those of us who participated, it was a long haul, but it was interesting. It was the first accreditation process I had ever gone through, so I found it really interesting, and I learned a lot.

(S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

The *Gilbert Independent* newspaper acknowledged the accreditation with an article about the college’s accreditation and the promotion of Arnette Ward to the position of college President. The article stated:

Official action changing the school name from Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center to Chandler-Gilbert Community College was taken by the Maricopa Community College District Governing Board on March 24. CGCC becomes the ninth college in the Maricopa system which is the second largest community college district in the country. The MCCD Governing Board also changed the appointment of college center provost Arnette S. Ward to college president effective March 25. ("CGCCC receives accreditation," 1992, p. 1).

As a result of the accreditation, administrative titles were changed from Provost to President and from Assistant Provost to Dean. Also Arnette Ward’s reporting
relationship changed with the District. Rather than reporting to the President of MCC, she would now report to the Chancellor of the District:

The other part about that is Paul had decided that when the Provost, if we should take the college to accreditation, then we would be appointed Presidents, because I never looked at the possibility of remaining here after the campus became accredited, and so we were appointed immediately after we received accreditation, as Presidents and Deans. That was a highlight because that meant exactly that we were up there, so to speak, with the other colleges. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

The first accreditation cycle was for a maximum of five years, so it wasn’t long before the college was undergoing self-study in preparation for another accreditation team visit in the fall of 1996. Future accreditations were also successful for the college. Cathy Urbanski had been the secretary to the Provost when she was initially hired at the college, and then became the institutional researcher. In that role, she provided primary research support for the second self-study. She remembered the accreditation process:

Another major event I thought of is when you [Maria Hesse] were the Self-Study Coordinator, for the second North Central [accreditation]. We were the only college [sic] to go through the North Central Accreditation without having to give any progress report for 10 years, and that’s when I said, “Yes!” Well I think that’s a major accomplishment. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)
At the time of this research, the college is currently in its third accreditation cycle as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

**CGCC Accreditation Cycles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Study Timeframe</th>
<th>Self-Study Chair</th>
<th>Accreditation Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-1997</td>
<td>Maria Hesse</td>
<td>June 20, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2007</td>
<td>Jeanne Canham</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduation**

Until 1992, students who completed their coursework at Chandler-Gilbert Education Center or Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center would be officially awarded their degrees and certificates through Mesa Community College. Chandler-Gilbert faculty and staff were considered a subset of MCC, so were invited to follow the MCC faculty and staff in the ceremony. The first two graduates of Chandler-Gilbert were Mary Lou Patterson and Julie Palinsky, as reported in the *Mesa Community College Bulletin* on May 11, 1987. The article explained:

Two co-eds, Mary Lou Patterson and Julie Palinsky, have the honor of being the first ever graduates of the Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center extension of MCC. Patterson is a re-entry student from New York who returned to school in August, 1985, after 25 years. She plans to pursue a degree in business at the University of Phoenix and hopes to become an executive. Palinsky, a resident of Chandler and CHS
[Chandler High School] graduate, has been attending MCC and then C-G since 1983 while working full-time as a hair dresser. Her daughter is a freshman at MCC and C-G. She plans to attend ASU to get a business degree with an emphasis on computers. ("C-G has first ever graduates," 1987, p.1)

The *Chandler Independent* reported that 13 students would graduate from CGCCC through Mesa Community College on May 19, 1989 ("CGCCC to graduate 13," 1989).

By 1990, with 18 students graduating, Provost Ward felt it would appropriate to host a convocation at her home prior to the next day’s graduation events. The *Arizona Republic* published a picture of the event and reported:

> With only 18 students, the Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center graduation list was so small that Provost Arnette Ward held a ceremony Thursday in her Tempe home. The students were included in official graduation ceremonies Friday at Mesa Community College. CGCCC is an extension of the Mesa college. ("18 in class of '90," 1990, p. 3)

MCC President Larry Christiansen recalled the pride he shared in the birthing of a new college and the last graduation ceremony that CGCCC held in conjunction with MCC:

> Probably one of the more fun things for me, and one of the stories, was the last graduation that we had when Chandler-Gilbert students went across the stage at Southern and Dobson. Great credit to the Chandler-Gilbert students, great credit to the Chandler-Gilbert faculty, great credit to our
Mesa faculty because they literally dedicated that graduation to Chandler-Gilbert. And the community video that we had was a historical look of the creation of Chandler-Gilbert. And so there was great pride. And I hoped and I think we accomplished, maybe the same, maybe different than other relationships of colleges that were designated as parents and others, we were able to kind of have an ending of that era, on a very upbeat, a very positive, a very collegial way, all centered around honoring students, that I think lots of people felt good about. And I also hope, and think it did, do away with any of the harshness that was impacted by do we or don’t we start our own office of student financial aid, and should we or shouldn’t we have this program or that, because I think it enabled us to collectively rise above some of those kinds of things in that setting. So that to me was an important time. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

As of February 1992, CGCC was independently accredited and able to confer degrees and certificates. The first graduation ceremony was fondly remembered by Assistant Provost turned Dean, Andy Bernal:

I think the fondest memory is our first graduation. … The very first one, we had it right here in the courtyard. And I don’t recall how many graduates we had, but it didn’t matter, we had our first graduates. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

The East Valley Tribune newspaper reported on the event:
With a bit of confetti and a lot of shouts of “way to go,” 170 Chandler-Gilbert Community College students graduated Friday night in the college’s first commencement. “I feel so privileged and honored to be one of the first, said Maria Elena De La Torre between congratulation hugs after the ceremony. “It’s the best community college there is.” “I’m simply ecstatic. Words cannot explain it. It’s just a wonderful feeling,” said college President Arnette Ward, who added she wanted the graduates to know she and the rest of the faculty were still there for them if needed. (Ettenborough, 1992, p. A1)

Larry Miller, librarian, remembered how hard everyone worked to make sure the event was special for CGCC’s first graduates:

…actually, I had been looking through some things that I had saved, and I had the first program for the graduation here at Chandler-Gilbert. That one was amazing. Everyone was so excited. We had just gotten accreditation in February. And the fact that we were going to be on our own campus, and everybody went overboard to make sure it was special. And the students came and their parents came. We really worked hard to make it look gorgeous. That was very important, very special. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Gil Gonzales, the former Associate Dean of Learning Resources, reminisced:

I was fortunate to be here when the first graduation, graduating class was awarded. … It was amazing. More tears than I’ve ever seen, and I don’t think you see that any more. I don’t think you can replicate it in a bottle
and sell it, but clearly that was a good example and outcome that demonstrated why this place was different. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

For several years, the courtyard between buildings A and B was used for graduation, but it wasn’t too long before the space could not accommodate the audience. For several years, graduation was held at the Chandler Center for the Arts. Several of those ceremonies were marked by mishaps. One year the ceremony was interrupted by a fire alarm and everyone had to be evacuated to the parking lot, in the middle of the speeches. Another year, a bat dive-bombed the speaker repeatedly, as recounted by physics faculty Robin McCord:

I think it was our second or third commencement and we were immensely proud of the fact that we were going to be able to use the City of Chandler’s Performing Arts Center. We had this beautiful program, and everybody was there in caps and gowns and regalia. And we had this bat swoop down and attack the podium. And it didn’t go anywhere else; it just went straight for the podium—didn’t circle the audience, didn’t circle the graduates; it went right for the speaker. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Since 2004, shortly after the completion of the Performing Arts Center and the Student Center, the Pecos Campus mall has been the site of graduations and remains so at the time of this research.
**Williams Campus**

CGCC and MCC have full-service accredited second campuses where entire associate degree programs are offered. All colleges have extension centers or specialty branches off-site including Phoenix College’s city center, MCC’s downtown business and industry institute, GCC’s university college center on the campus of ASU West, SCC’s air park campus, GateWay’s Skill Center, South Mountain’s centers in Ahwatukee Foothills and Guadalupe, PVCC’s Cavecreek/Carefree Center, and CGCC’s Sun Lakes Education Center. Estrella Mountain Community College is in the process, as of this research, of buying land for future centers in western Maricopa County, while GCC North is in the process of being developed as a comprehensive second campus for GCC. CGCC’s Williams Campus is unique among the pack.

CGCC’s Williams Campus was the first comprehensive second campus of a Maricopa Community College that was recognized by the North Central Association. When the NCA team visited the Pecos Campus in the fall of 1996, they also sent team members to visit the Williams Campus. It was and is the only Maricopa campus to have on-site houses and residence halls available to enrolled students. It remains the only Maricopa campus co-located with a functioning airport, the Williams Gateway Airport. It is also co-located with Arizona State University at the Polytechnic Campus, which was called ASU East until 2005.

When Assistant Provost Hogan recalled truly significant decisions that were made which influenced the course of the college, she spoke of Williams:

… the one that I think is really major is the closing of the Williams Air Force Base, because we were able to petition to be a part of the divvying
up of those buildings and that space. And so we really gained a lot by being a part of that re-development, and to have the opportunity to work with the university in partnership there; I think it was major. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

How did the former Air Force Base come to be used as a college campus and how did it become a part of CGCC?

Williams Air Force Base had been a training site for U.S. military pilots since the 1940s. The federal government could not afford to continue operating the large number of bases around the world and began closing bases. In 1991 the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Committee recommended that Williams be closed and on September 30, 1993, Williams Air Force Base closed, “pursuant to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law No. 101-510)” (Hull, 2001, p. 3174).

The Williams Air Force Base Economic Reuse Plan (August, 1992) provided initial direction for the establishment of a consortium-based campus, comprised of a variety of educational institutions, which would jointly develop and utilize a wide array of education, research and training facilities as well as take advantage of its close proximity to the new Williams Gateway Airport. The Williams Education, Research, and Training Campus Master Plan was initiated in May, 1994, to define and plan for a 753 acre, multi-institutional campus at the former Air Force Base. ("Catalog and student handbook 2003-2004," 2003, p. 6)

Larry Christiansen who was instrumental in obtaining a footprint for MCCCD at Williams remembered:
…the very unusual phenomenon, the closing of Williams Air Force Base. And having an opportunity in the community for additional service that didn’t fall in the concentric six-mile circle. Williams was in the wrong place. And so it was one of those things where, as a district-wide initiative, we went down because it was the right thing to do. But it was not very strategic, and it was probably in some ways not as smart a decision as we’d made on other things, but it was extremely emotional. There were 4,000 jobs being lost, there were people panicking and they expected the local community college district to step up and do something, and ASU was stepping up, so we moved forward I think in a good way, but I think that was a factor that will also impact exactly where Chandler-Gilbert is. (Larry Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

John Underwood, CGCC’s first aviation program Director and then Associate Dean, was also heavily involved in the discussions about Williams. One of the reasons CGCC was included in the discussions was that it made good sense to lobby for the Williams site particularly because of the unique aviation facilities that would be of tremendous benefit to CGCC’s aviation program. The notion of using the former Air Force Base facilities to support aviation training resonated with the public. It seemed like a cost-effective way to provide specialized education and training facilities in support of the aviation industry that was growing in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Underwood recalled:

…the aviation program was the lynchpin, or it was the anchor that kind of moved those kind of things out, and I remember the flow of the politics
that went around those two years. I mean it took us two years to finally get to where we were, but during those two years, you know the Embry Riddle Aeronautical University was a major player that wanted to come in to Williams. In fact there was even discussion that they would close down their Prescott Campus, or even change the Daytona Campus and make this their hub area instead of Florida. … it was this opportunity for the District, Chandler-Gilbert, and the four other colleges when we first started, Rio, Mesa, South Mountain was in there, and GateWay, to do something out there, that hadn't been done before. And working on an Air Force Base and how do we convert it? I think it changed, from my perspective, the potential that Chandler-Gilbert thought it had to a much higher level. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

The concept of operating multiple community colleges on the MCCCD footprint at Williams was easier than the reality. Who would make decisions about which buildings would be used by which college? Who would pull together a schedule of classes that would make sense to students? Who would represent the community colleges in ongoing discussions about the terms of the land conveyance? Which college would work with the university to coordinate transfer course offerings? After discussions with university leaders, Chancellor Elsner decided that it was necessary to change course and place the Williams Campus under the direction of just one of the Maricopa Community Colleges. Five Maricopa Colleges had initially been involved in the Williams discussions (MCC, CGCC, GWCC, SMCC, and RIO), but only MCC and CGCC had on-site programs. And in an almost “squatter’s rights” fashion, both MCC
and CGCC had started using Williams buildings, so the decision to make Williams a CGCC extension was a difficult one within the Maricopa District. MCC was, at the time, also hoping to establish a new second campus at Red Mountain. Arnette Ward was struggling for resources to support CGCC’s growth and she had the aviation program. She explained:

…when you do not have any money to do things, you start thinking about how you can win what you need. The Williams Base is in the City of Mesa and I knew that my challenge was going to be with Mesa [Community College]. MCC knew they could not pressure CGCC to step aside and leave the Base to them to become their campus, because Chandler-Gilbert held the winning chip. Chandler-Gilbert had the program that would attract a favorable decision for Maricopa to be a part of the redevelopment of Williams Air Force Base, and that was the aviation program. …aviation was the linchpin to everything about community colleges in terms of requesting a part of that facility. The internal quiet debate was that Mesa Community and Chandler-Gilbert should jointly share the responsibility. At first that did happen, but down the road I needed places for people to go and I needed to build enrollment. So I argued the point with the Chancellor and I told him that to give the campus to Rio Salado or Mesa would really upset my communities. I would not get any votes for anything if we ever came back to this community [for a bond election] and the other thing was that I had nowhere else to go. I needed that facility because we were paying
something like $80,000 a year or more for the few facilities which housed the aviation program. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Williams eventually became an extension of CGCC, but John Underwood remembers that Larry Christiansen, President of Mesa Community College, had a significant role in the founding and early development of the Williams Campus:

Larry Christiansen played a big role. He didn’t get the building that the aviation program is in right now, which is what he wanted. I might have had something to do with that, but we’re still friends, but he did play a key role in helping Chandler-Gilbert, along with Arnette, to establish this Williams Campus…. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Underwood recalled the day when it became clear to him that MCC would receive the Red Mountain Campus, and CGCC would receive the Williams Campus:

…even though it happened to be in Mesa, I remember when [Vice Chancellor Alfredo] De la Santos was sitting around the table with all the other college Presidents, and he knew that there was going to be some bickering perhaps going on, or some heavy discussion, I’ll use those terms. He went up on the board and he drew a circle around Chandler-Gilbert, and drew a circle around where Red Mountain [MCC’s extension campus] was going to be, and drew a circle around Williams Air Force Base, and he said its close enough to Chandler-Gilbert its going to be Chandler-Gilbert’s, and that’s kind of how it just evolved. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)
At the Governing Board meeting on August 27, 1996, Chancellor Paul Elsner declared that Williams would become an extension of Chandler-Gilbert Community College, while Mesa Community College was authorized to “move forward on planning its second campus in the East Mesa area” ("Governing board minutes, August 27, 1996," p. 2). Later that week, Elsner sent a letter to ASU President Lattie Coor explaining his decision to make MCCCD’s footprint at Williams, which had once been planned as a multiple-college endeavor, an extension of Chandler-Gilbert Community College:

At the MCCCD Governing Board meeting last Tuesday night, August 27, 1996, I announced the decision to designate Chandler-Gilbert Community College as the parent college to the MCCCD Williams Education Center Extension. The college’s leadership is very excited about this decision and all are ready to continue to expand on the current efforts to further develop the campus.

Lattie, would you please pass along this information to Dr. Backus.

I know there was some concern on the part of ASUE about whether or not they would have to work with more than one of the colleges regarding issues like student services, articulation and library services. (P. Elsner, personal communication, August 29, 1996)

John Underwood felt that the closure of the Base was significant in terms of raising the presence of the aviation programs in the community. “In a very significant way it brought on new partnerships, like the University of North Dakota for their flight training program” (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005).
Aviation faculty members Harvey Stone, Joe McCourt, and Bashir Khalil moved the aviation program from its rental facilities on Price Road to the Williams facilities, that were in need of major renovations. They began offering aviation maintenance courses at Williams in spring 1995.

This new site was also significant for the college’s general education and university transfer programs, where the large majority of students were enrolled. Because of the potential for partnering with ASU to offer lower-division general education courses at Williams, it was necessary to assign residential faculty to Williams. Alice Conkright, a founding faculty member in English and humanities, recalled that this caused some anxiety at the Pecos Campus:

Williams was a huge event. People went there; people taught there. What were we going to do with it? What programs? How are we going to keep our share from Mesa and ASU. It is just an ongoing thing. It was huge.

(A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

Three general education faculty were assigned to help start the academic programs at the Williams Campus, David Weaver in physics, Marybeth Mason in English and humanities, and Maria Hesse in business and computer information systems. David Weaver had previously been a division chair and had had experience in class scheduling, facilities planning, and hiring and supervising adjunct faculty in math and science. In addition to teaching, Marybeth Mason had been the college’s staff development coordinator, and was known for helping the college implement innovative programs in active learning and service-learning. Maria Hesse had been the first CSAO at the college
and knew administrative processes and procedures. Marybeth recounted how she became interested in the possibilities for this new venture:

I didn’t have any interest until the administration, Margaret and Andy, started setting up tours for our faculty and staff to go out and take a look at this space a year or two before it was scheduled to open—so it must have been around 1995-1996, somewhere around in there. We got on a bus, I think they rented a bus, and a bunch of us went out there on buses. We got kind of a Greyhound tour of the space out there.

When we walked into some of the spaces I just got really excited about it. They were talking about some people would be teaching out there, and I started thinking it could be a wonderful little world for a team of faculty who could get together and start something special. I actually envisioned one giant learning community where there would be a team of faculty teaching everything we did thematically, in some way or another, either a linked model or an integrated model if we could get the right people. (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Marybeth Mason’s enthusiasm wasn’t shared by others who were worried that the new Williams campus would drain much-needed resources from the Pecos Campus:

Margaret [Hogan], who was the Dean of Instruction at the time, seemed pretty excited about allowing us to create something cool and new and innovative and some kind of a learning community model. But then she put the brakes on and got nervous and started using the term “brain drain.” Maybe somebody made her panic, I am not sure exactly. It might not have
been her own panic; it might have been someone else that said you can’t
let all of those good guys go out there together. It would take too much
away from the Pecos Campus, perhaps. I think that was really
unfortunate. She kind of pulled back Melinda [Rudibaugh], pulled back
Pam [Davenport], although I do not think Pam ever was all that enamored.
… And so she let David Weaver go and she let you, Maria Hesse, and I
go out there. So we started from there. (M. Mason, personal
communication, June 2, 2005)

Margaret Hogan was instrumental in establishing the Partnership in Baccalaureate
Education with ASU East, whereby ASU students could enroll in CGCC general
education courses as part of their ASU class schedule and never pay more than they
would as full-time students at ASU. She worked with David Schwalm (Figure 13), ASU
East Vice Provost, to iron out the enrollment, financial, and programmatic details. The
Partnership was in tact at the time of this research, although there had not been any
significant growth in the number of co-enrolled students as a result of changes in
university policies and directions.
David Weaver remembered that when the three general education faculty worked in the ASU buildings and collaborated daily with ASU colleagues on program content, class scheduling, and service arrangements, there was a real sense of partnership. In future years, he recalled:

…that sense of partnership was something I really felt early on when the three of us went out there, that we met with Dave Schwalm [Vice Provost of ASU East] and we actually existed in their buildings for quite some time. And so I really did feel that team kind of spirit, that in recent years I haven’t felt. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Marybeth Mason saw Williams as a chance to create something from the ground up:
Not very many people in their lifetime have a chance as a teacher to create
a space exactly the way you want it. Design the furniture, pick the
furniture, place the furniture, design the curriculum, recruit the students,
and then get to teach it. It was an amazing experience. (M. Mason,
personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Dr. Elsner visited Williams periodically and was particularly interested in the
first-year experience learning community which had begun in the fall of 1988. He
recounted:

When you [Maria Hesse] were at Williams you remember, you were
basically into the redesigning in a very revolutionary way, of people’s
consciousness about community and citizenship and participation would
all be blended into general ed and liberal arts. When I would go out and
visit with Marybeth [Mason] and listen to what she was doing with the
young people, all that was very, very much a part of, I think, seeing a new
reality for the college. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28,
2005)

Williams had its challenges too. Brenda Larson, a faculty member in teacher
education and computer information systems, described how she loved her classes and
her students, but it was isolating for the faculty who had their offices at Williams and the
lack of student life made it difficult to attract and keep students “out there” (B. Larson,
personal communication, June 10, 2005).

Also, for a number of years there was ongoing confusion about CGCC’s hosting
of MCC programs at Williams. Because the Williams Campus had been started as a
collaboration among several of the Maricopa Community Colleges, including Mesa Community College, and because the Air Force Base footprint itself had been annexed by the City of Mesa long ago, it was difficult for MCC administrators to let go of Williams. Ken Schultz, who had been a former Dean at MCC, was appointed as the first facilities director at what was initially called the Williams Education Center (WEC) and in that role he jointly reported to MCC President Larry Christiansen and CGCC President Arnette Ward.

When WEC became CGCC’s Williams Campus, Ken Schultz was reassigned to report directly to President Ward. However, it is clear from correspondence in President Ward’s files that some confusion persisted in Schultz’s mind about his role and the decisions he was authorized and not authorized to make related to what had become a CGCC campus. In March of 1997, when Schultz allowed MCC to move one of their programs on-site without President Ward’s knowledge, President Ward responded with what this researcher would term a “blistering” memo. She stated emphatically that “the campus is now CG’s,” and Schultz was not authorized to allow other colleges to use CGCC facilities without consulting her, that he did “not have the authority to give up space,” that she considered his actions “to be in total disregard” for her as President, and that any arrangements such as those that had been made were “a courtesy, nothing more” (A. Ward, personal communication, March 28, 1997). Schultz wrote back indicating that he had misunderstood the new arrangements for Williams and still thought he had some obligation to “service both CGCC and MCC facility needs,” but now better understood the situation (K. Schultz, personal communication, April 1, 1997). Within a year, Schultz had taken a leave of absence and shortly thereafter retired from the Maricopa system and
accepted a new position in Michigan (Kenneth Schultz named V.P. and Chancellor for 
FSU – GR, 1999).

Interestingly, Ward, who was always concerned about being a good steward of 
taxpayer resources, did not require the MCC programs to move, but rather sent 
correspondence to MCC President Christiansen stating that he should make arrangements 
to move his programs into his own facilities as soon it was feasible. This researcher also 
reviewed more recent correspondence to MCC President Christiansen about the history of 
Williams and the ongoing need to clarify “confusion that results about having MCC 
programs in CGCC buildings at the Williams Campus” (M. Hesse, personal 
correspondence, January 15, 2004). As of the time of this research, MCC continues to 
work on finding space for the programs that are temporarily housed at the CGCC 
Williams Campus.

In its first 10 years of operations, Williams had not had an on-site administrator 
with broad responsibilities. The aviation faculty were used to being self-sufficient due to 
being located off-site from their program’s inception. The general education faculty 
reported through their academic divisions and sought support as needed through the Dean 
of Instruction, a position later retitled the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Ken 
Schultz, formerly from MCC, had served as a facilities director for the campus for several 
years in its infancy. Frank Zamora had served as the student service coordinator for 
several years. However, there had been no senior level administrator who had 
responsibility for all aspects of campus operations. In November 2003, the college 
President Maria Hesse appointed John Schroeder as the first Provost of the Williams
Campus. John had served as an aviation faculty member with CGCC for five years before taking a position at the Maricopa District Office in technology.

In 2005, Provost Schroeder was in the process of developing a facilities master plan for the Williams Campus; overseeing the development and construction of two facilities, a general education and healthcare building and an aircraft hangar; expanding services to students and employees on-site; supporting new academic programs such as nursing; and establishing community linkages with the growing community of Queen Creek.

Sun Lakes Education Center

The mid-1990s were busy times at CGCC. The Williams Campus was under development and construction had begun on the Sun Lakes extension center. Paul Elsner describes the strategy behind the Sun Lakes location:

… when we looked at Sun Lakes and then when we looked at Williams, we were basically responding to pockets of need that were out there. We know that the adult learner, senior learners and so forth were a very important aspect of demographics in the Valley, and I think that was part of, you know, filling out kind of a repertoire of services and outreach that needed to be done. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

The abbreviated college history provided in the College Catalog explains the beginnings of what would come to be called the Sun Lakes Education Center:

Passage of the general obligation bond in November, 1994, provided $500,000 for the development and construction of a 5,000 square feet
education center in the Sun Lakes/Sun Bird communities. Sun Lakes
Education Center, planned as a college extension to serve the retirement
community of Sun Lakes, is located on the northeast corner of the Alma
School and Riggs Roads in Chandler/Sun Lakes. Non-credit classes began
in the fall 1995 and credit classes began in fall 1997. ("Catalog and

The groundbreaking ceremony (Figure 14) was held on May 8, 1996, and the
building dedication was held on May 10, 1997. Mary Kaye Allen, a resident of Sun
Lakes and a former secretary at the Pecos Campus, was asked to coordinate this new
endeavor.

Figure 14. Groundbreaking ceremony at the Sun Lakes Education Center. Pictured from
left to right are Dean Peterson, Manager of Computer Lab; Nancy Stein, MCCC
Governing Board; Mary Kaye Allen, Coordinator of SLEC; Arnette Ward, College
President; Frank Ramirez, Dean of Continuing Education; and Dawn Edgmon,
Coordinator of Marketing and PR.
Chuck Bedal, founding mathematics faculty, explained that in addition to meeting the intellectual and social needs of the mature adult communities in the Southeast Valley, it was important to connect with this audience and provide services that in turn would connect them to the college:

The Chandler Public Schools had long ago learned that the Sun Lakes people were very good at voting down bond issues. One of the things that we decided we must do is make sure the Sun Lakes people were involved so we could get their support and pass the bond issues. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

By 2004-2005, the Sun Lakes Education Center was serving close to 1,000 people per year with a variety of non-credit programming. Credit classes were offered on occasion at this location, but that was not the primary focus of the programming. At the time of this writing, the Center was under construction to add a second story with approximately 6,000 GSF to allow for additional programming. In addition, the name of the Center was changed from the Sun Lakes Education Center to the Sun Lakes Center as of August 11, 2006, as explained in the meeting minutes of the President’s Executive Council:

Mary Kaye Allen explained that soon new signage will be placed on the side of the college’s Sun Lakes building. The emphasis on the sign will be CGCC, with the specific college location (Sun Lakes) being secondary. She and other members of the Sun Lakes construction project team felt that this was a good time to officially rename the center the Sun Lakes
Center, removing the word “education” from its name. The signage makes clear that the center is part of Chandler-Gilbert Community College and therefore implies that the programming is educational in nature.
"President's Executive Council minutes, August 11, 2006," p. 9

This section of the chapter has covered the formation of the college. These years, 1985-1995, were the formative years for the college in that the organizational structure was developed, the educational philosophy was articulated, and the facilities were planned. A college president was appointed. The first phase of the Pecos Campus was constructed, the Williams Campus had been obtained, and the Sun Lakes Education Center was under construction. The college was named after the two communities it primarily served. Committed employees worked closely with the community to provide programs and services, which will be discussed in more detail in another section. Following the initial accreditation, the first graduation ceremonies were held to confer degrees and certificates.

There was lots of creative activity during this phase, and there was humor and collegiality. Nearly everything was a first and so it was special and memorable, as noted by many of the individuals who were interviewed. There were too many items to cover to do it justice, but the researcher has covered those items which met the criteria defined in Chapter 3.

There are numerous stories that were not told, such as the selection of the school colors and the mascot. The former Director of Student Life Duane Oakes described that process in detail in his interview and few others remembered how the school colors came to be teal and silver and the mascot became a coyote named “Cody the Coyote” (D.
Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005). This researcher encourages readers who want to learn more about the formation of the college to look at the interview transcriptions which are posted on a college history web site, www.cgc.maricopa.edu/history/.

Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan described the creative energy that characterized this stage of the organization’s development. “There’s a euphoria when you’re starting something new that isn’t matched by any other stage of the organization’s development because you’re creating—you don’t ever forget those times. Because you’re at your peak—you’re soaring” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

**Growth**

*Chandler-Gilbert has survived the surrounding growth pains.... But to be able to survive them with a feeling of comfort for the employees and for the students and the feeling of comfort for the community, is no small trick.*

(L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

This section highlights the major events and activities that marked the years from approximately 1995 through 2005. There is some degree of overlap with the last section because certain topics such as accreditation and graduation were described at their first occurrence and then summarized through 2005.

Student enrollment had grown steadily but in small increments from the move to the Pecos Campus in 1987 to 1995, from 3,846 students to 5,419 students annually. From 1995-2005, as new buildings were built with the funds provided by the passage of
the 1994 bond election, enrollments more than doubled to approximately 12,000 students annually. With new extension sites opening, Williams in 1995 and Sun Lakes in 1997, and faculty and staff spreading into an expanded footprint at the Pecos Campus, the college experienced growing pains.

The communities surrounding the college were growing. There were many new home developments. The school districts added new elementary and secondary schools. Retail stores cropped up on corners that had previously been farms. Governing Board member Ed Contreras explained:

I think the boom in the East Valley with the homebuilding and the movement of individuals to the southeast portion of the valley affected the community college dramatically. It, again, added emphasis to the fact that some of the smaller communities would have greater needs than some other ones because of their growth potential and the demand of citizens who lived in that area. The boom was particularly evident around Chandler-Gilbert because when we first opened the school, in it’s earlier years, there was not very much around it other than farming land. And today farming land is becoming almost extinct in the area and being taken over by large leaps and bounds because of the homebuilding industry in this area and commercial development also. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005)

The population growth in the Southeast Valley was dramatic. The college environmental scan in the fall of 1995 reported:
Both Chandler and Gilbert are ranked among the top 3-4 fastest growing communities in the nation. Chandler has grown from a small agricultural community to the seventh largest city in Arizona with over 126,000 people in 1995, and is projected to reach 151,865 by the year 2000. Gilbert has grown from a population of 29,000 in 1990 to 52,000 in 1995—a 79.4% increase. ("Appendices for self-study report 1996," 1996, p. 2-A)

President Ward felt, “Arizona was actually a growth mecca, if I could say it that way. It was something. The weather, the space, whatever it was attracted so many people from out of state, businesses, industry, and so forth” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005). Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan described the development of the local communities in the following way:

Growth of population is just absolutely the major thing, a change in demographics, and the culture, because these were farm communities and they were wanting to change. Gilbert wanted to become a city. And Chandler wanted to be more urban. And both of them didn’t want to be tagged as bedroom communities, and so there was a lot of interest in economic development and both communities saw this college as a vehicle for helping them in their economic development. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

MCC President Larry Christiansen commented on the growth of CGCC during the years following initial accreditation. He said that the community growth in turn exerted pressure on “Chandler-Gilbert to be all things to all people, sometimes prematurely” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005). He explained:
Many of these institutions around the country had an opportunity to grow in a more controlled way. Chandler-Gilbert I think faced, in some ways, and will continue to face, a microcosm of what Mesa Community College faced during its history. It would fill every class it offered, and so there became this urgency to offer five more sections of English 101 and 10 more sections of College Algebra, and this, and this, and this, and the needs and the pressures didn’t seem to ease. And then again as the population continues to grow it continues to even be more dramatic. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

The passage of a bond referendum in 1984 had provided dollars with which the Pecos Campus was born. MCC President Larry Christiansen described that bond as the “most significant” in the college’s development (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005). However, the subsequent bond referendums proved to be critically important as well.

The passage of a bond was crucial for the growth of the college, but the college community experienced a low moment when the bond election of 1992 failed. Brenda Larson, a computer information systems faculty member at that time, recalled that “it kind of knocked the wind out of our sails” (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005).

But the college community bounced back from the disappointment. MCCCD reshaped the bond package, strategized about when to go out for election and how to better communicate the needs, and then went to the community with another request for help in 1994. The passage of the 1994 bond referendum provided $386 million district
wide and $31 million dollars for CGCC ("Self-study report 1996," 1996). The dollars provided for capital expansion in that bond were used to significantly expand the Pecos Campus including the Library, a new classroom complex (Figure 15), faculty offices, science labs, art facilities, a Student Center, athletic fields, parking and roadways, signage, technology, and more. At the Williams Campus, the old Air Force buildings were remodeled for use as classrooms, labs, and service areas. The Sun Lakes Education Center was constructed.

Some of the staff were surprised at how quickly student enrollment began to grow. Julie Palinsky, one of the first CGCC graduates, became an employee in the computer lab and then in the Admissions and Records Department. She commented:

*Figure 15. The C and S classroom complex on the Pecos Campus which opened for classes in the spring of 1999.*
I think the growth has affected us in a good way, and I think having the three campuses has affected us. When we first started doing that I thought, why are we putting a campus out there, who's going to go to that? Well, they do! (J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

As new buildings were built, more students enrolled, therefore more faculty and staff were hired and additional programs and services became available. These were exciting times, but they were also times of stress on a young organization. Yolanda Penley, business faculty, described the years following the initial accreditation as a time characterized by “[s]ubtle conflict, not outward conflict, but you felt it. You felt the tension” (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

Structural Changes

After accreditation in 1992, the Provost became the President and the Assistant Provosts became Deans. Previous to that time, they had shared a variety of duties and from year-to-year different employees would report to the one person and then to the other person. It was a small and fluid organization and this structure allowed for both Assistant Provosts to gain experience with all functions of the organization. Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan, who eventually became the Dean of Instruction, described the circumstances:

I had a number of roles here and it was mainly because we were trying to figure out what should be the administrative structure. And in the beginning Andy [Bernal] and I shared a lot of the roles. We just split administrative and student services between us and it worked okay as long
as we were small. But then it got a little confusing—it just seems there’s a lot of pressure to do the traditional things. And in time then it seemed like we were going to need to have one person who was this and one person who was that. And so I spent, as an Assistant Provost, [time] doing mainly Arts and Sciences and some of the Student Services and some of the Administrative Services. And then when Andy became the Assistant Provost over Instruction, I took over the Student and Administrative Services. And that’s where the acronym SAS came from, Student and Administrative Services. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

When the Assistant Provosts became Deans, there was pressure to conform to a more standardized organizational structure. Within MCCCD, Deans had responsibility for certain areas of functioning, so there were Deans of Instruction (now called Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs), Deans of Student Services (now called Vice Presidents for Student Affairs), and Deans of Administrative Services (now called Vice Presidents of Administrative Services).

MCC President Larry Christiansen described the difficulties in configuring the CGCC leadership team:

…when Andy and Margaret were hired here at Chandler-Gilbert, they started on a path, I think in terms of the initial kind of planning. The structure is kind of interesting, contrary to either Homero [Lopez at EMCCC] or John [Cordova at PVCCC], Arnette didn’t want to have an Assistant Provost for Instruction and an Assistant Provost for
Administration, or Assistant Provost for Student Services. They were her Assistant Provosts and all three of them tackled all the issues. …she and I had long talks about that because she didn’t want to change that. And I said it clearly works as you’re planning a place, the question I have is, is it going to work once you’re moving down the road and you have to provide some Chief Academic Officer leadership or Chief Financial Officer leadership. I mean sitting down and looking at each budget decision, or sitting down and looking at each instructional decision, might be the way its fun to do, but from an economy of scale and efficiency it probably wasn’t quite as efficient, if they stayed in that way. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

The CGCC leadership team did move towards a more conventional structure. Andy Bernal was appointed as the Dean of Occupational Education and Margaret Hogan was appointed as the Dean of Arts and Sciences, so that they both had some responsibilities for academic programs. Faculty members recalled difficulties in the 1992-1993 timeframe:

I think that accreditation was a pivotal point toward change. The Provost became our President, the Assistant Provosts became Deans and things changed a whole lot at that point. People were not getting along as well, I hate to say that, but I think there was a definite feeling that there were people jockeying for position. Who was running whom, who reported to whom. I know that probably it is not politically correct to say, but I think
that is what happened. It was no longer as much fun. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

In 1993, only one year after CGCC received initial accreditation, Andy Bernal left and took a position as Dean of Instruction at GateWay Community College. Upon his departure, Margaret Hogan was appointed as CGCC’s Dean of Instruction, where she remained until her move to the District Office in 1998. Founding faculty member Alice Conkright recalled:

It was very significant when there was a change in the administration. I do not remember when that was. One of the Assistant Provosts, Andy Bernal, left and went to GateWay Community College. Then several years later, Margaret left and went to District. New people came in, new administrators. When the two Assistant Provosts left a lot of tension went with them, even though I am not inclined in any way to say they were the creators of the tension. But just because they had been there from the beginning and had worked with everybody, as with any kind of clean sweep, as it were, when they left many tensions left too. I do not mean that in any kind of personal way. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

Yolanda Penley, the first chair of the Business Division, left the college and went to neighboring Mesa Community College in spring of 1997 (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005). She explained the situation from her perspective:

Andy Bernal left to GateWay [Community College], I think. Then somewhere along the line there—I was not here because I was already at
MCC—Margaret Hogan, the Dean of Instruction, also left under circumstances that probably everyone had wished to avoid. But the neat thing about the faculty here is that they all bounced back and they supported the President and they supported her decisions and they made the transition. I mean nobody liked it, and there were difficulties, but they lived with it and they worked through the transition and got things back on target. I think that is one of the beauties about this school is that people generally liked working with each other. They will do what they have to do. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

From 1993 to the present there have been different administrative configurations. Working with the college and District human resources staff, the researcher tracked the dates of service for each of the administrators who served at CGCC.

In administrative services, Patti Johnson served as CFO until 2002. Johnson had come to CGCC in February of 1988 as the Coordinator of Marketing and Public Relations and then in 1991 became Executive Assistant to Provost Ward. She became Associate Dean of Administrative Services (CFO) in August of 1993, then was promoted to the Dean of Administrative Services in January of 1995. Johnson became a faculty member in journalism and mass communication in August of 2002, where she still serves as the time of this research. Librado “Lee” Garza, accounting and marketing faculty member, was tapped to serve as Interim Dean of Administrative Services from August 2002 to July of 2004. Mark Mason, the Vice President of Administrative Services at the time of this research, was hired in August of 2004.
In student affairs, Maria Hesse served as Associate Dean (CSAO) until 1989 when Lois Bartholomew was appointed by Arnette Ward in August 1989. Following accreditation in 1993, Lois became a full Dean and is now called the Vice President of Student Affairs, a position in which she continues to serve.

Andy Bernal and Margaret Hogan both alternatively served as the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) of the college during its first years of operation, swapping from year to year as to who had primary responsibility. The records show that following initial accreditation, Andy Bernal became Dean of Occupational Education, until such time as he transferred to GateWay Community College in the role of Dean of Instruction in 1993. Following her time as Assistant Provost, Margaret Hogan served as Dean of Arts and Sciences and then became Dean of Instruction from 1993-1998. President Ward appointed Maria Hesse as Dean of Instruction in 1998. Hesse had been originally hired at CGCC in 1987 in student affairs and had been serving as Business/CIS faculty for nine years prior to moving into the CAO role. In 2002 when Maria Hesse was selected to become the next college President, Marybeth Mason, English and humanities faculty, served in the CAO role for the fall 2002 semester while a national search was underway. William “Bill” Guerriero was selected and started in January of 2003. Bill had been in that role for three years at the time of this research. In January of 2005, the title of Dean of Instruction changed district-wide to Vice President of Academic Affairs.

At one stage, the college had a Dean of Continuing Education, Frank Ramirez. Frank came to the college from the District Office in January of 1996. College organizational charts from 1996 indicate that he had responsibility for an unusual combination of duties including continuing and community education, the Sun Lakes
Education Center, athletics, fundraising, college safety, facilities, and special projects. Upon his retirement in 2000, the position was not refilled. Oversight for athletics was returned to the student affairs area, while oversight of fundraising, college safety, and facilities returned to the administrative services area. Responsibility for continuing and community education programs was given to the academic affairs area of the college.

John Underwood became the first Associate Dean of Instruction, specifically charged with development of occupational/vocational programs. Underwood started at CGCC in 1988 as an aviation faculty member. In 1989 he became the Director of Aviation Programs. In January of 1996 he became the Associate Dean of Instruction and then in July of 1998 was promoted to become Senior Associate Dean with responsibility for both career and technical programs, as well as college technology. John took a promotional opportunity as Executive Director at GateWay Community College’s Skill Center, leaving CGCC in 2003. Marybeth Mason served in the Associate Dean role in an interim capacity in the spring of 2003. William “Bill” Crawford was selected as Associate Dean in 2003 and promoted to Dean of Career and Technical Education in 2005. At the time of this research, he is still in that role.

Ken Schultz, a former Dean at MCC, served as the Director of the Williams Education Center from 1995-1999, and was considered part of the administrative team because he reported directly to the college President. In that capacity, he had responsibility for the physical facilities and some services. After his departure for Ferris State University in Michigan, the position was not filled. In November 2003, John Schroeder was appointed the first Provost of the Williams Campus and is in that position at the time of this research.
Gil Gonzales was the first Associate Dean of Learning Resources or Chief Information Officer (CIO). His areas of responsibility included the library, learning assistance, and technology. Gonzales took a promotional opportunity at the District Office in 1992 and then moved to MCC in 1994 as the Dean of Information Technology (CIO). The library was realigned to report to the Dean of Instruction. A separate CIO was not initially hired upon Gonzales’ departure. Rather technology departments reported to Administrative Services, then Student Affairs, and eventually to the Dean of Instruction. As Associate Dean, John Underwood assumed responsibility for technology, and was therefore promoted to Senior Associate Dean to acknowledge the broadened scope of the responsibility. As technology issues became a major concern of the faculty, Earl Monsour was hired as Associate Dean of Information Technology (CIO) in May of 2000. When Earl transferred to the District Office in 2003, Victor Navarro became the CIO with the title Director of Information Technology.

So there have been many different administrative constellations over the years. At the time of this research, the college administrative team consisted of Bill Guerriero, Vice President of Academic Affairs (CAO); Lois Bartholomew, Vice President of Student Affairs (CSAO); Mark Mason, Vice President of Administrative Services (CFO); John Schroeder, Provost of the CGCC Williams Campus; Bill Crawford, Dean of Career and Technical Education; Victor Navarro, Director of Information Technology (CIO); and Jaime Garrido, Associate Dean of Administrative Services.

The founding Provost and President Arnette Ward retired in 2002. Maria Hesse (Figure 16), who had served as CSAO, faculty, and then CAO, became the second president in July of 2002.
Figure 16. Maria Hesse became President of Chandler-Gilbert Community College in 2002.

Academic Divisions

As the college grew, the college leadership structure changed and other structures within the organization also changed. In October of 1986, Provost Ward appointed a committee of faculty and administrators to recommend a structure for academic divisions. They deliberated and Alice Conkright, chair of the committee, reported they had reviewed organizational charts from other Maricopa Community Colleges, and read numerous articles and books (A. Conkright, personal communication, March 28, 1987). The committee recommended a five-division structure: Languages and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Science and Mathematics, Business and Computer Sciences, and Communications and Fine Arts. The Provost accepted the recommendations and appointed the first division chairs—Alice Conkright, Sandra
Stuebner, Chuck Bedal, Yolanda, Penley, and Diane Travers, respectively (Starks, 2006), who began their terms in fall of 1987 (Ward, 1988).

Chuck Bedal remembered being tapped as the first division chair for the Science and Mathematics Division:

Andy just said Chuck you are going to be the Chair of Science and Math. And at that time, I was just given the responsibility. The fall semester had already started, and I had been given the responsibility of developing a schedule for the spring semester and finding what the teachers wanted to teach and working around time schedules like that. I was not allowed to spend any money. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

The Aviation Division was formed in the fall of 1989, with John Underwood serving as division chair. John had been initially hired as aviation faculty, but because the job was year-round, was reclassified as a manager (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005). Counseling was formed one year later and Olivia Lara was appointed chair in fall of 1990. These two new divisions had been formed by the administration during the summer months when the faculty were not present. Further, at this stage in the college’s development, Division Chairs were appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Assistant Provosts. There were no elections for Division Chair positions until 1990.

Some people thought that separation into academic divisions was a necessary organizational structure for growth. Others felt that it changed the climate of the organization. “I think the selection of division chairs, that whole process was negative for me. I didn’t agree with the policies or procedures, for selecting division chairs,
especially when it became the popular vote kind of focus” (W. Matthews, personal
communication, June 14, 2005). Business faculty member Yolanda Penley explained that
each division vied with the others for limited resources:

After we got accredited, growth continued. We kept adding faculty and
soon we became more division-oriented. You know, the competition for
resources increased and resources were scarce. The divisions became
much more competitive after NCA accreditation. (Y. Penley, personal
communication, June 1, 2005)

During the next 10 years, there were a series of smaller changes in division
structures. Aviation elected a faculty division chair, whereas they had previously had a
manager in that role. New curriculum was adopted and placed into divisions (Hesse,
2005).

In 1999, there was discussion about new curriculum areas and their possible
placements within the division structure. There was no existing process for forming or
changing divisions and there was agreement that a process needed to be developed. A
pilot process was developed and it required that a written proposal be developed that
would address implications for organizational structure, costs, benefits, and other items.
A proposal would proceed through a process of review and input and ultimately the
President would make a decision (Hesse, 2005).

In 2000, the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division recommended the formation
of a division for health and other wellness disciplines. The Wellness, Health, Nutrition,
and Physical Education (WHNPE) Division was approved by the President’s Executive
Council in April of 2000, effective in July 2000. The librarians sought division status in Fall of 2000 and were approved to become a division effective July 2001 (Hesse, 2005).

In the Fall of 2003, the former Counseling Division was moved into the Wellness Division when they became part of Academic Affairs. Formerly the counselors had been part of Student Affairs and had reported to the Dean of Student Services. They were the only faculty who did not report through the Dean of Instruction at that time. WHNPE changed their name in Fall of 2003 to the Wellness Division. Math and Science proposed a division split in the Spring of 2003, and it was approved effective Fall of 2003.

However, there was debate over placement of some curriculum as the division members did not have consensus. In a presentation to the Faculty Association in the fall of 2005, Maria Hesse who had become college President in 2002, recapped the history of division structures at CGCC. She recalled that in 2003:

There were multiple other suggestions that surfaced and were discussed informally among faculty members about division structure. Should life sciences split from physical sciences? Has Language and Humanities become too large? Can there be separate divisions at the Williams Campus? What if an existing division wants a curriculum area that is currently placed in another division? Who decides divisional placement for new courses and programs?

In fall 2003 the Faculty Association and the college President agreed that a “moratorium” would be in effect on division changes until the faculty had time to examine a variety of questions and consider developing policies related to these issues. In Fall 2004, there was a
request directly to the President to change the alignment of Engineering from the Science Division to the Math Division. The President responded that the agreements reached with the Faculty Association as a whole would be abided by, that is, no more changes would be made until such time as some questions were adequately addressed (see attachment #2).

In Spring 2005, there was a faculty committee who developed a process for modifying divisions/departments (see attachment #3). Also in the Spring of 2005, the Faculty Senate made a recommendation to the President to form a Nursing Division, stating that it was a requirement for establishment of the nursing program. The Nursing Division was formed, effective July 2005. (Hesse, 2005, pp. 9-12)

At the time of this research, there are 10 academic divisions: Languages and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Communication and Fine Arts, Business and Computer Information Systems, Mathematics, Science, Aviation, Wellness, Library, and Nursing.

The Division Chair Council, which was originally formed in 1988, meets on a weekly basis during the academic year. This group has a significant leadership role at the college including such matters as academic planning, class scheduling, faculty orientations, conflict resolution among faculty members, and more. The chairperson of each academic division serves on the Division Chair Council. Each year one of the chairs is selected to serve as the Chair of the Division Chairs. This person works with the CAO to establish agendas and prioritize projects. Support for the functioning of the council was generally provided by the secretary or administrative assistant to the Dean of
Instruction or the position now called the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The picture below (Figure 17) portrays the Division Chair Council of 1995.

![Division Chair Council in 1995](image)

Figure 17. CGCC Division Chair Council in 1995. Seated from left to right on the bottom row are Larry Miller, library; Margaret Hogan, Dean of Instruction; Pam Davenport, Language and Humanities; Olivia Lara, Counseling; Barbara Green, Administrative Assistant; Lee Garza, Business and Computer Information Systems.

In the top row are Richard Malcolm, Social and Behavioral Sciences; David Weaver, Science and Mathematics; and Gordon Jesse, Communications and Fine Arts.

Not pictured: Joe McCourt, Aviation.

As was previously described, major changes in the administrative structure were taking place as the college grew. Competition for resources became more severe and
relationships, which were generally considered collegial, became strained. As more faculty were hired and they awaited the opening of new buildings to accommodate the increased numbers of employees, it was often the case that residential faculty had to share offices. For a period of time, many residential faculty had cubicles along the back wall of the Pecos Campus computer lab, while others were housed in cubicles in a temporary modular building at approximately the site where the south end of the Performing Arts Center is located at the time of this research. Others doubled up in offices in the A Building. The Faculty Association formed an Office Committee to determine a fair system for allocation of offices as they became available. Sandra Stuebner, psychology faculty, told a story about “the fights” for faculty offices that characterized the times:

Faculty offices were so contested. It was just ridiculous and it got down to when you were hired. Not just in the fall of 1990, but what day in the fall of 1990. We have a very complex list of seniority days and where you are in the list of seniority for office selection. I remember one of our former Vice [Assistant] Provosts would make fun of the faculty for being so passionate about their offices and my argument was if everyone had a good office there wouldn’t be these kinds of passionate feelings. If you’ve got a cubical with no door and no ceiling, you’ve just got this cubicle where people can hear your conversation with students. You can’t lock things up, you can’t feel that your tests are not compromised. That is why it was that way. We had temporary offices for a long time. I do not know how many years of our 20 years that we have not had faculty in temporary
housing for offices, and we do again. It was always a big exciting day when there were names drawn.

I remember there were names drawn one year. That was the year I was sharing an office with Robin [McCord] and the snake. I did not want to share an office with Robin and the snake. My name was pulled as the next person to get an office and there was an empty office with a window which of course made it invaluable. And I was so excited. And then I heard some rumblings that somebody was going to contest it, because they thought that maybe they should have that office. And I was like, “Oh, no!” So I ran and moved immediately! I figured, you know, possession is 9/10th of the law. If I am in there, no one can throw me out. And the person who wanted that office, I won’t name names, but that person didn’t speak to me for two years. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

*Relationships within MCCCD*

The internal changes at CGCC caused a degree of stress and conflict in the organization. There were also tensions with sister colleges and the District Office. “I think as we severed the umbilical cord, so to speak, there was still a little tension about the separation” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

The decision to expand the Maricopa Community Colleges system by adding new centers on the periphery of the county was initially met with enthusiasm by internal employees in the early 1980s. As the new centers developed, there was a feeling that
new opportunities might be available for internal employees, as described by MCC President Larry Christiansen:

    When Paul [Elsner] hired the Provosts for Paradise Valley and Chandler-Gilbert and Estrella, it was an internal-only search. So that impacted, I think in a positive way, a feeling of all the Maricopans, even though there may have been a large number of people who were interested in those jobs, at least it was going to be a fellow Maricopan who would be able to get one of those positions. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Dr. Christiansen’s predecessor as MCC President, Dr. Wally Simpson, explained that even those faculty and staff who did not intend to transfer to the new centers shared in the excitement of developing these new sites:

    …the MCC staff, faculty, department chairs, and especially the Deans were enthusiastic about this new campus. In other words, they didn’t view it as an extension of Mesa only and as a possible threat in the future, and I really applauded them for that. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

But Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner shared that the early enthusiasm was tempered by the reality that these centers would eventually become independent colleges in the system:

    …the college presidents never really warmed up to the fact that we would have 10 independent colleges, and so when we started Chandler-Gilbert, for example, it was conceived by Mesa Community College as a center for
them. Okay? And when they started Paradise Valley, it was conceived as a center of Scottsdale Community College, and Estrella a center of Glendale. None of those centers, as soon as they saw any size, and I probably let out more than hints, that if they got up to a certain size they might be able to invoke their sovereignty and go for regional accreditation and move on as an independent, and then set themselves up to be independent colleges. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Soon, there was a realization that these new colleges would be competing for resources and would have start-up costs that could be seen on the one hand as investments for future growth of the District or on the other hand as a drain on limited resources. MCC Larry Christiansen described the “internal Maricopa politics” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005):

How much do you invest in new places where your cost per FTSE [full-time student equivalents] is more, as compared to other places where your cost per FTSE is less. The internal politics of accepting the vision of this is the kind of thing that needs to play itself out. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

So the older and larger colleges were worried about the potential of these centers to drain resources and they had reason to be concerned. Larry Christiansen described that the existing colleges lost many good people to the new centers:

… Paradise Valley was first, faculty were allocated out of the current college’s budgets, so the Provosts went and looked at the faculty from all of the rest of the Maricopa Colleges and tried to convince someone to
come and join their faculty. And then the schools that faculty were taken from to go to the new institution were not given replacement positions for three years, were only given visiting staff dollars. And so the hatred, and I say that somewhat in jest, but somewhat to build the feeling of emotion, when a Maricopa President saw a Provost come on campus, they knew what they were going to do, and that is to try and convince members of their faculty to come to their institution, and the current Maricopa institution would pay a price for that. And so it was very, very tense. (L. Christiansen, June 6, 2005)

So the more senior colleges were not inclined to help the new centers. Meanwhile, the people at the new centers were frustrated with the lack of resources for start-up operations. Some of the employees at the new centers had been in Maricopa long enough to remember the sizeable facilities with which PC, MCC, GCC, and SCC had had at opening or shortly thereafter. They knew that the status of MCC, GCC and SCC as extension centers was very temporary and that they became independent colleges within a couple of years of opening. They knew that Rio and SMCC hired college presidents right away to help plan for and start those colleges. So this newer concept of developing centers with partial facilities, limited programs and services, administrators with similar duties but lessor rank and pay, etc. was exciting at first, but eventually rankled the employees at the new centers. CGCC’s Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan remembered, “… the other colleges weren’t required to start as centers. And they weren’t shepherded by, only informally were they shepherded by, their sister institutions like Phoenix College
helped Scottsdale and Glendale, you know that type of thing” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005). Larry Christiansen described the situation:

… one consistency that was prevalent with Paradise Valley and Scottsdale, and Glendale and Estrella, and Mesa and Chandler-Gilbert, is that the new place couldn’t wait to get rid of the old place, and so this angst that was created was pretty significant. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

The frustration could be heard even years later as CGCC employees were interviewed for this research. In reference to trailing MCC faculty at their graduations, business faculty member Yolanda Penley recalled, “…we were like the stepchild for MCC” (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005). They couldn’t wait to be free and when they did finally achieve initial accreditation, they were delighted. Brenda Larson phrased it, “We broke away from Mesa [Community College]” (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005).

President Ward wanted to establish a distinct identity for CGCC, as she and her staff felt confined by MCC’s oversight. “There were so many things that we were restricted with by being connected. People were then beginning to ask about the institution; how long, how long before the center became a college?” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

Furthermore, the MCCCD system engaged in extensive comparative analysis between the colleges and centers, which fostered an intensely competitive environment. Larry Christiansen explained that the financial picture, the distribution of resources, was the primary source of the stress between colleges:
... every future step that a Chandler-Gilbert takes, starting a baseball program, or starting a music program, or starting a theater program, comes with such an angst over the priorities, and its usually a new underfunded mandate that needs to get put in place, and comparisons are made of these new places to older places, and those comparisons are made by Board Members, they’re made by community members, and they’re made by students. And they’re made then also by internal employees. That creates a feeling of haves and have-nots that’s very problematic with having a model and then not having it be funded at levels when you could play it out. So I think if there was a common thread for Chandler-Gilbert, probably more so than Estrella and for Paradise Valley, but common to all, was one of expectations outstripping resources. And that, I think, was a difficult one to play. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Speaking about the constant comparisons with other colleges and particularly PVCC, Gil Gonzales recalled:

Well, Chandler-Gilbert had a twin sister. And the twin sister was Paradise Valley. And then it had a younger sibling, Estrella Mountain, that all were developed about the same time. And the Paradise Valley, Chandler-Gilbert dynamics were played out in terms of, in some cases, just open competition…. There was always discussion about how Paradise Valley received additional funds, received a larger founding allocation per capita to build buildings, etcetera. All built around the assumption that they had
the ability to bring in additional enrollment that Chandler-Gilbert could not grow to. So the founding philosophy of Chandler-Gilbert was one of constantly trying to articulate the need for resources to grow in competition with others…. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Founding mathematics faculty member Chuck Bedal recalled making his own constant comparisons:

David Coryell always kept us up-to-date on the enrollment factors, and when the college was first founded (you will have to talk to Tom Nicol about the actual amounts), we received something like $9 million to build the campus, and Paradise Valley received something like $15 million. We thought the District [Office] was really telling us what they thought of us by giving us two-thirds of what they gave Paradise Valley. David Coryell would say, “Ahhh, but look at the enrollment. We had more students than Paradise Valley.”

I did not get to go to Paradise Valley until about 1989, and I walked into their library and their library was larger than our entire campus – I said wow. Paradise Valley really did a marvelous job of building this beautiful structure, but Chandler-Gilbert’s enrollment was higher. I was very proud of that. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

Arnette Ward recalled her sense that decisions were not always equitable, which made the comparisons all the more difficult:
We were given 25 days to establish a master plan that has lasted us all these years when the other new colleges received a year and a half, plus at one point something like a million for operational budgets, plus $15 and $14 million. Oh gosh. This was my second sign that certain District officers in power to determine destinies for institutions actually did so in any way they could. They favored some and not others. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Board member Ed Contreras described the political atmosphere within MCCCD and attributed the strained relations to the financial situation:

I think negatively from my standpoint, during the first 20 years the college, because it was a brand new college, had to overcome that aspect of being the baby within the system. Actually, one of several babies within the system. And for that reason, not very much resources were dedicated to the college. And I think it had to grow and spend or I guess demand that it receive recognition to the same level or to an adequate level so it could sustain its growth. I think people underestimated the number of people that were being served by the Chandler-Gilbert Community College facility. And for that reason I think there was difficulty in exhibiting that to the rest of the Board or the administration that more resources were needed there. I think the other problem that affected the college was also service area and that it overlapped with Mesa [Community College] and Mesa being the strongest community college within the whole system, tended to push its weight on Chandler-Gilbert
and at times infringe on its market area. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005)

Governing Board member Nancy Stein recalled that the tension during her years on the Board was between the big (older) colleges and the small (younger) colleges:

There was a lot of discussion when I got on the Board about three colleges: it was Chandler-Gilbert, Estrella Mountain and Paradise Valley. And in my opinion it seemed like you were the adopted child. And, those three colleges really had a tough time because of their limited resources.

There were times I can remember students coming to visit with me at the colleges. And they said well, why can’t we have this program here meaning, Chandler-Gilbert or PV [Paradise Valley], you know the other colleges have it. Why isn’t there a full program here or why isn’t all the curriculum the same as the other colleges, or student services the same. And it went on like that for years that I can remember. (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Chancellor Paul Elsner had a hands-off leadership style and did not get into the squabbling among colleges. He remembered that he “tended to leave them alone, to sort of settle some of these things” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005). This approach posed difficulties for Arnette Ward. In an interview almost 20 years since the founding of the Chandler-Gilbert extension center, she recalled her frustrations about the limited resources and how that played out in her relationships with other Maricopa Colleges and specifically in her relationship with Paul Elsner. At one stage, she reached her breaking point, and she recalled in detail the despair she felt:
I actually went to my boss, my big boss, Paul Elsner, bless his heart. He will not remember this because he does not want to remember this. And I had mustered up all my courage. I did not tell my family anything. I was ready to say, “It’s yours.” Give someone this job, because I can’t go back. I can’t go back and not take home the bacon, so to speak. I had done it too many times. I was running out of faces to take back. I had really thought about it really well, no question, because I did not cry when I did it. I think of Paul as a loving big brother that every now and then I want to smack. Instead I end up bubbling, my eyes get full of water and stuff so I kind of clean them out and my system and so forth.

I went to him and said in essence, I think that I have done enough. I need you to give me a dean’s job. Let me go my way, I have done all that I could do. I think I have met every need that you requested of me, and exceeded that, but I can no longer operate the way I have been operating with the District Office over the years. It is taking too much of a toll on me emotionally and I am beginning to have to explain more to my folk as to why I don’t get things that the college needs. He kind of looked at me as if to say, which planet are you on today. First of all, I had asked for a 45-minute meeting, instead of the usual 30-minute meeting. He said I had wondered why you needed so much time. I worked hard to not go to Paul’s office for anything unless he called me.

Sure enough, I gave him the job back. He saw I was serious. I said the only thing I would fight you on is keeping a Dean’s position,
because I know I would do well there. I am entitled to a Dean’s job. He looked at me and said, “I don’t know what you are talking about, and frankly nobody is going anywhere.” He started reminiscing about a few other things he had going on similar to my request. He said he did not want to talk about it anymore. “Let us talk about something we can do about it. Do I need to bring someone here, and we can sit down and talk?” And he just went on and on. He said, “You are not going any place. We can talk about it later, but you’re not going anyplace.” I said, “Okay, we can talk about it later, but I am not changing my mind.”

Well, we go to the Board meeting the next month. There had been a little bit of talk about the new colleges getting performing arts centers. But at a Board meeting about two months out, we are sitting there very polished and polite, and he had to do his little message. He told the Board that he had decided he was ready to go for revenue bonds to build performing arts centers for the colleges that didn’t have them. And he went on for at least three to four minutes about the first college that will start. He said I think it should go to Chandler-Gilbert. When he said that I think I did not hear anything else he said, but they tell me that he talked about our program, what we had done over the years, how we had actually built a performing arts program without facilities. I mean he went on, and I was just sitting there. And somebody tells me that my eyes were just open wide, and yet I started to tear up. I do remember Homero Lopez who sat next to me and he patted me on the back and he said, you deserve that,
you really, really deserve that. Then I took a big sigh and I sat down and
then I looked out in the audience. People were looking at me. And then I
smiled and kind of dried my eyes and that’s when I knew Paul had heard
me all of these years. That was his gift. That changed me. It did not do a
lot of changing at the college, but he did say finally that he had really been
hearing my voice, but you had not found the way to step in. (A. Ward,
personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Arnette explained how she kept herself going during difficult and frustrating
times. She drew energy from going back to CGCC after spending time at the District
Office or at other colleges, and she hoped that her faculty and staff did so too:

That is where the gratification came in, I hope, especially for our faculty
and our staff. Because what they could talk about in their meetings was
something that others could not. And that is how wonderful it was to
come back to Chandler-Gilbert after attending District meetings. I do not
know where you all are they would say to peers. I know where we live and
its nothing like what you’re talking about. That is where I got some of my
energy. Because when I would talk with faculty on the corridors they
would tell about how it was so much better at Chandler-Gilbert than at
their other colleges. I’m glad we don’t do things the way they do at other
colleges. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

So clearly relationships within MCCCD were stressed by the new centers. The
centers competed against each other and they bristled at their “parent” colleges.
However, despite the difficulties, MCC President Larry Christiansen and Provost Arnette
Ward concurred that the relationship between MCC and CGCCC was better than the relationship that the other centers had with their parent institution. He summarized, “As an observer of that phenomenon, Chandler-Gilbert probably had the best of the relationships with its sister or parent institution at Mesa, but still it was rocky” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005). Arnette Ward concurred and stated that despite the rivalry, there was respect:

Regardless of the rivalry so to speak that began to come out of the relationship with Chandler-Gilbert and Mesa, we always regarded them as a hallmark when it came to academic programs and offerings and the reputation that it had garnered over the years and so we began to step in that path. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Interestingly, despite the tension over resources and the competitive nature of the colleges and centers, there was also a remarkable amount of collaboration. Gil Gonzales spoke about the strength of the system and what CGCC could contribute to it:

We really tried to take advantage of the fact that we were a start-up. We had some things we could contribute to the District. Some things we could contribute to the region. We established informal relationships between campuses to build up services and support where it made sense. Oftentimes it took a lot of strategy to do that, but we did it because we knew that was how we could successfully deploy systems and services. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

It is difficult to say how the college would have developed had relationships between CGCC and the District Office and CGCC and sister colleges been established
somewhat differently. Cathy Urbanski was Arnette Ward’s secretary and assistant for many years. She went on to complete advanced degrees and moved into institutional research and then a faculty position teaching computer software. She shared that she remembered the lack of resources but felt that it would have been better for the college to have had a less contentious relationship with the District:

… the only recommendation I have, and I would really like to have seen at the time was that we had better communication with the District. I think that’s the only thing that I regret we didn’t have. Because I think we probably would have received a lot more support. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

The next sections of the document will specifically cover three other major events for the college during its major growth years, 1995-2005: the opening of a new library building, the construction of a new Performing Arts Center, and the establishment of athletic programs. During these years, there were many new courses and programs added to the curriculum, changes in the student body, and there were new facilities constructed. A considerable amount of specific information about those items and more is included in separate sections later in the chapter.

Library, Learning Resource Center

When the Pecos Campus opened in 1987, a small space in what is currently the B Building was designated as the library. The philosophy was that resources would be available electronically, thus there was not the need for large amounts of space for shelving books and journals. The notion of a paperless library was ahead of its time. The college’s first librarian Larry Miller recounted that a consultant:
... convinced the campus initially that a paperless library would work just fine, so that’s why we ended up in 2,000 square feet. Actually I knew the consultant because he was from College of DuPage in Illinois, and he did not have anything like a paperless library. They had one of the largest community college libraries. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Miller then described the current situation with a large new building, many electronic materials, and a more diverse collection of resources for students and faculty:

We’re now entering a stage where we can do more, and we do have electronic books, and we do have reference over the computer, we do have full-text journals that students access from home. So it’s about 20 years after he [chuckles] projected it, but its not totally there yet and probably won't be for another 10 or 15 [years]. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Despite its small size, it was a challenge getting the initial library open in 1987. A mishap with a supplier caused some grief as the library staff prepared for the dedication of the new Pecos Campus:

We had ordered furniture from a company back east, called Brodart. And we had ordered our books from another company and they were in storage in Las Vegas. So we knew when we were going to have the opening, and I said, “Okay, send the books.” So we got the books and I said, “Okay, now send the furniture.” And the representative called and said, “We have a problem.” I said, “What's the problem?” “Well, the factory caught fire
and all your furniture burned up.” So I said, “How are we going to have an opening and a dedication of the campus when we have no furniture!”

So, I ended up talking to Chris Cress who was in charge of plant operations. He said, “Well, if you come and help me set up the classrooms with the folding tables, if there’s any extras I’ll give them to you.” So I came in one Saturday and I helped him set up classrooms. I think he was just shorthanded people and it was just an excuse anyway. But I ended up getting folding tables, so we could at least, when people would walk in after the dedication, they would see some tables and chairs. We never did resolve the stacks for a couple of months because I had just laid the books out in call number order, in rows on the floor and so if anyone asked I said, this will have to do until the shelves get here. But that was the most bizarre thing that they were burned to the ground. Our order was in there, not anybody else’s! (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Gil Gonzales, to whom library services reported, concurred that the first few years were tough:

We had quite an adventure putting up with this first small library. The shelving systems we purchased they were all wood, metal ends. Just absolutely gorgeous and, of course, they burned down in the factory. So we had no ability to procure shelving systems for the opening of the library. So we had to scramble and buy a bunch of press board library
systems which were awful ….  (G. Gonzales, personal communication, 
June 28, 2006)

The initial Pecos Campus facilities were small, so most spaces served multiple 
functions. The library was no exception. For a while, it housed animals for the science 
program. Larry Miller recalled:

I also remember security letting me into the library one time, and actually 
it was Cheryl Sooter, and as we walked in and started to turn on lights— 
we had paintings on the walls—we found geckos, pretty good size ones, 
were loose. And this was the time when the library was more, I guess 
Robin McCord used the word “exploratorium,” because she would get all 
kinds of animals, she’d have geckos or some sort of lizards with tongues 
that would go out like 12 inches and swoop down and get those flies or 
whatever, but she talked me into getting them in the library. Little did I 
know they would get out. And in the morning, like I say, the whole 
building was just… the library [chuckles], they were just crawling all 
over! And Cheryl said, “Oh, I’ll get those.” And I said, “Fine Cheryl. 
Call me when you get them all.” I didn’t know these were rather exotic 
aanimals. I wasn’t sure where they came from and wasn’t going to get bit 
by any, but she had no problem. She’d go ahead and take care of them. 
She did capture them all, but we made sure we kind of moved the animals 
out of the library after that. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 
2005)
The new larger library facility, which opened in 1998, also had its share of animal problems. Miller explained how birds learned to manipulate the sensors on the sliding glass doors which caused disruptions:

Now the birds are another story. With the new building, they learned how to hover in front of the doors and make them open so they can come in and make their nests. That was a problem because we were getting complaints from students about how unhealthy the new building was and they were being dive-bombed by birds. So that one didn’t work out too well. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Despite the bird issue, the new building was a vast improvement over the original tiny space. It contained shelving and stacks for books and periodicals, classrooms, meeting spaces, a learning assistance center, and offices for the librarians and staff. It was previously mentioned that there was some concern with the original consultant’s plan for a paperless library. There was also some disagreement among employees about the philosophy of the library. Alice Conkright, who had served as a librarian at SMCC prior to coming to CGCC as the founding member of the English and humanities faculty, said:

I do not know what happened to the Learning Resource Center plans. They just went really eskew. I was very involved in them because that is what I was hired for; at least for a couple years. I did that in 1985. There was a plan for a library or a Learning Resource Center that was probably more like – although I have never been there, but I have read about – Estrella Mountain’s Learning Resource Center, which I think is very computer based. There were plans for this and then it just never
happened. It really became a very traditional library. I think that was always shocking to me, every year, and I have no idea why. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

Gil Gonzales who had administrative responsibility for the library, technology, and other departments, concurred that the plans shifted to a much more traditional library than had been originally envisioned. This may have been an overcompensation for the difficulties that occurred by having such a small space and few resources for the first decade. Gonzales recalled that users of the library seemed to resist moving towards a more modern library experience:

I think there were many assumptions that were part of the master plan that we went through and actually either articulated or we refuted. And part of those changes led into master planning changes, led into new facilities changes. I’ll pick on the library as the best example of it. We had expectations that folks would not be using the library in a certain way, and frankly we were wrong. I mean, we believed that people would not be using, students would not expect to have the type of experience of being in a facility that looks like a library. We thought they wanted something different or we wanted them to have something different. And so what it turned into was a very traditional library as part of the next phase of development, from what I understand. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)
Larry Miller remembered conversations about developing “a comprehensive learning resources center” (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005) that also never materialized:

Another plan we were talking about, and that was having a comprehensive learning resources center. That wasn’t anything new; California had done it since the 1970’s, that was everything coming together in terms of testing, instructional design, library and media. All those things came together and we really thought that was going to happen and that’s what Gil Gonzales was shooting for. We’d have a place, we’d have extended hours, and they all had, whether its tutoring or whether its library or whether it’s a computer lab, they would have extended hours and that was one thing that we really thought was going to go. And, it could’ve gone, but I think because Gil had gone on to different positions elsewhere, there wasn’t the ability to follow-through with that. So, I mean we tried to make it happen but, you know, maybe it’ll come again some time, who knows? (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

The new library facilities (Figure 18) opened in 1998 with 35,000 GSF of library space and other space supporting technology and general classrooms for a total of more than 60,000 GSF. There was increased staffing, expanded hours, and a substantially larger collection. Larry Miller thought, “I’ve died and gone to heaven” (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005).
Some of the concerns mentioned above may be addressed in the 2005-2015 capital expansion plan. At the time of this research, funding has been approved for a building that will adjoin the east side of the library for the purpose of more fully integrating technology with library and learning assistance functions.

Performing Arts

Because the Southeast Valley Task Force had wanted the college to provide arts programs, a theatre instructor, Gordon Jesse, was hired in 1987. Shortly thereafter a dance instructor, Sally Jesse, and a vocal music instructor, Marcus Denton, were hired. Together they established a performing arts program at the college which is known for musical theatre productions. Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan explained why arts were an area of emphasis at a young college:
Music and Performing Arts were things that the communities wanted.
And they really saw the campuses developing into a cultural site for them, and a place for their kids to come and continue their interest in those areas.
… I think we were the first to kind of have an emphasis on integrated performing arts, where it was music, theater, and dance, and all of our productions were all three. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Space was a difficulty from the beginning. A multipurpose room on the Pecos Campus was the home for performing arts programs, but also served a variety of other purposes. For several weeks each fall, registration took place in that multipurpose room. Student and employee orientations, trainings, meetings, and celebrations were held there. College special events such as guest speakers, community gatherings, and presentations were scheduled there. It was truly a room for multiple purposes, which caused frustration for the performing arts faculty who needed dedicated space for their programs.

Business faculty member Yolanda Penley remembered attending “some performances years back when we were in this tiny little all-purpose room that accommodated 75 or 100 people” (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005). Board member Nancy Stein recalled that with no specialized spaces student performers would have to do their costumes and makeup in the public restrooms, with the audience members:

When you put on a play, or you put on any kind of an event, the students were changing their clothes in the bathrooms. You didn’t even have a room to change in and if you did, it was for more of the makeup or more
of the last minute kind of fix up for a costume. That bothered me, because
there were other colleges and they were older, I admit that, but they
seemed to have this PAC [Performing Arts Center] already on their
campus. And I’m thinking, you have the students and you’d have more if
you had a facility for it. (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21,
2005).

For several years, the performing arts faculty managed to host an arts festival
almost entirely outdoors. Sharon Flury, the college curriculum coordinator, told the story
of one of those festivals and how it was necessary for all faculty and staff to pitch in and
help:

I remember the first San Tan Arts Festival. It was held out in the
courtyard between the A and B buildings. Of course, that was all we had
at the time other than the security building that housed security and
maintenance. It was held in the spring and it was very warm, and so to
shade the dance area in the courtyard they tied a tarp to the palm trees in
the courtyard. Well, as the day wore on and the winds started flapping
that tarp, the tarp started to get lower and lower and lower. Here are these
dancers out in the middle of this courtyard in 90-some degree weather,
flinging their arms and legs and having a great dance as this tarp was
descending on them. I remember that Chris Cress, who was the director of
maintenance at the time, and I each took a rope and pulled as hard as we
could to try to get that tarp up so that the students would not be hitting the
tarp with their arms. I thought, well, this is one of those interesting “other
duties as assigned.” I think everyone pretty much turned out to help at the
San Tan Arts Festival – it was fun. (S. Flury, personal communication,
June 1, 2005)

A district-wide commitment to the performing arts has resulted in most of the
colleges having a performing arts center on campus. Maricopa Governing Board
member, Jeremy Butler, stated that the construction of the performing arts centers at
Phoenix, Mesa, Glendale and Scottsdale colleges was a significant accomplishment
during his tenure, which ran from 1968-78. Those facilities were not built with general
obligation bond proceeds, but rather were funded through revenue bonds that would be
repaid with revenue generated from student fees, food services, and book store sales
(Felnagle, 2000). Each facility was planned for approximately 18,000 GSF and colleges
were allowed to configure the facility to support their specific needs. Therefore, at some
colleges these facilities are built for theatre programs, while at others they are designed to
support all performing arts.

Initially, the new colleges and centers, Chandler-Gilbert, Paradise Valley, and
Estrella Mountain, and South Mountain, did not have performing arts centers and lobbied
that the District consider using revenue bonds to build centers. This was a source of
considerable debate. Board member Linda Rosenthal remembered “the theater, the PAC
fight that we had” (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005). Board member
Ed Contreras also recalled the situation:

As the discussion progressed, it came about that the idea of having a
performing arts center also funded with revenue bonds would be beneficial
to actually not just one location, but to five locations. There was a great
deal of discussion among the Board members as to whether there was a
need for that many performing arts facilities and whether there really was
a benefit to the communities and was it necessary for those dollars to go
there. It would put an extra strain on the students and there was a concern
whether there was still a need for the arts to that degree at each of the
community colleges.

I felt that one of the things that would help students in the future
and had been an area that I thought was needed in my life was the
performing arts because it provided areas for expansion of the individual
to a greater degree rather than just his chosen field but the ability to speak
or to communicate on a higher level, to get a message across. And I felt
that our students needed that ability and that availability of those classes
and with that, then, they could grow to a better potential and be able to
serve the community better. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June
24, 2005)

The discussion culminated at a Governing Board meeting on April 22, 1997:
… I remember we went into one Board meeting and because of the citizen
input that came across related to the need for the PACs and the discussion
between the Board members, we were able to win the approval of the
PACs by a 4-1 vote. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24,
2005)

The meeting minutes indicate that CGCC students Amada Dunlap and Valerie
Shumway spoke in favor of constructing a PAC stating, “performing arts programs are
important and their presence, along with appropriate facilities, would enhance student enrollment at the college” ("Governing board minutes, April 22, 1997," p. 4). CGCC theater faculty member Gordon Jesse also cited “lack of space for performing arts at Chandler-Gilbert Community College. He suggested that revenue bonds may be the only way these centers would be built” ("Governing board minutes, April 22, 1997," p. 7).

The minutes stated:

Further discussion between the Board Members and the Chancellor indicated that many students and community members had come forward in favor of the performing arts centers and they should be listened to. To build the [performing arts] centers at the smaller colleges would provide the opportunity to enhance the communities they serve. ("Governing board minutes, April 22, 1997," p. 7)

Recalling that Board meeting, Arnette Ward said the Chancellor surprised her by announcing his intent to build Performing Arts Centers using revenue bonds and that Chandler-Gilbert would receive the first of the new centers. Ward recalled, “…he talked about our program, what we had done over the years, how we had actually built a performing arts program without facilities” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

CGCC’s Performing Arts Center (Figure 19) was completed in 2002 and was dedicated on April 11, 2003. A “fast facts” sheet about the facility described:

Performance and performance support facilities include make-up and costume changing areas, a full-scale set-building shop, indoor and outdoor areas for scenery storage, and a conference room/classroom. The PAC
features a variety of performance-enhancing special features. In addition to the latest in high-tech lighting from Scotland, the stage area is designed so that movement on or backstage cannot be heard by the audience. The walls on both sides of the audience are paneled in wood and are shaped to dampen sound and reduce echo. Catwalks are located over the performance areas for more directed lighting and special effects. ("CGCC performing arts center fast facts," 2002, p. 1)

Figure 19. The CGCC Performing Arts Center at the Pecos Campus in the spring of 2003.

The facility design team was honored with several architectural awards including one from the American Institute of Architects and another from the City of Chandler. “The PAC was awarded an architectural design award by the American Institute of Architects in 2001” ("CGCC performing arts center fast facts," 2002, p. 2).
The performing arts faculty and staff were so excited to have the facility that they didn’t wait until the grand opening to hold the first performance. “The first large-scale performance scheduled to be held in the PAC is *The Secret Garden*, which will begin October 18 [2002] and run through October 26. Funds received from these performances go towards production costs” ("CGCC performing arts center fast facts," 2002, p. 1).

At the time of this research, the PAC is the home of CGCC programs in vocal and instrumental music, dance, and theater. Four faculty and three support staff have offices located in the building. They publish an annual calendar with dozens of performances and concerts annually. During her interview on the history of the college, Governing Board member Nancy Stein remarked, “I see the PAC building now and it is with great pride. The progress you have made. It’s just wonderful” (Nancy Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005).

**Athletics**

Although the community had wanted an athletics program, the college had no athletic teams at opening and no plans to develop teams in the first decade of operation. There were too many other competing priorities. Faculty member Robin McCord remembered:

In the initial I think seven or eight years we never planned on having athletic teams. …we didn’t think that the campus would be able to sustain those costs, or find the budget for them and look where we are now. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)
David Weaver, physics faculty, stated that he disagreed about “the importance of having sports teams. Because I was very much opposed to that idea, and its one of those things that we’ve gone ahead and moved forward on that, and so that’s not a bad thing, but that’s something that originally we didn’t start with sports teams…” (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005). But community pressure to consider athletic teams built over time. Other colleges had athletics programs and local high school students, their parents, and coaches, advocated for at least examining the interest and the feasibility at CGCC.

In the 1996-1997 academic year a committee was formed that included college employees, local high school coaches and athletic directors, and community members. Their charge was to determine which athletic teams, if any, CGCC should have. They surveyed local high school coaches, students, and parents. In 1998, based upon the recommendations of the committee, CGCC hired an athletic director, Jeff Mason, former athletic director at Apache Junction High School and teacher and coach at Chandler High School. Then, based upon the survey results and the committee’s recommendations, four sports and six teams were formed in 1998-1999, including women’s volleyball, men’s and women’s soccer, men’s and women’s basketball, and women’s softball. Approximately 80-85 full-time student athletes were on the rosters (J. Mason, personal communication, August 15, 2006).

The volleyball and basketball teams played their home games at the gymnasium on the new Williams Campus. There were no athletic facilities at the Pecos Campus, so the softball and soccer teams played at off-campus sites.
A plan was developed to build athletic fields on a portion of the 40 acres of land that the college had purchased after the 1994 bond referendum. In 1999-2000, a softball field was built at the Pecos Campus, and in 2000-2001, a soccer field was built at Pecos.

In 2000-2001, a men’s baseball program was added to the array of teams. During the 2000-2001 academic year, the number of full-time student-athletes on the CGCC rosters rose to 125-130 (J. Mason, personal communication, August 15, 2006).

The baseball team played at Snedigar Park in Chandler until a baseball field (Figure 20) was constructed on the Pecos Campus in 2003.

Figure 20. A baseball field at the Pecos Campus opened in 2003.

In 2005, men’s and women’s intercollegiate golf teams were added. Thus, by 2005, there were 175-180 full-time student athletes participating in nine athletic teams (J. Mason, personal communication, August 15, 2006).
Comprehensiveness

The years of 1985 through 1995 were formative years for the college. From approximately 1995, following the passage of the 1994 bond referendum, college programs and services began to grow and develop. Chancellor Paul Elsner had hoped that over time this would come to be, although he knew it would be difficult. He recalled:

I wanted it to be fairly comprehensive, I wanted it to be a collegiate place, and I worried that might not happen because you were, in some ways the centers were very much starved at the very beginning too, you didn’t have a lot of money. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

A glance at the Annual Report to the Governor filed by the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges and more recently by the Arizona Community College Association showed the type of program development that was occurring at a fairly rapid pace as the college moved towards becoming comprehensive. Here are a few examples:

- The Center for Computer Training was established in the Fall of 1994, in response to the needs of business and industry to have an efficient and cost-effective method of training employees on current software applications. Short-term classes are offered in Windows and DOS-based applications including spreadsheets, graphics, word processing and database applications. The Center has been very successful. Now in its second year of operation, other classes and times have been added to better accommodate industry’s needs. ("Annual report to the Governor 1994-1995," 1995, p. 19)
• Aviation technology examined ways to respond to the critical national shortage of aviation mechanics. Coursework was expanded for the CISCO and Microsoft examinations. …An automated manufacturing program was developed and courses added in developmental disabilities and media arts. ("Annual report to the Governor FY 1999-2000," 2000, p. 15)

• The College is developing a more comprehensive curriculum; maintaining and expanding its ties with business and industry; expanding the Continuing Education program; and adding sports to the athletic program. A Community Band joined the Orchestra, Jazz Band, and Jazz Choir programs. Continuing Education worked with local school districts, cities, community agencies, and business and industry. It held summer classes for gifted children in science, mathematics, and aviation; Spanish classes for employees of the Chandler Unified School District; and English-as-a-Second Language classes for local businesses. ("Annual report to the Governor FY 2000-2001," 2001, p. 15)

• Two new programs graduated their first classes. Crime and Intelligence Analysis, only the second program of its kind in the country, graduated 23 students, most of them already working in law enforcement or private sector agencies. Electric Utility Technology graduated 18 students, 11 of whom secured jobs as line workers in the
industry at the time they graduated. ("Annual report to the Governor, 2002-2003," 2003, p. 11)

- In November 2003 the CGCC Continuing Education Department was awarded The Learning Resources Network International Award for Excellence in Business and Industry Programming. ("Annual report to the Governor, 2003-2004," 2004, p. 12)


- CGCC was chosen by the Association of American Colleges and Universities to become part of a network entitled “Shared Futures,” which focuses on developing general education courses dealing with global issues. ("Annual report to the Governor, 2004-2005," 2005, p. 12)

- CGCC admitted its first class of nursing students at the Williams Campus. ("Annual report to the Governor, 2005-2006," 2006, p. 15)

- The Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board approved creation of the CGCC Law Enforcement Training Academy, which began enrolling students in January 2006. ("Annual report to the Governor, 2005-2006," 2006, p. 15)

The college worked to provide more breadth and depth in the curricular offerings and support services in order to better serve student and community needs. Higher education historian George Vaughan explained, “Although it is impossible and
unnecessary for all community colleges to offer all programs, students must have choice in what they study for a community college to accomplish its mission. Without choice in program and course offerings, open access and equity lose much of their meaning” (Vaughan, 2000, p. 5). The notion of becoming more comprehensive continued to be the driving force behind the college at the time of this research.

The growth years of 1995-2005 changed the face of CGCC, literally and figuratively. This section of the document provided information on the community growth that occurred surrounding the college during this timeframe, the significance of the bond elections to the expansion of facilities, the structural changes that occurred within the administrative team, the evolution of academic divisions, and the strained relations between CGCC, the District Office, and the other Maricopa Community Colleges. In addition, three significant events in the growth of the college were discussed: the expansion of the library facility and services, the construction of a Performing Arts Center, and the development of athletic programs and facilities.

The local communities had grown and college enrollments grew in double digits for several years. As more students enrolled, more faculty and staff were hired and more programs and services were added. There were significant new programs that were added during this timeframe such as teacher education, healthcare and nursing, engineering, administration of justice, and electric utility technology. Fledgling programs in service-learning and learning communities that had begun in the early 1990s thrived and gained national recognition. Partnerships were formed with universities, outreach programs were developed with local school districts, and there were many other significant developments. More details on many of these new or growing programs and
services, as well as information about students and employees, are provided in separate sections of this chapter. The physical facilities changed dramatically with two new extension locations and significant expansion at the Pecos Campus. More information on land, facilities, and equipment is upcoming as well.

In 1965, Bruce Tuckman theorized that working teams go through a developmental process that involves forming, storming, and norming (Tuckman, 1965). This researcher believes that it is fair to characterize CGCC’s early years from 1985 to approximately 1995 as forming years, and then 1995 to 2005 as storming years. MCC President Larry Christiansen summarized these years:

Chandler-Gilbert has survived the surrounding growth pains …. Early cow farms that were all around you… And now, you know, I’m not sure what’s worse, the smell from the feed lots or the continuing rattling of the power-driven hammers that permeate the air and create all this noise pollution, and the related growth and development, and where do you put an auto mall, and all of those kinds of things are greatly challenging to a place like Chandler-Gilbert. But to be able to survive them with a feeling of comfort for the employees and for the students, and the feeling of comfort for the community, is no small trick. And so those are, I think, the kinds of successes that are there. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)
Leadership

There’s just something about starting a new endeavor such as that that calls upon people to be extremely flexible and giving and committed. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Many different people and organizations provided leadership for the college during its inception, formation, and growth stages. Community leaders advocated with the Chancellor and the Governing Board for a college in the Southeast Valley. The Chancellor strategized and the Board approved visionary plans. The President as well as staff of Mesa Community College were supportive, especially in the startup of the college. The Provost/President, Assistant Provosts/Deans, faculty, and staff of CGCC worked tirelessly to begin and sustain the institution. This section includes information about each of the key people and organizations who helped to start and sustain Chandler-Gilbert Community College.

Community Leaders

Many community leaders played a part in the founding and development of the college. The District Office provided a file to founding Provost Arnette Ward with copies of the letters that had been received over the years advocating for a college in the Southeast Valley. Included were letters from key community leaders written in 1983 such as Jim Patterson, who was the Mayor of Chandler at the time; Karl Cayford, who was Executive Vice President of the Chandler Chamber of Commerce; Tom Freestone of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors; James Sossaman who served as majority whip of the Arizona House of Representatives; L. J. Reed, who was the Mayor of Gilbert;

At the October 16, 1985, meeting of the Southeast Valley Task Force certificates of appreciation were given to individuals (see Table 4) who had helped start the college (Ward, 1985, p. 2).

Table 4

*Members of the Southeast Valley Task Force as of 1985*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jack Whiteman</th>
<th>Ron Ballard</th>
<th>Eddie Basha</th>
<th>Karl Cayford</th>
<th>Milt Lee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Sharp</td>
<td>Bill Holt</td>
<td>Dorothy Elledge</td>
<td>Barbara Knox</td>
<td>Ted Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Sossaman</td>
<td>Don Drake</td>
<td>Efren Navarette</td>
<td>Velma Rezzonico</td>
<td>Coy Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Conley</td>
<td>DeDe Ortiz</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
<td>Don Skousen</td>
<td>Jim Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton Riggs</td>
<td>Mary Day</td>
<td>Al Flowers</td>
<td>Grant Christensen</td>
<td>Theo Heap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Ward, 1985, p. 2)

Arnette Ward recalled that this group did not always agree on directions for the college. For example, some wanted a vocational/technical college, while others wanted a more comprehensive college. But she credited them with coming together, compromising, and supporting the start of a new college for the communities of the Southeast Valley (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).
Individuals who were interviewed as part of this research recalled many community leaders who contributed to the establishment and development of the college. Chancellor Paul Elsner remembered, “We talked to Ed Robson and Eddie Basha and Dwight Patterson and some very large and looming figures, who were great civic leaders about this region” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005). Former MCC President Wally Simpson recalled that “Senator Sossaman and then Sue Sossaman as a community member … were very much involved from the start. And the mayor of both Chandler and Gilbert at that time and Dr. Grant Christensen, who was a board member on the Maricopa Board, was influential and deeply involved” (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006). Arnette Ward said:

There were key players [like] Eddie Basha, Mr. Whiteman, he was the founder and owner of Empire Machinery Corporation, Mr. Lee, who was very powerful in Mesa because he was over the United Way. … Milt Lee, yes, he was very good. … he was a very warm man and really had the respect of everyone. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Andy Bernal, former Assistant Provost, spoke about the influence of Dwight Patterson on CGCC and the entire East Valley:

Probably the one person that stands out the most that influenced, and not just this college but anything that’s happened out in the East Valley was Dwight Patterson. Because I believe that he’s the one that influenced people to purchase the land. And that was his land on Dobson and Southern for MCC. And also I think this land that the college now sits on was his property as well. So he’s been very influential and very visionary
in seeing what the population, and the public needs were, and not just in
education but in other areas as well. (A. Bernal, personal communication,
June 7, 2005)

Margaret Hogan, former Assistant Provost, recalled how Chandler Mayor Jerry
Brooks supported the college:

Jerry Brooks was the Mayor of Chandler and he was ubiquitous [laughs].
He was everywhere, on the advisory committee, involved with the
Chamber of Commerce, and as Mayor. And no matter where he was, you
know he was always working for the college. (M. Hogan, personal
communication, June 8, 2005)

Larry Christiansen, MCC President, lauded all of the municipal leaders who were
involved from both Chandler and Gilbert saying, “I think the various mayors from both
Chandler and Gilbert, and there have been a number of them, who all spoke with great
pride, and great support for Chandler-Gilbert” (L. Christiansen, personal communication,
June 6, 2005). He also spoke about support from the East Valley Partnership (EVP) and
he remembered the role that Kerry Dunne, the Director of EVP, had played in helping to
promote the aviation program. Christiansen said:

Kerry looked at things like support for Chandler-Gilbert and its aviation
program, during the continuous battle with Cochise [Community College],
and created ways that this community could take what could’ve easily
been cast aside as a single program from a new small place, and turned it
into, we have to support them, Chandler-Gilbert, this is an important thing.
And created ways where those kinds of conversations were most positive.
Board members recalled the involvement of the mayors of Chandler and Gilbert, as well as farmers and legislators. Governing Board member Linda Rosenthal remembered the influential role of Jamie and Sue Sossaman, as did Board member Ed Contreras. Contreras also recalled Marvin Morrison and stated, “Mr. Morrison owned a dairy with his family I think out here, and some farmland also. He had a great influence I think on the need for providing education for the citizens” (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005).

Industry leaders, chamber of commerce directors, school superintendents, and others were also mentioned by those interviewed. For example, Margaret Hogan mentioned:

…at the time the most significant organizations in the communities were the Chambers of Commerce. And so the Executive Directors of the chambers always were very involved and very supportive. Wally Delecki, who was the Superintendent of the Gilbert schools, was just marvelous. The Vice President from America West Airlines too was another big supporter. … Greg Tilque [Economic Development Director for the Town of Gilbert] … was another great supporter. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Gil Gonzales credited Karen Drake, the Director of Chandler Public Library. He recalled, “…she really helped us get a solid ground in the community, for what we were doing and how we were doing it. And to make sure that we were well connected with the rest of the library programs and systems in the state” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006).
Don Campbell, a long-standing member of the MCCCD Governing Board, was impressed by these community leaders and their commitment to bettering the community for themselves and for others:

I think probably the main thing is that people in the community were willing to come together for a new idea, which was a campus. And they had never had this before, but they were willing to come together and say let’s see what can we do for our community, what can we do for our students, how can we improve what we have out here. We’re growing, and there are certain things we need. But willing to come together and listen to each other, and not necessarily always agree with each other, but able to listen to other people’s ideas and so forth. (D. Campbell, personal communication, June 22, 2005)

Rather than seeing their work as completed upon the start of the college, Arnette Ward leveraged the community interest in and support for the college by forming an ongoing community advisory council. She recalled that “Chandler-Gilbert was the first to actually start an official or formal community advisory council to the President. We were the first. The other colleges started their councils much later” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

That President’s Community Advisory Council (PCAC) continues to operate with the understanding that:

Maintaining a quality community college requires community involvement. The President’s Community Advisory Council provides “community voice” for CGCC and helps to shape strategic directions for
the college as it strives to serve the needs of the Southeast Valley. …

Membership on the Council will include representation from business, industry, government, education, and residents. Members will be experienced in their occupations, knowledgeable of the trends in their professions, aware of the needs in their communities, and committed to promoting higher education for residents in the community.

Members of the President’s Community Advisory Council will provide information and ideas that reflect community perspectives, create connections for the college with various segments of the community, offer input to CGCC regarding strategic directions and plans for the future, identify underserved populations in the Southeast Valley, assist in identifying future facilities needs, provide advice and support on a variety of college issues, serve as knowledgeable ambassadors for CGCC in the community, attend PCAC meetings twice annually, and attend at least two other college functions annually. (Hesse, 2002, p. 1)

Assistant Provost and Dean Margaret Hogan reflected back upon the college’s development and credited committed community leaders for their advocacy in support of the college. “I think the supportive community was the best positive factor. We really had wonderful people in the community who touted us and supported us in so many different ways” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Arnette Ward reminisced and hoped that all of the individuals involved would take pride in the important contribution they had made to their community:
I think the community, especially those who were around in the beginning, and some of them are still around. I think they still sit in their living rooms and talk with their kids, and grandkids and great grandkids about what they did with and for the institution. How they were involved. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

_Governing Board_

Chancellor Paul Elsner credited the MCCCD Governing Board with being progressive about establishing additional community colleges within the county. Elsner and Board members who were interviewed for this research were particularly complimentary about Grant Christensen who served on the MCCCD Governing Board from 1979-1985 and again from 1989-1994. Elsner recalled the vision of Christensen:

Grant Christensen, a long-standing citizen in this area, and a very, very good thinker and planner about building and capital programs, … said we ought to look at that [buying land in Litchfield] seriously. And then when we bought land for Chandler-Gilbert he had the same view and he consulted with us on it, helped us think this through. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Governing Board member Mrs. Linda B. Rosenthal recalled working with Grant Christensen, seeing the college site for the first time, and realizing what would occur:

I can remember coming out here with your then Board member Grant Christensen, looking at this piece of property in the middle of nowhere with a farm across the street. … standing there and saying someday there
will be houses there. And indeed, of course there are and it’s surrounded.

(L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

MCC President Larry Christiansen also remembered the influential role that Grant Christiansen played. He recounted:

Grant Christiansen has to lead that list, as a member of the Governing Board. Grant, a retired dentist, had probably as much vision for wanting to serve the East Valley as any person that I’ve worked with, in the land capacity. He deeply supported Chandler-Gilbert, in a very powerful way—spoke highly of it, shared the vision of it. Every time someone criticized it, he would gently say, well, that may be the way it is today because we really haven’t given them enough money, but what it can be like, and then he’d kind of lay out this vision picture. And he dissolved so many people who wanted to do kind of unkind things or selfish or whatever, as smooth as anybody I’d watched. And so he took a great personal interest in, and cared deeply for the institution. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Dr. Paul Elsner agreed with the assessment of Grant Christensen’s leadership. Elsner stated that Christensen’s influence on other Board members was pivotal:

Grant Christensen had a larger overview of things because he had been involved in large corporate projects and church projects and so forth, so he was in a sense, involved with building and expansion. The other board members were a little bit numbed by the kind of aggressive recommendations that we made, but they went along with it. And I think
Grant was one of the stabilizing forces that allowed that to occur. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

It was not always easy for Board members, given the far-reaching nature of their decisions. Elsner described the stress they felt:

I think the Board felt they had to rise to that standard regardless of how sometimes cautious and shaky they were on some issues. We never really knew until the very last end sometime whether they were going to really approve something. … A lot of it could’ve been stopped very easily by just one, you know. You needed unanimity, usually, and we had that. I give them credit for going along in a very, very tumultuous and very rapidly expanding area. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

MCC President Wally Simpson stated that Board confidence in the Chancellor and the District’s strong reputation was key to their ability to make far-reaching decisions about expansion sites. He reflected:

I think the other factor that the Board must have felt—a strength—is that the District was so well regarded by the taxpayers at that time; I think they felt confident that they could move ahead on providing new campuses for students. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Dr. Don Campbell, Board member, recounted the process of residents buying land from farmers during the MCCCD expansion years:

…you had Sossaman out here and Cooper and all those people who were running farms and so forth. … more people began to say we want to be in
Maricopa County, but not necessarily in Phoenix, we’d like to be in outlying areas. So builders and developers began to talk to the fellows who were running farms about selling their properties. And as they sold their properties people said well that’s not a bad deal, I can live out here and drive to Phoenix if I want to. And a lot of people preferred being farther out, rather than downtown. (D. Campbell, personal communication, June 22, 2005)

Campbell explained that once farmers started selling their land to developers, and people starting buying houses on the periphery of the county, it made natural sense to think about locating community colleges in the vicinity.

Board member Rosenthal recalled that the development of the colleges also made sense in light of the economic development needs in the entire metropolitan Phoenix area. She stated, “…community colleges over the years have become more and more important for job training and workforce development” (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

In addition to supporting the Chancellor’s vision, Board members also helped shape the structure of the new campuses. Linda Rosenthal recalled that she was supportive of the need for additional colleges, but had an eye on the costs to taxpayers, therefore she recommended that the Chancellor look for cost-saving measures. She recounted her conversations with Paul Elsner:

Well, as you know and remember, you were first developed as a center connected to Mesa. Now that was an idea that I may have developed at the time, just to frankly save some administrative costs. “Paul, let’s not
call them Presidents. Let’s give them the title of Provost or Assistant Provost. It’s cheaper.” And so that’s what we did. And you had your services tied to Mesa for many of the things that students needed. Your financial aid and all those things, until you were able to declare your sovereignty, is basically what happened. (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Board members helped establish the new college campus, influenced its structure, and also provided oversight for its development. For example, Board member Nancy Stein served on the CGCC Sun Lakes Education Center advisory council for many years. Arnette Ward, founding Provost and President of CGCC, spoke not only of the leadership of the Board, but also of the ongoing personal and professional support she received from several of them. She described her relationship with Board member Ed Contreras:

I could not go and yell in front of CEC [Chancellor’s Executive Council] and talk about what we did not get and what we did not have, because it would have sounded accusatory. That’s a part of the politics that I had to actually learn to do, with the help of consolation from people like Ed Contreras when he came aboard as a Board member. He recognized that there were some things that he could not do as a Board member representing Chandler-Gilbert because our Board members have to work for all of the colleges regardless of the area they actually serve. Just the notion that he recognized our problems was helpful to me. He was able to add a great deal to my energy and my sense of retaining some sense of professionalism. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)
There were many Board members who served MCCCD during the years of the college’s inception, formation, and development. Board members and their terms of service are outlined in Appendix D.

**Chancellor**

MCCCD Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner was visionary and strategic in the establishment of new colleges for MCCCD in the 1980s. In an interview conducted almost 25 years after he initiated the planning process, Elsner described his thinking:

I had developed a Chancellor’s blueprint for long-range planning. We had hired Max Tadlock Associates to come down from California, who had master planned the State of Colorado when I was the State Commissioner there. And we had a pretty good hold on where all this growth was going to go. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Then he spoke with the Governing Board about the possibilities. Board member Linda Rosenthal recalled:

In the early 80s, Paul Elsner, then Chancellor of the [Maricopa] Community Colleges, talked to the Board about the need for developing colleges in the outer areas. Before I came on the Board, South Mountain and Rio Salado College, ’78-‘79 had been developed. And at that point the inner city area, Glendale, Mesa, and all of the major areas had been developed. It was obvious that the growth of the county was going to come in the periphery, in the Chandler area, Paradise Valley area and
Estrella Mountain area. (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Elsner relied heavily on the knowledge base of developers in the area and their demographic studies which they were willing to share. He described his strategy:

It wasn’t rocket science to figure out that most of the developers were buying up 300 acre and 200 acre parcels of land. And then in the early days, they could put 175 houses on a section of land there, and so forth, and then the people would come and buy them. But there were a lot of sophisticated people in the Valley who were big developers who were coming from California. And we spent a lot of time talking to people who were more knowledgeable than we were about what the demographics are. And they knew where the highways were going to go. They knew what MAG [Maricopa Association of Governments] was thinking about, and what the restrictions were going to be, and the covenants were going to be. They also did much more demographic studies than we were able to do in terms of cost. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Larry Christiansen, who has served as President of Mesa Community College since 1988, explained Elsner’s strategic outlook:

… under his leadership over 22 years, Maricopa grew from five to 10 colleges. He believed deeply that the way you responded to increased populations was to provide a place that took the name of its community, was involved in the community, was a part of the community, and didn’t have to particularly look like any of the other Maricopa Colleges. So
when the population projections for the Southeast Valley started to emerge and to some degree even ahead of the curve, Paul received a certain amount of criticism for going both to the far Southeast Valley, and to the West Valley. It may have even been three to five years ahead of where people would have said oh, we have this need and they’re pounding on the desks of the Governing Board. But he felt the timing was right to move on those new locations to provide access points. He was also wise in his idea of responding to growth, because Chandler and Gilbert, two communities, bought into this place. … Also Paul was very astute in relationship to understanding that that growth had to take into account the difficulties of transportation. And the six mile planning radius that was fundamental to every one of the Maricopa sites still holds true. Eighty percent of our students will come [from] within that six mile concentric circle. And so early in the discussion, we kept drawing circles and the land that Chandler-Gilbert sits on, at the time of the discussion of purchase, and the land that was being purchased that’s now the site of MCC at Red Mountain at Power and McKellips, were purchased very early in my tenure in Maricopa. I was on the west side [at GCC] so I just kind of watched how all that unfolded. But they literally would take out the pencil and the pin and the string, and draw the circle, and talk about where the circles touched. And if you do that with this campus, at Gilbert and Pecos, Power and McKellips, and Southern and Dobson, you really do cover the East Valley. And it was very strategic in terms of this strategy of bringing
a wonderful place, like Chandler-Gilbert, to the Southeast Valley, and then let the rest kind of unfold. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

CGCC employees had great admiration for Chancellor Elsner. Gil Gonzales, the Associate Dean for Learning Resources at CGCC, marveled at the “interest of the Chancellor’s office to prepare the organization for the future” and called it “very forward thinking” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006). President Arnette Ward recalled that Elsner’s vision took hold at CGCC:

…the he wanted to provide all of the first two years of higher education in every region of the county. He also wanted the training connection to support the economic development of the communities where his colleges resided. So that is what we did. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Chancellor Elsner also allowed quite a bit of freedom to the colleges to develop in a manner that fit the distinctive needs of their communities. He described his philosophy:

You may not realize this but you were a highly empowered, decentralized, somewhat economist system, even though the District Central Office could’ve been kind of a nuisance to you. The fact is that we really did play to the initiatives of the institutions. If the institution is doing it then that’s all in our best benefit, and that means the system moves forward. And we said that was inculcated and primarily because of the independence of all you as thinkers and doers, but also that was kind of part of the ideology, and I think that was accepted by the Board, because
they saw, I think subconsciously that that was working. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Arnette Ward appreciated his hands off approach and confirmed:
…we were given the opportunity to actually do what we thought was best.
That was one of the real joys and gifts from the President and Chancellor.
Although they watched over us and we needed to report to them, they allowed us to work with the community and make the community a part of what we were doing …. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Although allowing local autonomy, Ward also felt that Elsner stepped in when needed to make vital decisions. When she was feeling uncertain about how to handle the community politics of the Southeast Valley Task Force and in particular the group that wanted to focus CGCC as a vocational/technical college, she appreciated the intervention of both Paul Elsner and Wally Simpson:

Finally, I asked Dr. Simpson and Dr. Elsner what am I obligated to do here? How much did I have to acquiesce? They said I did not have to worry about it because they would make the decisions about whether the college would be a comprehensive institution or not. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Not surprisingly, in all of the interviews for this research, most references to the Chancellor were made specifically about Paul Elsner. There were three other Chancellors (Cardenas, Gaskin, and Glasper) who overlapped CGCC’s history for six of the 20 years being researched, 1999-2005. They were mentioned very infrequently in the
interviews. There is no doubt that the name of Paul Elsner is synonymous with new
college development in MCCCD, and specifically as the Chancellor responsible for the
founding and oversight of CGCC. Governing Board member Linda Rosenthal
summarized the contributions of Dr. Elsner saying, “…we had a very, very smart leader
in Paul Elsner. Very smart leader. He had marvelous, marvelous foresight. He did
Maricopa County a great service and really laid a foundation for the new growth of the
colleges” (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

*MCC Presidents*

Dr. Wallace Simpson came to MCCCD from Inver Hills Community College in
Inver Grove Heights, Minnesota, where he served as President. Simpson became Mesa
Community College’s President on February 21, 1984 (Puyear, 1987), just as the
community was lobbying the Governing Board for the establishment of a new Southeast
Valley community college. He recalled his time at MCC and helping to establish CGCC
as a “tremendous experience” (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

His four years in MCCCD were memorable to Arnette Ward with whom he
worked closely in the development of CGCC. Dr. Simpson selected Provost Ward from a
group of internal MCCCD applicants. He credited Ward for working closely with him to
get CGEC started:

She was deeply involved from the start. She wasn’t a bystander, but
depth involves. I think obtaining funds for the new campus construction,
that is, after the Catholic school was remodeled, and adding other facilities
when the Maricopa District was being stretched financially was a real
challenge. And I know on my part and Arnette’s part too, making this case often before the Chancellor and Board was something that we put as a priority. In my own case, I think the divided time for myself was exhilarating in one case, but in another case Mesa’s college campus was growing very fast, too, and I know that divided time was somewhat stressful. I think that was offset by Arnette Ward’s work ethic and her skill in working with so many different parties. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

His leadership philosophy was to allow CGEC and later CGCCC to have considerable local autonomy:

… we just simply felt that the sooner a Provost and then administrators and faculty could be appointed, the sooner we could have responsibility placed on that campus. …it was important that the people right on-site become involved in the community and have the commitment to that community rather than rely upon the main campus at Mesa. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Founding Provost Arnette Ward confirmed this in her first annual report, A Pioneering Spirit, that “Dr. Simpson provided executive leadership and support but he gave us the freedom to develop uniquely” (Ward, 1986, p. 2).

Founding faculty member Alice Conkright remembered Wally Simpson and his wife Rose, who often attended employee gatherings at CGCCC, as, “just charming people. They were such sweet, nice people. You could not meet nicer people” (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005).
As an experienced college President, Simpson mentored and encouraged Ward. In retrospect, Arnette Ward stated, “… if I were to change anything I would have hoped that my President would have stayed a little longer… I would have liked to have had the same type of balance and support throughout the first five or six years” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

Dr. Larry Christiansen became MCC’s President in 1988 (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002). Christiansen recalled his path to the presidency:

I started my educational career as a high school teacher at Perry High School in Perry, Iowa, and spent seven years there. I enjoyed thoroughly being a high school teacher. I had an opportunity to go to the University of Minnesota as both a faculty member and an administrator, spent eight years there, was a business Division Chair. And so the majority of my career up to that point was all on the instruction side, and all focused on business and marketing. … I had an opportunity to hear about an Associate Dean of Occupation and Cooperative Education, from two close friends who I served with on a national board, the National Association of Business Education Teachers, and both were administrators in the Maricopa District, one was a faculty member and had been an administrator at Mesa, the other at Scottsdale. They encouraged me to apply for the opening at Glendale Community College. I applied and, candidly, had some reservations about leaving the University of Minnesota as a tenured associate professor on one of the finest retirement systems
that the country has, to come to a community college on the west side. I
spent three years as the Occupational Dean and then applied for, and
secured the new position, then, of Dean of Administrative Services, and
worked for John Waltrip. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June
6, 2005)

Christiansen was grateful for the opportunity provided by Paul Elsner when
Elsner selected him as MCC’s next President. He reflected:

I am appreciative of the opportunity that Paul Elsner gave me. Mesa
conducted a national search for its President. There were four sitting
Presidents or Chancellors, and me, in the group of finalists. And he gave
me the opportunity to go to the largest of the Maricopa Colleges without
the experience. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

He recalled his years as MCC President when CGCCC was an extension site of
MCC:

I’m completing my 17th year as President of Mesa Community College,
and I did have the privilege of working with Arnette Ward and her team
during my early time in Mesa Community College, and worked with them
through the initial accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of
North Central to transition Chandler-Gilbert from the Chandler-Gilbert
Center to Chandler-Gilbert Community College. (L. Christiansen,
personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Larry Christiansen’s leadership at MCC set the standard to which many of the
Maricopa Community Colleges aspired. Arnette Ward recalled that she always regarded
MCC as the “hallmark when it came to academic programs and offerings and the reputation it had garnered over the years” (A. Ward, May 23, 2005).

Christiansen had a different relationship with Arnette Ward than his predecessor, as he had previously been her peer in a Dean-level position within MCCCD. There was a rivalry that began between MCC and CGCCC as the center matured and began looking towards independence from its parent college. Nonetheless, Christiansen credited Ward for her work, “Arnette did a tremendous job of motivating the early employees, and developed a tremendous amount of employee loyalty toward Chandler-Gilbert” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005).

**CGEC Provost, CGCC President**

The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges indicated in their records that Arnette Ward was appointed Provost of “Chandler/Gilbert Educational Center” in 1985 (Puyear, 1987, p. 20). Ward said, “My charge, along with Dr. Simpson, was to establish a comprehensive institution” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005). And that she did. She is the person most responsible for the character and culture of Chandler-Gilbert Community College. So who was she? What was her background?

Fresh out of a master’s program at ASU, she accepted a counseling position at Mesa Community College. Ward remembered:

I moved to Arizona in 1967. My husband and I came out here to go to Arizona State [University] and found that we could not just come and go to school, we had to work. I ended up at Arizona State, not in 1967, but in 1970. I went there to get my Master’s degree. I had been teaching in the
Roosevelt District, physical education, for two and a half years. I needed a Master’s right away. I had done my homework and so I was able to apply for a FIPSE grant and study to become a counselor. That was a program for one year. I completed that program and during that summer of 1971, a friend of mine that I had met in church came and asked me to come and have lunch with her and Dr. Nate Painter from Mesa Community College. I said why, and she said, “Well, he is looking for a counselor.” In those days, it was quite different seeking candidates with special expertise. MCC evidently needed an African-American counselor, and since she knew one, we all went to lunch. I was interviewed on the campus baseball diamond by the founding President [John Riggs] and ended up being hired on Mesa Community College’s baseball diamond, in the bleachers.

I started about two weeks after that in August 1971. I became a counseling faculty. After that, I became the Division Chair of Counseling. I frankly thought I was going to be a counselor my entire career. No one actually within the department wanted to take on the responsibility [of Chair] so I said I would, and I did. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

She became MCC’s Dean of Students and held that position for six years. Ward recalled how she came by that position:

I did become Dean of Student Services because the founding Dean, Janette Kirk, bless her heart, wonderful lady, decided that she needed to retire.
And at that time the institution felt that they wanted to go internal and not external. Several colleagues, some of whom I had not really talked to over the years, stopped by the office, stopped me in the corridors to ask me if I was going to run for the Dean of Students position. I said, well, no, no, not me and they continued to ask. Then one day the President [Theo Heap] called and asked me to come to his office. He said he heard I was interested in running for the Dean of Students position. I told him you know I am not looking to do that because we fought too much, because I used to fight with the President over students, especially the minority student athletes; they used to have a bit of a problem adjusting. So I told him no. I even recommended a colleague of mine instead of me, because at least I knew the politics at Mesa Community College. Once you get out of the faculty realm, you become an administrator, you could be fired at anybody’s will, so I wasn’t looking to be fired; because I wasn’t going to keep my mouth closed. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Wallace Simpson became MCC’s President in 1984, as discussions were underway about starting a new Southeast Valley extension of MCC. He recalled that “[p]eople in the [MCCCD] system were asked to, invited to make an application for that position. Out of all those applications, Arnette Ward was chosen and then recommended” by him as the new center’s Provost (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006). Arnette Ward described her decision to apply for the Provost position, after having been the Dean of Students:
From there, my career sort of moved fairly quickly. I think I did get a little flirty about it, you know. Well, if I could become a Dean maybe I can do something else. When the District decided they were going to open a center in Chandler, I thought maybe I would just try to run for that position, not thinking that I was going to get that position, thinking you know who would hire Arnette? I actually applied and became one of two of the final candidates. There were about eight employees throughout the system that applied. The politics at that time were that Mesa was not going to have someone outside of MCC that was going to be serving in this situation, so that was one thing for me. But as I went through the process I was appointed and found that there was just a little bit more that the committee saw, which I did not see in myself. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

MCCCD Chancellor Paul Elsner also had an opportunity to interview the person who Wally Simpson had recommended for this important post. He described why he concurred with Simpson’s recommendation to hire Arnette Ward:

The neat thing about Arnette that I thought attracted me to her was that she would always have a climate on the campus of celebrating students. I mean that was very evident in the interview. She sat at the District Office, the Chancellor’s office, on the edge of a maroon couch, and I said, “Well, you want to give me just sort of a feeling of what you envision this college to be?” And the one thing that she said was that students will be the center of everything, you know, I believe in the potential of everybody given an
equal chance and students will be celebrated as the core of what this college is all about, their achievements. In many ways, she had kind of an “in local parentis” attitude about students. She was going to be the kind of person that would be aware of the students and where they are and what they’re going through…. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Initially, Arnette did not fully understand the magnitude of the leadership role she had accepted:

I was appointed Provost of the new campus, the extension campus to Mesa. I thought the job would be fairly easy because it was a matter of building a class schedule, being a part of Mesa Community College and, yes, I would have staff, but nothing like a President, with total responsibility, because President, Dr. Simpson, would actually supervise all of us. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Others were unsure she had enough background and experience to take on the role, but Paul Elsner had confidence and explained:

… they were taking bets on Arnette that she didn’t know enough about planning, … it never became one single issue on planning, … and she had plenty of visions and schemes and everything for what this campus ought to be and she believed in all of it. …she even walked me through this place saying, we need that and this is where we have to have people, and notice how they’re stuffed in here and so forth. I couldn’t believe some of
the offices you had! But it all got done, it all got done. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

She grew into the position over time, providing what Wally Simpson called “strong” and “consistent” leadership (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006), establishing a unique and enduring legacy.

Arnette Ward built a college culture focused on student success. Governing Board member Ed Contreras recalled, “Arnette brought a lot of life to the college, and a lot of caring for students” (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005).

Librarian Larry Miller confirmed that she was clear about her goals. “Arnette always said this wasn’t the place for everybody, and she wanted to interview people and see if their orientation was toward the student, really for them being successful” (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005).

Communications faculty member Diane Travers told a favorite story about being hired at CGCCC. She had been a student at MCC, where she knew Lois Bartholomew and Arnette Ward in a student-to-administrator relationship. She completed her bachelor’s degree and then attended graduate school on the East Coast before returning to Arizona. She shared:

Well, my favorite one was at my beginning, and I mentioned that I worked with Lois Bartholomew when she was the Director of Student Activities at MCC, but also there at the same time was Arnette Ward. She was the Dean of Students. And when I worked on the student newspaper and as a student wrote stories for them, every now and then I would get a little direct with Arnette and try to corner her about issues and, of course, I was
the student advocate and I was full of vim and vinegar and just really wanted to get the story. I really got into the newspaper business probably a bit much. And she would just shake her head. But it’s okay and I moved on.

I kind of forgot that and it wasn’t until I interviewed with the college I realized that Arnette would have the final say. It was in my interview with the President that I said, we brought up my being a student at Mesa Community College and she said, “Oh yea, I remember you.” And I thought to myself, “Well, kiss this position goodbye. She’ll never hire me.” And she looked at me and she said, “Girl, if you weren’t so into students, I wouldn’t be hiring you as I am now. But I knew you were then and I know you are now and I’m giving you the job.” And I just wanted to kiss her I was so ecstatic. But she saw what was in my heart and that I really did care about providing a wonderful educational experience for students, and so I was really happy that I didn’t burn the bridge by being pretty direct and confrontational as a student, not realizing that she would be the person to say yes or no on whether I would get the job. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

Arnette worked hard on creating a collegial and collaborative employee community. Governing Board members, other administrators, and faculty and staff confirmed that. Business and computer information systems faculty member Brenda Larson later taught education courses. She recalled, “Arnette’s strength was as a people person. And she did a great job of building community and things like that. And I think
that’s what we will all remember her for, and also be grateful about” (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005). Governing Board member Nancy Stein concurred that “… Arnette had that feeling to make people feel important. And she was very supportive to all employee groups” (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005). MCC’s President Larry Christiansen explained:

The need to nurture a bit was a great strength in Arnette, and I think she carried Chandler-Gilbert through a time, but at huge personal and professional expense to herself, I think. And I’m not sure that the college will ever fully appreciate what she did… most of it in my opinion, naturally, just who she was, what was important to her. This is what her vision was, and this is how I’m going to play it out, and articulated that internally. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Arnette Ward “had a real sense of connecting with her employees” (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005) and surrounded herself with good people who she attracted to CGCC. Chuck Bedal was the first mathematics teacher at the college and explained how Arnette set the tone for future hiring:

Another factor that impacted the operation, Arnette was very particular about hiring people. I remember talking to Wayne Gautreau after his interview with Arnette. He said he was on the phone with Arnette for over two hours and she asked him questions and questions and questions.... He said that lady really wants to know everything about me and to know that I am going to do a good job of teaching. That was a very important issue
with Arnette; she wanted caring faculty and pretty much, I think she got
caring faculty. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

Librarian Larry Miller explained that he came to CGCC because, “Arnette had
hooked me, you know with her vision. Hook, line, and sinker she had me, so when the
opportunity came I was real glad to come out and right away…” (L. Miller, personal
communication, June 21, 2005).

Other individuals described how she empowered employees to take leadership for
various college initiatives. Duane Oakes, the first Director of Student Life at CGCC, felt
supported in helping to develop the service-learning program and said, “I think another
thing that was important is that we always had administrative support from the top.
President Ward saw this [the service-learning program] and thought it was good and did
not ever get in our way” (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

And she was a determined person, willing to make tough decisions and fight for
what she thought was right. Sid Ford, accounting faculty, stated, “I think Arnette did an
excellent job. I think she surrounded herself with good people, made changes when
necessary, grew the college very well” (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005).
John Underwood, the first aviation faculty member and later an Associate Dean,
described Arnette’s determination. “You know she had the heart the size of Maricopa
County, didn’t have a lot of patience sometimes, but she had the heart, and she was
willing to fight for what she wanted to do” (J. Underwood, personal communication, June
10, 2005).
A unique aspect of her leadership style was her willingness to use her artistic
talent in support of the organizational climate. She set an example by bringing all of her
talents to work, including her remarkable singing voice. David Weaver recalled:

… I also think that having a President or a Provost that would come in and
sing at meetings would change the tone of things, because its kind of hard
to get all grumpy when somebody’s up there singing to you. So even if I
might disagree with Arnette about certain things, you know, I still would
smile. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Gil Gonzales, the Associate Dean of Learning Resources, explained that “Arnette
Ward created a community of people who she infected with her care for students. I mean
she would show up for the beginning of the year and end of the year meetings, all
employee meetings, and sing” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

In addition to her many responsibilities on the campus, Provost/President Ward
worked tirelessly in the community, serving on many organization boards and attending
many activities. This was confirmed by Board members, the Chancellor, MCC’s
President, and her staff throughout the interviews that were conducted. Examples of
comments included:

- I know you had a Provost appointed who became your President who seemed
to do a darn good job. Arnette Ward was certainly active in the community
and got you going very well. (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8,
2005)

- … one of your ambassadors in the early, early days was Arnette, and she came
to be on very good terms in Queen Creek, and Chandler, and Gilbert, and she
endeared herself to them I think in a way that was very effective. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

- All of the folks that started new places, and Arnette was no exception, became very engrained in the community and the community leadership knew the institution. So this whole sense of community was very important. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

- Arnette made sure she got the Mayor involved, the City Council involved and she also got the Sun Lakes people involved. I do not see that any area was left out. I thought they did a marvelous job of getting everybody connected and involved. That was very important for the success of the school. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

Arnette struggled with issues of diversity and her faculty seemed aware of the challenges she faced in this regard. Physics faculty member Robin McCord explained:

We were the only community college in the United States [sic] for almost two decades to have a black woman President, and I think on a large scale, it was very uncomfortable for some constituents to deal with, and that we weren’t maybe seen as a serious contender in all efforts and, the fact that gender influences the way that we do things which is actually a good thing. You know we’ve been referred to as a woman’s school and I’m not sure why that is so bad. Who would not want to be Wellesley or who would not want to emulate Smith, and take advantage of that? We do things differently. We present the budget in a different way. We talk
about our needs in a different way. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Wanda Matthews, reading faculty, confirmed:

I think, sometimes I sensed a lot of envy towards our Provost, at that time Provost Ward, I don’t know if I can call it envy. Yes, I will call it envy. I don’t think that they accepted the fact that President Ward, and during my time Provost Ward, was chosen to man the ship. (W. Matthews, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

Arnette recalled her own frustrations in learning to maneuver the MCCCD political system:

I think the other challenge was just getting people to know who I am. I had to realize after about four years, none of the District facilities management staff knew me, I mean I had just came out of nowhere. The Vice Chancellors at that time did not know who I was. They had worked with other faculty, college administrators, and district committees. I was not there. I learned too that when people are somewhat in charge of the sources and resources that you need, they are actually the authorities over what you can and cannot have. Just as I am. I am extremely partial about Chandler-Gilbert. I have the authority for my campus. I had not yet proven myself to be what they wanted to see. It made my challenges a lot more difficult. I moved through the political structure like a counselor, politely requesting. Taking good data, but politely asking, not demanding. Not walking the halls, like you walk the halls at the legislature and other
places. I had not done my initiation. The District administration knew
others a lot better than they knew me. I finally had to come to that
conclusion; I needed to come to a good conclusion that I could accept.
Therefore, my problem began to be the way I fight, which is not the way
other people thought I should fight. (A. Ward, personal communication,
May 23, 2005)

Over the years she came to terms with her worries about working in a male-
dominated environment:

Years ago, I often wondered if a male Provost would have done a better
job than I and what would Chandler-Gilbert look like today? Today I
don’t believe a male Provost could or would have done a better job than I
or my administrative colleagues. A male Provost might have been able to
get more money but that’s the way males work with males. (A. Ward,
personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Starting a new college is a weighty responsibility. She faced challenges that were
sometimes overwhelming in nature. In a personal interview held almost 20 years after
starting as Provost, she expressed her anxiety about the lack of financial resources and
her worry that somehow she had let her employees down:

I probably did not know how to get what we needed. And to this day, that
worries me that I didn’t know. I talked and requested advice from my
former President, the Chancellor, executive colleagues across the country.
Each reviewed the steps I had taken. Each offered other ideas and
strategies. I used many of their suggestions. Nothing worked. I felt like I
had always believed the District feelings about SMCC. It did not matter if they became a quality institution. They and Chandler-Gilbert received the least amount of money and other support needed. It was not intended that we become great institutions. … Because the faculty and staff worked so hard, but I could not bring funds back. [sobbing] I am sorry. I just haven’t talked about this very much and it hurts, and I believe it hurt my campus because I could not do it, so they had to do without so much. They had to work with so little. But they produced like we had 25 million or so, and there was no way that I could pay them back. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

The employees of Chandler-Gilbert Community College held Arnette in high regard, as evidenced by their interviews which are available on the college web site at www.cgc.maricopa.edu/history/.

After seven years as Provost and ten years as President, Arnette Ward (Figure 21) retired in 2002. She talked about her final years:

I had somewhat become tired; I did not realize how much I had worked and I began to not be interested in going to CEC [the Chancellor’s Executive Council]. … I was not ready for the tasks from that point. All I knew was that the job was becoming too much of a chore. Sometimes I forgot that I had made a decision and you all let me know that I had. I said, “Good God, well what’s going on here?” So I decided it had been a wonderful journey. We had done pretty much what we were supposed to
do, in fact, exceeded what we were supposed to do. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Figure 21. President Arnette S. Ward upon retirement in 2002.

In retirement, she spends part of her time in Arizona and part of her time with family in Florida. She described her life after CGCC:

I did retire and I became President Emeritus and now I am on the 49% active retirement program and I am doing some very nice projects for the Chancellor and for South Mountain Community College’s President, which I have been doing for the past few years. I travel for six months, go to Florida, where my husband and I have built a home, and I come back here for six months. It has been one of the nicest things that could happen to me. It has been good. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)
**Assistant Provosts, Deans, Vice Presidents**

Two Assistant Provosts played a pivotal role in the founding of the college, Andy Bernal who was hired in March of 1985 and Margaret Haddad [later changed her last name to Hogan] who was hired in July of 1985.

The Provost position was equivalent to a Dean in MCCC, so the Assistant Provosts were hired at a salary and grade slightly below that. However, following the initial accreditation of the college in 1992, the Provost was appointed a President and the Assistant Provosts were appointed as Deans. As of the time of this research, positions that were titled Deans are now called Vice Presidents. So the Assistant Provosts had a very important leadership role at the developing institution.

Bernal had grown up in Gilbert and had served in the military before getting into the field of education. He recalled why he came to CGEC:

Well, the reason I came to Chandler-Gilbert is I was born and brought up in Gilbert, Arizona. And I had a strong loyalty to the community of Gilbert and the surrounding areas, and also to the community college mission. I think that’s what had attracted me to come to Chandler-Gilbert. Also because I like start-up kinds of operations. Most of my career had been in a start-up kind of operation from my very first job at McClintock High School as an attendance coordinator. That was the very first job that I had in public education. Then before I came to the Maricopa District I was at Arizona Western College where I was involved in some start-up programs there, starting the centers in Yuma, in Somerton and also in
Parker, which still are there today. I started those in 1976, ’77 and around that timeframe. Also I started the program out at Apache Junction for the Pinal Community College system. I was there for a couple of years, so I always liked start-up kind of operations. It’s more of a challenge. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

His tenure in the Maricopa Community Colleges began at Rio Salado and when internal applicants were invited to apply to work at the new extension centers, he jumped at the chance to start something new:

I went to Arizona Western College to Central Arizona College, and then I went to Rio Salado Community College and I was there for a few years. I gained some experience there as a Director of Cooperative Education and then Director of Apprenticeship Programs and also the Director of the Motorola Technician Training Program. So I had a good base in dealing with the business community from that experience at Rio Salado so from that position, as a Director of those three programs, I applied to the position at Chandler-Gilbert and I was fortunate to get that. And I think with my experience at starting up a number of programs at Central and also at Arizona Western gave me an edge I think on getting the job here. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Andy was remembered as an energetic individual by Julie Palinsky:

I think what probably jogged my memory today is talking about Andy. Somewhere there’s a video tape of him and I dancing out in the middle of this courtyard. Yes, there is [laughs]. And I think Roy asked me about it
one day, and I said I don’t know anything about that [chuckles]. I’ll have to dig that up. I think there were some mariachi’s here or something, and Andy said come on, and I said I don’t know how to do that dance and he goes, “Yes, you do. Come on, and we were out there just dancing like professionals and he can make anybody look good [laughs]. Somewhere there’s tapes.... (J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

Math faculty Chuck Bedal remembered Andy as a person with many ideas who was always thinking about new ways to serve students:

Now Andy, good ‘ole Andy Bernal, he pestered me and pestered me about teaching an introduction to computer class on a Friday night. I said Andy, nobody is going to come sign up for a class held on a Friday night. Well, he pestered me and pestered me. Finally, I thought I would say yes to this Friday night class and when nobody signs up, they would cancel it. Sure enough, the class filled and I ended up teaching a Friday night class in the spring of 1986. I was just amazed that so many people were interested. A lot of them were people who worked, and they were involved in other activities Monday-Thursday, and so Friday night seemed to be the only time to take a class. It was a change of pace for them. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

Margaret Hogan was the second Assistant Provost. Almost 20 years after her hiring, she sat down for an interview and described her background and how she decided to come to Chandler-Gilbert:
I was the first English faculty member to be hired at a brand new college in El Paso, Texas, at El Paso Community College. And with a developing institution very similar to Chandler-Gilbert, people do a lot of different things because you’re small and you’re growing fast. And so I spent five years teaching. In addition to that I was the Division Chair. In addition to that I was the Faculty Development Coordinator. They called me Educational Development Officer (EDO) in those days. So after five years at El Paso I had probably 15 years worth of experience. It’s just the beast—it’s what happens.

And I left there and went to work for a national consortium of two year colleges, all of them developing institutions. And for them I was a Faculty and Organizational Development Specialist because of the experiences that I gained at El Paso in a multi-cultural environment that had high priorities on educational strategies that were different and new on the scene. So when Alfredo [de los Santos, Vice Chancellor at MCCCD] came to the Maricopa District he recruited me to come as the first Faculty Development Specialist that the District had had. And the District was small at that time, five colleges. Small by comparison to today, but certainly large in comparison to other institutions in the states. And nobody knew what a Faculty Development Specialist was. And so I had to teach people and help them develop their own campus programs and the focus was always on instructional improvement, faculty effectiveness.
So after seven years of doing that, and being associated with large planning efforts, the arts and sciences task force, the occupational task force, the master planning for the District, … I had a pretty solid background I think for being part of a new institution, if you think all the way back to El Paso. In fact I feel like I made a career out of being a part of developing institutions.

So I was ready for a change after seven years of herding cats from the District Office [laughs]. And three positions opened up. One was the Dean of Instruction at Phoenix College and the other two were Assistant Provosts for the new centers. I applied for all three because I would have been very happy to have had any of them. And the third interview was the charm. By the time I did the third interview I must have been very convincing. And Arnette and I had made a very good connection through the women’s leadership program, so she knew me and she wanted instructional people for her associates. And so Andy was chosen for his background in business and industry and me for my background with instruction and faculty development. And so I was very pleased and proud to be made a part of this new institution, and they were some of the best years of my life. Frankly I just had such a good time helping get this college underway. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Margaret was key to the establishment of several important programs for CGCC. She took the lead role for the college in establishing the partnership with ASU East (now ASU at the Polytechnic campus) at the Williams Campus. Barbara Shovers recalled that
Margaret brought the concept of learning communities to the college. Shovers stated, “…from the very beginning I think it was Margaret [Hogan] first bringing this initiative in…” (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005). Marybeth Mason credited both Margaret and Andy for their commitment to faculty development, but said that Margaret’s background was instrumental in the college’s development. “Margaret was very interested and that is where her training and background was. When she moved to administration, she had been working in faculty development before that. So that was really important” (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005).

Andy Bernal was at Chandler-Gilbert for eight years from 1985-1993. “And after the eight years that I was here I went to GateWay Community College, and I was there for five years. Then after the five years at GateWay Community College I retired from the Arizona State Retirement System” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005). He is active in the Hispanic community, particularly in regard to educational projects, and he spends time with his family.

Margaret Hogan was at Chandler-Gilbert for 13 years from 1985-1998. She returned to the District Office for several years, after which she retired. She remains active in a number of community organizations including Arizona Quest for Kids where she mentors a brother and sister, the Arizona Democratic Party, and the International Science and Engineering Fair, among others. She is enjoying traveling, spending time with her family, and working on her house (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).
Arnette Ward spoke of their many contributions to the founding and early development of the college and called Andy Bernal and Margaret Hogan “outstanding educators” (A. Ward, May 23, 2005).

Faculty and Staff

Governing Board member Ed Contreras recalled the commitment of the faculty and staff:

I think that one of the good things about Chandler-Gilbert was the selection of the people that came to serve here. I think, you know, that it was a group of individuals that were highly inspired and dedicated…. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005)

The first wave of faculty had to teach whenever and wherever they were needed. They were often responsible for advisement of their students, promoting their classes and programs, attending numerous meetings, serving on college committees, designing learning spaces, representing Chandler-Gilbert at various District meetings, and more.

MCC President Wally Simpson remarked:

I think the knowledge that the first faculty brought, and I don’t mean just knowledge, I’m talking about their commitment, their flexibility, their success in using whatever special talents they had and their skills and their education, I think that was key. That people would commit themselves to this endeavor and say, boy, I’m just going to go in there and give it the best I have. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

He continued:
You had just superb faculty. I think of Mary Alcon Young, one of the first Mesa faculty to want to go out and help. And, of course, Andy Bernal and Margaret Hogan. There were people that really wanted to go there and do the job, so there are a lot of folks that deserve accolades. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Larry Christiansen, who followed Wally Simpson as President of MCC, described the faculty and staff of Chandler-Gilbert as:

…a whole lot of young pioneers, extremely outspoken in some cases, extremely opinionated in some cases, but young and full of energy and wanting to do great things, …. They too mellowed as time went on and provided, I think, a very stable and hardworking cadre of faculty and staff. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Arnette Ward was also in awe. She explained that the work of the faculty often inspired and sustained her:

So I always have to go back to the faculty, because I learned from them. I was not the type of President who sat and dictated. I told them, bring me your best expertise because I do not know what you need. If you can let us know that, keeping in mind what our students might need and the educational challenges that they will face when they leave here. That is what I ask. Then you make the program/course work for students and you give me something good. I also asked faculty to be able to cancel the program if it was not working and then try something else. The faculty
and their work carried me, so to speak. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Lois Bartholomew, who became the Dean and then Vice President of Student Affairs or CSAO, recalled that there were hard times, but people were resourceful and dedicated. She remembered:

It was hard—it was not an easy journey—but I think that’s kind of indicative of the people who were at Chandler-Gilbert during that period. Especially in the way beginning but I still think we recruit faculty who are creative and think out of the box. That’s a hallmark, I think, of this institution. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

John Underwood, the first faculty member in aviation and later Senior Associate Dean, remembered the scenario when he first interviewed for the position at the college. The challenges seemed substantial:

…when I first got here, I asked the question when I was doing my interview…. They said, “Do you have any questions?” I said, “I only have two. Where’s the curriculum?” “Ahh, we don’t have it yet.” Okay, do I dare ask the second question? “So where is all the equipment and the facility?” “Ahh, we ain’t quite got that yet.” Woah! [chuckles], but the heart was there, and the desire was there, and so it all worked out fine.… (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

As the initial faculty and staff came on board, they were often responsible for hiring other faculty and staff in their departments and areas. Arnette Ward recalled how they were very careful to find the right people for the college. “Together we all,
including faculty, looked for people who really had at least passion for teaching and learning. Who really cared about what happened to the students in their classroom” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

Because often there was more work than could be reasonably accomplished, faculty and staff involved their families with the college. Dr. Ana Jarvis, Spanish faculty, spoke of having her family attend college events and help with special projects. When describing memorable times at the college, she mentioned the involvement of her family among them:

… I remember when we sort of gained our independence from MCC. That was nice. I remember when we first got our accreditation for five years. You and I worked together on weekends. I remember that went well. And passing the bond election, twice. [I was] very involved in all that. In fact, my whole family has always been very involved with Chandler-Gilbert. This has been a wonderful experience for all of us. (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2005)

For many of the young faculty and staff who came, they looked at this as an opportunity to make their own mark, to assume leadership for important areas of a developing college, and to lay the foundation for the future. Duane Oakes remembered being enthused about becoming the first Director of Student Life. “Professionally, to have the chance to come into a brand new institution and be hired and to think, ‘Wow! I can build a program!’” (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005). Ana Jarvis concurred:
Then I heard about Chandler-Gilbert and I was truly intrigued by the idea of starting a college from zero. I thought that must be the most wonderful opportunity because you can look at everything you’ve done before. You can look at other colleges and hopefully improve on everything. (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2005)

Faculty and staff were responsible and hard-working, and often worked with little oversight and direction. Most liked the autonomy and were willing to take responsibility for the development of their programs, as described by communications faculty member Diane Travers:

Well, for sure I would say that this has been the place where I could really sink my heart and soul into, where I was allowed and encouraged and rewarded for pursuing professional growth activities. I feel autonomous when I teach my classes, where I’m trusted to stimulate as much thought and increase the skills of my students in the ways that I deem would be most effective. And I like not being told exactly what to do. I like having that autonomy because I’ve seen what’s working and what’s not and I can manage that myself and I really really like that. (Diane Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

Many of the CGCC faculty became leaders on campus, in the District, and nationally. Their accomplishments further enhanced the college environment. Dr. Ana Jarvis was the co-author of many Spanish textbooks including the best-selling series, ¿Cómo se dice...?. She was and is a well-known national presence in the teaching of Spanish. Yet, she spoke of her colleagues with high regard:
I think that we have been lucky. You have hired incredible faculty. I am in awe of so many of them, and the administrators and the staff. It’s like we went out there and just got all the best people. And every day I see how determined they are that this is going to be excellent. (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2005)

The early faculty and staff were a small but committed group of people who were determined to serve the students and the community well. Carolyn Sittner from Business Services summarized:

I think the major positive factor was that the college had employees that were very, very committed, and just did whatever it took, and stayed as long as it took to get everything that needed to be done. There were so few employees but you’d never know it because they worked so hard and diligently. (C. Sittner, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

Programs and Services

When we first started, the biggest focus was serving the community and providing a university transfer education. And if you look at the goals back then most of them are certainly still valid today. But we’ve moved beyond just a university transfer focus, to a fully comprehensive college. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

When describing programs and services offered by community colleges nationwide, higher education historian George Vaughan (2000) said:
Although the needs are as diverse as the communities served by the colleges, and may change over time, most communities have many needs in common and expect their college to meet those needs. Most communities want programs that permit students to transfer into a bachelor’s degree program. Most want vocational and technical training, often including training that meets the specific needs of a local industry. They expect a choice of credit and noncredit courses that lead to certificates, degrees and diplomas. Most want the college to offer remedial or developmental courses that will assist students to qualify for college-level work. Most communities want courses and activities that meet the recreational, social, and cultural needs of the community. (Vaughan, 2000, p. 6)

Such was the case with the SE Valley Task Force recommendations for CGCC, although different community members wanted certain programs within that mix to have varying degrees of emphasis.

**Academic and Occupational Programs**

Alice Conkright, one of the first faculty members hired, remembered that initially, “the administration really tried to implement some of the recommendations of the Southeast Valley Task Force. It was the document everybody who was in the college used over and over again,…” (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005). But it was not possible to offer much variety so “it was pretty much a basic program to
begin with, so that people would have the opportunity to do the general education requirements” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Over its first five years of operation, the college subsequently put in place a number of other courses in English, humanities, foreign language, mathematics, science, communication, the arts, social and behavioral sciences, business, and computer information systems. So although some members of the Southeast Valley Task Force had hoped the college would become more of a career and technical school, a basic university transfer program grew from the general education core classes that were initially offered. Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner recalled:

When you started I was a little bit worried about the political forces, that had wanted more vocational technical education, but we never really intervened on that and I don’t think we ever had a falling out with Jack Whiteman on that, but I think they wanted something else, okay. Then they started looking toward the Mesa Public Schools for a solution and I think that’s when EVIT [East Valley Institute of Technology] and some of these other places took off. But I was never worried about that. What I was worried about was that you would not have a comprehensive core of collegiate identity of theater and the performing arts and all these other types of things. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

That’s not to say that the college did not try to respond to the needs of the business community. Andy Bernal who served as Assistant Provost was in regular contact with business leaders and described:
…the business community constantly told us to make sure that our
students can read, and can write, and can compute. We can teach them the
rest of the stuff, but if they can't do that, you know, we’ll spend time
remediating what they’re doing. But building a strong academic base and
listening to what the business community wanted and needed in their
workforce, that’s what drove us. (A. Bernal, personal communication,
June 7, 2005)

Thus the emphasis was on university transfer curriculum and its role in helping
students prepare for careers. Bernal reflected on the emphasis that was placed on quality
in academic programs:

…we wanted to create a school, not the Harvard of the Southwest, but a
school that had a strong academic base so that students that graduated
from Chandler-Gilbert Community College and then went to universities,
any university in the nation, they could compete with anyone else. They
knew how to read, they could write, and they could do math, they could
compute, they could do all those things that are required of a university
transfer student. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Business faculty member Yolanda Penley concurred and stated:
We also were conscious of our function as a transfer institution. Were we
teaching the standards that our students will need to do well at Arizona
State, University of Arizona, and NAU? We did focus on that from day
one. We wanted to make sure we participated in all of the articulation
meetings. There was a real collaborative effort with the community and
the universities to make sure that we provided our students with tools for success. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

In the educational specifications document for the initiation of the Pecos Campus, program groups were identified in general education core and distribution including communication, humanities, natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, and physical well-being. Additionally, six other categories for potential development were identified: business, electronics, art, music, theatre, and telecommunications (Ward et al., 1985).

Initially class scheduling was patterned after heavy enrollment classes at Mesa Community College. Bernal explained:

…since we were under the auspices of Mesa Community College, we studied exactly what Mesa Community College offered in their program of studies. And basically when we first started we stuck with what we knew would work, and what is also required, and those things are the general education requirements, the English requirements, the math requirements, the science requirements, social science requirements, those things that are required courses of study in any program that the student gets into. So that’s what we first started with because we knew that is the core of any educational institution, the general studies programs. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Paul Elsner agreed that this approach made sense at a start-up institution like Chandler-Gilbert. He spoke about getting the “bread and butter” courses in place:
As soon as you opened up a college, what do you do? You go into the 4800 courses in the course bank, and if you went to something like 12 to 18 percent of them, they’re in the general education spectrum, and they’re the ones that are the bread-and-butter courses when you start a college.

(P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

After the core courses were in place, it became more difficult to determine what else to offer, but the administration and division chairs looked at patterns at other Maricopa Community Colleges, surveyed students, and used their judgment to grow the curriculum. Sandra Stuebner taught psychology and served as Chair for the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division. She described the scenario:

When we were building the college and building the course bank, the programs, and all that, we were guessing a lot. What might students want to take after they take psychology? In terms of psychology, we had Intro to Psychology for several years and now it is time for a second course. And so, what do they want to take? And we could ask in our classes and all of that, but a lot of times students in the earlier years only came for a year, and then would move on to Mesa [Community College] because we did not have a whole lot of second or 200-level courses. So we were trying to guess, I think again we guessed right a lot. We would look at other colleges to see what they had a lot of, that shows a lot of student interest, or our students are probably a whole bunch different than the ones at Mesa, so things like that. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)
David Weaver taught physics and served a couple of terms as Chair of the Science and Mathematics Division. He remembered discussions about not wanting to be a college that offered only first-year courses:

…programmatically, something that we wanted, early on, was to be able to offer the arts. We wanted to make sure that we didn’t just start and stay as, okay, here is a remedial, here is a junior-junior college where we just do preliminary kinds of courses that feed courses at other campuses. We don’t just want to be math and English, we want to have a diversity that could help build a well-rounded student, and I think we’ve been true to that as well. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

How subject matter was taught was emphasized as much as what was taught. Many interviewees described a college-wide focus on active and collaborative learning strategies which will be described in more depth later in this chapter under the section on Successes and Accomplishments. Alice Conkright recalled that “[t]he major emphasis in teaching and learning as far as my own division is concerned, Language and Humanities, was collaborative learning and process writing and cultural diversity” (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005).

Paul Elsner remembered that this emphasis on engaging and developing students was a unique characteristic of the college:

… you were interested in the developmental stages of students in a different way I think than a lot of other places were. You concentrated on a strong academic core, and made sure that was put in place, you really
were committed to learning support. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

More information about active learning, service-learning and learning communities is forthcoming in this chapter, as those would become major college initiatives in support of student learning.

Deciding what to do with vocational/technical programming was a challenge. Even though vocational programming was emphasized by a contingent of the Southeast Valley Task Force, it took years for the college to develop in that area. Alice Conkright recollected that “Chandler-Gilbert never had a strong occupational focus at the beginning, although people talked about it all of the time in meetings. If I am remembering correctly, the first NCA report focused on, suggested that there be more occupational programs” (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005). There were only two occupational programs that were initially established, computer technology and aviation.

Margaret Hogan stated, “We had a big emphasis on business and computers because that was something we had the facilities for” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005). She elaborated:

We just had an original goal that we would provide computer based training for the community and try and bring the community along as well. Because if you remember 20 years ago, it was Apple IIEs [laughs]. And so we were right on the cutting edge. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Gil Gonzales concurred that business and computer information systems provided a starting point for occupational programs. He remembered:
from an academic program perspective, we were about what most American community college is about which is delivering the AA [Associate of Arts], delivering business administration training, a strong business program, through the computer literacy type programs, the BPC [Business and Personal Computers] series of courses, certificates, etcetera.

That’s where our strength was at. We knew that’s how we could grow.

(G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

In 1988-1989, the college undertook a master planning process for facilities. Part of that planning process included environmental scanning for the purpose of suggesting program directions and student enrollment patterns. The report identified possible occupational program directions for the college:

The current profile for the East Valley reflects rapid change. While Chandler and Gilbert have strong agricultural roots, a strong manufacturing base emerged in the 1980s and will continue through the next decade. Manufacturing, construction, commercial, retail trade, and service industries will continue to expand in the East Valley. Thus the potential program and service needs for the occupational programs at CGCC should reflect this trend. Certificate programs in the areas of clerical office, office automation, computer science, telecommunications, health services, and all retail services should be considered. (Slattery et al., 1989, p. 4)
Note that of the list of proposed certificate programs, three of the six are technology related and office automation and computer science were immediately pursued by the college.

After computer technology was in place, the college became involved in aviation. Hogan explained:

…when we got over here [to the Pecos Campus], we really struggled about what are we going to do with occupational/technical education. But with the urging and the support of the aviation industry, we were able to get a separate building for the start of the aviation programs. And business and aviation and computer instruction were pretty much the occupational programs for a long time. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Gonzales concurred and explained:

…I think that was one of our strengths in some cases. Although, I’ll mention the constant, constant struggle from the business folks and the aviation folks for the limited amount of occupational funds coming from
the Chancellor’s office as part of our distribution. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

College documents from the early 1990s described the rationale for the move into aviation programs:

America faces a major shortage in the rapidly-expanding field of aviation. … A recent survey of the nation’s 21 largest airlines found 4,000 vacancies in the 69,000 mechanics’ positions available today. The demand for mechanics is expected to grow about 10% per year in the next decade. Particularly in demand are mechanics trained to repair the sophisticated electronics of large aircraft. If airlines feel the “pinch” from the shortage of mechanics, general aviation feels the “stab.” The shortage is already severe at the independent repair shops that service small aircraft (The Arizona Republic, August 7, 1989). (Master plan update & 10-year capital development plan, 1992-2002, 1992, p. 3)

Because one of the rural community colleges, Cochise Community College in Douglas, Arizona, already offered aviation, there was quite a struggle about whether or not one of the Maricopa Colleges could offer aviation in the metropolitan Phoenix area, despite the demand. Margaret Hogan recalled:

It definitely had to do with the fact that there was only one program in the state and it was in Cochise. And this airline that was going to be in Phoenix, going to be home based in Phoenix, wanted a program closer to home. And especially in maintenance, because they couldn’t find enough people to hire and they wanted some control over the training of
maintenance employees. And so, they helped us with the fight. We had to
fight at the State Board to get permission to have the program. (M.
Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

John Underwood who was the first faculty member hired in aviation remembered
that it was unique at the time for Chandler-Gilbert and for the Maricopa District:

You know, if I can take you back 16 years the only real other occupational
program were the business programs, the business computing labs, and
some of those other kinds of things that fell in this broad category of
vocational and occupational programs. And they had a couple of
certificates but there really wasn’t any large presence of a lot of
occupational programs. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June
10, 2005)

He goes on to describe that the uniqueness brought attention to the college, but
also created some challenges. The aviation program was located off-site from the Pecos
Campus so the aviation faculty did not have regular contact with the other faculty, and
the college culture was not conducive to occupational/technical programs. Underwood,
who later became the Associate Dean with responsibility for all occupational/technical
programs, recalled that it took a number of years for the aviation faculty to find their
place at the college:

And so I think because we were off campus, and because it was only a few
of us and there wasn’t a large number of other vocational/occupational
faculty as part of the group of faculty, they didn’t understand us. We were
strange, we were foreign, we were weird, you know, why would they do
something like that, and they just couldn’t get it. (J. Underwood, personal
communication, June 10, 2005)

Later in this chapter under the section on Successes and Accomplishments, the
development of the aviation program is described in detail, as it moved from being a
source of concern for the college to a source of great pride, as described in college
documents:

The college’s Aviation Program is one of its unique offerings with
specialized offerings in Aviation Maintenance Technology, Aircraft
Construction Technology (sheet metals, plastics), Avionics (electrical
systems) and Flight. Unlike other aviation programs, Chandler-Gilbert
Community College has an airport as a classroom and laboratory at the
Williams Campus, the former site of Williams Air Force Base. (A tribute
to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 20)

Because computer information systems and aviation were high-cost, capital-
intensive programs and the college had limited resources, these were the two primary
occupational programs offered for the first decade of the college’s existence. Gil
Gonzales explained that Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan who eventually became the
Dean of Instruction sent a clear message about not developing other occupational
programs:

I think under Margaret Hogan’s direction, we were very specific. We
didn’t do others. We didn’t do any others. I don’t recall actually. I’m
under the impression, I can’t think, I can’t think of any other occupational
programs at the time. I mean, between ’86 and ’92, ’93, I can’t think of another one. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

As has been mentioned, the story of the aviation program’s development will be told later, but there were industry pressures behind the computer technology programs too. Yolanda Penley was the first Chair of the Business and Computer Information Systems Division. Penley recapped:

A lot of the early goals revolved around how we were going to address the issue of technology. Therefore, we really focused on technology. That was happening regionally too. We had a lot of technology companies: Intel, Motorola, and many others that have come in, Orbital. I do not know how many are in the area anymore, but technology companies were going to hire our students, so we had to be on top of technology education. It impacted us regionally and locally. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Victor Navarro who was a manager in the Technical Support Services department for many years and became the Chief Information Officer (CIO) remembered that what made the computer technology program unique was both the community interest in technology, but also the flexible formats in which the courses were offered. For many years, the computer technology courses were the only college courses offered in self-paced, short-term, or online formats. So the technology was not just the content of the course, it actually influenced the delivery of the content. While describing the development of college programs, Navarro explained:
The whole computer literacy focus. The open-entry/open-exit lab, early on. Not only did it generate tremendous community interest because of this opportunity to go teach and develop new skills for using technology, but in terms of teaching and learning it was a little bit of a paradigm shift, you know, from the traditional classroom. We had students that we could accommodate on various schedules, and they could come and go and learn as it fit their schedules. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Faculty members Brenda Larson, Sid Ford, and Yolanda Penley all remembered the emphasis on technology and the significance of technology enrollment at the college:

- I think business [the Business/CIS Division] did a real good job with occupational programs. They had a lot and since I was in that division for most of my time those are the ones I’m most familiar with. They then moved on to the Microsoft Certification Programs. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

- Certainly ITI [Information Technology Institute] has been a major program that’s led the college and has increased enrollment significantly over the years, and some of the certificates and so forth we offer with Microsoft, so that certainly has been successful. (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

- I think then the technology program, and I am talking about the mid-1990s when all the internet and networking classes, and technology programs started up. That was a big deal. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
Kathy Saucedo, who was hired as residential faculty in 1990, provided initial leadership for a set of programs that came to be called the ITI or Information Technology Institute. Microsoft, Cisco, Oracle and other certificates and degrees were, and are, available.

John Underwood agreed that it was helpful to the college when multiple certificates and degrees were offered in the business and computer information systems area. He described the changes that took place as more occupational programs were developed:

But as more occupational programs came on board, with the Microsoft’s and the Cisco’s and the list goes on, of the new occupational programs that were brought to the campus, when those kinds of things began to happen, the makeup of the faculty, as a whole, had a better balance of the pure academia faculty, and the occupational vocational faculty, and then I saw a growing understanding across that whole group of individuals, that made things much easier as we kind of moved down through the system. (J. Underwood personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Technology programs evolved over the years to address the newest hardware and software on the market for which there were employment demands. Thus program enrollments fluctuated from a couple hundred to well over a thousand, depending on the year and the market forces. Brenda Larson explained that transitions were natural in technology programs, “We pursued them to the maximum and when we see that some things are no longer relevant to the community or to the workforce then we move to something else” (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005).
In 1994, the college began discussions with Intel about the preparation of semiconductor manufacturing technicians. There were no existing residential faculty specifically trained in that area, so David Weaver who had physics and electronics background was asked to provide leadership for program development. Weaver recalled:

… we started our first conversations with Intel when they were going to be building their Ocotillo Plant and they asked us to put together a Semiconductor Manufacturing Technician program. Margaret asked me since I had some background, would I go ahead and get it started. And I kept on emphasizing, this is not what I want to be when I grow up, but I’m willing to do what it takes to help get it started. And so I designed and taught all of those courses for a couple of rounds. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

David was responsible for all facets of program development and operations. One of the challenges at a new school is to use the expertise of a small number of people across a broad range of needs. Few individuals can consult with industry representatives, design curriculum, market a program, teach the courses, handle the budget, facilities, and equipment needs, and resolve other program related issues. Weaver did that for several semesters, while maintaining other duties at the college as well, but when it came time to hire the first full-time person in the area, it was difficult to find individuals who came with all of these skill sets. Weaver explained:

I had to design and put together those courses, and then ultimately teach those courses. I was primarily, initially responsible for the marketing, going out to high schools, doing visits with Intel, and we really did little
other than press releases. And then when it came time to hire somebody, it got all gummed up. We didn’t think it through, and had to hire at the last minute, so that got rushed. We hadn't planned for the idea of having somebody to kind of direct the program and people to teach, it was again, one person to do everything. So we didn’t do that well. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

The program, although still in operation at the time of this research, has had very low enrollment for several years. In 2000, the curriculum was revamped with the help of a community advisory council to provide preparation for various automated manufacturing technician positions, not only semiconductor manufacturing. The automated manufacturing system (AMS) program debuted in 2001 (Flury, 2006). However, several residential faculty have come and gone, and there is debate about the long-term survival of the program.

There were multiple programmatic directions discussed over the years that, for one reason or another, were not pursued. For example, agricultural programs, especially in the early years of the college, were discussed. Andy Bernal explained:

Since we started out here and it was primarily an agrarian community, there were some folks that wanted us to start some agricultural programs out here. And there was quite a bit of interest in that area. And I, coming from an agrarian area, knew the need, but I also could see that it was also receding. So we had to be able to try to meet their needs but not commit a lot of the resources to them, because we knew eventually those programs were not going to sustain themselves for a long period of time. And also
because in some of those programs there was not really good jobs for them. A lot of times the people get those jobs without going to a college. So there was not really a lot of reason to put a lot of resources behind them. Many times you would want to do something for them, but it just didn’t make economic sense to start an agricultural program. MCC wanted to send us some of their programs over here, and we rejected some of that as well because they were not really doing that well, so then we’d just pick up their program and end up in the same way. So a lot of the programs we rejected were mostly dealing with the agrarian-type programs. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Sandra Stuebner recalled discussion about the possibilities of pursuing programs in hotel and restaurant management:

There was also an early look at and discussions about hotel management and restaurant management. That seemed to us to be a place we did not want to go. The pay doesn’t seem to be significant. I think when we looked into similar programs in Scottsdale they were struggling, so it did not seem to me to be a place we wanted to go. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Sharon Flury, who worked closely with the Assistant Provosts and then served as curriculum coordinator for many years, remembered that as casinos were expanding on local Native American reservations, there were private discussions about program directions that might be pursued related to gaming. She said, “I think a lot of the discussions about occupational programs were not necessarily made known to the college
community at large. But I do recall there was some discussion about gaming machine repair technology” (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

Resource constraints made it difficult to pursue any of these options without additional major support from business and industry. Further, the process for developing occupational programs within MCCCDD required that there be evidence that students could find work at a decent salary level after completion of a program. Robin McCord described the link between some programs and the market demand:

Of course, no matter how hard you look at implementing these programs they are always going to be tremendously influenced by whatever the economic factors in the community are. So even though the programs that didn’t last long or never got off the ground on the scale that we wanted to, it was never for a lack of expertise [sic] or effort. But in most cases it was just the response of the local business and industry not being able to support it themselves. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Many of the occupational programs that were pursued were successful and continue to operate to this day; however, there were some notable failures.

The Virtual Reality Center was a start-up program that developed simulations and modeling in virtual reality under the leadership of Ken Schultz, who was the facilities director of the new Williams Campus. In 1999, Schultz became Vice President of Ferris State University in Grand Rapids, Michigan (Kenneth Schultz named V.P. and Chancellor for FSU – GR, 1999). The goal of the Virtual Reality Center was to help students learn how to create virtual environments. There were expectations that this
program would draw hundreds of students to the Williams Campus while making money for the college. This program was touted in the Annual Report to the Governor:

The Virtual Reality Competency Center (VRC²) opened its doors for training and education on July 13, 1998. The center is a joint venture between the CGCC and Prosolvia, a Swedish-based international software company. A five-year agreement to develop the center was approved in January, 1998.

A primary purpose of the center is to develop software applications that will be used for education and training in our colleges, universities and our local industry. While the technology is over 25 years old, it has finally become affordable and quite effective on PC and UNIX platform computers. ("Annual report to the Governor FY 1997-1998," 1998, p. 15)

Schultz was so convinced of the program’s viability that he and President Arnette Ward requested and received a large loan from the MCCC which was to be paid off with the profits from the Center. Unfortunately, not only were profits never seen, but the college had major expenses associated with the program. The ongoing expenses, coupled with the debt which had to be paid back to the District Office, posed a major financial challenge for the college for several years. Arnette Ward explained what happened:

There was one [mistake] that I did make – I got mad once, I was going to show the Chancellor, bless his heart. I got into a high-end software program with another country. God knows, I have never been out of the country in my whole life at that point. I connected with a new software program where we could help generate software, and do all kinds of
program planning using this wonderful technology. I sold the idea so well that the Chancellor believed it, the Board believed it and we were supposed to make all of this money; it turned out that it did not work. So I ended up paying. … Prosolvia, yes, virtual reality. Bless the hearts of virtual someone. Someone will probably do that one of these days. But I felt pretty good about that until I realized what I did not know about overseas business and how it happened. Things can drop in a flash and so it actually did. I had to pay the money back to the District. That was a lesson and it was costly. The good thing about it is, it was the only one.

(A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Ultimately the costs involved with maintaining the Virtual Reality Center were too large as a proportion of the total college budget. In spring of 2003, with only three students enrolled, the program was closed by President Maria Hesse so that the resources could be utilized for other college needs. The employees from the Virtual Reality Center were moved into the technology department and the grants area, the specialized virtual reality equipment was sold to the Air Force, the classroom and employee computers were distributed to other departments, and the classroom and office furnishings were moved to other areas in need. The college was no longer sustaining additional expenses but spent three more years, six years in total, paying off the accrued debts.

In more recent years, as the college has tried to become more comprehensive, a variety of other programs were developed.

The Electric Utility Technology (EUT) program, supported in large part by donations from Arizona Public Service and Salt River Project, has grown since its move
to CGCC in 2002. This program started at Scottsdale Community College, but when they closed it, CGCC hired the staff and began offering the program at the Williams Campus. College materials described the program, “The Electric Utility Program, housed at the Williams Campus, trains line workers for both above ground and underground service” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, pp. 20-21). This program, although young, has been a source of pride for the college, as described by Admissions and Records Technician Julie Palinsky:

The EUT [electric utility technology] students coming through now are just great students, I mean that’s just amazing...that they’ve put together a whole new thing, which these kids start out and make a great amount of money, in a two-year program…. (J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

In the area of health and wellness, the college initially had few offerings, but did have a fitness center which opened in 1987 when the Pecos Campus opened and included weight machines, treadmills, and other specialized equipment. Ward explained that the fitness center served students, employees and community members. She described that “the fitness center became quite a program for us here, in terms of generating enrollment. It provided not only physical fitness and wellness kind of programs, just general kind of programs, for the college but also for the community” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

The first fitness center coordinator was Lori Anonsen. When she transferred to Paradise Valley Community College, Regina “Regi” Munro became the coordinator. The
college opened a second fitness center at the Williams Campus in 1997, first under the leadership of Dan Bergland and subsequently Brent Alvar.

For a while, that was the extent of programs in the health area, although there were courses offered as prerequisites or corequisites for health programs at other colleges such as MCC and GWCC. Yolanda Penley recalled, “We did some, what I would call, pre-professional nursing training or allied health training like biology, anatomy and chemistry. Students need these courses to qualify for nursing and other allied health programs” (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

There were challenges in addressing additional health care needs. First, there were resource constraints that made it difficult to consider any equipment-intensive programs. Second, there were MCCCD restrictions on which colleges could offer various types of health care programs. The Maricopa Health Care Integrated Education System (HCIES), an initiative which began in 1996, allowed only certain colleges to offer nursing programs, although any colleges could offer prerequisite HCC (Health Core Curriculum) courses (Harris, 2005, pp. 1-2). President Ward described the situation:

We had been asked to start a nursing program for a long time, even before our first accreditation. Would you ever help us get nurses or technicians in our hospitals? At that time, Chandler Hospital was somewhat small, but it was growing fast. We could never get into that program. The policies at the District changed a little. First of all, they had enough, they had five campuses that had nursing programs. However, if we had started one, the waiting lists at other institutions would not have been so long, we thought. Somehow there was a moratorium that had been put on establishing
additional programs at the time, and we had to let go of the idea of starting a nursing program. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Faculty member Chuck Bedal explained that there were also facilities and equipment limitations that would have made it difficult to offer nursing:

One of the first occupational programs considered was nursing. The conclusion was that nursing required the wet labs for microbiology, and we just did not have the capability of doing that. The advantage of the nursing program was that Mesa Community College, which had a nice nursing program, had long lines – waiting lists – people wanting to get into the program. It was a much-desired program, but the micro labs were very expensive, and we just did not have the facilities. Then we moved over here, and we did not have wet labs. It was just impossible to do, so that idea was dropped. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

The critical shortage of nurses in Arizona caused some revisions of the initial recommendations of the HCIES recommendations, such that all Maricopa Community Colleges who are able can now offer nursing programs. In 2004, Barbara Winckler was hired to develop the CGCC nursing program, which began with 40 students in the fall of 2005, with the intention of expanding to 80 students by 2006 and 160 by 2010.

The Therapeutic Massage Program was developed by Phoenix College and is shared with CGCC. The program began in the fall of 2004 with Ed Loughlin as the program Director. Both a certificate and degree program are available (Loughlin, 2004).
The Dietetic Technology Program trains students for careers in nutrition and
dietetics. Students prepare for jobs in schools, hospitals, nursing homes, restaurants and
resorts, and other locations. The program held a site visit of the Commission on
Accreditation for Dietetics Education in December 2005 (S. Gaumont, personal
communication, February 7, 2005) and obtained American Dietetics Program
accreditation in 2006 (S. Gaumont, personal communication, August 16, 2006).

Thus programs in health care and wellness grew and the college anticipates
continued growth in this area of programming. In addition to health and wellness
programs, other programs have started in recent years as well.

The college has offered some teacher education courses for many years. The
expansion of local school districts and the statewide shortage of qualified teachers moved
the college to respond with a full two-year program in teacher education as of the fall of
2001. Sharon Fagan, who had been a residential English faculty at the college since
1995, and Brenda Larson, who had been a residential computer faculty at the college
since 1987, were selected to provide leadership. Fagan had spent many years in the Mesa
Public School system, while Larson had spent more than a decade at Greenway High
School in the Glendale School District. In the fall of 2005, more than 300 students were
enrolled in CGCC’s teacher education program.

In 2001, Bassam Matar was hired to develop an engineering program for CGCC.
Matar had previously been an engineering faculty member at Glendale Community
College. Given the industry demands for engineering technology and engineering, the
program has grown steadily to seven courses that are taught at the lower-division level
before students transfer to a university engineering program. There are challenges with
having only one residential faculty member in many of the programs that have been described. David Weaver, physics faculty, recalled the difficulties with trying to find one person with all of the skills needed to start and sustain a program in semiconductor manufacturing technology. He lamented that it was not possible to provide more support in engineering:

…we hired one person and that one person is responsible for doing everything, and again without a whole lot of additional support, or at least in terms of the marketing kinds of stuff. And I know that our marketing department tries to help, but it's not like we really strategically set out, okay this is going to be one of the jewels in the crown, so what are we going to need to do ahead of time to make sure that this thing is successful from the get-go. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

The above is not a comprehensive list of academic programs offered at the college. It should be noted that the researcher’s goal was to be able to chart the start date for each of the college’s academic programs. However, this was a more difficult task than imagined. It is easier to identify the start of cohort-based programs than most other academic programs. There were many questions that arose during the research such as what constitutes the start of a program? Is it when the first few courses in that area started being offered? Is it when the full compliment of courses required to complete a certificate or degree have been offered for at least one cycle? Is it when a residential faculty member is hired to lead a program? Is it when there are graduates of the program? This researcher tried, with the help of the college Curriculum Coordinator and several Division Chairs, to identify the start dates for many of our academic programs,
but these parties did not agree on what constituted the starting point for many of our programs and some of their correspondence contains conflicting opinions about when they believe a program to have started.

Some programs have started, stopped, and started again. For example, in the early years of the college, an engineering course was offered by a residential faculty member, but the researcher believes that most employees would associate the start of our engineering program with the hiring of residential faculty member Bassam Matar in 2001.

In some cases, no residential faculty member has taught in a particular discipline, although the courses have been taught for many years. For example, political science courses have been offered since the early years of the college, but most people would associate the start of the program with the hiring of the first residential faculty member in the discipline, Noel Morelos, in 2004.

In some areas, what faculty members reference as a program is not considered a program by the Maricopa Colleges District Office. For example, college documents provided information about the English as a Second Language (ESL) program since 1987 through the present. The residential faculty who teach in the area identify the series of courses that prepare students for entry-level college English courses as the program. There is no earned certificate or degree, which is the Maricopa system’s definition of a program.

However, in other areas where a particular certificate or degree program goes through a process for approval at both the college and district levels, it is easier to track, but not an entirely accurate way to track the start of a program. A college can gain
approvals to start a program, but then not begin accepting students into the program for some time. For example, the retail management certificate was approved in 2004, but the courses unique to the program did not begin to be offered until more than a year later in 2005 (S. Flury, personal communication, August 15, 2006).

In some programs, there is little debate about when they started. For example, the Microsoft Certified Systems Engineering certificate program began in 1998. In 1999, Cisco certification became available, then Oracle in 2003 and Linux in 2004.

Licensed programs are easier to track because the licensing or accrediting bodies keep detailed records and monitor progress with required reports and periodic visits. For example, after receiving Arizona Board of Nursing approval in spring of 2005, the nursing program began at the CGCC Williams Campus in fall of 2005 under the auspices of the accreditation of the MCCCD nursing program. A law enforcement academy program began in spring of 2005, after receiving approval of the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board (AzPOST). However, the start of a program may not be associated with the receipt of licensure or accreditation. For example, nutrition and dietetics courses were offered at CGCC long before accreditation was received for the dietetic technology program by the Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education of the American Dietetics Association. The aviation maintenance technology program was certified in January of 1989 by the Federal Aviation Administration and is designed to prepare students for licensure as certified airframe and powerplant (A&P) mechanics, but aviation maintenance courses were offered before that certification was received.

Also, as can be seen by the list of programs mentioned above, it skews one’s view of the college curriculum to speak only of programs that lead to a degree or certificate,
that involve special licensures, or have cohort-based student enrollment. For the large
majority of Chandler-Gilbert Community College’s enrollment is in general education
and university transfer courses. If one examines the prefixes of the courses that produce
the most full-time student equivalents (FTSE), mathematics, English, communications,
biology, chemistry, physics, geology, and psychology are standards. If one examines,
student self-identified majors, students come to CGCC predominantly for business and
liberal arts majors.

Creating balance in the program mix to serve students and the community well is
the goal. Sharon Flury, the college Curriculum Coordinator, reflected on the progress
being made towards that goal:

I looked in our college catalog earlier today and there were 15 items in
the master plan proposal, and I think that Chandler-Gilbert has done very
well by those 15 items. The only one I could think of that we are still
working on it, responding to workforce development by expanding our
occupational program. This last year has been a real eye-opener with the
number of programs that we have added, either because they are shared or
college specific programs. So we have done very well this last year
[2004-2005] especially. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Psychology faculty member Sandra Stuebner agreed saying, “…I think we have a
really well balanced occupational set of programs right now with nursing coming in” (S.
Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005). Computer faculty member Cathy
Urbanski concurred and stated:
I think we’re known for the aviation program, for the business program, and I think that we’re moving to the right direction right now. We’re expanding our health field, which I think is very important to the Southeast Valley. … I think we are moving in the right direction now because we added the health field, the police academy, the crime and intelligence; I think those are very important. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Community members agreed that the college was meeting community needs. In 2005, CGCC was presented the Chandler Chamber of Commerce “Industry of the Year” award for the college’s contribution to the growth of the local economy and service to its community.

Continuing Education

Continuing education courses have only recently begun expanding at the college. President Ward remembers that “…we built a special interest component, but it was very small” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005). Gil Gonzales commented that continuing education was “very limited” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006). There was a Dean of Continuing Education named Frank Ramirez for four years, but upon his retirement in 2000, the position was not replaced and continuing education was folded under the Associate Dean of Instruction position, which has been retitled as Dean of Career and Technical Education.

As of the time of this research, there are hundreds of continuing education courses offered each semester, as evidenced by the non-credit class schedule, including courses in
arts and crafts, business, investment and finance, health and well-being, hobbies and personal interest, languages, and computers, as well as professional development programs in language training, pharmacy technician training, and workplace Spanish ("Fall 2006 non-credit class schedule," 2006).

The Sun Lakes Education Center (SLEC) also offered non-credit continuing education courses and special events for the mature adult community, most of whom were retired seniors. College materials explained the nature of that facility and its programming:

The Sun Lakes Education Center is a unique branch of the college, serving senior citizens in the Southeast Valley. The center is adjacent to the Sun Lakes Health Center and offers non-credit, special-interest courses. “We are seeing a significant number of retirees enroll in computer classes,” Hesse notes. “They want to e-mail their grandchildren, write family histories, research genealogy, and track personal finances.” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 20)

Because SLEC has been discussed previously, it will not be covered in additional depth here.

Student and Academic Support Services

In addition to a broad array of academic programs, career and technical programs, and some continuing education offerings, there were a variety of services offered at the college. Some services were provided directly to students such as enrollment services,
some were related to academic support such as learning assistance or tutoring, and some were provided for employees such as institutional research.

In the beginning the services were minimal. Margaret Hogan remembered the initial suite of services provided for students and stated, “We knew that we needed library and learning resources, advisement, registration, financial aid. Those were pretty much the initial services. We also offered tutoring” (M. Hogan, June 8, 2005).

Lois Bartholomew recalled her arrival in the summer of 1989 and what was in place at that time:

…I came to Chandler-Gilbert to take over Maria’s [Maria Hesse] position and she had built a wonderful foundation. She had been the first Chief Student Affairs Officer here. She had this very small team of dedicated staff who did everything because at that point we were still an extension of Mesa Community College so Maria and her team started all of admissions, records, financial aid, orientation, counseling, advisement, recruitment, student life. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005) She continued:

And I think by 1989 Dean Hesse realized that it might be a good time to get a little more sleep at night because I think she was working 24 hours a day. She then decided to join the faculty, and President Arnette Ward, who was Provost at that point, invited me to follow in Maria’s footsteps and help build Student Services here at Chandler-Gilbert Community College. So I joined the team that summer. Maria mentored me that first year, and I learned about admissions, records, financial aid and
recruitment, counseling, student life. We started developing all sorts of things. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Initially there was just one administrative level position with a few support staff, but over time, departmental managers in each key service area were hired. Bartholomew remembered her first few managerial hires:

I got to hire a Supervisor of Admissions and Records, Ruth Romano. I got to hire our Director of Financial Aid, Doug Bullock. We added quite a few people in my first couple years on the job which really helped start to grow the division of Student Services here at the college. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Because the priority was instruction and there were minimal resources, the college did without some services for almost the first decade. The focus remained on enrollment services, as Margaret Hogan recounted, “Services were also basic, and I think we did the ones that we felt were absolutely essential for intake …” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Enrollment was underway virtually year-round, but during heavy periods of registration, all offices moved to the multipurpose room or what is now called A165 to make it truly a one-stop process for students. Admissions and records, advisement, financial aid, the cashier, student identification cards, parking stickers, and more were available at stations around one room. Carolyn Sittner, who managed the Fiscal Office, had fond memories of those registration periods. She stated, “I enjoyed the days when we first started and I was able to work the registration line, all of us over in the
multipurpose room together, just working frantically and feeling the excitement of starting a new semester” (C. Sittner, personal communication, June 14, 2005).

In addition to enrollment services, there was a bookstore, a small cafeteria, and a child care center. A scan of the college in 1992 by consultants, described the scenario with services:

Within the limitations of the current space and staffing, the college nevertheless does an admirable job of providing academic support and student development services and activities. Library, tutoring, computer and telecommunications/media support the curriculum and the students. Advisement, assessment, career and personal counseling, financial aid and fiscal services are provided for the students in addition to an amazing assortment of student clubs and activities. The college also provides day care, cafeteria and bookstore services. (Master plan update & 10-year capital development plan, 1992-2002, 1992, p. 16)

Hogan remembered that even these services were not in standard service spaces. She stated, “Services and activities buildings, performing arts buildings, … we did without those for a long time which was too bad” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

It can be difficult to track the administrative leadership in service areas because titles changed over the years. For example, there have been only two Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAO), Maria Hesse and Lois Bartholomew, both of whom were initially titled Associate Dean of Student Services. Upon achieving independent accreditation, promotions were awarded and titles changed. The CSAO was retitled Dean
of Student Services. Lois Bartholomew recalled, “I became the Dean of Student Services in 1992 as a sort of coming of age for the college and so that’s when we became a full division in Student Services” (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005).

Following the completion of the MAT employee group reclassification study in 2004-2005, the CSAO title was changed again and became Vice President of Student Affairs. Lois explained, “…there was a reclassification study and all of the Deans of Student Services in Maricopa were retitled as Vice Presidents of Student Affairs across Maricopa. So my new title is Vice President of Student Affairs” (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005).

At the time of this research, Lois Bartholomew had been the CSAO at Chandler-Gilbert for 17 years. Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner spoke about the tone that Lois established and her deep concern for the success of students:

Lois is a good example of how committed you were to being there for the students when they needed you and they wanted you. Then she also knew a lot about, you know, the crises that students face, and she had kind of a mental health view of the world. When people were troubled or in difficulty she was there, and I think that permeated the whole campus, you know. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Academic affairs and student affairs worked closely together. Margaret Hogan explained that the emphasis was on student success:

The umbrella was really student success and the instructional models were designed to help students succeed. And that carried through the learning and resources arm as well as the student service arm so it connected the
instructional programs with the student services programs. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Founding Provost and President Arnette Ward had come from a student services background, so she knew the value of strong support services. She shared her perspective:

I always said to the service side of the campus, our support service people, that their work was just as important as what goes on in the classroom. If you are not treating students right at the beginning, it’s not going to be right in the middle and at the end. They all bought that philosophy and they all seemed to want to live that philosophy and they actually did. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

The college’s student development philosophy was written in 1987 by a team of faculty and staff, led by Maria Hesse (Ward, 1988, p. 3). It still appears in the college catalog almost 20 years later as a statement of commitment to student success. It reads:

The goal of Chandler-Gilbert Community College is to assure student success. Success is defined as the accomplishment of, or the continued opportunity to accomplish, students' individual goals. The success of our students will be determined not only by their acquisition of knowledge and skills, but also by their personal growth and development. This would include intellectual development, multicultural awareness, aesthetic appreciation, physical wellness, emotional well-being, community responsibility, and values clarification.
Chandler-Gilbert Community College will provide the environment in which students can identify and pursue their goals. The following general institutional practices are necessary to insure student success:

- To provide programs that assure student competence in specified academic and skill areas;
- To provide a full range and schedule of services to permit students to benefit from college programs;
- To provide simplified and clearly defined processes for admitting students, monitoring their progress and maintaining accurate academic records;
- To provide activities that encourage students to effectively interrelate with others in their college and communities;
- To provide opportunities for the development of self-esteem, personal identity, independence and self-direction;
- To provide coordination with secondary and postsecondary schools, and business and industry;
- To provide delivery of instructional services through alternative systems which prepare students to function in an increasingly technological and informational-based society; and
- To develop and implement a comprehensive staff development program to educate the staff in student development philosophy and practices.
Chandler-Gilbert Community College will assist students in initiating their own paths to success. The college recognizes that all students are unique and capable adults, responsible for directing their own development throughout life, and that the major responsibility for a student's development rests with the student. All faculty, administrators and staff members of CGCC will support and contribute to the implementation of this student development philosophy. ("Catalog and student handbook 2006-2007," 2006, p. 3)

That philosophy attracted employees who helped shape and grow services. Duane Oakes was the first Director of Student Life for the college. He stated:

I think one of the things that I learned as a professional in the student services area, is that the focus of what we are all about is about students first. I brought with me and have a plaque that still hangs on my wall to this day that says “People before Programs.” The reason we are here is to support students – in student development, student growth and student learning. That was really the main reason I came here. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Student clubs and activities were established within the first months of the opening of the Pecos Campus in the fall of 1987. The first student leadership retreat was held in spring of 1988 and shortly thereafter the first student leadership council (Figure 22) was formed.
Maria Hesse served as the advisor. The emphasis of their activities was on providing service and support for other students and for those in need in local communities. They worked with the local Boys and Girls Club, the homeless shelter, and the food bank, as well as starting a variety of student support services on campus. When Duane Oakes arrived in 1991, he also focused heavily on service-based activities:

Many of our leadership models, many of our leadership activities were focused around service. From the very beginning we did service projects, service activities, adopt-a-family and they were carried on by past predecessors. I think, Maria [Hesse], you helped start some of those. That was an important philosophical approach that service is important. In fact, one of the leadership techniques and principles I taught is service is
leadership and leadership is service. That was the first leadership principle I would teach my students. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

The emphasis on student development through co-curricular learning was important and helped shape the relationship between instruction and services over the years. Duane Oakes described it:

Unfortunately, in the academic world, there is a great divide – Student Services is on one side and Instruction is on the other. Because Chandler-Gilbert was a new college, we were able to build the opportunity to have learning supported and valued in both. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

He also spoke about the impact of having supervisors and faculty colleagues who were of the same mind:

Both yourself, Maria Hesse, and Lois [Bartholomew] had been student activities people and so they understood the value of co-curricular learning. That is not seen by many people. You do not have that everywhere else, so I had those mentoring opportunities all through my career – it was huge. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

The integration of services in support of instructional programs was a distinguishing characteristic of the college that has developed in many interesting ways. Lois Bartholomew reflected:

You know I have been the Dean of Students and my colleague and friend and mentor at one point, you [Maria Hesse], have been a faculty member
and the first Chief Student Affairs Officer. You’ve been the Dean of Instruction and now the President of the college and when you were the Dean of Instruction it just continued that legacy of getting together around the table and figuring things out. So in the years that you served as the Dean of Instruction, it was just sort of, “let’s figure this out together.” There were so many things that were so collaborative between Instruction and Student Services while you were the Dean of Instruction that I got so spoiled with that, this whole relationship, because you brought to the table what was best from a teaching perspective, and you know I was always about what is the student need from a Services perspective. So it was kind of this wonderful hand in glove relationship and how it just seemed seamless. It wasn’t your domain or my domain; it was a student’s domain. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Bartholomew concluded that:

…developing that hand in glove relationship between services and instruction made us very unique and very successful. Because we took all the resources we had collaboratively and we figured out how to make it work and at the heart of that was the student. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Several programs such as service-learning and learning communities were mentioned often by interviewees in this research. Both serve as examples of cooperative working relationships between instruction and services, and they will be discussed later in this chapter under the heading of “Successes and Accomplishments.” The active or
collaborative learning agenda was also affected by the integration of services as the college developed an alternative weekly schedule of classes that featured Monday-Wednesday, Tuesday-Thursday, and Friday-Saturday classes, and a “community hour” designed to bring students and employees together for special events, meetings, and activities.

This was a radical idea in its day and stemmed from the faculty desire to have longer class periods. This program will be described in more detail later in this chapter, but it was the driver behind the new class schedule that also gave rise to the notion of reserving time for special events in the middle of each class day. Many special events were also held on Fridays, because fewer classes were offered on Fridays. Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner remembered:

You also were courageous by taking Friday off, and having a day set aside for advisement of students and things that students need to have done on the college and you weren’t not here, you just changed the commerce of the whole week, because it was around learning and student development.

(P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Accounting faculty member Sid Ford remembered the change as primarily helping with standardization of his classes:

For me I really think one of the big things is when we decided to go to a four-day programs where all of my classes were an hour and 15 minutes. That makes a difference for me as a faculty, where all of my classes I have the same amount of time to give exams and to lecture and to do the things I do. And then have the Fridays for our meetings. I really think that that
has been significant in managing our time and for students as well. (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

But others also remembered the impact it had on their students’ involvement with co-curricular learning activities. Brenda Larson, faculty member in teacher education, stated:

I think when we went to the Monday-Wednesday, Tuesday-Thursday schedule, that that was big also. I think it’s more advantageous for students than it is for faculty. Because we’re “meetinged” to death so, but I know especially from my education students that’s when most of them do their Service-Learning. And without having that Friday, I’m not sure how many of them would be able to complete their service-learning. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

The college became increasingly known for its alternative class schedule, service-learning program, and learning communities program, all of which received significant support from student services.

In addition, the college was known for its student life and leadership programs which were highlighted as a college strength in the 1996 accreditation team’s report. They stated:

Given the lack of space and resources to accommodate extracurricular activities and a traditional college atmosphere, the success of student activities, the student government and its involvement, and most important, the students, their enthusiasm and their commitment are a strength of this college. It is clear that Chandler-Gilbert makes a
difference in the lives of its students, in their knowledge, behaviors, and attitudes. (Gibson et al., 1996, pp. 53-54).

Duane Oakes, the first Director of Student Life for the college, remembered thinking about the opportunity to start a program from the ground up:

I saw a great opportunity to develop a program in this area, even using the storage area. I said I would like to have this area as long as I can negotiate the use of this storage space. I remember Chris Cress [Director of Maintenance and Operations] wondering what I was doing, and I told him I am going to turn this place into a place that would have hundreds of students involved. I jokingly said, “One day we will have so many students in here you will not want them.” A year or two later Chris said, “Okay, Duane we have enough in here!” We could not keep them out.

We negotiated a little office area, I put up a portable desk and made a little cubby for my area and then had an area for student leadership. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

The variety of programs available had an impact on students and on the employees. Julie Palinsky was one of the first graduates of the college and then became an employee. She remembered the significance:

When we got student life and when we started adding all these things to the college that we hadn't had before that. When I was a student here we were part of Mesa so if we did anything as a student group it was with Mesa students, and it wasn’t the same as when we started doing things here. (J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005)
Duane Oakes, who had come to the college in August 1991, eventually transferred to Mesa Community College in 2000 in a faculty contract managing their service-learning program. He left his imprint on the college and the college left its imprint on him. He reflected:

I remember doing leadership retreats in Payson and Prescott, taking hundreds of students from a little college. We used to go to the District-wide retreat and then we started our own retreat and it was almost as big as the District-wide retreat. We would take students from all different groups – the Hispanic group, the Native American group, the LDS [Latter Day Saints] group, the Christians in Action group, you know, all of the groups together and have a fun time. Not seeing individual groups, but we were one big group and we were a team. We had fun together and we laughed together and we played together and we had a great time. We made great memories together. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Students received word of programs, services, and activities primarily through word of mouth in the early years and later with print publications. The first student newspaper was called *Footprints*, then it was the *Spectrum* (J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005), which was produced for five semesters from spring 1990 through spring 1992. The *Connection* newsletter was started in the fall of 1997. It was not a student newsletter, but rather a college news bulletin about programs and services. At the time of this research study, the *Connection* is mailed to all currently enrolled students, employees, and a large database of community leaders. Since the advent of the...
internet, more and more information is available to students via the college website and e-mail communication.

There were many other services provided for students, however, many such as advisement, orientation, admissions and records, financial aid, were mentioned only in passing by those interviewed for this research. There was not specific information provided that related to their history and development. Others such as early outreach services, international education, re-entry student services, and disabled student services and resources are relatively new and the researcher surmises that therefore they did not come to mind with interviewees as related to the history of the college.

Some services have been addressed in more detail in other parts of this research, therefore, they will not be addressed again here. Athletics and performing arts were previously addressed, as was the library. Computer lab services will be discussed briefly under the Technology section of this chapter, which is a subset of the heading, “Land, Facilities and Equipment.”

The learning assistance or tutoring program deserves special note, as it was highlighted in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) 2005 survey results as contributing to CGCC’s top performer status. The college has offered tutoring to students since its inception, but the coordination of the service has taken different forms. Initially, in 1988, it was coordinated by a Learning Center Technician, Shirley Troye, who worked for the Associate Dean of Learning Resources, Gil Gonzales. In 1990, a manager called the Director of the Learning Center was hired. Her name was Suzanne Aragoni and she remained in that position for almost four years until 1994.
Then for a period of years, the tutoring money was divided among the Division Chairs for them to hire and organize tutors as they saw fit.

With support from the Division Chair Council, then Dean of Instruction, Maria Hesse, hired a new Learning Center Director in spring 2000. Eva Falletta was hired in that capacity and she documented her initial priorities:

The Learning Center Director and the Dean of Instruction decided that the initial focus would be on “building the infrastructure” of the Learning Center. This included coordinating and centralizing all tutoring services (Writing Center, Math & Science Tutoring, ESL, Spanish & Foreign Language, Economics, Accounting & Business, Computer Programming, Information Technology, Philosophy and Aviation) under one department—the Learning Center. Additionally, the Director was charged with establishing, implementing and disseminating the Learning Center’s mission, policies, procedures and goals. Tutor guidelines, job descriptions, roles, responsibilities, expectations and a tutor training notebook were also developed. The Director wanted to ensure that the learning assistance provided was compatible with college priorities and offerings and that it provided enriched environments to facilitate learning and student success. Planning and much effort went into creating a five-year Learning Center Strategic Plan which became part of CGCC’s 2000-2005 Academic Plan…. The current infrastructure and collaborative operational model was established over the past five years and now all tutoring services are centralized and coordinated through the Learning
Prior to Spring 2000, CGCC provided content tutoring through the various academic divisions—Language and Humanities, Math, and Business (Accounting). The Learning Center Director works closely with faculty to ensure tutoring services and hours of operation are established to be compatible with course offerings and student needs to the extent possible. Learning Center services, hours and resources have expanded over the years, giving students more support to supplement and enhance classroom instruction. Evening and commuter student needs were taken into consideration while establishing Center hours. (E. Falletta, personal communication, August 15, 2006)

In a document prepared for an awards program, the college reported Learning Center statistics:

In 2004-05, the CGCC Learning Center served 34% of the students enrolled, with 3,485 students visiting for a total of 33,108 hours. The number of student visits to the Learning Center has increased a remarkable 721% over the last five years, and has served as a model for other colleges to emulate. (M. Mason, personal communication, October 31, 2005)

Administrative Services

At the time of this research, the administrative services division of the college had responsibility for strategic planning and budgeting; fiscal operations; facilities planning, operations, and custodial services; safety; institutional research; grants, fundraising, and development; marketing and public relations; contractual services such as the bookstore,
food services, and copy services; and human resources or personnel support. This was not always the constellation of departments that reported through administrative services. In 1992, college documents report that “[a]dministrative services include buildings and grounds maintenance, security, fiscal operations, public relations/marketing and administration” (Master plan update & 10-year capital development plan, 1992-2002, 1992, p. 16). When asked about college programs and services, few interviewees discussed the history or development of administrative services as a division. However, the results of these services are discussed in subsequent sections of this chapter that focus on employees; finances; and land, facilities and equipment.

This next section will paint the picture of the types of students who came to the college to take advantage of the programs and services that were available.
Students

*We attracted students who were more interested in small classes and a closer relationship with faculty.*
(Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

More than three hundred students enrolled at the Chandler-Gilbert Education Center “at the former Seton High School in Fall 1986” (Puyear, 1987, p. 21). Who were they and why did they choose to come to this new site as opposed to an older and more established college?

Business faculty member Yolanda Penley felt that certain types of students were attracted to the smaller, more intimate learning environment. She said, “We were small enough that we could pay attention to everybody and we knew everybody” (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

Andy Bernal, Assistant Provost and later the Dean of Instruction, felt that the key to attracting students to Chandler-Gilbert was to create a “welcoming” environment (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005). He explained:

I think that was what we were trying to create here at Chandler-Gilbert—a community college where … people feel welcome so that when they walked in they felt welcome here. And it is not like, “What are you doing here, what do you want here?” It’s, “How can I help you?” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Initially, there were no employees whose job title was recruiter or advisor. In the first five years, all employees helped recruit students and build awareness of the college, and all faculty helped advise students on course selection and educational goals.
Psychology faculty member Sandra Stuebner, who also served as the college’s first counselor, explained how she would recruit students to the college:

We kept thinking students are not going to come out this far if they can get the courses somewhere else. But they just kept coming. I remember talking to a student who had gotten shut out of all of the psych [psychology] classes at Mesa [Community College] and really needed it, and somehow I got him on the phone. He was like, “Okay, if I get in the car and drive over there right now, are you sure the course will still be available?” I said yes, the course would still be available, because we probably had 10 more seats. Then he said, “Where do I have to park?” I told him to park anywhere he wanted except in a handicapped spot. He said, “So, there’s no problem with parking?” And I told him no, no problem with parking. He said, “Well, maybe I should take all of my classes there.” I said that might not be a bad idea. Why not come on out? I was luring them over from Mesa. They would come over for one course and end up staying. They liked the small college too. It was interesting how we sort of built our student body. (S. Stuebner, June 2, 2005)

As displayed in Appendix M, enrollment grew almost every year. Appendix M also shows the annual headcount and full-time student equivalent (FTSE) enrollment through the years. In addition to positive changes in the numbers of students attending, there were several changes that occurred in regard to student demographics as well.

The student body became, on average, younger over time. It appeared that as the college facilities grew to look more like a college, the age of students who attended
became younger. In the fall of 1987, only 13% of the student population was 19 years or younger, while by the fall of 1990, 21% were 19 years or younger (Master plan update & 10-year capital development plan, 1992-2002, 1992). In 1995, 27% were 19 or younger, and by 2005, 42% were 19 or younger. These are striking changes for which there are several possible explanations. As the college matured, there was a greater variety of programs and services available, including some that tended to draw younger students, such as collegiate athletics, residence halls and on-campus housing, a student center with student life and leadership opportunities, and performing arts. In 2005, it should also be noted that many of the students who are 19 and younger are not on the college campus, but rather at local high schools taking dual enrollment classes or enrolled in the Achieving a College Education (ACE) program. Home schooled students and other underage students account for a portion of the growth in younger students as well.

The college has attracted more day students in the past decade too. In 1995, 56% of the students were primarily day students, while in 2005, 69% were day students, with less than one third (31%) being evening students ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006). This day/evening ratio may be related to the age of the students. The expansion of programs during “prime-time” hours may also attract more day students.

The student body has become more diverse in terms of ethnicity. The ethnic background of students was similar for the first five years of college operations with approximately 84-85% of the population being Caucasian, 11-12% Hispanic, 1-2% Black, 1-2% Asian-Pacific Islander, and 1% Native American (Master plan update & 10-year capital development plan, 1992-2002, 1992). By the fall of 1995, only 78% of the
student population was Caucasian and by fall of 2005, 66% were Caucasian ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006, p. 9).

A shift towards a more diverse student body occurred. In 2005, 15% of the student population was Hispanic, 5% was Asian/Pacific Islander, 3% was black or African American, 2% was Native American, and 9% did not specify their ethnicity ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006).

As a black woman, reading faculty member Wanda Matthews was particularly attuned to the concerns of minority students. She felt that the college could and should have done better attracting minority students in the early years:

… I think we did recruit a lot of students, but we didn’t recruit a significant number of black students. I don’t know if we should have had a minority student director or, and when I say minorities, I guess I’m specifically saying Black students, Hispanic students. I don’t think we recruited Hispanic students nearly enough. (W. Matthews, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

Alice Conkright, English and humanities faculty, remembered efforts in minority student recruitment without much success:

… in those initial years a lot of talk and effort was also put into trying to recruit minority students – how to get them, where to get them, and what were the best places, and so on. I do not know if that is still going on. I do not think it was ever very successful; it just simply may not be the population here. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)
She also remembered Chancellor Paul Elsner trying to prepare employees for a shift in community demographics and, therefore, student demographics in Arizona. Conkright recalled:

I remember the Chancellor, Paul Elsner, saying over and over again by 2000 maybe, I am just guessing, I am not quoting him, half to three-quarters of the student population will be Hispanic. He was really tied into the community college population, what it was becoming in Arizona, who our customers were, and planning for the future. That influenced an incredible amount of hiring decisions and other decisions…. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

In regard to students’ purpose for coming to CGCC, most students came to prepare for transfer to a university:

According to the 2005 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), 81% of CGCC students surveyed—compared to 69% of community college students nationwide—indicated transfer to a four-year college or university as their goal. ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006, p. 7)

For years, CGCC faculty members worried about preparing students adequately for a more unforgiving and difficult university environment. Chuck Bedal, founding mathematics faculty member, stated that helping students was natural at CGCC:

The community college attitude is we can do things to help that student. We call them up and say, “Gee, Bill, I have not seen you in class in a couple of weeks. Is everything okay?” You find out they have broken a
leg, or they are in the hospital, they have had a serious car accident or something like that so arrangements are made to withdraw the student or make another arrangement so the student can complete the class. That attitude, the universities say we “coddle” the community college students. Well, maybe we coddle the students, but you know, it is a more humane treatment of students, therefore I am very much in favor of that attitude.

(C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

MCC President Wally Simpson stated that he was always impressed with Chandler-Gilbert’s focus on students and their success (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

Students came primarily from within CGCC’s immediate vicinity. The Master Plan for 1989-2005 showed a map with the “CGCC service area,” a circle radiating from the Pecos Campus with a six-mile radius (Slattery et al., 1989, p. 5). The borders of that circle stretched approximately to Baseline Road on the north, Power Road on the east, Hunt Highway on the south, and Price Road on the west. MCC’s Southern and Dobson campus was shown with a circle that overlapped the CGCC service area, radiating as far south as Chandler Boulevard and as far east as Lindsay Road.

The notion of a service area is now outmoded within Maricopa. In more recent years, colleges have recruited wherever there is potential interest among students for the programs and services they offer. This is a significant departure from previous years. Back in the 1970s and 1980s, there were MCCCD “attendance zones,” much like those that school districts set for their elementary and secondary schools (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 97). MCCCD directed students to the campuses based upon these attendance zones; that
is, the college campus students would attend was based upon the high school district in which they lived. Exceptions were made for students who wished to pursue specific courses of study not offered at their zoned college (Hinsdale, 1973).

Moving to the concept of service areas instead of attendance zones offered colleges a little more flexibility in working with students. Service areas often overlapped slightly and the goal in planning college sites was to make sure that the Valley’s population could reach at least one of the Maricopa Community Colleges within a short drive (Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000, 1978).

As the financial outlook for the Maricopa District changed over the years, it was clear that not every college would be able to offer all courses and programs. Most of the Maricopa Colleges have some distinct programs that are not duplicated elsewhere in the District and, in some cases, there are regional programs offered at a handful of the Maricopa Colleges. Students are able to attend the college that best meets their needs, even if that college is not located within their service area.

Development of mass transit in certain parts of the metro Phoenix area and the freeway system have made it easier for students to get to campuses that were previously considered remote. It is common for students to “swirl” and be jointly enrolled in more than one Maricopa College and/or at the state university or another institution simultaneously. The development of the San Tan Freeway (also called the Loop 202), which as of 2005 has an interchange just south of the CGCC Pecos Campus and as of 2006 just north of the Williams Campus, will allow more students the possibility of taking classes at both the Pecos and Williams campuses.
It has been noted that CGCC is drawing younger students who enroll in predominantly day programs. Many of those students are recent high school graduates. The 1989-2005 facilities master plan had an appendix that showed that the Southeast Valley would continue to have a steadily increasing number of high school graduates, from approximately 1,200 in 1991 to 1,700 in 1994, from four area high schools. Those high schools are identified as Seton High School, Queen Creek High School, Gilbert High School, and Chandler High School (Slattery et al., 1989). In the past few years, several new high schools, which were not even planned for in the 1989 timeframe, have been added in the area, such as Higley, Basha, Hamilton, Highland, Mesquite, and Desert Ridge.

In 1989, the CGCC “student population draw is currently 2.5% from the overall population. … For the purposes of the Master Plan, it is assumed that the student populations draw will increase as additional campus facilities are added” (Slattery et al., 1989, p. 3). In 2005, the CGCC college-going rate or student draw rate from the general population was 3% (National community college benchmark project, report of 2006 aggregate data, Chandler-Gilbert Community College, 2006).

**Employees**

_We were very careful to select people who had energy and color and wanted to do something for the students, that believed the students deserved the very best even though we were a small institution._

(A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)
Employees were attracted to MCCCD and CGCC for many different reasons. In some cases, moving to a fair weather state with a good quality of life was the draw, as Diane Travers explained:

I’d be lying if I said that the weather didn’t affect my decision to relocate out here and to come back here. After a harsh year in West Virginia, I longed for the warmth of the Southwest. We’ve got a great quality of life here for those of us raising children. I really enjoy living in Gilbert and in this part of the Valley. And I know with the housing market, at least it used to be more affordable here. Lately the prices have really gone up but compared to other higher priced areas, California, back east, the home market is more realistic where an average family hopefully can get a home. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

Other employees already lived in the metropolitan Phoenix area but had long commutes, or lived in the East Valley and wanted to work there as well. Chuck Bedal, mathematics faculty, was already working in MCCCD at Maricopa Tech (now GateWay Community College) when he heard about the new extension centers. He requested to be transferred to Chandler-Gilbert when it opened:

I was attending these Board meetings and, at that time, Maricopa Tech was at 40th Street and Washington, and I was living in Mesa and when the river was running it was about a two-hour drive to get to work. So when I first heard they were going to consider a community college in Chandler, which would be a much shorter drive, in both time and distance, I thought I would keep my ears “perked” and I will listen for what options come up.
Sure enough, about March, they announced the two provosts [Chandler-Gilbert and Paradise Valley] now have permission to hire faculty, but they must be transfers from other community colleges. The very next day I made sure my resume was up-to-date and on file and submitted. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

For others, the lure was the chance to get in on the start of a new institution. Gil Gonzales was at the University of Arizona and had done some consulting work for Assistant Provost Andy Bernal. He recalled that Bernal “invited me to come to campus and he mentioned that he was starting a new campus. I thought it was a wonderful thing at the time to begin, to start something from scratch” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006). Other employees had similar thoughts. Spanish faculty Ana Jarvis, explained why she came:

Then I heard about Chandler-Gilbert and I was truly intrigued by the idea of starting a college from zero. I thought that must be the most wonderful opportunity because you can look at everything you’ve done before. You can look at other colleges and hopefully improve on everything. The program, Spanish, was non-existent. There wasn’t even one student, so we had to start that program from the ground up and I found that very challenging and just wonderful. (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2005)

English as a Second Language (ESL) faculty Barbara Shovers was honored to be selected:
I was hired in ’87. I had been working in the District as an adjunct faculty member for six years and attending ASU. I came over here to really start the ESL [English as a Second Language] program. That was my focus. I felt so honored to be able to do that from the ground up. (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Physics faculty Robin McCord was enthusiastic about the chance of using what she had learned elsewhere:

I was a full-time employee at Glendale Community College when I read that a new campus was starting in the East Valley. And I thought that it sounded like an exciting opportunity to be in on the ground floor of a new science department. And I was very enthusiastic about the idea of using so much of what I had learned at Glendale, as far as new methodologies and new educational technologies. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

The opportunity to work within the reputable MCCCD was also a draw. Librarian Larry Miller who came to MCCCD from the Chicago area recalled, “Maricopa seemed to offer more opportunities, more challenges, and as well as the reputation for trying to do different things, technology and whatever” (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005).

Some employees started as students and then began working for the college. Julie Palinsky, currently an administrative assistant in the Admissions and Records department, remembered, “I came back to school and I started taking classes and just fell
in love with the people at the school. I started working right away with registration…”
(J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005).

Victor Navarro was working within MCCCD and came to CGCC as part of an internship program. He moved through a variety of technical support positions to management and at the time of this research serves as the Chief Information Officer (CIO), titled Director of Information Technology, for CGCC. He recalled, “I saw the opportunity to come out here. I felt like I could make a difference, and use the skills that I had developed” (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005).

Lois Bartholomew had been the Director of Student Activities at Mesa Community College for many years, reporting to MCC’s Dean of Students, Arnette Ward. When Chandler-Gilbert was getting started, she told Ward she would love to be a part of it. “I just thought it would be the most exciting experience to help grow a new school. And you know I told Arnette I’ll come be a janitor. I’ll do anything if I can come to the college” (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005).

Thus employees came from many different places and for many different reasons. They quickly bonded together as they worked in less than ideal conditions. CGCC’s Pecos Campus began in a small facility which was surrounded by agricultural fields and located across from a large dairy. Provost Arnette Ward selected a theme, The Pioneering Spirit, around which employees could rally, and early employees did think of themselves as pioneers. Wanda Matthews, reading faculty, vividly recalled:

… that’s really the way I became associated with the college, as a pioneer,
I started out as an adjunct faculty. … As a pioneer, I had to, of course,
sometimes use the trunk of my car as my office. As a pioneer, we were, I
think, a close-knit organization. I think we enjoyed the camaraderie, and it was just fun being a pioneer. (W. Matthews, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

From the beginning, there was a sense of being short-staffed, that is, of not having enough people to adequately accomplish all that needed to be done. Victor Navarro recalled, “I think individuals wore many hats, because we had limited staffing. We had really good people and they worked really, really hard, but there were some significant challenges in that area” (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005). David Weaver, physics faculty, concurred stating that “[t]he challenges have always been that we’ve had too few people trying to do too much, but that probably could be said of a lot of places. I think it’s maybe a little truer here than other places” (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

The budget has grown and more staff have been hired, but the college is still stretched in terms of having an adequate base of full-time employees given the expansion of sites, as well as programs and services. Table 5 shows the growth in the number of employees as the college has developed. As of August 2005, CGCC had 612 employees serving in a variety of capacities. Excluding the 327 adjunct faculty, this represented a 200+\% increase over the number of full-time employees in 1995 (92 to 285). Residential faculty positions increased from 44 in 1995 to 101 in 2005 ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006).
Table 5

*Number of CGCC Employees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodians/Grounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note.* College Safety became a separate employee group in 1998.

The CGCC employees have always been an ethnically diverse group of people. In 2005, the full-time employee demographics showed 20% Hispanic, 7% Black or African American, 3% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 1% Native American employees.

Employment structures have changed within MCCC over the years, with CGCC and other newer colleges becoming more reliant on adjunct faculty and part-time employees. If one studies the figures at the older and more established Maricopa Community Colleges, they use more full-time employees and residential faculty. For example, in the 1984-85 academic year, MCC had student enrollment of approximately 14,000 students with “215 full-time faculty” ("North Central Association accreditation review self study report," 1984, p. 61). Ten years later, in the 2004-2005 academic year, CGGCC enrollment neared 13,000 students and there were approximately 100 residential faculty.
Margaret Hogan explained the difficulties of trying to run a college with such a large proportion of temporary employees:

We were always struggling with having enough people to do the job. And we would bring people on but with those temporary contracts and then have to face the music at some point because we didn’t have the money to put them on permanently. That was a very big struggle. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Sid Ford, accounting faculty, concurred that the ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty was a significant “challenge” (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005). Yet the Division Chairs as well as the residential faculty hired and supported hundreds of adjunct faculty each year and found ways to weave them into the fabric of the institution. Diane Travers recalled the importance of CGCC’s adjunct faculty and the efforts that were made to provide adequate resources for them:

…because I’ve had the wonderful opportunity of being a student, being a volunteer, being professional staff at the District, being adjunct faculty, being full-time faculty, being a division chair, I’ve got to experience what it’s like to be part of a Maricopa Community College from different views. And I know that as an adjunct faculty member I really felt disconnected from the institution and so when we were designing the second phase [of the Pecos Campus], I remember working with Margaret Hogan and saying we’ve got to have space for adjunct faculty. We need work spaces, we need a place for them to meet with students, meet with each other. … And so Margaret gave the approval and so I worked with
the architects to select furniture there because we wanted to make it a
work room and of course have one or two little couches in the corner so
that they could sit back and gather their thoughts, take a break, and I feel
it’s just wonderful that we’ve not had to take it back for classes, that
we’ve been able to make a commitment to the adjunct faculty and respect
them and provide them a workspace with computers and photocopying
and things like that. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

Over time, the working environment changed for employees, given the sheer
numbers of new employees, coupled with the percentage of part-time employees and
adjunct faculty, and the physical separations that resulted from the significant facilities
expansion at the Pecos Campus and the addition of the Williams Campus and Sun Lakes
Education Center. Diane Travers, communication faculty, explained that it is difficult to
know everyone now:

... throughout the years when new people would be hired, I would make it
my point to go and get to know the new people and there’s just so many
now. And there’s so many people who I haven’t had the chance to really
get to know. And so it’s different, and I know that’s an inevitable part of
growth, but it still kind of makes me melancholy for the days when I knew
everyone, and everyone knew everyone and it was neat. (D. Travers,
personal communication, June 13, 2005)

Former fiscal office coordinator Carolyn Sittner shared the same concern, stating,
“Expansion I think has caused us to not be as closely knit as we were in the past, and you
don’t see that camaraderie as much as it was prevalent before” (C. Sittner, personal communication, June 14, 2005).

Travers says that nonetheless, employees do their job “from the heart” and their expertise, enthusiasm, and commitment has “made the college” (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005). CGCC continues to be characterized as a collegial and collaborative working environment by employees. The college culture is described later in this chapter.

**Finances**

_The lack of sufficient funding was a major negative factor. ... However, we not only survived, we thrived. We were kind of like the little engine that could. You know, despite the fact that we didn’t have the money we needed, we did very well._

(M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

The Maricopa County Community College District is funded by three primary sources—property taxes, tuition, and state aid. The revenue from each of these sources is tied to enrollment changes. “We have a spending limitation formula tied to the change in inflation and to the increased number of Full-Time Student Enrollments (FTSE). Those percentages affect the District’s ability to assess property taxes and to receive funding from the state” (_A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges_, 2002, p. 46).

As an extension center of Mesa Community College, Chandler-Gilbert began with a small operating budget and a small capital outlay. Arnette Ward recalled:
We actually started with a [operational] budget of only $650,000. Just as we started with the smallest [capital] budget of five and a half million or less to actually build the first phase of the facility. And that was because it was projected that we were going to be the slowest growing community, so therefore we did not need more. In fact, I found there had been discussions that we frankly should not start the institution in 1985 and instead wait three or four years before doing it. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

For many years, District allocations were primarily based upon the numbers of full-time student equivalents (FTSE) a college produced. Although enrollment grew steadily at the college, overall the numbers were fairly small. Thus, for its first few years, Chandler-Gilbert did not see significant budget increases.

There were minimal special allocations related to start-up costs at new institutions. The internal finances of the District were not well-known to students and community members, so they did not understand why Chandler-Gilbert could not provide certain programs and services, such as those available at other Maricopa Community Colleges.

Governing Board member Nancy Stein had the impression that CGCC was “always a step behind” when it came to budget and facilities (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005). She recalled that “not having the capacity to serve the students” because of financial limitations caused image problems for the college:

I think you were, again, behind in hiring enough faculty. You had the students. The problem was that you had students here, but not a full
curriculum to serve them. Many students left and went to another sister college. And that always bothered me. And students didn’t like it. Students would say why should we go X-amount of miles away when we have a college here? We’re paying the same tuition. Why don’t we have these same services, same programs, same curriculum here. Students don’t like to wait. I understood what they meant and they were right. And I think that was a negative problem. (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Governing Board member Ed Contreras explained his thinking that an investment in younger colleges would pay off in the future. He described the difficulty of getting Maricopa as a whole to change its thinking in this regard:

I think as I mentioned before, I think it was one of the bigger struggles, was getting acceptance by the system that this was going to be a major community college within the system. And that it would have to be funded to a greater degree to make that happen or for its programs and its offerings to flourish within the community and for students to come here. Because when it first started out, it was only offering selected classes and limited classes, and couldn’t offer the whole gamut for individuals so that they could do everything that they wanted to here at this community college. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005)

District funding allocations were difficult decisions to make when resources were so scarce. Mesa Community College President Larry Christiansen summarized the internal struggle, “How much do you invest in new places where your cost per FTSE is
more, as compared to other places where your cost per FTSE is less” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005). Governing Board member Linda Rosenthal explained the dilemma when the appetites of the colleges exceeded the capacity of taxpayers:

Remembering that there are not unlimited resources and with 10 mouths to feed, and that’s how I figure my children, actually 11 because District has to be fed a little bit at times too, with capital monies as well as obviously operating monies. We’ve got to spread it around to what the community will bear in terms of taxes because that’s how we get most of our money....

(L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Although some of the financial stresses were caused by district-wide traditional funding formulas that did not take the unique circumstances of new centers into account, some of CGCC’s financial struggles came from decisions made internally at the college. It is less expensive to offer English, math, and most other general education courses than most occupational/vocational courses or programs. Offering more sections of the general education curriculum would have produced more FTSE, therefore the college would have received a proportionately larger allocation of budget the following year. However, the goal of the college was to become a comprehensive institution providing students in the Southeast Valley with a wide array of programs and services.

When very expensive programs like the aviation and information technology programs were identified as major directions in workforce development, it restricted growth in other areas. Gil Gonzales explained, “We also engaged in some fairly expensive occupational programs, like aviation, which was always a constant debate
internally about why should we be spending large numbers of dollars in low enrollment, yet, I believe, successful occupational programs” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006). Sandra Stuebner recalled:

I think the most significant decision that was made in the early years was the decision to bring aviation here. It was a mixed blessing, I think, for Chandler-Gilbert to bring aviation here. It was a significant program; it was something that students couldn’t get anywhere else in the state except for, was it Thatcher [sic], way out of town. Certainly not a commutable distance so students were able to stay in Maricopa [County] and do it. I think it was a significant decision because it brought a lot of attention to Chandler-Gilbert, but it also produced a huge drain on our budget that maybe a brand new school had difficulty sustaining.

I remember in the early years on the Division Chair Council, when it was time to make the budget decisions. Because the aviation program had FAA approval and they had to have certain things or they could not have the program, we would sit down with what we had for budget and John Underwood would say, well we need a new plane, and then the budget was gone and the discussion was over and we were done talking about it. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

From a student’s perspective, the cost of education including tuition and books has increased significantly. MCCCD did not charge any tuition until 1980 when tuition was set at $3 per credit hour. The Maricopa Community Colleges continue to be an extraordinary value for students, providing educational opportunity at a significantly
lower rate than state universities and private colleges, but tuition has increased steadily over the years to $60 per credit in 2005. That is lower than the national average for community colleges, but significant from a student or parent perspective. The price increase has not proven prohibitive, as enrollments continue to climb, but colleges have begun working on fundraising and development programs to provide for more student scholarships as well as contribute to operating and capital costs.

Dr. Rufus Glasper, serving as the Executive Vice Chancellor for Human Resources and Administration prior to becoming Chancellor in 2003, noted:

Unfortunately, state allocations for new FTSE have decreased from a high of $1,600 to a current level of $527. Currently, property taxes fund 65% of the District’s budget, but these tax increases are limited to two percent annually. State aid, which accounted for 55% of the District budget in the 1960’s, is now approximately 13% of the budget. The third funding source, student tuition, now accounts for 22%. (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002, p. 46)

As Chancellor, Dr. Glasper has continued to pursue alternate sources of revenue, cost efficiencies, and other financial strategies to provide ongoing financial stability.

Maricopa categorizes its budget into Funds. In brief, Fund 1 is considered the general fund or the operating budget. Disbursements from Fund 1 are primarily used for instructional programs, academic support services, and other student and administrative services. Fund 2 is the auxiliary fund which includes expenditures for college and student activities, athletics, food service operations, and non-credit special interest programs. Funds 3 and 4 are restricted funds with revenues coming primarily from
grants and donations and expenditures related to specific-grant funded programs, student scholarships, and more. Fund 5 is associated with student loans. Fund 6 is for endowment funds which are given by a donor. In these endowments, the initial investment, or corpus, remains in tact and the income from the investment is expended. Fund 7 is the plant fund which includes several components. These funds are used primarily for capital purposes such as land purchase, building construction, equipment purchase, and more. General obligation bond and revenue bond proceeds are shown in this fund as well ("MCCCD adopted budget FY05," 2004). Table 6 displays the growth in CGCC budgets for the most commonly used funds.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund 1</td>
<td>$746,580</td>
<td>$5,079,477</td>
<td>$8,904,253</td>
<td>$16,712,979</td>
<td>$27,672,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$297,861</td>
<td>$873,937</td>
<td>$2,925,129</td>
<td>$3,442,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$190,498</td>
<td>$853,864</td>
<td>$2,129,158</td>
<td>$4,641,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund 7</td>
<td>$5,559,840</td>
<td>$216,384</td>
<td>$283,015</td>
<td>$1,652,123</td>
<td>$524,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Capital monies come from general obligation bonds, revenue bonds, and from the state funding formula. General obligation bond proceeds are used to construct facilities, refurbish existing facilities, and purchase equipment. Revenue bonds are paid with student registration fees and they are typically used to support the construction of student centers, athletic facilities, performing arts centers, and other services. Governing Board
member Ed Contreras lobbied other Board members and District Office staff to persuade them to fund a performing arts center at CGCC. However, he explained that the outcome of that decision had an additional affect in that it pointed out that the younger colleges had special needs. He recalled:

\[\ldots\text{one of the most positive things that influenced Chandler-Gilbert because it wasn't just the approval of the PACs [Performing Arts Centers], what it was was an approval of a need to fund the smaller community colleges to a greater need and to fulfill a need even at the detriment of funds for the other major schools that we already had established. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005)}\]

Nancy Stein also remembered lobbying for special allocations to the younger colleges in the system. She recounted a discussion about marketing and public awareness:

\[\text{So I did go to my colleagues and I said, what would you think if we helped out three community colleges [PVCC, CGCC, and EMCC] that were smaller than the others to assist them in marketing/public relations. I said to make sure their communities know that they're there and give them a chance for growth. And they agreed. \ldots you spent it wisely and you spent it on things that I believe brought more students here. So it was funds I think very well spent and I always felt good about it. And I always wanted you to get your fair share. (N. Stein, personal interview, June 21, 2005)}\]
The bond referendums passed in 1984, 1994, and 2004 were very significant for CGCC. Proceeds from the 1984 bond were used to construct the Pecos Campus. Proceeds from the 1994 bond provided for the expansion of the Pecos Campus, as well as enhancements to the Williams Campus and the development of the Sun Lakes Education Center. The 2004 bond proceeds will significantly expand classroom space and labs at all CGCC locations, refurbish technology, provide expanded parking and roadways, and much more.

Employees understood the ramifications of these bond elections, as shared by accounting faculty Sid Ford who said, “… I know we were all on pins and needles up until the bonds were passed because we certainly knew that it was going to make a major difference” (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005).

The *Community College Times* heralded the passage of the latest bond referendum in November of 2004:

Voters in Maricopa County (Arizona) on Nov. 2 decisively endorsed the sale of $951 million in capital bonds for the benefit of students at the Maricopa Community Colleges. With all precincts counted, statistics from the county election department show 76 percent of voters endorsed the measure. “It’s all about access and opportunity,” said Chancellor Rufus Glasper. ("$951 million in bonds approved for Maricopa," 2004, p. 3)

Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner reflected on the significance of the overwhelming public support for the 2004 bond:
…this last bond, you know, it tells you what you’re doing for the community. I mean you just cannot get 70 percent support, if people don’t believe in you, if they didn’t believe in you they would’ve found you on the ballot somewhere, you know, and bopped you, but that didn’t happen. It’s really quite a remarkable achievement…. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Bond revenues provided for the land and facilities, as well as much of the equipment which will be discussed in the next section.

Land, Facilities and Equipment

The facilities are just full of love. I did not know that you could build a facility and it sort of talks to you sometimes.

(A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

After the initial five colleges (PC, MCC, GCC, GWCC, and SCC) were established, one of the seminal reports on which decisions about the expansion of the system were grounded was the Long Range Master Plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000. This report was published in May 1978 by Tadlock Associates, Inc., in consultation with District Office staff and using data from several community agencies such as the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG). The report analyzed community characteristics, projected population growth and patterns, and suggested a system for development of “a network of educational delivery systems to meet community needs up to the year 2000” (Long range master plan for Maricopa
Some of the major points from the 1978 report which would impact the construction of future campuses included:

- A service area’s population could serve as a basis for campus development. Over time, the District had enrolled about 3.5% of the population across the county, but “it cannot measure any one service area by this guideline alone” because of geographic and demographic differences between parts of the county (Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000, 1978, pp. 18-19).

- The District should assume that part-time enrollment would increase to a ratio of 2:1 as compared with full-time student enrollment. Therefore the District can estimate the day FTSE potential of a service area by multiplying the population by a factor of .012 (or 1.2%) (Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000, 1978).

- New campuses should be planned when a service area population reaches 170,000 to serve a projected day FTSE of 2,000 in the first phase. New campuses may vary in their facilities needs but, in general, the core of a new campus should include classroom and lab spaces, a library/learning resource center, student services spaces, faculty and staff offices, physical education facilities but no major athletics/sports facilities, parking for 1,200 cars, and other support facilities (Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000).

- To develop a new campus, estimated costs “in 1977 dollars” would be $14.5 million: $10 million for approximately 200,000 GSF of facilities, 80 acres of
land at $12,500 per acre or approximately $1 million, site development costs of approximately $1 million, and furniture and equipment costs of approximately $2.5 million (*Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000*, 1978, p. 44).

- When the population of an area reached 285,000, a college could expect headcount of approximately 10,000 and FTSE of approximately 5,000, with day FTSE of 3,420. These full-service or comprehensive campuses would, in addition to the basic facilities, have expanded classrooms, labs and vocational/technical spaces, more physical education facilities with selected sports facilities, additional student services facilities, an instructional resource center, parking for 3,000 cars and other support facilities (*Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000*, 1978).

Service areas were shown as 12 miles across with some overlap between all established colleges at the time. The Tadlock report also stated “that as the District expands geographically, the need to expand vocational offerings on the campuses will also grow with the result that Maricopa Technical Community College will lose student enrollment” (*Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000*, 1978, p. 6).

Further, in discussing plans for future “special area campuses” they recommended that a Maricopa Tech/South Mountain Community College consortium open in 1980, a Litchfield/Goodyear area campus (now EMCC) be opened in 1990, a south Mesa area campus (now CGCC) be opened in 1995, and a North Phoenix area campus (now PVCC) be opened in 2000 (*Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000*, 1978, p. 6).
As it turned out, the community politics influenced the start of these new sites, and they were developed in the reverse order of the recommendations with PVCC first, then CGCC, and then EMCC, with all of them well underway by the 1990 date proposed to begin the expansion process.

Fortunately, the Chancellor and the Governing Board did not wait until 1995 to start the Southeast Valley site. The site location for the Pecos Campus was approved by the MCCCD Governing Board on May 10, 1981, and the land was purchased on May 15, 1981 (J. Rasbach, personal communication, April 18, 1985). This parcel of land would cost too much to consider purchase nowadays. MCC President Larry Christiansen credited the Chancellor and Board for their foresight:

> The Governing Board bought land in outlying areas 10, 15, 20 years in some cases, out ahead of the population growth. They bought land when it wasn’t popular to buy land, and received criticism for working to position Maricopa Community Colleges with sites that probably we couldn’t afford now. … Grant Christensen to his credit, absolutely insisted that there was going to be land purchased in the East Valley, in both the Southeast Valley and the Northeast Valley. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner explained that his strategy was, “We should build it in the path of progress and keep them close to the major arterials” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005). He described the process:

> When we approached Dwight Patterson, who at that time had just come off the Board of Regents, and [was] a very looming, powerful figure in
this community, he didn’t even blink an eye that we’ll need a campus here. We also did a lot of touching base toward the end, when we were really buying up land, after Rio and South Mountain. We laid a lot more foundation with the Board. We laid foundation with the members of the legislature out here. We went to old time community leaders like Mr. [Max] Killian and all kinds of people and talked to them. In fact Mr. Killian handled the land transaction when we bought the land from the Pattersons…. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

After the locale was determined, Elsner’s only concern was that the size of the parcel might not be adequate for the long-term. He described his concern:

I was very worried that we didn’t have enough land, because I think we initially bought 80 acres and then augmented with another 20 [sic], I believe. And then we fought very hard, largely through Grant Christensen’s help, for getting an easement onto Pecos Road. We were really worried you’ll never get out of here and you’d jam up so badly it’d be awful. And I wish we would have bought the whole; we couldn’t at that time afford the corner. The corner was already secured. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Mathematics faculty Chuck Bedal remembered visiting the site after it was purchased but before any buildings were constructed. He recalled:

I remember in the fall of 1985, my wife and I came out here to see developments and consider moving out here. We came to about where this ATM machine is over here [on the east side of Building B on the
Pecos Campus] and there was just a pile of dirt about 10 feet high. I climbed up on top of it and looked in all directions and, of course, the dairy was on the south side and the Allen farm was on the east side and north was Humphrey Elementary, and then west you could see all the way to Cooper. It was just alfalfa fields. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

In 1995, the college bought an adjoining 40 acres to the east of the original 80 acres. Larry Christiansen helped with that transaction saying he “was pleased to help Arnette [Ward] with the purchase of some additional land that was here. And I put that in place because the first 80 acres I think would’ve forever limited this place (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005). He lamented not pushing for the purchase of the corner land (at the northwest corner of Gilbert and Pecos Roads) which in 2005 was being planned for retail development. He stated:

A failure of mine was not convincing them to buy the corner. It was one of those decisions that you can rationalize in listening to Board Members and Vice Chancellors and others, to the point where both Arnette and I agreed that, yes, that just made sense. In retrospect we should have been a little harsher, a little more pointed, about the long-term future, because it was available, and it was available within the reach of the District. It would’ve been a tough reach, and it may have needed a tradeoff or two, but in retrospect part of the original vision of the footprint, and the original perimeter that was there. It ultimately will be limited by not having the corner. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)
With the land purchased for the Pecos Campus and approximately $5.5 million for facilities, the Provost and Assistant Provosts worked on the specifications for the first buildings. Note that the Tadlock Report suggested $14.5 million with $10 million for approximately 200,000 gross square feet (GSF) of facilities (*Long range master plan for Maricopa County Community College District, 1978-2000*, 1978), so the funding fell considerably short of the recommendation. Arnette Ward recalled the sequence of events that she believed caused the severe underfunding:

Paul felt that he had promised the community that there would be some presence of a facility in the area and so he wanted to get it started. I think what made that change was the Maricopa County MAG [Maricopa Association of Governments] group that assesses the growth for the State and County had printed that the Paradise Valley community would be the fastest growing community. This was at the time when the District was making the decisions as to how much money they would provide for each institution. They felt it was imperative to start something in the Southeast Valley because there was a lot of discussion from the mayor and the city folk, executives who really felt like it was the right thing to do. The mayor argued that Chandler knew they were going to grow but somehow MAG information indicated otherwise. Therefore, the District planning office and others recommended that we receive far, far less. That meant that we only received $650,000 for operational budget and $5 million or so to build the facility. … That was a decided problem. At that time, all of the funds that could be allocated had been allocated. About a month or
two months later, MAG printed an article—front-page, big print—saying that they had made a mistake. That was because Chandler had really pressed upon them that they needed to go back and make that change. They really argued the point and MAG finally had to own it. They then, of course, announced that Chandler and the Southeast Valley was the fastest growing area in the State and somewhat apologized. Our Board, Dr. Amrein at the time was the President of the Board, sent a note out to everyone saying we do not know how we made the mistake, what did we do here? He had to make a public statement in effect telling the Southeast Valley that the District had made a mistake and used the MAG data. He apologized for the mistake. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

But no adjustments could be made at that point because the bond allocations had been publicly announced, and it would have caused too much turmoil for the District to reduce allocations in other parts of the county to make adjustments for Chandler. MCC President Larry Christiansen recalled that this posed a real challenge to the new Southeast Valley center:

And one of the real tragedies, in my opinion, was the initial allocation to the three new centers that were being talked about. Paradise Valley had a strong population growth and a strong political force, a voice of citizens that really lobbied and lobbied hard. And so Paradise Valley was started very early, had a $10 million allocation, and I think it was augmented slightly, but not to a great degree. And I remember, very wrongly, some
leaders within Maricopa cut the allocation for Chandler-Gilbert to $5 million as the initial allocation. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Nonetheless, with the allocation that was provided, planning began for the new Chandler-Gilbert campus near the northwest corner of Gilbert and Pecos Roads in Chandler. However, this “MAG” mistake would cause problems for CGCC over the years ahead.

While the Pecos Campus was under construction, the college began operations in rented facilities in Chandler at the site of the former Seton Catholic High School. Arnette Ward recounted:

Our first building was a blown out, burned out old Catholic High School that no one seemed to want to remodel and use anymore. In fact, we almost looked at a hospital once, an old hospital that was closing, but the renovations would have been too expensive. We remodeled Seton Hall. There were seven, small classrooms. We remodeled it and we started. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Assistant Provost Andy Bernal recalled that those were challenging times. The rental facilities were small, there were many tasks to be accomplished with very few staff, and the timelines were tight for getting underway. He and others pitched in to make the temporary facility functional and usable. He told a story about outfitting the classrooms:

I remember we didn’t have our chalk boards up in time, so I had to borrow these portable chalk boards from MCC, from Rio, from Chandler High
School, from all over, and I had my little blue pickup. I went all over the
place picking them up so that the faculty would have chalk boards to
write, the first day of class. … It was a zoo. (A. Bernal, personal
communication, June 7, 2005)

Facilities were sparse and people were creative in their approach to making do.
Chuck Bedal, one of the founding faculty members, remembered:

In the first two years, we were in the rented facility on Chandler
Boulevard and the railroad tracks. We did not have a student center or
anything like that. Arnette Ward went and got two picnic tables. So
especially the first month, we had all employee meetings, almost every
lunch hour, sitting around those picnic tables. (C. Bedal, personal
communication, May 25, 2005)

The educational specifications document for the development of the Pecos
Campus was published on May 13, 1985. The plans projected a facility which in Phase 1
would be predicated on a day enrollment of 772 FTSE and by the year 2005 have an
enrollment of 3500-4000 day FTSE (Ward et al., 1985). They outlined how much space
should be allocated for the functions that would be needed to get started. The estimated
sizes for planned functions are shown in Table 7.
Table 7

Approximate Size of Facilities Planned for Functions at the Initial Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Learning Resource Center, Public Services</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Offices</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Learning Resource Center, Teleconference Room</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Operations</td>
<td>14,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving and Shipping</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Learning Resource Center, Learning Assistance/Study Area</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Learning Resource Center, Media Production/Instruction</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Room</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Multipurpose Classrooms, 15 classrooms x 810</td>
<td>12,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/Office Automation Lab</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Lab</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics Lab</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE Multipurpose Room</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Fitness Center</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker/Dressing Rooms</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Storage and Prep</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Offices</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Arnette Ward wanted a facility that made people feel welcome and comfortable. She described her thinking, and stated, “I realized it is possible for mortar to actually speak to people, and make people feel fairly warm. It is kind of crazy to say, but we had
an option and I said I wanted warmth …” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

From the educational specifications, architects were hired to plan the campus.

“The initial Master Plan was completed by Lendrum/Sasaki Associates in 1985” (Slattery et al., 1989, p. 7). Then the first phase buildings were constructed by Westbrook Construction. The architectural and construction firms who designed and built CGCC facilities are identified in Appendix N.

The initial A and B buildings totaled approximately 69,000 GSF and were occupied for the first time in the late summer of 1987. Larry Christiansen marveled that “Arnette and her team squeezed the most out of $5 million of any crew I have ever seen. Just a tremendous cost-effective way to have the initial footprint put in place” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005). For approximately one-third of the capital budget and one-third of the GSF recommended for the first phase of new campuses in the Tadlock Report, the first phase of the Pecos Campus was implemented.

Gil Gonzales remembered the functionality of the design:

Some of the characteristics of the wings were absolutely wonderful in terms of the courtyard, providing a place for students to see each other as they went through classes. They talked about social spaces or large halls with locations where students could work together outside of class. A lot of the design principles are still used by many architectural firms and they are still in practice. So overall, they really did take some of the initial design philosophy and employed it for the initial first phase. …
A wing was the student affairs, student services, with a health, fitness center, faculty offices, administration, president, provost, vice-provosts at the time. And offices, and classrooms, and a large multi-purpose room. And then in Wing B you had the library, tutoring center, telecommunications or media department. Completing the facility you had computer classrooms, other classrooms as well, and science labs. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

The new buildings were a step-up from the rented facilities on Chandler Boulevard, but they had shortcomings as well. Gonzales recalled:

Some of their weaknesses were things like sound acoustic management. We started with what we thought was a TV studio, but we could never use it, because it didn’t have the appropriate sound treatments in the building. In fact it was always interesting the first time the maintenance crew would pull out the floor polishers outside, on the other side of the wall, plug it in, take down the head end, and ruin anything we were doing in that area. It didn’t have a strong technology orientation. As I mentioned before, we spent a lot of time rebuilding, re-running, re-architecting the core architectural systems of the campus, the video and data systems. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Overall, Margaret Hogan felt that “[t]hese buildings were so multi-purpose. It was really wonderful …” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

By 1989, an additional building of 7,800 GSF was under construction and would serve as “the first phase of the Learning Resource Center” (Slattery et al., 1989, p. 7).
That building contained several classrooms and a restroom. It is displayed on the north side of the campus map, which was used in the fall 1998 class schedule (Figure 23). The building labeled “D” was eventually subsumed into the Library or L building. The L building was still under construction when the fall 1998 class schedule was published.

Figure 23. CGCC Pecos Campus map, from the fall 1998 class schedule.

The initial footprint of the A, B, and D buildings was in place for almost a decade before additional buildings were added. The master plan also laid out the concepts for the next phases of campus development.

The Provost and Assistant Provosts, with help from Mike Svaco, MCCCD Director of Facilities Planning, Martin Quinn, Construction Manager, and Eric Holtz,
Projects Manager for the Heery Program Management Group, envisioned the next phases of campus planning, including a walkway:

…a more expansive interior boulevard we have called the Galleria. The Galleria will function as a “Main Street” of the complex. Here the casual visitor can “browse” the educational activities, stop at the bookstore, meet a friend, or stop for coffee. The aim is to create an experience of high interaction, interest, and intensity. (Ward et al., 1985, pp. 25-26)

Thus one of the prevailing architectural features of the Pecos Campus facilities was the walkway or the mall. The notion of creating a mall was partially in response to the shape of the land purchased, a long narrow north-south strip, and partially in response to the popularity of shopping malls at the time. Margaret Hogan explained:

…from the very beginning, we talked about the first phase of the Pecos Campus being like a mall. At the time malls were major attractions. And people loved them and they spent lots of time in them. And so we were hopeful that we would kind of replicate the things that are so attractive about malls. People being able to walk through the campus and seeing interesting things going on. And there would be spaces where they could sit and talk and enjoy themselves. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

The Provost and Assistant Provosts provided the architects with a number of design parameters which they hoped would guide the planning and design:

We had some design parameters and because the weather is so beautiful we wanted to create spaces outside where teaching could go on, if
necessary. In the early days we did have faculty that would take a class outside [laughs] when it was cool. I think that you know it was a little, we had a little touch of some Frank Lloyd Wright parameters, you know bringing the outdoors in and the indoors out. And we wanted lots of open spaces. All the landscaping had to be native and drought resistant. That was another design parameter. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

The firm of Smith, Hinchman & Grylls/Southwest, Inc. completed the updated facilities master plan for 1989-2005 and expanded on the concept of having north-south and east-west walkways or malls, which would create different zones on the campus. David Slattery was the Project Manager (Slattery et al., 1989) and he explained:

The campus is organized to place all open space along the central north/south axis. Buildings are located on each side of this axis and form the perimeter of the open space system. Parking is located on the east and west perimeter and is accessed by a perimeter loop access road. The open space system was conceived in the 1985 Master Plan to be developed as a series of distinct exterior spaces defined by the campus buildings. Three distinct zones of buildings would have different forms and associated plaza or landscape. In all cases, however, the axis is kept open to allow long views to the mountains to the north. Lateral walkways provide cross-campus linkages from parking areas to the central campus areas. … The buildings are planned to increase in height and change in color at each of the four building zones, starting with the one-story existing buildings and
increasing to two stories in the Student Services/LRC zone, three stories for the instructional buildings, and up to four stories for the Performing Arts or future construction. Bright colors are meant to be used on all the buildings and to progress from the pinks used on the initial buildings to orange in the second zone and purple in the third zone. (Slattery et al., 1989, p. 8)

The 1989 updated Master Plan suggested that Phase 1 include a Learning Resource Center (LRC) and Library of almost 100,000 GSF, a student services building of 77,000 GSF, and classrooms, science labs and faculty offices of approximately 47,000 GSF. Also in Phase 1 an off-site aviation building of 115,000 GSF on approximately 10 acres of land was suggested. Phase 2 proposed an athletics/fitness facility of 33,000 GSF and renovation of up to 22,000 GSF in student services. In addition to mentioning that 20 acres be developed for athletic facilities, the diagrams show fields marked for football, baseball, softball, and archery. In the proposed Phase 3, another approximately 113,000 GSF was suggested for additional classrooms, science labs, computer areas and faculty offices. In addition, a 51,000 GSF Performing Arts Center, a 10,000 child care center, and a warehouse and maintenance building were suggested for almost 14,000 GSF. In Phase 4, another 36,000 GSF was suggested for athletics/fitness, while another approximately 50,000 GSF was recommended for classrooms, labs, and computer facilities. It was also noted that consideration should be given to the purchase of additional land for athletic facilities and additional parking (Slattery et al., 1989).

In the fall of 1989, Provost Arnette Ward appointed the Capital Development Committee which met monthly over a year to develop the 10-year Capital Development
Plan. This committee was also charged with providing oversight for construction. The documentation provides insight into the committee’s work:

Nine separate building committees were formed under the guidance of the Capital Development Committee. Membership in these committees included faculty and staff of CGCCC, as well as students and members of the community. Each of these committees had responsibility for planning in a specific area: Learning Resources, Administration, Student Center, Fitness/P.E., Technology, General and Science Classrooms, Child Care, Performing Arts, and Aviation. (Master plan update & 10-year capital development plan, 1992-2002, 1992, p. 1)

It is understandable to this researcher that many employees became frustrated with the facilities and funding, as evidenced by their interviews. They began planning in 1989 for buildings that were minimally 10 years from the start of construction and many of which, at the time of this research, have still not been built.

Although the planning committee recommended some changes in the Master Plan Update and 10-Year Capital Development Plan, 1992-2002, many of the original design concepts were reaffirmed. The planning committee recommended that the design:

… be a “magnet” that attracts people and encourages participation. B. Stimulate lively, stimulating, creative activity that acts as a focus for the community at large. C. Reflect a “state of the art” facility that has the impact necessary to compete with other centers of activity and still function as a model community college. D. Reflect advanced thinking necessary to support the operation of the facility well into the next
The progress with facilities expansion was directly related to the passage of bond referendums. The 1984 bond provided funding to construct the initial facilities at the Pecos Campus. The 1994 bond provided funding to significantly expand the Pecos Campus, as well as remodel old buildings at the newly secured Williams Campus, and build the Sun Lakes Education Center.

The capital development program that followed the successful 1994 bond was titled “Building for the Next Century.” The planning process was very inclusive, and allowed all employees to share their perspectives about the next set of proposed buildings. Librarian Larry Miller recalled:

Arnette [Ward] had gone ahead and had butcher paper put on the walls in one room when we were talking about new buildings. And one was the library and one was a classroom and everyone—all employee groups—were there and they wrote what they wanted those buildings to look like, what kinds of things should happen, what feeling should they have. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

The documentation was prepared by then Dean of Administrative Services, Patti Johnson. It compared the status of the college in 1995 to projected status in 2001, as shown in Table 8.
Table 8

*Figures Related to the 1994 Capital Development Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Size</td>
<td>75,000 GSF</td>
<td>Projected Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>3,500 students</td>
<td>Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTSE</td>
<td>1,600 approximately</td>
<td>Projected FTSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Projected Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Projected Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The *Building for the Next Century* documentation also listed specific projects planned at the Pecos Campus as a result of the successful 1994 bond election. Table 9 displays the projected uses of the bond funding.
### Table 9

*Project Description, Size, and Projected Costs Associated with the 1994 Bond*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase (east parcel adjacent to main campus)</td>
<td>40 acres</td>
<td>$1,003,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Lab Complex (approximately 30 classrooms, 4 labs, a large lecture hall, 60 faculty offices)</td>
<td>70,200 GSF, 55,000 NSF</td>
<td>$8,463,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resource Center (includes 28,000 sf library, learning assistance center, study areas, telecommunications, administrative computing)</td>
<td>40,000 GSF, 35,000 NSF</td>
<td>$6,798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant (plus 7,500 GSF chiller yard)</td>
<td>3,500 GSF</td>
<td>$1,138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Lakes Education Center (three classrooms, computer lab, meeting space and offices for three staff members)</td>
<td>5,000 GSF</td>
<td>$1,138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1994 Bond Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,213,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** *Building for the Next Century* (Johnson, 1995, p. 1).

The diagrams associated with this document display a football field surrounded by a track, baseball and softball fields to the east of what was the original 80-acre footprint, with tennis, racquetball, a pool, and a physical education complex to the north end of the campus, near Frye Road. Also, the Student Center would be located across from the Library, the classroom complex would be across from a further-into-the-future set of additional classrooms, and the Performing Arts Center was near the north of the campus layout (Johnson, 1995, p. 2). This layout is not consistent with the building locations at the Pecos Campus as of the time of this research.

Even with the significant expansion afforded by the 1994 bond, CGCC could not build fast enough to accommodate enrollment growth. Governing Board member Nancy Stein recalled:
In the ‘94 bond, you were cramped for space. And I can remember as soon as you opened up the facilities you were, “All right, when’s the next move because we need more bricks, and we need more room because we’ve got these students we can’t serve.” You were always a step behind.

(N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

However, many of the faculty were excited to have additional classroom space and private offices. Communications faculty Diane Travers reacted positively to the new classroom space:

… another thing I’ve liked is the classrooms. We have color, and I really have to give credit to the architects we had in the second phase who thought of introducing color in the classrooms. And even though that’s the first time I’ve ever heard of “muted” colors and I heard it so much, but the colors are wonderful there, enough to promote visual stimulation but not too much. And it’s very nice that we have classrooms in different sizes, having different color schemes, each floor of the C building is a different color scheme. And even the furniture. I told the gentleman who built the furniture for us, I said, “Not that we will, but I want to able to dance on those classroom tables so that they’re not breaking.” And they’ve really worked well; they move nicely. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

After buildings were built, life in them was not always without incident. President Ward’s office files about facilities have multiple letters, notices, and memorandums about air conditioning failures, leaky roofs, ingress and egress issues, and
other facilities-related problems. In one report, the maintenance and operations director, Chris Cress, summarized some of the challenges he faced in a letter to a roofing vendor:

After the recent rainstorm, we have located 10 separate leaks in buildings A & B. These roofs are covered under the 10-year warranty provided by Poly Tech. Your technician was here in August of 2000 and made some temporary repairs. The roof is still leaking in these same areas. We are sustaining water damage every time it rains, and are in need of a long-term repair solution to our leaking roof problem. (C. Cress, personal communication, November 9, 2000)

In another memorandum from President Ward to the Pecos Campus faculty and staff, she explains the emergency repairs to the air conditioning system in buildings C, S, E, and L. “Depending on the temperature in the classroom, teachers should use their discretion in addressing their class needs. Some options include: move class to a more comfortable location, meet briefly with class to handle any course business, give an off-site class or alternative assignment, dismiss class early” (A. Ward, personal communication, October 9, 2000).

Despite the occasional challenges and the placement of some buildings in different locations on the grid, the Pecos Campus started to resemble the master planning documents that had been developed more than a decade before. By 1999, with the addition of the Library building and a large classroom complex, the original planning scheme was starting to take shape. An aerial photograph (Figure 24) showed the layout of the campus in 1999.
The colors of the exterior paint on the initial buildings at the Pecos Campus, A and B buildings, were controversial. They were pink with teal and cream accents. The pink was unusual for a college and people had differing opinions about it. Arnette Ward explained how it came to be:

…what I asked for made the architects think about colors. I want warmth; tell me how I can have warmth in a building. Sure enough, they went out, drove all over the place and found out that our hotel, the now old Sheraton [at the time of this research the Crowne Plaza San Marcos Golf Resort] was pink. Light, dusty pink way back when Mr. Chandler founded the town. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Each new building at the Pecos Campus had a distinct color. The L building was yellow, while the C, E, and S complex was purple. Margaret Hogan added, “And it was
supposed to be kind of like the desert too in that the buildings would get higher as they
grew back and the colors would be from the desert” (M. Hogan, personal communication,
June 8, 2005). As Gil Gonzales put it, they were “colors of the sunset … sunset in
Arizona” (G. Gonzales, personal communications, June 28, 2006).

There was some hesitation on the part of then MCC President Wally Simpson to
approve the initial proposed color scheme, as he had ultimate responsibility for the new
center. Ward recalled:

The architects brought the colors up, and this is the first time I ever saw
Dr. Simpson—he was a very quiet man—sort of swallow and look that
way and this way. And Ken Schultz told me I think this is awful, and Dr.
Simpson said no, it sounds pretty good. I knew he was an artist, Dr.
Simpson, one of his degrees was in art, and so I got away with it. And so
that is how we got the colors of the buildings. (A. Ward, personal
communication, May 23, 2005)

Ward said most people found the colors distinctive and interesting, but one Board
member objected. Ward recounted:

The only person in the District who really did not like the colors was
Linda Rosenthal, and she will tell me that. She rode me on the colors of
the buildings for several years until she finally said I won’t bother you
about the colors but you know I don’t really care for those colors. (A.
Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Linda Rosenthal confirmed in her interview that she found the colors
“disconcerting” and said, “I believe that the only thing that I objected to was the color—
that wonderful pink that was on the outside—I know it was a color of the sunset” (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

When Larry Christiansen became President of MCC, he was also taken aback by the colors. He thought the colors disadvantaged a college that already had image issues. When discussing the facilities during his interview, he stated:

…I don’t know if Arnette did it on purpose, or if she was victimized, but I’m not sure that the brightness of the early pink buildings was a part of her master plan, but it forever sealed an image [chuckles] in the community that at some point in time you’ve got to turn into advantage.

(L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Board member Ed Contreras recalled hearing about the colors and said they eventually grew on him:

I think one of the stories, or things that I remember was first coming to the college. I had heard about the college and that it went through a different approach as to how it would be built and what it would look like. People had commented that the color scheme was quite dramatic or different than other schools. I can remember coming up to the school the first time and looking at the colors and wondering, “Who picked those colors?” But then I remember coming to the school one time and it was near sunset and it was a clear day and you could see how the color scheme kind of blended in to the mountains and the background. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005)
Communications faculty Diane Travers felt that the colors, although controversial, were helpful in drawing attention to the new college. She remembered that:

… it was just really interesting how we became noticed, even though we were across the street from the dairy farm, people knew us as the buildings with the pink colors and I think it helped put us on the map. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

By 1999, the layout of the Pecos Campus was beginning to take shape. The next major projects were the Performing Arts Center and the Student Center. The Performing Arts Center was funded by revenue bonds and had an approved budget of $5,433,300. The architect for the PAC was Gould Evans. CGCC held a groundbreaking ceremony for the PAC on Saturday, April 15, 2000, and construction began shortly thereafter ("CGCC performing arts center fast facts," 2002).

The Student Center was positioned just north of the Performing Arts Center and west of the C, E, S complex. It was funded by the general obligation bonds from the 1994 bond referendum. The Governing Board approved construction to begin in 1999 with a budget of $3,060,000. The architect for the Student Center was Architekton and the contractor was Brignall Construction. Construction began in August 2001 and was completed ahead of schedule in January 2003 ("CGCC student center fast facts," 2002).

Dean of Student Services, now Vice President of Student Affairs, Lois Bartholomew worked closely with the design team to create unique spaces such as the “pavilion,” which is described and displayed (Figure 25) below:
Figure 25. The Student Center on the Pecos Campus in 2004.

A large student pavilion will be the focal point of the Student Center, providing a gathering space for students and featuring seating for 250. A unique feature of the Student Center is its overhead coiling or “garage doors.” When the doors are open, they will allow the pavilion and outside plaza to become one large space for student events or gatherings. ("CGCC student center fast facts," 2002, p. 1)

The Student Center had office space for several Student Services departments, including Disability Resources and Services, Student Life, Athletics, and the Dean of Student Services (later called the Vice President of Student Affairs) office. Several architectural awards were received for the building design by the American Institute of Architects ("CGCC student center fast facts," 2002).
The Student Center was the last major project funded with the revenues from the 1994 bond. However, an additional small parcel of land was purchased near the Gilbert Road entrance to the Pecos Campus in 2003. The Governing Board action item showed that the purchase price of a 2.9 acre parcel was $4.50 per square foot or $567,293, plus closing costs. Don Switzenberg helped President Maria Hesse to purchase this land below the appraised value of “$5.95 per square foot or $750,000.00” (Helfgot, Hesse, & Diaz, 2003, p. 1). The rationale provided for the purchase was:

Traffic flow on Gilbert Road, amplified by the San Tan Freeway, is estimated to increase to carry 22,000 vehicles per day by 2020; thus the City of Chandler plans to increase the size of Gilbert Road to six lanes. The east campus entrance will become the primary entrance to CGCC’s Pecos Campus. In an effort to adequately plan for these changes and to prepare for a dominant campus entrance, the purchase of the 2.9 acre parcel, which is on the west side of Gilbert Road about 627 feet north of Pecos Road, will provide for expansion permitting two entrance/exit lanes from campus onto Gilbert Road while maintaining ample space from city development and business facilities planned to be directly adjacent to the entrance. (Helfgot et al., 2003, p. 1)

Parking, roadways, landscaping, and signage were expanded and enhanced during the years 2004 and 2005. A north loop road connected the east and west parking lots while a new entrance to the campus was constructed from Gilbert Road.

Appendix N records the acreage at each of the college locations, identifies when each building was constructed, and provides square footage information for each building.
at all CGCC locations. By 2005, the Pecos Campus contained more than 270,000 gross square feet of facilities. A map (Figure 26) displays the layout of the campus as of summer 2006.

Figure 26. A map of the CGCC Pecos Campus in summer 2006.

While the Student Center was under construction at the end of the 1994 bond funding, planning began for a proposed bond referendum in 2004. It began with updating
the college master plans for the next decade of anticipated growth. The minutes of the Governing Board meeting of December 11, 2001, recorded:

At its September 2000 retreat, the Governing Board decided to proceed with planning for a new capital development program. Updating the facilities master plans for each site is an important preliminary step to implementing a new capital development program. The facilities master plan represents the physical plan that keys into and supports the mission, goals and academic plans for each college. (Cardenas & Diaz, 2001, p. 1)

The firm of Gabor Lorant Architects was selected to develop the 2004-2013 facilities master plan for CGCC which was published on December 6, 2002 (Lorant, 2002). The passage of MCCCD’s $951 million bond in November of 2004 will allow for the implementation of a portion of that master plan. The bond revenues will provide for refurbishment of existing facilities, technology and occupational program equipment, new buildings, and land acquisitions. CGCC is anticipated to receive approximately $83 million in allocations. As of this research, there are no plans to purchase additional land for the college, but the facilities at all CGCC locations will be significantly expanded to include more classrooms, labs, and support services spaces.

Thus far, the explanations of land and facilities have focused on the Pecos Campus. The next few paragraphs will describe the Williams Campus and the Sun Lakes Education Center.

When the Williams Air Force Base closed in 1993, approximately 55 acres of land was conveyed to MCCCD in two parcels, parcel G and G1. As has been previously mentioned, although the MCCCD parcel was originally envisioned to be shared by a
consortium of several colleges, plans changed. With Governing Board approval, Chancellor Paul Elsner made the Williams Campus (Figure 27) an extension of CGCC at the August 1996 Board meeting ("Governing board minutes, August 27, 1996," p. 2).

Parcel G was 47 acres and, at the time of this research, includes instructional buildings such as the Aviation and Technology Center (ATC), as well as residence halls and homes. Parcel G1 was eight acres and includes four instructional buildings:

- The General Studies Building (GSB) which contains seven classrooms, four faculty offices, and support spaces;
- A building adjacent to GSB, in which CGCC hosts MCC’s fire science program, but will eventually become subsumed as part of a larger general studies complex;

*Figure 27. CGCC Williams Campus, at the site of the former Williams Air Force Base, in November 2001.*
• The former base gym which was remodeled to serve as a Physical Education Center (PEC) and contains a gymnasium, a fitness center, showers and locker rooms, and more; and

• A Science Lab Building (SLB) which contains four science laboratories, four faculty offices, a small computer lab, and preparation and storage spaces.

The terms of the 30-year land conveyance permit CGCC to use the land for educational purposes. The land was conveyed in 1995, thus MCCCD on behalf of CGCC will become the owner of the land in 2025. In the meantime, the college must provide a biannual report to the United States Department of Education on the status of the facilities and the educational programs at the site. CGCC’s Williams Campus Provost John Schroeder prepared the 2004 Utilization Report that verifies college compliance with the terms of the land conveyance (Schroeder, 2004).

It should be noted that parts of the former Williams Air Force Base were conveyed to a variety of other entities, with which CGCC shares the site. As of the time of this research, Arizona State University at the Polytechnic campus has 614 acres on the site; the Gila River Indian Community has 138 acres on which they operate the Toka Sticks Golf Course; the Williams Gateway Airport has 3,020 acres which includes three airport runways; Salt River Project (SRP) has two acres as the primary power provider; the House of Refuge East (HRE) has six acres to provide transitional housing and support services to homeless individuals and families; the Williams Community School, part of the Maricopa County Regional District, has 20 acres but their on-site school closed in 2005; the U.S. Military has 17 acres, seven acres of which is used by the Air Force Research Laboratory and more than 10 acres on which the U.S. Army Reserve operates;
and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration operates a National Weather Service station on one acre (Arnett, 2006). Thus the CGCC Williams Campus has several special features in that the community college is co-located with a major research university, a functioning airport, and a number of other entities.

Also of interest are the residence halls and homes for university and community college students. “The Williams Campus is unique in the Maricopa system in that it has available housing; both apartment-style housing and single family homes are provided. There are five residence halls and 45 single family homes on the CGCC footprint” ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006, p. 67). Schroeder explained the housing situation in the 2004 Utilization Report:

All housing at Williams, dormitories, and homes, on the combined ASUE [now Arizona State University at the Polytechnic campus] and Maricopa sites is managed through a jointly selected independent housing manager. The housing is operated, maintained, and filled without regard for property boundaries, ownership or student affiliation. … In 2001, the Maricopa Governing Board approved a ground lease of the residential properties at the Williams Campus to a third party to fund a series of capital improvements, which will total $21,130,000. The lease began March 1, 2001 and runs until June 30, 2032. … The lessor is Mesa Student Housing, LLC (MSH). MSH has entered into a Management Agreement with Century Development and Century Campus Housing Management for the operation and maintenance of the housing property as well as completing
the capital improvement project. CGCC/MCCD and ASUE are benefiting from these major capital improvements. (Schroeder, 2004, p. 7)

In 2001, when the Governing Board requested that facilities master plans be developed for all of the Maricopa Community Colleges, the architectural firm of Gabor Lorant Architects Inc. was contracted to plan for the CGCC locations, including the Williams Campus. However, when ASU undertook a facilities master planning process after the MCCCD plans were finalized in 2002, there was a need to revisit the Williams Campus plans to make certain that the university footprint and the community college footprint would mesh well for students. Thus, Gabor Lorant was contracted again in 2005 to re-examine the facilities plans for the CGCC Williams Campus.

The 2004 bond referendum provided $22 million for expansion and refurbishment of facilities, as well as the purchase of technology and other equipment for the Williams Campus through 2013. As of 2005, planning was underway for both an aviation hangar and a health care and general classroom building. “The campus will eventually feature a high density core designed for walking, inviting conversation and study spaces and small group seating, both inside and outside, with varied food service available in multiple locations” (Arnett, 2006, p. 21).

The CGCC Sun Lakes Education Center (SLEC) is a single building of approximately 5,000 GSF. It is at the northeast corner of Alma School Road and Riggs Road in Sun Lakes (Figure 28), located on the 9.5 acre Sun Lakes Health Center Complex (Lorant, 2002). It is approximately nine miles southwest of the Pecos Campus “just one mile north of the Maricopa County and Pinal County line” (Lorant, 2002, p. 74). SLEC held a groundbreaking ceremony on May 8, 1996 and the building dedication
was held on May 10, 1997. The building includes “a computer lab, 3 general classrooms, a gathering area, general in-take area, and administrative offices” (Lorant, 2002, p. 74).

![Figure 28. Chandler-Gilbert Community College, Sun Lakes Education Center, at the northeast corner of Alma School Road and Riggs Road.](image)

At the time of this research, a 6,000 GSF expansion of the SLEC facility is underway. A second floor is being added to the existing ground floor, and it will include a large meeting space, several classrooms, staff work spaces, elevators, and a covered patio and entrance area. The estimated budget for the expansion is approximately $2 million.

Parking spaces consume a major part of the land at all CGCC locations. Even with the housing and residence halls at the Williams Campus, CGCC has predominantly a commuter student population. Providing adequate parking has been an issue from the early days of District operations. In 1968, for example, Phoenix College used eight acres
of its land to add 908 parking spaces for students and employees, expanding its total capacity at any given day or time to 2000 cars (Hinsdale, 1973). Parking spaces were planned at a 1:1 ratio, that is, one space was planned for each student (Hinsdale, 1973).

A combination of factors intensified parking issues over the years. As colleges have become landlocked by surrounding development, the possibility of acquiring additional adjacent land for parking has been reduced or eliminated. With fewer full-time students and many more part-time students, each commuting to a campus and many more part-time faculty as well, there is more need for parking. Currently, parking spaces are figured at three or four students for each planned space, under the assumption that more part-time students come at different times of the day, afternoon, evening, and weekend, and can share spaces. The 2004-2013 facilities master plan states, “the current goal on its campuses is to provide one parking space for every 150 GSF of building area” (Lorant, 2002, p. 42).

Colleges have utilized a variety of techniques to increase spaces. Restriping a lot can increase the number of spaces considerably (Lorant, 2002). Colleges cluster buildings more tightly to allow for more acreage along the perimeter of a campus for parking. More mass transit availability, emphasis on carpooling, and more recently, the increase in distance learning and hybrid classes have the potential for reducing demand for parking.

Parking lots are not assumed to be paved any longer. Crushed gravel lots, temporary parking on athletic fields, and other overflow parking techniques are used to create less expensive parking options.
Within a couple of years of this research the college locations at Pecos, Williams, and Sun Lakes will look significantly different than they do now as a result of the passage of the 2004 bond referendum and the implementation of the capital development plan. The major challenge being faced is that “[c]onstruction cost increases will continue to erode the value of the 2004 bond issue, causing the college to reexamine the size and amenities for buildings under construction and those still in the final planning stages” ("Annual report to the Governor, 2005-2006," 2006, p. 16).

Interviewees for this research were asked to reflect on the original plans for the college. Many spoke of the college’s early days when a small structure was located out in the fields across from a dairy. David Weaver, physics faculty, remembered that an architectural model for the completed Pecos Campus was on display for many years after the move from the former Seton school location to the Pecos Campus in 1987. He stated:

I remember for years looking at the model that we had for this place, and so I think facilities-wise that we haven’t been completely faithful to that, but I think we have been faithful to the intent of that. We still use nifty colors [laughs]. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Former business faculty member Yolanda Penley had relocated to Colorado State University in Fort Collins, Colorado, by the time of this research. She dropped by the Pecos Campus to be interviewed while she was in town visiting her daughter during the summer of 2005. She reflected:

During my time, obviously the first thing was to get buildings and a real campus. I have been gone two years and I see the campus has so changed. There are no cows around here any more! My daughter and I were driving
down Gilbert Road and she says to me, “Look Mom, there is Chandler-Gilbert!” I turned around and I did not even recognize it. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

In addition to buildings, the college had a significant investment in equipment, most of which was technology-related or associated with specific programs. Examples of program-specific equipment includes tools, specialized electronics equipment, sheet metal and plastics machinery, and airplanes for aviation; hospital beds, overbed units, bedside tables, and computer simulated patients for nursing; telephone poles, harnesses and buckets, and a truck for electric utility technology; police cars for law enforcement; and more.

Some equipment was donated by local companies such as Intel, Boeing, Hill-Rom and CHW East Valley Hospitals, Arizona Public Service and Salt River Project, among others. Other equipment was provided by Proposition 301 revenues, oversight of which is provided by William Crawford, Dean of Career and Technical Education, as of the time of this research.

For approximately the first decade of the college’s existence, through 1996, equipment was inventoried and accounted for within one equipment account. In 1997, new categories were added to include land, improvements, buildings, and library (Ortega, 2006).

A physical inventory of assets was taken at least once every two years (*Capital asset accounting definitions*, 2006) by the CGCC Fiscal and Receiving personnel. They checked equipment and items that were valued as capital items. The threshold for capitalization has changed over the years. When the college opened, items valued at over
$250 were inventoried, but in 1989 that threshold rose to $500. Effective in fiscal year 1996-1997, the capitalization thresholds were $1,000 for equipment and $5,000 for land, buildings, and improvements.

The total value of equipment has increased significantly during the lifetime of the college. In 1987, the equipment was valued at $515,512, but one year later upon the opening of the Pecos Campus, the equipment value was $1,328,022. By 1996, that value had risen to $4,428,859, and in Fiscal Year 2005-2006, at the end of the period of this study, it was $6,484,640 (Ortega, 2006).

Approximately 60% of the equipment is technology-related, therefore, technology is addressed separately in the next section.

Technology

Initially, technology was used primarily as a way to organize student and employee records. With the advent of Rio Salado College, various forms of technology became significant in contributing to convenient access to and distribution of learning materials. Today technology is used to facilitate and enhance learning, to accommodate communication, to access information and research, and to maximize convenience and service.

The first published year-end report from the Chandler/Gilbert Education Center confirms that technology was to shape the institution. In this report, *A Pioneering Spirit*, it reiterates the information originally published in the 1985 CGEC Master Plan Proposal and Educational Specifications:
Emphasis will be placed on integrating technology into existing programs and courses, and then developing new ways to deliver instruction using the technology. For example, courses in business communications will include training in the use of microcomputers to create business graphics and text. Marketing students can use computers to prepare multi-media productions for concept or sales presentations. Accounting students will use spreadsheets and accounting software. Art students, theatre students and music students may work together to create music videos or high-tech theatrical presentations which utilize various media technologies. (Ward, 1986, p. 11)

In further describing the technology infrastructure that was proposed for the new Pecos campus in 1986, the report says:

The [Chandler-Gilbert Community College] Center will be outfitted with the appropriate communication pathways to carry voice, data, and video signals. Plans for future expanded uses of the facility will be developed so any conduit or other built-in requirements for the communications and data system can be installed during initial construction. Planning of this kind will prevent future building modifications which may be costly and difficult. Microcomputer labs and databases will be linked within the Chandler/Gilbert facility and with other computer facilities within the District. Accommodations will also be made to allow any video based programming to be sent out of the building by microwave or satellite uplink. (Ward, 1986, p. 13)
When interviewed, Arnette Ward recalled the significance of technology within the overall plans for the college:

CGCC was the first campus to use technology as a major support system to faculty where the focus was on teaching and learning. Without the use of technology in the classroom, the library and admissions and records and use of a telephone system for enrollment and the registration process, CG [Chandler-Gilbert] would have suffered a huge set-back in its growth and development in the first five years. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

The goal was not to become impersonal but rather more personalized by way of the technology. Margaret Hogan described that “our original plans were kind of pie in the sky [laughs], but I think we very closely approximated some early thoughts we had about this being a high-tech/high-touch environment” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Gil Gonzales was the first Chief Information Officer (CIO) for the college. His title was Associate Dean of Learning Resources, and he had responsibility for technology, as well as the library, media, learning assistance or tutoring, and other academic support services. He remembered seeing the CGCC Pecos Campus for the first time, “… they drove me out to the site. There was nothing out here in this field other than a foundation that was being laid. And then the adventure started” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

MCC President Larry Christiansen remembered Gonzales as an upstart:
The other hire that I always pick on was a young rash, young man that came to Chandler-Gilbert and was clearly the most irreverent person that I had ever seen in college administration, and that was Gil Gonzales. And Gil, I think, helped Arnette shape the IT [information technology] discussion for Chandler-Gilbert in a good way. But I will never forget a retreat that Arnette had with the Chandler-Gilbert staff, and I was invited, at the Dobson Ranch Inn. Gil was an equal opportunity critic. He was critical of the stuff we had done at Mesa, he was critical of what Arnette had done at Chandler-Gilbert, he was critical of all his fellow administrative colleagues. And the payback for me in that story is that I told Arnette after her retreat—and she and I were recapping and many good things in terms of the long-term planning for Chandler-Gilbert were laid out—but I said Arnette, I guarantee you one thing, absolutely, and there is no question about this, that I will never, ever, hire Gil Gonzales to do any job [laughs]. And then of course he went on to be one of my Deans of IT [information technology] at Mesa Community College [chuckles], as he matured and mellowed. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Gil Gonzales and the CGCC administration were very interested in technology and its potential for shaping the institution. Gonzales recalled:

Arnette S. Ward was absolutely one of the most wonderful people I have had a chance to work with, who cared deeply about everything we did, but wasn’t necessarily a strong technology person. The technology
orientation, the administration came from Margaret Hogan and Andy Bernal…. And they were really interested in trying to understand how we were going to change lots of things, and it wasn’t just academic, it was administrative as well. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Of course, the technology available at the time of this research is far more sophisticated than what existed in the mid to late 1980s when the college was formed. Staff member Julie Palinsky remembered:

Oh, my gosh. When we first opened at Seton we had whatever probably Stauffer [the District’s surplus property disposal facility] had out there. Mary [Alcon] and Chuck [Bedal] went out there and we had computers with no hard drives at all. Everything was operated with a DOS disk and we had a couple of Mac’s. We had a Wyse terminal, and we had some kind of a contraption that was a word processing thing, and I don’t even remember. I thought I’d never forget that machine [a DecMate]. I’ll probably think of it later, but it was a big god-awful heavy thing like a [laughs], almost like a Volkswagen, and it did word processing, and it was between a computer and a typewriter. (J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

Cathy Urbanksi was the secretary to the President when the college opened and at the time of this research was serving on the faculty as a teacher of computer applications. She spoke of the changes in technology during her time at the college:
I don’t know if you know the Decmate. When it first came out, I think I was the first one who used a Decmate. And then the Apple. That’s when I remember we were typing the master plan … it was on an Apple computer at the time. Then after that we moved into higher technology. After that we switched into better computers. We had IBM and we had all the stuff and all the software, electronic mail, e-mail. I remember when e-mail first came out, oh my gosh, we were just all terrified and after we lived with it, we can't live without it [laughs]. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

David Weaver recounted that the entire CGCC environment was influenced by the emergence of ubiquitous technology:

And so it was, I think, a big part of what we did, because, for a lot of people before they started working with us, they hadn't really used technology much. We had the student information system and e-mail that were burgeoning applications and you couldn’t do your job no matter who you were without doing those things. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Victor Navarro was one of the staff who had first-hand knowledge of the changes that took place over the first 20 years of the college’s development. Navarro had been a computer operator at the Maricopa District Office. He came to CGCC on an internship and was then hired as a technician. Over the years, he worked his way into management positions, ultimately becoming the CIO in 2003. When management positions were retitled around the District in January of 2005, Navarro’s title changed to Director of
Information Technology. He recalled the technology scenario as the Pecos Campus was opening in 1987:

At that time, which was mid-‘80’s, late ‘80’s, technology was mainframe-based, dumb terminals, [with] very limited if at all, network capabilities. I remember, from an instructional perspective, there was one IBM VM370—that was the classification of that particular computer—that supported all colleges across Maricopa. And the way you would get access to this, you would dial in. There was a maximum, across Maricopa, of 12 to 24 users on this district-wide mainframe. But anyways when I saw the opportunity to come out here, I felt like I could make a difference and use the skills that I had developed. There was an internship program … to participate in the implementation of technology at the new institution. So the core systems we were focusing on was establishing a new phone system, establishing localized SIS [student information system] support, installing terminals, providing the core foundation for technology for that new campus. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

In the college’s 1987-1988 accomplishments document the Provost spoke about the progress that was made with computer lab facilities and flexible course formats:

With the move to the new campus, the space for the computer information center has more than tripled and we installed a personal computer network consisting of 49 IBM or compatible computers and 24 Macintosh systems.
The open-entry, open-exit structure allows persons to become “computer literate” at their own pace at their convenience. (Ward, 1988, p. 4)

Navarro remembered that the distribution of personal computers to employees and computer labs at the Pecos Campus was considered very progressive at the time. He described the excitement:

… it was exciting to go ahead and deploy—at that time I remember it was a big deal—when we had a desktop project. Again it was linked to the bond, which allowed us to deploy approximately 200 computers. That was a major event. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

In addition to administrative technology systems, computer labs, and employee desktops, classrooms were being infused with technology. Yolanda Penley credited Chancellor Paul Elsner with advocating for Maricopa to take a leadership role in educational technology:

Nationally there was a really big push in the 1990s towards technology. At the time, Dr. Elsner was our Chancellor and he was a big advocate of MCCD being the leader of community colleges in technology. One of the hiring questions asked had to do with your approach to new technologies. All of us were computer literate and if you were not, you became computer literate very quickly. That was a national trend, but because the Chancellor, from the top down, wanted the whole District to be on the leading edge, it became a kind of pervasive atmosphere within the District and certainly within Chandler-Gilbert. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
In addition to Chancellor Elsner, Maricopa had two other district-level technology advocates, Vice Chancellors Alfredo de los Santos, Jr. and Ron Bleed.

Ron Bleed served as the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology in MCCCD for more than 20 years, overlapping CGCC’s development, and retiring in 2005. At this researcher’s request, he recalled and wrote down a few pages about MCCCD’s technology history. He explained that technology had much to do with the decentralization of the colleges in the 1980’s, and that a new e-mail system allowed for maintaining communication despite the expansion of the colleges to the further outreaches of the county. He recalled:

One of the most interesting applications on the new architecture was the e-mail system. Maricopa was truly one of the first organizations to use widespread e-mail. It started top down with the Chancellor and members of CEC being the first to use e-mail. It gradually was installed to nearly every employee. E-mail supported the strategy of decentralization and open communications among all members of the organization. (R. Bleed, personal communication, April 17, 2006)

Alfredo de los Santos, Jr. was the Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs from 1978-1999. In Richard Felnagle’s book on the history of the Maricopa Community Colleges, de los Santos tells the story of how he was challenged by Paul Elsner to get computers into the hands of faculty and other employees. In an interview with Felnagle in December of 1996, de los Santos recalled that he studied how Carnegie-Mellon, Stanford, and other schools were using technology, then he attended a conference with fellow Vice Chancellor Ron Bleed. He concluded:
I went to a League for Innovation conference in Miami, and Ron Bleed was my roommate. I had read all kinds of stuff. I told him about the idea that I had, to recommend to the Chancellor that we use another technology, not the central processing unit—the big mother computer in the sky with phone—but a microprocessor. Ron thought about it, and he said, “I can support that. I’ll help you with it.” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 227)

Thus, the Faculty Computer Literacy Project (FCLP) was born. Bond money from the 1984 bond referendum was used to purchase 75 Apple IIe computers, which were distributed to faculty who completed training and agreed to explore ways to use the machines for enhancing instruction (Felnagle, 2000). Several of the faculty who participated in FCLP ended up coming to CGCC.

Within a few years, Apple Macintosh computers were being used. Gonzales remembered:

We started the campus, as Paradise Valley did, with bringing a bunch of Macintoshes. And Macintoshes allowed us to have common operating systems and common applications, a network that would work and so on. It was very common for us to be running Appletalk all over this building, and eventually connected to the District so you could eventually see every single Appletalk node from every campus. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Each new technology created controversy and inspired creativity. Victor Navarro explained with enthusiasm some of the changes that transpired over time:
Just to give you a sense, I mean, at that time, I remember the introduction of a mouse, was a big thing. … Up to that point a personal computer consisted of nothing but some sort of a large, desktop computer with a keyboard. A mouse never existed until the Mac came on board. But, in terms of establishing technology across the campus, it was a big deal to establish networking connectivity, and provide the ability for computers to connect and share information between them, and share printers. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Gil Gonzales also recalled that VAX machines were distributed to the colleges so that administrative systems such as the Student Information System (SIS) could be operated on-site:

At the time we also brought in our own VAX, that was one of the Ron Bleed initiatives in the late ‘80’s, which was that every campus had their own student information system and we tried to use that system for every possible application we could think of. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Many of these innovations pertained to media services as well as employee desktops. Gonzales described:

We worked very hard in the area of telecommunications, particularly in video distribution. We started a campus where planning assumptions were there were no VCR’s in the classrooms. And we put monitors in there to start, and eventually put remote control systems in there to follow. And the faculty could, in fact, hand a tape off to somebody and have it played
from the [cable] head end. So we were looked to in lots of different ways
to use technology that, you know, hopefully made our lives better in terms
of learning support for faculty. (G. Gonzales, personal communication,
June 28, 2006)

A significant portion of time was devoted to training in new technologies, often
before deployment of hardware, as well as on an ongoing basis afterwards. There was
district-level training as well as campus-based training. One of the founding faculty
members, Alice Conkright, said that a big part of the successful implementation of
technology was the emphasis placed on training and support. She recalled:

One trend that the District picked up on, and I have mentioned before,
they did a good job of implementing, was technology, the computer. The
District was right on top of that with workshops, getting everybody
computers, and so on. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25,
2005)

Brenda Larson, education faculty, also spoke of the ongoing support and training
that was available:

I think we’ve been real creative because of the leadership that we’ve had
as far as expanding what we can do. We do a lot. Anybody that’s
interested at all can get one-on-one help. There’s a lot of staff
development that’s available to people. (B. Larson, personal
communication, June 10, 2005)

Sandra Stuebner, psychology faculty, described her own transformation as a result
of the technology and training made available to faculty:
When I was hired I had never used a computer. That was 20 years ago, so I had never used a computer. Low and behold I was here a couple of weeks and one of those little teeny Mac boxes showed up on my desk. And I did not take any computer classes. I was too busy, so I figured I could just figure it out for myself. I think I took a one hour workshop or something, and that was it, and then I spent hours, of course, trying to figure it out for myself. …

I have become very computer literate, I would say. I think I am probably more computer literate that the average faculty member at this campus. I don’t just use e-mail, but I use databases and I can do spreadsheets and I was very familiar with SIS [student information system] when I was Division Chair. I do not do that anymore. I can still use SIS and I jumped into Blackboard. …

I love technology. It has made teaching so much [easier], it so improved all of that housekeeping kind of stuff. My students have everything at their fingertips. If they lost the syllabus and it is the day before the final they can go get it with no problem. They do not have to call me, or put a note in my box, you know the old fashioned ways of communicating. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

One prediction that did not come to pass was a paperless campus. Alice Conkright reflected:

There was a lot of talk in the early years, but I think this was true nationally too, with all of the computers that it would be a paperless
campus. … It was always surprising to me when I would go to other colleges or campuses or other areas (my brother-in-law’s stock broker office, for example), I would realize how good this campus was in comparison in terms of using electronic information services, but it never became a paperless campus. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

Certainly the progress made with technology wasn’t without struggles. It required patience and perseverance as several faculty and staff recalled:

- …when Marybeth [Mason] came from, I guess, a computer savvy high school, she and Pam Davenport tried to set up a program where the English 101 classes were taught in the computer lab, every class met there. This involved an incredible amount of work and Dean Peterson was in there full-time helping and coordinating. And to me it always seemed like the effort to use the computer, the printer and everything that was going down and so on, was way too hard, it took away from what really should be done. (A. Conkright, May 25, 2005)

- When I first came here as full-time faculty, I remember the main thing was learning the technology. It just astounded me that we were given a computer and it was wonderful so it required learning the technology just to function as a faculty member. (D. Travers, June 13, 2005)

- Blackboard I think is another thing that has been very instrumental. It’s a blessing and a curse because it actually takes quite a bit of time for a
teacher to keep everything up there and to keep it current. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Many of the individuals interviewed for this research spoke about the relationship of the bond referendums in regard to technology progress. Arnette Ward shared, “On the computer programs, when we started the campus the bond election that we had passed, passed with a huge component for technology; helped us to bring technology into the classroom” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005). Vice Chancellor Bleed stated that MCCCD’s three major bond referendums in 1984, 1994, and 2004 were significant in terms of moving the Maricopa system forward. In addition to providing money for construction of new buildings and refurbishment of aging building, the bonds provided “capital funds for the large scale expansion of technology” (R. Bleed, personal communication, April 17, 2006).

He also said that personal computing blossomed for employees and for students. “The number of computer terminals/personal computers grew from 150 in 1981 to 20,000 in 2000. Staff to support this technology grew from 75 to 500 districtwide” (R. Bleed, personal communication, April 17, 2006). People produced documents using word processing, they organized data in databases, and they tracked and calculated numbers using spreadsheets, all on their desktops. Meanwhile, the District had large scale databases such as the Student Information System (SIS) that maintained hundreds of thousands of student records including their registrations, payments, and transcripts.

Victor Navarro agreed about the leaps that were made when new money and thus new technology was made available:
Beyond that, in the early ‘90’s, when we were successful in passing our ‘94 bond, that’s when the dramatic change occurred in terms of technology capabilities on our campus. We quickly evolved to a very rudimentary network where PC’s were sharing access to devices, to the campus-wide and district-wide network, very sophisticated, at that time. And then shortly thereafter that ’94 bond, then the whole internet evolution began and that had some major implications for growth and access to technology and moving forward. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Technology permeated MCCCD. Glendale Community College was the acknowledged leader with technology (Felnagle, 2000), but the new colleges such as CGCC were also hotspots for innovation. Gil Gonzales explained:

…in many cases, [we] built relationships with campuses that were willing to work with us in the IT organization area. We worked very closely with Glendale Community College. At the time, Jim Jacob, who was the Director of their High Tech Center, as they called it then, worked very closely with people like Chris Zager and others who were interested in collaborating on building services and systems that made sense for institutions to share. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Physics faculty David Weaver described some of the additional innovations in which faculty and staff were involved:
We also had installed the ability to do broadband, what do we call it, our video distribution system, where we had a head-end and we could send stuff out to each of the classrooms. It was a change from pretty much the only technology you had available was an overhead, that now you had media that could be moving. We also, early on, dabbled with in fact using HyperCard to use a computer in a classroom to control the head-end, so we dabbled a lot with emerging technologies that way. And I think we’ve continued to do that. We were the first campus in the District to provide ubiquitous wireless. We were the first campus to provide ubiquitous web space for our students. Now, electronic portfolios. We were the first campus in the District, to my knowledge anyway, to use laptops with students. We were, I think, one of the very first in Maricopa anyway, to use computer data acquisition for science classes. So I really think that we had been, have been, continue to be, on the cutting-edge of a lot of technology. I think its part of the culture here. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Innovation and change are often coupled with challenges. One of the challenges was that it was hard to plan in advance because sometimes important technologies emerged very quickly and then the teaching and serving landscape would change very quickly. Bleed recalled how quickly the emergence of the internet revolution came upon MCCCD:

In the middle 90’s another major technology force emerged upon colleges and society. This force was not even mentioned in the 1994 bond
The Internet became popular around 1995 and grew to be very pervasive in education, business, and society. It became a major addition to the instructional processes of the colleges. (R. Bleed, personal communication, April 17, 2006)

The turn of the century provided another technology challenge for both CGCC and MCCCD as a whole. CGCC employees worked with District teams to ensure that our systems would be “Y2K” ready (R. Bleed, personal communication, April 17, 2006). Up until that time, most computers had only a two-digit field for years, and many other data elements were then calculated from that date. Therefore, it was necessary to convert all two-digit date fields and many other elements of the system to be ready for the year 2000. Victor Navarro recalled:

Oh, the turn of the century? We spent a tremendous amount of resources for, gosh the term [Y2K] escapes me at the moment [chuckles]. But, you know thinking back, there was the potential threat at the time, where because computers were digital devices and very much driven by time-based calculations. The turn of the century introduced the potential for applications to fail, and systems that relied on applications to go through a major effort to reevaluate their code, look at all of their day calculations, extend the century string, that would enable us to move beyond the 2000 timeframe. We probably in our District spent, both before and after, about five years, to prepare for, and respond to all the associated changes for that. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)
Bleed remembered, “In 2000, another new technology greatly impacted the instructional processes. Software called course management systems (Blackboard and WebCT) became popular with the faculty” (R. Bleed, personal communication, April 17, 2006). Students and faculty wanted access virtually round the clock, which required significant restructuring of technology support to add new features like help desks.

Each of these emerging technologies involved not just hardware and software purchases, but also impacted college business processes. Once it became clear that technology was pervasive and changed rapidly, employees realized that replacements once a decade, when new bond referendums passed, was not sufficient. The college established two committees in the 1990s to help make recommendations about technology purchases, the Administrative Technology Committee (ATC) and the Instructional Computing Committee (ICC). Margaret Hogan recalled, “We had instructional technology and we had administrative technology councils and those groups planned for the use and the access to technology. So there was a major emphasis and our budget sometimes was eaten up by the needs of the technology” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Brenda Larson, education faculty, spoke to the role of the Instructional Computing Committee in helping to create the collaborations that occurred between departments.

I think the Instructional Computing Committee has a major role in what we buy, when we buy, and those types of things and since that’s made up of faculty and managers. Everybody - it seems like everybody - has a role in deciding what we do get and how we do move forward. I think we’ve
always looked at the goal as we never have enough money, but you know if we can take a little bit from this department and some from this department then maybe we can do things. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Communications faculty Diane Travers recalled that faculty tried to be good stewards of the limited resources by stretching the replacement cycles for technological equipment. She explained that sometimes difficult choices had to be made:

Many things usually come down to funding and I know that technology is expensive and as soon as you buy what you think is state of art, it’s already out of date and that’s been challenging because I think we all need to balance what our needs are with being good stewards of the money. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

One of the most dramatic changes that took place over the first 20 years of the college’s development was the use of the internet and world wide web. Navarro described the evolution of the college website:

It’s amazing. We talk about the college website, and what the end user may [see]. To them, it seems like one website, and in fact, we have a highly distributed, highly complex collection of web servers, that interact with dynamic web pages. And, to the end-user its, I mean, it’s the right perspective for them because all of that is transparent to them, so all they care about is accessing information, whether its coming from Chandler-Gilbert’s website or the District website or a national source from someplace. But it’s amazing, to look back and think of the first time we’d
sit at the whiteboard and kind of define the relationships and how
information should be presented, to [chuckles] where we stand today and
it’s really and truly amazing. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June
10, 2005)

In 2005, there were a number of technology initiatives in progress. More hybrid
classes (held partially face-to-face and partially online) and online courses were
available. Accounting faculty Sid Ford was teaching online and spoke about the progress
being made in that regard:

> With online learning becoming more and more prevalent amongst our
colleges and our campuses, certainly that one for me particularly has been
significant. I now have two online classes and am developing a third
class, and I want to have all the accounting classes, we offer three right
now, where students can take those online if they choose to. (S. Ford,
personal communication, June 28, 2005)

More mobile computing was available with many faculty and staff carrying hand-
held devices, personal digital assistants (PDAs), and mobile phones. The R25 calendar
and resource scheduling system, although not new in 2005, had been refined for more
broad-based use. The implementation of a new student information system is on the
horizon. Navarro described how identify theft, information security, and other issues are
posing threats for which the college is also in the process of investigating solutions:

> In terms of other events, the evolution of the internet and information
security is now a major deal. And the events of 911 and the impact for
how technology is being used—actually in ways that creates a threat to
organizations, and the interesting technology that’s being used to respond to those threats. You know handwriting recognition, biometrics, all of the wireless technology that’s available now to introduce security services and solutions for surveillance and that sort of thing. 911 had a major impact on that. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

With the passage of a bond referendum in 2004, an infusion of new technology will likely propel the college forward, as has happened following past bonds.

There have been amazing changes with the technology over the years. Navarro summarized:

Starting with what used to be a dumb terminal with no intelligence, no local computing capability or storage capability, moving through a personal computer with local software and local storage, through the evolution of connecting those devices. The connectivity part of it then introduced mobility issues in that we want to be able to provide consistent access, you know, throughout the organization, you know, whatever I’m able to get to in my office, I want to be able to get to in the computer lab, or even at home. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

CGCC started with an emphasis in technology and has maintained its status as a leader in technology among the Maricopa Community Colleges. Navarro said:

I’m proud of the level of collaboration and respect that has been achieved, not only at this college, but I think Chandler-Gilbert is well recognized across Maricopa in the types of programs and services that we offer. I view Chandler-Gilbert as a leader in many areas. We were the first
college to develop lots of new technologies. Going back I remember when we first established our first file and print server—that was a big deal. And we were one of the first, well the first actually in Maricopa, to establish a fully pervasive wireless campus. In recent years we have been recognized for the kinds of application development, solutions that we’re delivering, ePortfolio is an example. We adopted one of the first help desk applications in Maricopa. So I’m proud of the fact that I view ourselves as a leader in many areas. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Accounting faculty Sid Ford stated emphatically:

This campus and this District has certainly been a leader across the nation in terms of technology. So I’ve always known it to be there and have always had it at my disposal to use to the degree that I choose. So the District and the campus both has to be really commended for their use of technology and the dollars that were put behind it. (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

“Technology has always been important, but only from the standpoint of how it would help us make the students more successful, what it would make sure that they learned better, so it wasn’t just for technology sake,” said librarian Larry Miller (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005). Spanish faculty member Dr. Ana Jarvis summarized, “Technology was going to be a part of everything, and it has been and it is and it continues to be” (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2005).
This section of the document has described the history of the college as it relates to land, facilities and equipment. Despite all of the concerns about initially not having sufficient land and facilities, the college continues to thrive. When Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner visited the Pecos Campus to be interviewed for this research study, he remarked, “I think your architecture’s been very good, very solid, very nice. It’s a striking campus; it really is. And I think it pulled together so nicely” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005). That is what Arnette Ward had hoped would happen over time. She reflected:

Like I say, the brick and mortar talks to you if you allow it, if you have a mind to allow the emotional experience. The planning from now on is based on the original master plan for the college. One nice thing is that we always knew we established a plan that we could build from for the duration. It is happening now, God knows it is happening. Each time I come back to the campus, I am in awe of the progress made. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

**Problems and Challenges**

*There is an old Chinese saying that success limits you more than failure. I think that sometimes adversity ends up bringing out of you stuff that if you had it handed to you, you wouldn’t be able to bring to the table.*

(D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

In analyzing the interview responses, the most often cited problems or challenges for CGCC related to the lack of resources—money, people, and space. However, for
almost all of the challenges identified, there is evidence that creative thinking and problem solving was employed or cost efficiencies were achieved.

**Budget, Staffing and Facilities**

Time (staffing) and money (budget) were an issue from the start of the new college. MCC President Wally Simpson described how juggling multiple projects with limited staff was difficult:

There were some challenges. I know one of the first was a conversion of a temporary campus we were lucky to get. The conversion of this temporary campus, which was a Catholic school in Chandler, for college use, and at the same time as this conversion was taking place, starting to plan for a new campus elsewhere was a real challenge early on. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Dr. Simpson stated that MCCCD had an unusual situation in that student enrollment was growing while resources were becoming constrained. He explained, “Other states were going through some budget cuts, but Arizona was going through budget cuts, at a time of very rapid growth” (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

When asked about CGCC’s challenges, MCC President Larry Christiansen was succinct in his answer, “More land. Better master planning. More resources operationally” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005). Arnette Ward was direct as well, “A shortage of facilities, money, and staff” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005). Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan stated unequivocally,
“The lack of sufficient funding was a major negative factor” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005). Chancellor Paul Elsner acknowledged, “In some ways the centers were very much starved at the very beginning too. You didn’t have a lot of money” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005).

In fact, almost all of the people who were interviewed as part of this research mentioned that insufficient resources caused problems. Whether it was capital funding which impacted land and facilities, or operational funding which impacted staffing and supplies for programs and services, resource allocations were limited for CGCC.

Examples of cramped quarters included the Office of Student Life, which was located for several years in the hallway between the security reception desk and the security bathrooms in the M building. Duane Oakes, the Director of Student Life at that time, remembered that it was embarrassing to have new students and visitors come to the office. Eventually, in order to create a little more space, they closed off one bathroom and used it for meetings and storage of materials. Duane recalled, “We had men’s and women’s restrooms, sometimes we would have meetings in there because of space, and I said, you know guys we can’t be doing that...” (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

The initial library was approximately 2,000 gross square feet. At the time of this research, the former library space serves as a reception area, a conference room, several offices, storage, and a hallway.

The original bookstore was in a classroom, but when classroom space was at a premium, the bookstore was moved into a modular building in the east parking lot. Students complained during periods of heavy registration when they lined up in the
parking lot, in the heat of the Arizona sun, waiting their turn to go inside. The fire code only allowed for a few students to be inside this small space at once. At the time of this research, the bookstore was located in a larger modular building west of the student center.

The challenge of functioning in inadequate or limited spaces was addressed by many different interviewees. Here are examples of their space-related concerns:

- They’re [students are] so adaptable, thank God. They were fine outside and on picnic benches and stuff like that, but I would have liked to have provided more space for them…. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)
- Faculty didn’t have offices, we had the trunks of our cars and we all had our little Pendaflex folders in our trunks. We didn’t have enough classroom spaces and everything was shared space and it was a challenge. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)
- …one thing of course is that we don’t seem to have enough classrooms… we need more classrooms. (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2005)
- We still need a Student Center, well we have one, but we need an expanded Student Center where students can really have meals. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Having some space for these functions was better than having no space, but space issues caused problems and tension over the years. Physics faculty member David Weaver reflected on the issue:

Paradise Valley, even though they were a center underneath Scottsdale, they were still pretty much given full services. They didn’t have enough
staff to do everything they wanted to, but at least they had all of the functions that they needed. It really seemed like [at] this campus we didn’t, that we started off at a deficit. That we have a wide place in a hall that is now where we have a receptionist—that was our library. A lot of our services and service spaces, etcetera, were not fully formed, and I think that’s not necessarily a bad thing, but I hope they learned from that because when Estrella came on following us, they got the full meal deal.

(D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

In addition to space issues, the limited number of staff posed challenges for the new institution. It was difficult for a few people to have all of the expertise needed to run a college and it was difficult to maintain service hours and program options comparable to other MCCCD colleges with fewer staff members. Margaret Hogan explained it from her vantage point:

Because you have those kind of money problems everything else seems minor in comparison. So I think that we needed a million dollars and that was a major leap in order to just have the staffing that was basic. And we used to make those arguments to the Board. We would carry organizational charts [laughs] with blank spaces in them that had to do with essential functions. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

David Weaver said in retrospect:

The challenges have always been that we’ve had too few people trying to do too much, but that probably could be said a lot of places, I think it’s
maybe a little truer here than other places. I think that recently we’ve
done a phenomenal job of buttressing the faculty ranks, but I think we’re
behind in staffing in a lot of other areas, and that’s been something that
has been a continual challenge. I think that since we were understaffed to
begin with that we had to have many people wearing too many hats, and
having more staff has reduced that to a certain extent. (D. Weaver,
personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Many of the founding faculty and staff had to wear multiple hats. In the services
areas, often one manager had responsibility for several different functions, while in the
faculty ranks, people who had expertise in more than one subject were hired. Business
faculty Yolanda Penley recalled, “There was such a demand and not enough of us, so you
had to be willing to cross-teach disciplines and areas” (Y. Penley, personal
communication, June 1, 2005). She then explained how she went back to graduate school
to obtain enough background to teach additional subject areas. Many residential faculty
were or became certified in multiple teaching disciplines, but there was also heavy
reliance on adjunct faculty. Larry Christiansen confirmed, “Allocations were so small
that it was hard to build a significant faculty in the early years, and [there was] heavy
dependence on adjunct faculty” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005).

This researcher heard a recurring refrain about the challenges related to limited
staffing in the voices of many different people:

- It’s always a challenge to try to get more faculty. I think as I told you we
  have to mention that the challenge of the full-time faculty ratio versus adjunct,
  that’s always a challenge. (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005)
• I think it was mainly the typical things—too little money, too few faculty.…
  (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

• Resources, staffing. I think individuals wore many hats, because we had
  limited staffing. We had really good people and they worked really, really
  hard, but there were some significant challenges in that area. (V. Navarro,
  personal communication, June 10, 2005)

• We’ve never had enough people…. I think that we’re still short-handed, and I
  would just like to see more staff. I think it’s key. I hate to see the students
  waiting in line for somebody to help them. (J. Palinsky, personal
  communication, June 14, 2005)

The lack of adequate staffing caused stress and strained the early faculty and staff.

Psychology faculty Sandra Stuebner explained:

Even though that was fun, it was also exhausting and a big drain on
people, I think. I worked a lot more hours back then than I do now. I was
working 50 and 60 hours—that’s what everyone was doing. (S. Stuebner,
personal communication, June 2, 2005)

The extra hours spent at work took its toll on some employees. The price of their
commitment was time missed with their families. Duane Oakes lamented the time
missed with his young sons:

The only thing I wished I could have changed is if I could have hired a
full-time staff member to support it. Unfortunately, as a brand new
professional, young, married with kids, I had to figure out how I could
balance all of that. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
Some of the issues with staffing were related to who was there and how the organization was structured, as opposed to simply having limited staff. Yolanda Penley remembered that the District was reluctant to fire anyone for lack of adequate performance. At a small campus where each position is critical, this caused problems, but she reflected:

Across the District, it is very hard to get rid of people that are not competent once they are hired. So you wanted to be careful. We had a few hires where we might have done better, but you know, you learn to work with them. And some of them turned around and others we just hoped would disappear. You do the best you can. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Another challenge related to personnel was not so much about the lack of staff, but rather the organizational structure. Several interviewees mentioned that the “swapping” of duties between the two Assistant Provosts was a challenge for them in the early years as they had different supervisors in different years, and therefore priorities for their areas shifted from year-to-year. CIO Gil Gonzales tactfully explained:

… in the middle Andy Bernal was swapped between instruction and support. So those are significant changes internally of how you think about what you’re doing and how you do it. And it was great for them to learn the different parts of our organization. It was probably more difficult for some of us to sort out how those changes positively improved what we did…. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)
In addition to space and staffing, there were other budget issues as well. Money for supplies, printing and copying, utilities, subscriptions, and numerous other items was always in short supply. Not unlike the comments heard about limited space and staffing, many interviewees mentioned the general lack of resources available to support programs and services:

- We were limited in funding, considerably, in both operational and capital monies. (A. Bernal, personal communications, June 7, 2005)

- I’ll mention the constant, constant struggle from the business folks and the aviation folks for the limited amount of occupational funds coming from the Chancellor’s office as part of our distribution. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

- Chandler-Gilbert was somewhat victimized by having less resources…. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

- A lot of problems came from just not having the resources. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

- I think one of the restraints was that we were limited in our budget resources, and so we weren’t able to react as quickly to ideas and plans that we would’ve liked to. (C. Sittner, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

- I recall my first year here, running out of office supplies in March and the new budget was not coming into effect until July 1st. There were other things like that operationally and sometimes it was a challenge. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
Former MCC President Wally Simpson marveled at how well people weathered the challenges and chipped in, when necessary, to help the college operate. He remembered, “The faculty had to do an awful lot and be very creative to provide their classroom resources early on. There were times that I’m sure people took money out of their own pockets” (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

The idea of beginning centers with partial programs and services, and limited space and staffing, was driven by District financial constraints. Most elementary and secondary schools, in contrast, are built from the beginning to accommodate their full capacity. It is often the case that a high school will be built and then the freshmen and sophomore classes will begin and each year an additional lower class is added until the first group of students graduates. They grow into their facilities, and they begin with a fairly comprehensive set of academic programs and support services. The level of service they receive is similar to what would have been provided at a neighboring high school. Maricopa took that same approach with its first several extension sites at MCC, GCC, and SCC. Although MCC, GCC, and SCC, started in temporary facilities while the campuses were built, when they moved on-site there were many significant structures and many residential faculty and support staff to get the new schools underway. The campuses were not complete, and there was room to fill in other buildings as growth occurred, but a core of facilities and staffing was provided. Maricopa experimented with the two new centers started in the mid-1980s, Paradise Valley Community College and Chandler-Gilbert Community College. The idea was to build them in part and staff them in part, and then as enrollment grew, more buildings and staffing would be allocated. Unfortunately, community members, students, and employees had come to expect a
certain standard of operation for Maricopa Community Colleges and this caused considerable discomfort for employees at CGCC. And because they knew the District to have considerable resources, it was hard for them to understand.

The District explanations for the limited resource allocations were not clear to Provost and then President Arnette Ward. She felt that “Maricopa was rich in budget in 1985 as it is in 2005. New colleges should not have to suffer in their development as Chandler-Gilbert actually suffered” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005). The emotions about this issue appeared strong to this researcher.

Governing Board member Linda Rosenthal explained, “You never have enough money. You probably don’t, nobody does, and nobody will” (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

David Weaver put it in perspective essentially stating that although it wasn’t easy having limited resources, it did have some lasting and possibly positive affects on the culture of the college. He said:

I alluded earlier about how when we were created, we weren’t created fully formed. I think that what would’ve helped probably is if there had been a master plan that had all the essential services identified, and made sure that we had the essential services that we could grow from, rather than the idea well we’re going to be sharing some of that with our parent college MCC. I think that really would’ve helped. And maybe that wouldn’t have been a good idea, because I think I mentioned earlier when I identified that as being a problem that that also, I think, made us who we are. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)
It was interesting to this researcher that for most of the challenges identified, there were related positive outcomes. For example, several individuals mentioned that the space and budget challenges caused the college to become more efficient than it otherwise might have. Gil Gonzales stated:

Given that amount of square footage and the operational budget at the time, we were doing a lot of things in a little bit of space. And that caused folks to have some tension, as you competed for resources internally. But also, I’ll re-emphasize that there wasn’t a whole lot here. And we were serving probably between 2,500 and 3,500 students under a very small facility. We were very efficient. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

The lack of funding made it difficult for the college to offer the wide range of programs and services that other Maricopa Community Colleges were able to offer. But it also had an interesting side effect in that, at least initially, it caused the college to prioritize carefully and focus effort in a few key areas. Assistant Provost Andy Bernal recalled that it helped him focus on the development of the core academic program, “The negative part of it was operationally there was just not enough money to do all the things we wanted to do. So we were limited to making sure that we had a strong academic base for the college …” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

There was careful planning around new initiatives. Paul Elsner explained that in retrospect, more money should probably have been set aside for the new centers, but nonetheless, he was pleased with the choices made with the resources that were available. He reflected:
I’m very pleased with the way the institution evolved. I think we probably should’ve projected a stronger base for you financially, knowing that you would end up being as important and as comprehensive as you are. … I don’t know if the allocation systems that we designed for either Chandler or a lot of the other colleges were really realistic and sensible in some ways, but you did remarkable things with it. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

In spite of the challenges, people look back positively on the early years of the college. Diane Travers, communication faculty, remembered the internal struggle over who would get a “real” office, given that there were not enough available for all faculty and staff. Her recollection though was that when people were doubling up and sharing and living in less than ideal spaces, there was a certain camaraderie created:

We finally got an adequate number of faculty offices and they all had a window and we had breakout areas and that was great. But yet, on the other hand, because of that, it reduced the contact that we had with each other. The times where we had two or three of us sharing an office or those who shared the trailer, they found that that really brought them together. And so it’s great we all have our spaces, but yet it kind of is a double edged sword in that it reduced the contact. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

Chuck Bedal, founding math faculty, spoke of the difficulty of not having adequate staffing, but later in his interview spoke of the advantages of having a small staff who were able to be in constant communication with one another. “The fact that the
entire faculty/staff could meet around one picnic table and discuss those kinds of things was really an advantage that helped all kinds of things” (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005).

Cathy Urbanski said that the workload was overwhelming at times, but then reflected that the doubling up on jobs caused her to learn new skills and function across the lines of various departments. She reflected positively on the years when the staff was small and the budget was tight:

Yes, that was really nice because I think I got to do everything. I liked that. I got to do registration, advisement, janitor, clean up the machines, repair person, and custodian person because we had those events, and we cleaned all the chairs and everything else. You know that was a fun time. I look back and you can't take those away. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

**MCCCD Politics**

The strained relations within MCCCD as a result of the constant competition for resources are discussed briefly earlier in this chapter in the section about the growth years for the college. Many of those interviewed viewed the political climate to be a major problem during the early years of college development.

Founding English faculty member Alice Conkright reflected on District relationships including the tension that was pervasive in the early years of college operations. In retrospect, she expressed some confusion as to why relationships became
so strained, given that it seemed that the Maricopa District Office was also supportive in some ways too. She recalled:

There was endless discussion about the District—endless. How are we going to get the budget through? How are we going to get more money? We are running out of money. We are going to have to cut back classes. It just was endless. It seemed to me that the first five years were devoted to trying to get economic support from District. That is the thing that stands out. The District was also very supportive of the campus, it seems to me. I do not know what that really means exactly. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

David Weaver believed that the District financial incentives were misplaced, focusing on growth, not quality. He explained:

We kept on getting rewarded for the growth. And I think that that has influenced some of how we do business, not necessarily in a positive way, that it’s a constant drive to keep on growing, because the only way we can maintain is to grow. And I think there’s a kind of unhealthy dynamic that’s set up by doing that. That if we don’t have the resources now to do everything we want to do with the students we have now, then getting more students just always seems like we’re pushing down the pike reckoning that there’s going to be some judgment day at some point where we don’t have the growth and we have to catch up. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)
Weaver also described the relationship with other MCCCD colleges in terms of sibling rivalry:

Some of the challenges are that being in this District, we have, at least from my mind, a certain love-hate relationship with the other campuses. I grew up in a large family and I’m the youngest of six, and I see us kind of like siblings, and there is sibling rivalry and some sniping that goes back and forth and we compete with each other when cooperation might be better. And then sometimes the parent, down there in Tempe, is kind of autocratic and makes certain decisions that the rest of us end up having to live with. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Sometimes decisions made at the District Office affected relationships between colleges. The comparisons among the colleges were constant, so much so that even 20 years later, Arnette Ward remembered, “CGCC’s initial budget was smaller than the others. Paradise Valley started with $15 million, and I hated going over to that school. It was just too much of what I did not have to offer” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005). Gil Gonzales recalled that there were consequences for not keeping up with the other Maricopa colleges:

As much as we’d like to think we were different in many areas, the students were comparing us to every other campus, so if we didn’t have something that they thought was a basic service, we lost out on those enrollments sometimes. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)
Larry Christiansen confirmed that some of the internal conflict was a direct result of the financial situation. He described that there was, “Early underfunding, both on the capital and operational side. District-wide vision not supported with resources. College-wide vision not supported with resources, because sometimes people get really frustrated by those activities as well” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005).

Arnette Ward’s interaction with other MCCCD Presidents was often focused around finances. Paul Elsner described the tension this created among the President’s group:

We did feel at times that there were some dynamics between the colleges that were giving you some difficulty, because after all of the settlements were made, we always thought you all had agreement on this among the Presidents, and then Arnette would come up and say, “Well, we still need more money.” And then all the other Presidents would say, there would be a gasp, you know like they broke some kind of a code or some kind of a trust, because a lot of them were old boys, and they didn’t like the idea of somebody just hanging in there wanting more money. And she really did believe that she needed more money, and she did need more money—we all needed more money. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

MCC President Larry Christiansen believed that MCCCD had adequate resources but they were stretched among too many different priorities to appropriately fund the new extension centers. He described:
The other thing internally that I would mention that is significant is that Paul was deeply committed to this growth strategy. In the ’84 bond and then in the ‘90’s and getting Estrella. And if you watch Paul Elsner’s history in the ‘90’s he went on to other things. He had his kind of year of technology, and then we went down the quantum quality, total quality management movement, and then we went through the fine arts era. Well, all that diluted resources and energy and building to these kind of new places that were kind of left out floundering just a bit. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005).

Christiansen elaborated on the competitive environment that was fostered, presumably to get the most from each college. He shared a story that explained the climate during the early years of Chandler-Gilbert Community College:

There was a lot of pull and tug, within the ranks of the Presidents. Paul almost fostered competition—he viewed competition as good—and so you had to kind of pull and tug those. And one story that I’m sure you’ve heard and I’m sure you can use prominently in this dissertation is it had come to a very unfortunate place one morning in a CEC [Chancellor’s Executive Council] meeting. The sides were taken and the lines were drawn, and it clearly was [about] the allocation of resources. The new Presidents were passionate and angry about being led. They had been hammered by their faculty and staff for about as long as they could tolerate it. And they were there, fists ready to pound the table.
The larger institutions had been providing the FTSE for the District, literally providing more resources than they were being able to be given back by their budgets. This had flown over time. Some of the institutions had increased by significant FTSE and had no new faculty positions over a period of time, and were told to go get more enrollment, but you better use adjuncts, and the feeling of anger was really prevalent. And then one colleague who we won't mention by name but has been a President for over 25 years in Maricopa and had established what he called the middle-college syndrome, which meant that the little schools and the big schools all picked on his school. And so he was really in the worst shape, even more so than the new places or the large places.

Well, one morning, and Paul didn’t go to CEC meetings very often, but one morning, he was scheduled to be there and there was not much pleasant thought and discussion. The sides were lined up, and they were all waiting to pounce on Paul, because things had to change [chuckles]. He was the Chancellor, and he better do some Chancelloring because these issues were just prevalent, and they were problems. And the small schools, or the big schools, or the middle-size schools were all upset. Well, Paul walked in the room, sat down and looked at all the faces, there wasn’t a smile there, looked at everyone and said, Maricopa is just like the great aquarium of life, and in the great aquarium of life, the big fish eat the little fish, unless the little fish swim faster to avoid them. Closed his notebook and walked out the door [laughs]. Ended the
discussion in terms of big, small and middle size institutions, and we just went on, because that was our message from the Chancellor. Fix it yourself. If I’m going to give you a very autonomous system that will respond to your community needs, I’m going to give you a system that gives latitude to the Presidents, I’m going to give you a system that is marveled and looked to by people across the country and around the world as the premier system, you better be able to fix this, because this is just [laughs] one of the annoyances you’re going to have. And, of course, he was right and we were able to do that. But I use that as an example of the kind of somewhat directional, but you had to sort it out [chuckles] to find it, leadership that Paul provided to the discussion. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Christiansen went on to explain that community members did not understand the internal competition and thus any explanations of why CGCC couldn’t deliver weren’t understood. He recalled that “… a system of competition didn’t lend itself to articulating” why resources were so limited for CGCC, “nor did it sell especially well to the external community” (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005).

Overall the “Elsner years” in Maricopa were remembered fondly by interviewees, despite the challenges. The post-Elsner years had a new set of challenges. In 2000, after one failed search, Fred Gaskin became Chancellor and MCC’s Christiansen remembered the transition after Elsner’s retirement:

The failed search for the Chancellor brought, in my view, two dynamics to the District. The first was one of frustration. You know, let’s get this over
with, life is better if we know who the Chancellor is, and how this is all going to work. And then secondly, everybody that wanted to do mischief viewed it as this kind of void of leadership. And so we tended to have some kind of rocky times within the District, and these impacted these new institutions. ... And then we go through the scenario when Dr. Gaskin arrived, clearly with a mandate at that time to bring greater centralization back to Maricopa, and that had all kinds of pulls and tugs, because it was absolutely contrary to the things that had transpired. And after several years, didn’t appear to work well. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

In general, despite the fact that MCCCD was a strong and reputable system, the internal politics presented a challenging backdrop for the creation of a new college. The competitive atmosphere made it such that colleges were more apt to share ideas and resources externally to MCCCD, than internally. Each grew quite distinctive, which is not necessarily bad, but a result of the forces within the system. However, newer and smaller colleges were disadvantaged in this climate, as it would be many years before they could compete with the breadth and depth of programs and services available at older and larger colleges. As tension mounted, every effort was made at CGCC to not be like the parent institution, MCC. Gil Gonzales explained that this was not a healthy outlook:

I think our thinking at the time was to move as fast and as far away from Mesa as we could, which was probably not healthy. ‘Cause it didn’t help the organization long-term. And in fact it was really, in some cases, not
helpful because it became, if Mesa did this, well we did something else.

And I don’t think that was always a healthy conversation. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Again, the internal environment is also covered earlier in this chapter, but it appeared to this researcher that internal relationships were strained, at best, and one could conclude that the political climate in a large district system with multiple colleges was a real challenge to a developing college.

Planning and Prioritizing

The last two sections covered budget and politics, which were district-wide issues. This section is focused on the problems or challenges that took place internally at CGCC around planning and prioritizing. It was stated earlier that several of the interviewees felt that the lack of resources initially caused them to focus on doing a few things well. However, it appears that after the initial accreditation, things became less focused, planning became more disjointed, and it became more difficult to prioritize because the goal itself was to become more comprehensive in nature.

Physics faculty member Robin McCord recalled that the desire to do it all was a problem. She said, “We had to be so many things to so many people, so quickly” (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005). She reflected on the difficulty in prioritizing:

I’d thought about this one and I think if it had been possible, I would like to have seen us grow a little slower, and a little narrower. We had a number of years where in trying to respond to so many constituents that
we were a mile wide and an inch deep in what we were doing. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Larry Christiansen felt that the lack of clear goal definition for what constituted a comprehensive college posed a problem for CGCC. He stated that it was not clear what directions to pursue:

We went at least two decades saying that you better become a comprehensive institution without ever defining what comprehensive was, and I’m still not sure we have a very good definition of one at all. So it’s kind of this elusive thing out there that we may not know that we’re there until one day we trip over it. And so the lack of definition in terms of where that goal is, lends for lots of misunderstandings and misinterpretations and harsh talk and adults saying unkind things, and that is always kind of problematic. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Christiansen explained that if he were to do it over again, he would have planned a number of things differently. He goes on to qualify that he is not criticizing CGCC, that he felt the same way about MCC, and that strategic planning was lacking. He said:

And I think that if any of us were doing it again we’d have probably spent as much time talking about what the full master plan might be like, for the placement of the some of the buildings and roads and things that are in place. … But as you take a step back from that, there’s a critical nature of saying, you know if this place is going to be here for 100 years, perhaps we need to get a tad more organized in terms of how all of that should
kind of play itself out. … But that’s a hard dynamic in Maricopa. And so when I say that there’s better strategic planning, that’s not just directed toward Chandler-Gilbert, that’s a system-wide scenario…. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

It has been previously mentioned that one of the challenges was limited staffing and that many individuals were hired and asked to handle multiple areas of responsibility. However, there was not a planned system in place to provide training and support. Sandra Stuebner, psychology faculty, shared her “let’s put on a play” analogy earlier in this chapter. She contends that enthusiastic but relatively inexperienced faculty and staff assumed major responsibilities and did the best they could under the circumstances. Communications faculty member Diane Travers certainly concurred with that notion when she shared this story:

I remember early on as the division chair, I had only been here a year full-time and it was time to have a division chair for Communication and Fine Arts. At the time there was only two of us here who were full-time faculty; it was myself and Gordon Jesse. And when they said that one of us would have to be chair, of course we both pointed to the other and said “you do it.” And I don’t know if we did something as lame as flipping a coin, I don’t remember, but I got it and it was quite the roller coaster ride in terms of knowing how to work within an educational institution because I was so “green.” I was so inexperienced and it definitely was being thrown in the middle of the pool and sink or swim. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)
Sharon Flury, curriculum coordinator, agreed that many staff and faculty would have benefited from a planned training program. Flury explained:

I think another challenge is that there isn’t a plan in place to prepare faculty for division chair leadership roles. I think there are people who are in division chair positions and are finding taking on a leadership role extremely challenging. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Flury continued saying that one way to mitigate a lack of exposure or experience is to consult with colleagues at other Maricopa Community Colleges. She states that this did not happen as often as she had hoped, largely because of the internal politics:

I think one of the things we tended to do was be fiercely independent out here. So there were times that we were flying by the seat of our pants, and if I had to do it all over again, I would probably have consulted other people in similar positions at the District or other colleges to get through some of the rough spots where we had some knowledge gaps. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Andy Bernal felt that part of the problem was a result of the unrealistic timeframes provided for the planning process. He explained that he would have done it differently:

For one thing I would’ve asked the District not to put a two-year time limit on getting the college started, and also asked the Board and the District administration to give the founding administrators more than 30 days to do the educational specifications [the conceptual plans for the buildings].

Subsequent to our starting this campus, Estrella Mountain Community
College, they gave them one whole year without having even to generate enrollment to plan the college. And I think that would’ve made a big difference, a really big difference in the quality of the planning, in the programmatic decisions that were made, and also putting it into place, everything. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Gil Gonzales who served as Associate Dean of Learning Resources or the Chief Information Officer (CIO) discussed the implications of planning in an environment where resources were not well-defined. He posited that planning could have been better had there been a mechanism to identify a predictable stream of resources. He spoke about the staging of facilities and the rather constant moving of offices and remodeling of spaces to be functional for those who would use it next, about the failed bond election, and the tactics used in the interim years before another bond passed. He stated, “We were going to grow in a sort of haphazard way, because we were tied to facilities and other things” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

Victor Navarro, who is now the CIO, believed that internally at CGCC, the planning and budgeting processes were never well-defined.

Because we were a new college there were some process-related issues that were undefined. In particular I’ll refer to our strategic planning and budgeting process early on. I recall the whole competitive nature of how that used to work. And it was highly stressful, it was highly competitive, and we had lots of pain going through those periods. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)
These issues appeared to be interrelated to the researcher. It has been mentioned that there was difficulty in stretching staff across multiple areas of responsibility. This also happened in the area of planning and budget. The person who had responsibility for marketing, research, facilities, safety, fiscal operations, inventory, and more, was also responsible for planning and budget. With few hands on managers, the administrators were stretched thin. Sandra Stuebner explained:

I also think that we did not have strong budget-minded people in the right places at the right time. I think there was not always a good understanding of what was going on in the budget, and that was a problem. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Brenda Larson concurred:

I think there may have been some financial areas that could have been covered a little bit differently that would’ve helped us with a lot of things. And I think it would’ve helped us more with priorities. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

In retrospect, the person responsible for financial planning for the college for its first 15 years or so of operation also agreed that better financial planning would have been helpful, but that with so many competing tasks and limited resources, it was always an elusive goal. Carolyn Sittner from Business Services explained:

I think it would have been good for the college, for us, to really have had a better financial plan, and had maybe some more experience with long-range planning in terms of finances, so that we could plan to have some contingencies. I think the money was perceived to be so short that we
always allocated it all to the penny and perhaps we could’ve done a better job at saving for a rainy day.  (C. Sittner, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

Thus the notion of planning, prioritization and focus came up in several interviewees’ remarks.  Business faculty member Yolanda Penley summarized:

One of the things I always worried about was whether or not we are trying to do too much.  I guess I would like to see Chandler-Gilbert start over with adequate staff, adequate faculty and adequate funding, and then limit the number of programs that they were going to focus on.  (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

There were alternative perspectives about planning at the college, with some interviewees feeling that the planning processes were fine.  Speaking about facilities planning and specific building projects, librarian Larry Miller felt that “[p]lanning has always been really good—the strategic planning for the college” (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005).  But because it was defined as a problem or challenge by multiple interviewees, this researcher included it, following the defined research methodology.  However, there was some level of disagreement about the extent of the problems caused by inadequate planning and prioritization.

Governing Board member Linda Rosenthal acknowledged that growing in phases complicated the planning process, but felt that CGCC did well with what it had:

It was an interesting plan to develop in stages.  Plan one, two, and I imagine you’re looking at the third phase with the latest bond issue.  It was small, it was developed that way.  Those were the resources that we
had. And, I think there were obviously some plusses and minuses. I think your library from the beginning was inadequate and yet it was developed with an idea that it would be okay for awhile and then you built a new one. We had some good planning. I think things were developed well. (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Ed Contreras, also a Governing Board member, had a different perspective. He believed that the staged build-out of the college caused ongoing challenges. He believed that District planning was inadequate at the start of the college, and that had ramifications throughout the history of the college. He explained:

I think if it could begin again, I think it would’ve been better to build out the college more in the early times and then expand to that basis. I think that initial planning was underestimated as to the need and the amount of demand that would be generated by this area. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005)

*Doing it Differently*

If a person could do it all over again, what would he or she do differently? This section has the potential to provide insight to current CGCC employees about areas that could be addressed better, as well as insights for other young and growing colleges.

There were only a few concepts that were mentioned repeatedly by interviewees. Despite the fact that, in general, community relations were strong, some felt more emphasis could or should have been placed on minority communities. Andy Bernal explained that connections with certain communities never gelled:
The other thing I think that I’d have done differently was I think would have involved the community more, especially, I mentioned earlier, the Indian community at Gila River. From the very beginning we should’ve involved them a lot more, just so that they could feel a lot more connected to this college. …we should’ve probably been much more aggressive in reaching out to communities that had felt disenfranchised for many years, such as the Hispanic community. … I think the other population that we missed out on was in the long-standing agricultural families that are out here. And somehow we just didn’t connect with them as well as we should have…. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

The lack of career and technical programs in the curriculum was mentioned by interviewees too. Sharon Flury, Curriculum Coordinator, mentioned that it has only been in recent years that the college has pursued some depth and breadth in occupational programs. As was mentioned in previous sections, for many years emphasis was placed on two occupational program areas, information technology and aviation. Since 1998, a significant effort was made to diversify occupational programs. She did a little research and concluded, “This last year [2004-2005] has been a real eye-opener with the number of programs that we have added, either because they are shared or college specific programs. So we have done very well this last year especially” (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

The particular occupational programs chosen, and the expenses associated with them, had a significant impact on the variety that could or, in this case, could not be offered. Programmatically, although many interviewees expressed pride in the aviation
program, they also wondered if that was the right choice for a developing college. Gil Gonzales reflected:

I mean the only real question that was out there, was probably one that we’ve been talking in and out about, was the aviation program. But that was the, you know, someone would debate that probably from here on out as to whether it was the right choice or not. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

John Underwood, the first aviation faculty member, who later served as the Associate Dean in charge of occupational programs for several years, felt that the lack of diversity in occupational programs had several negative ripple effects. He also cited the fact that the aviation program was located off-site from the “main campus” or the Pecos Campus, as a problematic factor. He reflected:

You know, if I can take you back 16 years the only real other [than aviation] occupational program were the business programs, the business computing labs, and some of those other kinds of things that fell in this broad category of vocational and occupational programs. And they had a couple of certificates but there really wasn’t any large presence of a lot of occupational programs. And so what probably compounded some of the problems is the aviation program was always off campus, and so it made it difficult for those faculty members to mingle with the other general educational faculty. And I’ll be the first one to tell you that vocational and occupational faculty have somewhat of a different mindset about how we do things, and what we do and what we don’t do, from what I would call
the more traditional academia—the English, the history, you know that
group of professionals. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

In previous sections, the financial resource limitations and the effect on space and
staffing were discussed. If they were to do it again, many interviewees would
recommend that start-up costs be considered more realistically. Many of those
interviewed believed that more realistic budgeting and staffing would have been helpful.
Sandra Stuebner, psychology faculty, said:

I think having more people here. It was all related to budget, I think.

Having more people to share the load, but I think we did a really good job
of hiring committed people and that has made a big difference here. We
had people who were willing to go above and beyond. (S. Stuebner,
personal communication, June 2, 2005)

One of the interview questions for this research was, “If CGCC could begin again,
what things would you recommend be done differently?” Several of those interviewed
spoke about land and facilities planning, and specifically the purchase of the land at the
northwest corner of Pecos and Gilbert Roads was mentioned as an opportunity lost.
Librarian Larry Miller explained his perspective:

One of the things that struck me is we should always have bought the
corner lot on Pecos and Gilbert. I mean Glendale has that corner, Mesa
has that corner, most of the campuses have those corners. I think that’s
one thing that we should’ve done and I know it was very difficult—never
could get the District administration to realize that we needed the money
to do that. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Others concurred. Sharon Flury said that one thing she would have done
differently was, “I would ask the Governing Board to buy that whole northwest corner off
of Gilbert and Pecos Road, for one thing” (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1,
2005). Communications faculty Diane Travers agreed, “I’m real sad that we did not have
the opportunity to have that corner property to really have our presence, to make our
mark and not be in the middle of the street” (D. Travers, personal communication, June
13, 2005).

Land prices have risen so significantly in metropolitan Phoenix that it would be
difficult for the District to purchase that land now and even more unlikely in the future,
given the escalating costs. There is extensive correspondence in the college files from
CGCC Presidents Ward and Hesse requesting that the Maricopa District Office purchase
the corner land, with the rationale for doing so. The lessons to be learned include that
sometimes opportunities present themselves and lack of a quick response is akin to a
negative response because the opportunity is lost. Responses to the interview questions
indicated that employees will move on and be fine without the corner land at Pecos and
Gilbert Roads, but it reinforced their sense that District Office staff are sometimes
perceived as blocking college progress, as opposed to supporting it. This was a major
opportunity lost that is not likely to be made available again.

Other reflections on facilities include the recognition that the types of facilities
built impact the types of students who enroll, as well as student interactions on campus.
Reading faculty member Wanda Matthews and others spoke about the importance of providing spaces for students to mingle and study. Matthews said:

… if we had planned, in the early stages, it should’ve been one of the first things on the drawing board, in addition to classrooms, the cafeteria, the library of course, we should have had a place for students, other than outdoors, there should have been some form of student union. However, if I think a little bit deeper about this, I guess the cafeteria served that purpose, on our campus, but if I were designing a building, the first day of classes students would have access to a student union-type setting, other than the courtyard, or the cafeteria. (W. Matthews, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

Also in regard to facilities planning, Gil Gonzales mentioned the value in having district-level expertise in planning for infrastructure systems. He mentioned that when District facilities planning staff began setting standards for all MCCCD buildings, there were tangible benefits. Gonzales stated:

Arlen Solochek and John, no and Lionel Martinez, but John, I don’t remember his name now, they did a great job in subsequent building programs that, if Chandler would have had them, when they started the facilities work, they may have been cosmetically the same, but from an architectural perspective and from a systems perspective, I think it would have been a lot better from a facilities perspective. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)
Diane Travers added a facilities related comment that harkens back to the notion of either planning a facility more fully for start-up or embedding some common features in each phase of facilities planning no matter how long between phases. She commented:

And I’d also like to see the whole look of the campus get more unified, being part of the Building Committee and master planning and having different architects and different visions, it seems like we need to do something to bring it together, perhaps through landscaping, through color perhaps. It’s difficult and I know some of the colleges within Maricopa were afforded the luxury of being able to build out or close to build out right from the beginning where it seems cohesive. So I think that’s something that remains to be fulfilled for us and I look forward to working on that. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

The most common interviewee responses to doing things differently, if one could do it over again, pertained to the need to adequately finance a start-up venture. This is not dissimilar to the planning undertaken for starting a new business, whereby planning for start-up costs is crucial to the long-range viability of a business. Arnette Ward explained her personal perspective:

I sort of laugh at that because my world revolves more and more around money. It has since I started here, so if I had to go back I would have asked the Gods in the heavens that are in charge of education on Earth, to help them make a different decision about funding a start-up institution. It makes us standout as the campus that had the most struggle when we
should not have had it. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Governing Board member Nancy Stein agreed that careful consideration should be given to adequate planning and financing of an institution. “I think if this community college started over again I would certainly want to make sure that everything is covered and looked at very carefully before you kind of hit and miss at the college” (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005).

And in retrospect, Margeret Hogan determined that “I think I would’ve been in favor of waiting until we could have the resources that we needed to get underway in the right way” (M. Hogan, personal communication June 8, 2005).

Business faculty member Yolanda Penley, who taught management and organizational planning, concluded that one does what one can in the face of challenges, but essentially without adequate resources, there is going to be frustration:

If you were going to start over, I would like to think you were going to start over with adequate staff and faculty. When we started we were so short of staff and faculty, and so short of money. But you know, you make do and there is no point in complaining about it, because it does not do anything but cause unhappiness. But if we were going to start over, it would sure be nice to start with adequate staff and faculty and funding for the programs. Not always having to rob Peter to pay Paul and short-changing programs. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
Governing Board member Linda Rosenthal cautioned against the “should have” or “could have” analysis, saying that the circumstances were quite unique to the Phoenix area. She stated:

I don’t think we understood the huge growth of the Valley. We knew it was going to grow, but I don’t think anybody could’ve anticipated 3.1 or 3.2 million [population] in 2005. And still growing. So, you know, we can always look back and say we could’ve and should’ve, but I’m not sure that we could be better prognosticators than we really are, than we really were. (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Former MCC President Wally Simpson reflected on what could be done differently, on the problems and challenges of start-up institutions, and on the lessons to be learned. As a person who has started several new institutions, he concluded:

You know, that’s some question. I’ve thought of that and I just had to smile because, having been through several start ups of colleges, I’d say that there always may be those things in hindsight, but I’m not so sure that in hindsight one makes the best decisions either. So I’d just like to go on record as saying I’m more than satisfied. In fact, I hold in great admiration that first adventuresome faculty and staff and especially the leadership provided by Arnette Ward. I don’t think I’d change a thing. (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006)
Successes and Accomplishments

I just think that espirit de corps that is so essential to making an institution do the right thing for students has always been at the heart of this institution. We have just been so fortunate to have this very eclectic group of people who bring such different skills to the table, but all in the nature of building a college that just has such a heartbeat of caring for students.

(L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

There were many individual and collective successes and accomplishments during the period of focus for this research, 1985-2005. Several people, not entirely in gest, spoke of the institution’s survival as a major accomplishment. For example, when asked, “What were the major successes or significant accomplishments of the college?” founding faculty member Alice Conkright said, “Oh, I think that it survived! It started from nothing and it survived” (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005). Physics faculty Robin McCord said, “Well the fact that we opened our doors, and that we’ve had tremendous growth” (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005).

But in addition to just surviving, a number of extraordinary successes and accomplishments were noted by interviewees. The first was that many employees were proud of the aviation program. They had had to fight for it and it was distinctive within the Maricopa Community Colleges. The second major pattern that emerged from the interviews was much more complex in that it had to do with the whole culture of the college, that is, the way in which the teaching and learning environment was shaped. Chancellor Paul Elsner reflected on the significance of that:
When you go back to think about Chandler-Gilbert and who is here and who came in on this campus, you all had a learning or an educational agenda. A lot of places don’t have that. … If you go on an accreditation visit and so forth, you see some nice things and some really great things, but if you go out and circulate among CEO’s and administrators and primarily the operational aspects of our work. We tend to lean more toward the operational. That was not the case at Chandler. You were really interesting. You looked at the students as the core central value here and you had ideas about how that would be done. And you argued them out and debated them among yourselves and set upon your own agenda. That’s more rare than we realize, frankly. As I said, it’s easy to hire people … I remember people who would come in for these jobs. They had tremendous places they had been, but they had no consecutive thoughts about what the agenda should be. What’s the educational agenda? Where is it? What do they want to do? And I thought Chandler-Gilbert distinguished itself in a major way in that respect. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Interviewees mentioned instructional initiatives in the areas of active learning, service-learning, and learning communities; the emphasis on faculty development and innovation; and the institutional culture that supported these efforts as the major successes and accomplishments. Thus this section is organized with headings for aviation, active learning, service-learning, learning communities, faculty development, innovation, and college culture.
Aviation

Among the many successes of the college was the establishment of an aviation program, unique within the Maricopa Community Colleges. Many of the people interviewed for this research study discussed it. Here is a sampling of the comments:

- The aviation program was a big deal, a really big deal…. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
- …one of the things that was high profile for us for quite some time was the aviation program because we had to petition the State Board [of Community Colleges] to be able to even have it. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)
- …it is certainly known for the aviation program and all its manifestations. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)
- I think we’re known for the aviation program. (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2005)
- Let’s see, significant accomplishments, definitely the AMT [aviation maintenance technology] program. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)
- Our aviation program is very well known. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)
- The first one that came to my mind was aviation because it is so special. … I would say that would be one of our signature programs. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
• Then there are certain academic programs that I think that we are known for, some of them because of their uniqueness, some of them because we do it so well. Aviation, as an example, is a program that there aren’t many like it, and we do it well. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

• I can remember when they were talking about aviation and I thought [grunts] aviation, and you know and it’s just amazing … the dreams … that you would hear these things and to watch them come full circle and now we just take it for granted. And people will say don’t you guys have an aviation program?

Yes, we do! [laughs]. (J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

So, why and how did CGCC begin an aviation program? Arnette Ward recalled the beginnings of the program:

There was Williams [Air Force Base] and the municipal airport. At the municipal airport there were plans for the next 15 years that they would widen their runways and renovate and expand facilities. They wanted aviation mechanics. Establishing an aviation program became my first big, big experience in politics at the community college level. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Margaret Hogan recalled that America West, which during the time of this research merged with U. S. Airways, was advocating for a local aircraft mechanics training program. She described their situation, “America West Airlines opened up and they wanted to support a program that prepared employees for them and so they were real champions of the college. Donated a lot of equipment and money” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).
Chuck Bedal was a math teacher but, as a full-time faculty member, had responsibilities for helping with many new programs. He remembered that there was a part-time instructor who was teaching for CGCCC at the time:

There was a person who was teaching aircraft maintenance and the school had rented a facility on Gilbert Road and Warner [sic], I’ll say a barn or kind of a warehouse type thing. They had parts of aircraft; they had a wing and a fuselage and an engine and so forth. This person, whose name I don’t remember, taught the classes there. He started a very nice program, and it became quite popular.

In 1987 when we moved to this campus, Margaret asked him to expand the program and maybe even go to a rented facility because we were renting classrooms at the airport. We were teaching math, English and reading at the airport because we ran out of classrooms here. I guess Margaret’s idea was if we are going to rent facilities out at the airport, actually hanger space is what it was, we could have the aircraft maintenance out there and expand the program. At the time, the instructor who was teaching the classes was so busy. He said if he ended up doubling the amount of time he spent with the program he would end up having a heart attack and dying at a very young age. Needless to say, he declined Margaret’s offer…. (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

John Underwood was hired as the first residential faculty member in aviation in 1988. He recalled that things were underway upon his arrival:
The whole discussion of the aviation program had started before I actually got here in ’88, and there was some existing faculty, Dave Weaver, some other folks, that were working with an Advisory Council that had already been put in place. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

But having an interest or willingness, along with a few courses, was not in itself sufficient. Occupational programs needed to be approved by the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges which was in operation at that time. Cochise College in Douglas, Arizona, had an airframe and powerplant (A&P) program and they were certain that if the Maricopa Community College system started an aviation program, Cochise would be put out of the aviation business. Phoenix-based aviation companies felt that it was impractical to send their employees to Douglas for training, while others felt that too few students who wanted to explore careers in aviation would relocate to Douglas. Thus there was a push for a program in the metropolitan Phoenix area. With CGCCC already offering a few classes in the area, and three airports in close proximity (Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport, Williams Air Force Base, and Chandler Regional Airport), MCCCD asked CGCCC to take the leadership for establishing an aviation program. With no residential faculty members in the area, physics faculty David Weaver helped with curriculum development along with several adjunct faculty in aviation, while Margaret Hogan pursued industry connections.

MCC President Larry Christiansen recalled that there was internal debate within CGCCC and MCCCD as to whether CGCCC was the college best positioned to take on this important initiative. He said discussion surrounded:
...the continued emphasis on workforce development, and the evolution in terms of exactly where Chandler-Gilbert would stake out its niche, with its first program in aviation. And people will either cheer or condemn that decision, but it was a decision. And it was one that the college made with pride and it was kind of this next statement out to I’m going to be involved statewide, I’m going to be involved on the national scene with this program and do a number of things. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Gil Gonzales confirmed that CGCCC’s strategy was to select one or two occupational programs that would be prominent:

I would say the one major initiative we had that was outside of delivering a strong, sound community college associate degree program, was the aviation program, which was one of the things that we partnered with America West on, and built facilities around, that would prepare aircraft mechanics, of which there was a significant need for it at the time. So we picked one or two very predominant types of occupational programs that were there and put our stake in the ground as a national, regional organization. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Achieving approval to move forward involved a monumental political struggle involving Chancellor Paul Elsner, MCC President Wally Simpson, then followed by MCC President Larry Christiansen, and Provost Arnette Ward. Ward recalled:

My gosh, poor Paul, he and Dr. Simpson, it was terrific. I found out about small versus large among districts, and boy, we stepped into the quagmire
of whatever because only one institution for almost 18 years or 20 years had an aviation flight [sic] program and they were determined not to allow anyone else – especially Maricopa County to get involved. But we fought it, and Paul fought it for us at the State Board because it was a definite request from Chandler, as well as Gilbert. They helped each other out on this request. They traveled with us to the different State Board meetings all over the State to give support for the aviation program. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

State Board approval finally came in June 1988, with several caveats, as reported in the Arizona Republic:

An aircraft-maintenance program has been approved for Chandler-Gilbert Community College after the college reached an agreement with Cochise College in Douglas, which runs a similar program. The state Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona voted Saturday to allow the maintenance program, which will be licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration, after the agreement was reached between the colleges in Maricopa and Cochise counties. Cochise, which has invested about $6 million in its program, initially had objected to the new Chandler-Gilbert program, saying the second program would kill the 20-year-old program in Douglas, which draws about 40 percent of its 125 students each year from the Valley. But the objections were withdrawn after Chandler-Gilbert agreed to limit its enrollment to 50 for the first two years, participate in a joint recruiting program and share instructional materials,
scholarships, and a computerized job-placement network. … About 100 students a year have attended non-certified aircraft-maintenance classes at Chandler-Gilbert since 1985, Hogan said. Many of those students already are employed by Valley aircraft companies, such as America West Airlines, McDonnell Douglas and Garrett Industries. (McCowan, 1988) The special arrangements with Cochise would become problematic for Chandler-Gilbert. John Underwood described the situation:

Part of the politics was we had another community college to the south of us, Cochise Community College, who had an existing aviation program that had been around since 1968. So one of those major initiatives was to change the mindset of the State Board, that there really was a need for another FAA approved aviation program in the metropolitan Phoenix area. And so between the State Board Representative that we had, the input from Dr. Christiansen, because we were still under Mesa Community College, the State Board agreed to allow Maricopa to have, not a rival program, but a similar program, like Cochise College had, but it came with attachments. For six years I met before the State Governing Board to respond to this 10-point agreement that we had in terms of what we could do and what we couldn’t do that would not impact Cochise College. And while the fact [is] that we were able to start our college, part of the significant impact was, we were constrained by how we could grow, for those next six years. And I think that was a critical turning point for Chandler-Gilbert because, normally when programs start you want to be
able to start and move, and we were sort of held back for six years, to do the kinds of things that we wanted to do. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

John Underwood also described the evolution of Paul Elsner’s thinking in regard to some programs being unique to a singular Maricopa college. Up until that time, each college determined what they would offer and if other colleges felt their local communities needed that program, they would also offer it. The costs involved with a major workforce development program such as aviation prompted some new thinking. John Underwood remembered:

I think another significant event is at one of the State Board meetings up in Springerville. I was sitting with Arnette and Chancellor Elsner at the time, and he was kind of giving us his vision of what Maricopa can do, and specifically the aviation program. And his vision was that we don’t replicate this program, this becomes the Maricopa flagship program, it’s housed at Chandler-Gilbert. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Arnette Ward recalled finally achieving approval by the State Board as one of the most significant accomplishments during her time as Provost and then President of Chandler-Gilbert:

When we actually received approval to do the aviation program, because it was such a political hot-potato between community colleges across the state. Even though the first program was at Cochise College. It’s sort of like when the little brothers [the rural community college districts] see one
little brother [Cochise] in trouble, all the little brothers band together
against the big brother, which was Maricopa. It was a tough time. What it
did is it established Chandler-Gilbert as a place you would have to reckon
with one way or the other. CAC [Central Arizona College] or any of the
other colleges within the [state] system would have to reckon with us. Just
because we were an extension campus, it did not mean we were going to
be an extension forever. We were standing tall.

So that really put us on the map, so to speak. That struggle, that
challenge. Usually when Maricopa took things to the State Board, the
Chancellor may have gone, but he would not have to intervene. The
facilities director would do whatever was necessary. If it was an academic
program, the Vice Chancellor would be there to speak to it. This was one
that Paul had to pull out all of his know-how to fight for the right to have
an aviation program. So that was a turning point. It helped to put us on
the map. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Securing State Board approval only provided the opportunity to begin the
program, but it didn’t mean that it was adequately planned within MCCCD and CGCCC.

John Underwood explained:

One of the major challenges, and I probably should’ve mentioned this
earlier, is there clearly wasn’t enough funding when I started this program.
I think if I remember right, Arnette [Ward] told me that there was like
$250,000, which was a lot of money back then, to start this aviation
program. And I can remember going to, at that time it was probably like a
FAC [Financial Advisory Council] meeting, or a CDAC [Capital Development Advisory Council] meeting or something where there were a bunch of people sitting around that I didn’t know at the time—Vice Chancellors, Board members, faculty—discussing whether or not they’re going to fund projects. And I remember Arnette taking me and she sat me down in the back. She was presenting to this group and I remember Dr. Waechter sitting there and a bunch of other folks. And then Margaret Hogan came up and was answering some questions about what was going on. I’m sitting there just biting at the chomps because I knew that $250,000 wasn’t going to get it, not knowing the community college culture. The fact that I was a Retired Chief Master Sergeant willing to do what I needed to get something going, I just simply stood up and walked to the front of the room, and Arnette looked at me, and Margaret looked at me, and I started to address Dr. Waechter [Vice Chancellor of Human Resources], and I said, $250,000 isn’t going to get it. I need more money. And so they started drilling me. So we ended up getting $450,000. But even still that was a small amount compared to what we needed to do. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Funding within MCCCD was never adequate, so the college turned to local companies for support. Andy Bernal remembered that America West Airlines, in particular, provided funding, equipment, marketing, and moral support:

And we had quite a bit of industry interest especially from America West. We got a lot of support from the industry to get that started. Without the
industry support, we could’ve never gotten it started. There was one man in particular and I don’t remember his name—he’s the Operations Manager [sic] for America West—and he helped us tremendously for the program. Getting it started, funded, and getting the word out. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

With the help of former Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan, the researcher determined that the America West executive was Don Monteath. A Phoenix Gazette article in 1989 quoted Monteath:

“The state has not been able to produce enough maintenance personnel out of Douglas to meet the industry’s need,” America West Airlines executive Don Monteath said. “My company has had to go out of state to hire close to 500 people to staff our maintenance force. Along with America West, other companies that have worked for more than three years with the Maricopa County Community College District in establishing the program are McDonnell Douglas Helicopter, Garrett Industries, Standard Aero and Northrop Corp. Monteath, who also serves as president of the program’s advisory board, said the companies are committed to helping recruit students, provide scholarships, and place graduates in jobs. (Fernau, 1989, p. SE-1)

The CGCCC facilities planning document had an excerpt from a newspaper column printed in 1990 about the aviation program. It stated:

The airport, located fifteen miles northwest of Chandler is home to America West Airlines and a major hub for Southwest Airlines of Dallas.
Sky Harbor is potentially a major employer of Chandler residents.

America West has supported the college’s efforts to train aircraft maintenance technicians and equip them with skills needed to work on modern jet aircraft. How the community of Chandler feels about the Aircraft Maintenance Technician (AMT) program is reflected in the following quotation: “The news that the FAA has raised the enrollment [possibilities] for aviation mechanic enrollees at CGCCC is a shot in the arm for both CGCCC and the city of Chandler. We hope that funding of permanent teaching facilities at the airport will soon be forthcoming. The CGCCC aviation program at the airport [Chandler Airpark] will greatly enhance the training and attract other fixed-based operations at the airport” (McGowan, Community Columnist, September, 1990). (Master plan update & 10-year capital development plan, 1992-2002, 1992, p. 5)

After the initial establishment of the program, the hiring of the first several faculty members, and the securing of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval, the program began to grow. John Underwood moved from a faculty to a management position as a 12-month program director. He remembered that:

…the next event was with Dr. De la Santos who at that time was a Vice Chancellor for Instruction. He really challenged me. He wanted a 10-year plan. What am I going to do with the aviation program? This was like on a Thursday, and he wanted it by the following Monday. So like a good military man, I snapped to, I said okay, and so I put together this proposed 10-year plan that included the expansion of the existing aviation program,
the avionics program, the flight program, the construction technology, and how those things would materialize over a 10-year plan. And so that drove the next direction of where we were going with those kinds of things. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

The closure of the Williams Air Force Base and the subsequent assignment of the MCCCD footprint at Williams as an extension of Chandler-Gilbert Community College was discussed earlier in this chapter. To recap, many different entities wanted a portion of the base. A consortium of educational, training and research organizations headed by Arizona State University vied for a large portion of the base. The Maricopa Community Colleges proposed that a portion of the footprint be given to the community colleges. CGCC’s aviation program became a major reason why MCCCD was given a portion of the base. As this was occurring around 1993 and 1994, Larry Christiansen, President of MCC, was also serving on the Board of East Valley Partnership (EVP). EVP advocated, along with East Valley Think Tank (EVTT), for the use of Williams as an educational facility, anchored by aviation programs at ASU and CGCC. Larry Christiansen recounted traveling to the State Board meeting to advocate for lessening the restrictions on CGCC’s aviation program, that were a result of the Cochise College concerns:

One of the things that comes to mind though, is where I had some direct input with Arnette—and we worked it and we worked it hard—was the aviation program. And the State Board met up at, I was going to say Payson but that’s not right, but someplace in one of the rural community colleges, and John Underwood and I traveled to convince the State Board that an agreement that they made years before that Cochise would have the
only aviation program was bad politics. And how this program at Chandler-Gilbert was a good program to be putting in place. ... And I was traveling there for two purposes, one was to support Arnette as a colleague, but two was that I was the President of the East Valley Partnership, and we felt that it was critical to bring an aviation program to Williams, because of the Base closure and the things that were playing out at the time. And it was brutal, the anger, the politics, the harshness, the need to defend [the] program was a way that I got to know Arnette and John Underwood a lot better. But it was really a symbol of how hard it is to build program and get it in place and to have people buy in.... (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

John Underwood agreed that the closure of the Williams Air Force Base was significant in the development of the aviation program. It provided facilities as well as a major presence for CGCC’s relatively new program. In 1995, a ribbon cutting ceremony was held to celebrate the inauguration of the Williams aviation facility (Figure 29). Underwood described the boost provided by assignment of part of the former base to CGCC’s aviation program:

The closure of Williams Air Force Base was probably the most significant, in the fact that it provided a new window of opportunity, not only for Chandler-Gilbert and the District, but more specifically for the aviation program, to sort of anchor an educational institution at the Williams Air Force Base, and then it turned out to be the Williams Campus. In a very significant way it brought on new partnerships, like the University of
North Dakota for their flight training program. And probably those events helped drive the success, with the backing, of course, from the business community, and a very, very strong Advisory Council, to move the aviation program where it is today. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Figure 29. Ribbon cutting ceremony for the aviation program. Pictured from left to right are: Jerry Brooks, Mayor of Chandler; Margaret Hogan, Assistant Provost; John Underwood, Aviation Program Director; Linda Rosenthal, MCCCD Governing Board; Dr. Paul Elsner, Chancellor of MCCC; and behind him are Larry Christiansen, President of Mesa Community College and Arnette Ward, Provost of CGCC.
The aviation program had moved to several temporary facilities during its first several years of operation and now it had a permanent home at the Williams Campus. It had begun in a storage warehouse off of Frye Road, approximately seven miles west of the Pecos Campus, in about 18,000 GSF of space. John Underwood remembered that site:

We were at an off-site location, so we had virtually nothing, and connectivity wasn’t something that happened back in ’88 and ’89 so there was a lot of faith, from Arnette, from Margaret, and everybody else, that this small group of renegades in this other location are doing what they’re supposed to be doing everyday, and doing what we’re supposed to do for our students, and grow programs…. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

The second site for the program was at the Chandler Airport. George Varga, a long-standing member of the Aviation Advisory Council, helped make those arrangements. Underwood remembered that:

And then, a couple years later I opened up a second campus, or a second extension campus at the Chandler Airport, through George Varga of Varga Enterprises. We rented a facility and we actually split the program, put the aviation-related on one side, power plant on the other, but by doing that, by getting a presence on the Chandler Airport, we then got involved with the Chandler business councils and the Mayor, and then we started
talking about expanding. And we actually had donated land prepared to
move the aviation program to property there at the Chandler Airport.

And then, about that same time, the Williams Air Force Base
closure came up. We had this window of opportunity. Do we stay at
Chandler? Do we move to the Williams Campus? Obviously we moved
to the Williams Campus, and it was a good move, because we clearly had
more opportunities to expand and do the kinds of things outlined in my
10-year plan. It would help us get to where we wanted to go. (J.
Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

He also recalled that obtaining FAA certification in January 1989 was a major
step. He recounted this as one of the victories along the way:

You may not remember when Arnette basically told me you get 60 days to
get this program up and running. They had hired me in July and they
wanted to start in August, and I said, “I’m Superman, but I’m not that
super.” And so we actually didn’t get certified until January of ’89. So I
think the fact that the State Board allowed us to start this program was
significant in itself. The next major significant event was that the FAA
approved us, and they continued to support the program as a group. And
then I think as we moved on, we have the Williams closure, and that
allowed the programs to grow and expand and do these other kinds of
things. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)
Thinking about the components of the aviation program, Underwood recalled the 10-year plan that he had developed at the request of Dr. Alfredo de los Santos, MCCCD Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs. He said:

In reality, all of the things that were proposed in this 10-year plan [for aviation program development], actually happened, surprisingly. They didn’t happen exactly when I thought they were going to happen, they were usually a couple of years off. … We had an FAA approved program, now, an airframe and powerplant program; we then branched out into an avionics program. … After that came the construction technology program, and then the flight training program. So, in a timeframe from 1992 to about 1996, the rest of that 10-year plan really began to materialize. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Underwood said that despite success in getting the program established in the former Air Force base facilities, the curriculum in two areas never fully materialized, as he had thought it would:

The parts that probably didn’t materialize the way I thought they would were the avionics program and the construction technology program. And I think if I can reflect back on that I think it was too much mass, in terms of programs for the existing staff that we had. And so we were expecting our staff to be able to be experts in these four major categories, and it was asking too much. And so I think, when I look back on it, the four initial instructors that we hired, that were hand picked for their expertise, to move the direction that I thought we needed to move, just couldn’t take on
those additional areas. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

The aviation faculty were a special group of individuals, each with a specific area of expertise. John Underwood had responsibility for hiring and supervising them in the early years. He described why each was selected:

I’d be remiss if I didn’t say that the four full-time instructors that we hired, brought it all together. I picked them. Yes, let me tell you about them. I mean, they’re still here, so that tells you that we did something right. We picked the right people. But I had this vision of what I needed to make this 10-year plan work.

And so I needed somebody that had a very, very strong background in general [aviation] education, and I found this person named Harvey Stone, who was working up at Thunderbird Air Park at the time. And I was going around trying to figure out who am I going to hire, what do I need to do, and amongst all the other stuff you guys gave me to do. And so Harvey Stone was not your typical academia person; he was a grunt. But I needed that grunt to understand and work with the general businesses.

And then my next choice came on board which was actually Bashir Khalil. Bashir was a challenge. He was a smart, smart person that had gobs of experience in avionics and electronics, and aviation, but his expertise was in the avionics and electronics, and I knew I had to have
somebody with those kinds of strong skills to move the rest of the programs that I wanted to get here so we brought on Bashir Khalil.

And then there was Joe McCourt, because I recognized that while I had an academic background, it was military academic, military schools, military funding and those types of things; it wasn’t true academia. And so Joe McCourt took the task, because he had been teaching at other A&P [airframe and powerplant] schools, at a university, at that time I believe he had his master’s degree, but he had the kind of academic credentials that I needed to share with the other two that didn’t have it, to help blend this whole group.

And then the piece that was missing is I wanted to move our program to be more technologically savvy, and that’s when John Schroeder came on board. John Schroeder had similar basic skills like everybody else in aviation maintenance and stuff, helicopter expansion stuff, but he had this experience with desktop publishing, which was new at that time. And I’m thinking, I want to be able to take these curriculums and do different kinds of things so we brought John on board, and John actually helped us move the curriculum and put it into a format where everybody could use [it]. At that time we were using Mac LC’s, and I had a little server set up and driving our IT folks crazy with what I wanted to do on this little site.

And so that core of four instructors really helped support how this 10-year plan was really going to work. And from there it moved. Because
I felt that I had the right people with the right kind of specific skills, collectively working together, to move what we needed to get done, and so far it looks like it worked out. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

The aviation students won numerous state and national awards and recognitions, which was also a tribute to the faculty and staff in the program. John Underwood described the Skills USA competition, in which students competed for several years:

That was an initiative I got involved with, at that time it was called Skills USA, and they had these programs across the U.S. [in] all occupational programs, and this happened probably in 1989, 1990, while the program was just starting. There was a state competition for aviation that probably had happened maybe 15, 20 years earlier, and it hadn't happened since. So I helped build that state recognition again, and so for the next six years or so, the Chandler-Gilbert aviation program participated in the State Olympic training, or Olympic competition, and every year, every time we competed we always took gold, silver, and bronze. Now because there was other competition, there were other schools that were competing, but I think the fact that we were successful was because had good, good, quality instructors, and so I think that was part of it. But the other part of that was those individuals, those that won the gold, and I think every time we went to the national competition, I think we went six times to the nationals.

When we went our very first year, I remember the State Director for the Skill Olympics telling me, “Now don’t get upset John if you don’t at least
place, that’ll be a good experience.” We came back with the gold, I mean, we wiped them out. And that was what happened every time we went, we would either get the gold, or we’d get the silver. Every time I took them they got the gold. Every time somebody else took them they’d get a silver, but I won’t go there [laughs]. And so that drove home not only to the businesses, that there was a good quality program that was going on out here. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

College materials and reports proclaimed with pride, “In the last four years, at the National Vocational Skills Olympics, CGCC aviation students have taken gold or silver medals every year” ("Annual report to the Governor 1995-1996," 1996, p. 16).

Program inception and formation have been discussed, as have curriculum, faculty and students. There were three other facets of the program that John Underwood and others thought were significant to its success: the Aviation Advisory Council, the annual Aviation Maintenance Symposium, and the partnership with the University of North Dakota Aerospace.

All occupational programs within MCCCD have curricular advisory councils whose primary purpose is to make sure that the college curriculum aligns with needed job skills. However, often the community members who sit on advisory councils also help in finding adjunct faculty, in securing donations, and in promoting the program. John Underwood held the Aviation Advisory Council members in high regard. He stated:

I think if you talk to people that were in the District, and knew what was going on at Chandler-Gilbert, I think one of the things that people would remember is that the Aviation Advisory Council was like no other
Advisory Board that any other occupational program had ever had, or ever seen…. They met on a monthly basis, they were engaged, they were into the politics, they helped with the city. So all of the original board members, there was Don Monteath who was the VP of Operations [sic] for America West, who by the way now sells real estate in Payson I think it is. You had Jerry, Ex-Mayor of Chandler, ...Jerry Brooks, thank you. I mean you had some community members that were engaged in what was going on. You had Varga Enterprises, George Varga, who was probably the longest standing board member the 16 years that I had been there. He was still on that Advisory Council. So I think the Advisory Board was key. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

The partnership with the University of North Dakota (UND) Aerospace Foundation was considered a major kudo for CGCC, as UND had one of the top aviation schools in the country. John Underwood recounted the benefits of working with another institution:

Probably another one is the partnership with the University of North Dakota. You know that came around, basically in 1994, ’95, but it really started to develop, as early at 1992, when we were first looking at the Williams Air Force Base as an educational institution, and how we could partner with other universities to do the kinds of things that we wanted to do. One key component to the reason why we wanted to partner with another private institution, was to ensure that we didn’t add an additional high-cost program onto the taxpayers of Arizona. A flight program was a
very, very expensive undertaking. I learned from what Cochise had run into, because they had a flight program down at Cochise College. As we began to look at their history, it was a very, very expensive program. They had airplanes, mechanics, and they had to have a runway, and so the direction that I took was well let’s partner with somebody who already had all of that and leverage our resources. And so I think bringing on the University of North Dakota as a partner for a flight training program, just added to the potential that the Chandler-Gilbert program could actually have. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

In March 2006, the Aviation Division celebrated its tenth annual aviation maintenance symposium, held in conjunction with the FAA. The symposium attracts hundreds of participants who want to keep informed about aviation topics, while updating their certifications. The faculty coordinate the several-day event with support from the FAA and local businesses. John Underwood described it as a significant event:

The Aviation Symposium, now that’s been going on goodness, what six, seven years, at least...longer, nine years. And that was a huge, huge undertaking. I remember sitting down talking with Arnette and some of the other administrators, and we’re trying to figure out where is the value added to Chandler-Gilbert to do this kind of thing, and it was hard to put our finger on it, but what it really was, was recognition and marketing the program. People now know, or did know, they obviously recognized it, that the aviation program is more than just a training program; it’s a community program that invites the community back in and it wants to
give back to the community, and I think that’s been an event that is well
recognized now across the U.S. because you had business from all over
the 50 states, including Puerto Rico one time. Obviously the Williams
Gateway Airport has benefited from those kinds of events, and that has
lead to other opportunities for other job training, for other kinds of
programs. (J. Underwood, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

The aviation program is considered a crown jewel, one of the major successes or
accomplishments at Chandler-Gilbert Community College. Despite the fact that there
were challenges, external and internal, the program has continued to develop and produce
quality aircraft mechanics and other aviation professionals.

Faculty and staff alike spoke of their pride in the program, even when they had to
forego other priorities. For example, communications faculty Diane Travers recalled:

I remember as division chair going to the division chair meetings and just
being so frustrated with … okay, we didn’t have enough money for
everyone’s needs and then aircraft maintenance technology would come in
and want this huge cut of the pie and I remember, if John Underwood
wasn’t such a nice guy, we would’ve really hated him. It was very capital
intensive and it was very frustrating, very challenging I think, to separate
myself from being an advocate for just my department and my division,
and look at the big picture of everyone’s needs, and be able to make some
hard decisions that maybe we could do with less so that more capital
intensive programs, occupational programs could make it with a little
more. And it was quite an exercise in being as objective as you could be
to make this occupational program go which it’s done really well over the years. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

Governing Board member Linda Rosenthal summarized, “There’s a lot of history there with the State Board and the Douglas Campus … all of the machinations that we went through,” but the college still takes great pride in this unique program (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Cooperative and Collaborative Learning

Engaging students actively in their learning had been the focus of college effort since its formation. Initially, there was an emphasis on using technology in classrooms and having students focus on reading and writing. From this grew the college’s cooperative learning initiative. Physics faculty member David Weaver was the college’s first Staff Development Coordinator. He remembered that “one of the major emphases was the idea that we wanted to do active learning in all of its various forms and formats and the first one that we really adopted as a campus was cooperative learning” (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

When Marybeth Mason was hired in the summer of 1990, she had had experience in faculty development and specifically expertise in David and Roger Johnson’s cooperative learning theory in the Mesa Public Schools. When Weaver stepped down from the role to go on sabbatical, Mason assumed the role of Faculty Development Coordinator and put in place a program to teach faculty how to incorporate active learning strategies into their classrooms to enhance critical reading and writing (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 1). Marybeth Mason explained, “…if you really understand cooperative
learning you understand that students need to move into groups and they need to be doing something. They need to be basically reading, writing, talking, or computing” (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005).

Founding faculty member Alice Conkright spoke about the role that Mason played in moving forward major college teaching and learning initiatives:

With my history, I think when Marybeth Mason came, this was a significant development. She was such an energetic, dynamic, confident person with her values, which were collaborative learning, service-learning and getting out of the classroom, hands-on kinds of teaching and technology, rather than subject focused, which is my value to be honest. She was able to make these the important initiatives on the campus. A lot of campus resources were devoted to them. People were hired because of service-learning. Student services supported it. I know that national attention was given to the campus because of service-learning. The collaborative learning structure that she proposed for classroom teaching became the established style. Lots of money was put into teaching people how to do that—workshops, reinforcement materials, and so on. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

The 1996 Self-Study Report for reaccreditation documented that cooperative learning had been a faculty development initiative since 1991 with faculty and administration placing “a strong emphasis on cooperative learning and other active learning strategies to improve student achievement, retention, critical thinking, and personal development” ("Self-study report 1996," 1996, p. 147).
In the fall of 1991, with money from a District Lodestar Grant, Marybeth Mason brought in Roger and David Johnson from the University of Minnesota. The Johnsons’ workshops were well attended by at least 75 residential and adjunct faculty (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 2). In discussions following the Johnsons’ visit to CGCCC, it was agreed that a focus on cooperative, or as it was also called, collaborative learning should be a college-wide initiative. The first workshop was offered on Monday, October 14, 1991 (M. Mason, personal communication, October 10, 1991). Onsite trainings at both the foundation level and secondary level were subsequently available for faculty each semester for several years. In a memo to faculty on August 19, 1993, for example, Marybeth Mason explained how the training was offered:

Dates, Time, and Place: I will be offering the foundation training in Collaborative Learning on Mondays, from 2-5:00, beginning September 13, in room B65. The training consists of 6 workshops to be held every other week over a twelve week period. The dates of the workshops will be Sept. 13, 27, Oct. 11, 25, Nov. 8, 22. We will try to offer the training again next spring in the evenings. Incentives: Residential faculty will receive one professional growth workshop credit for attending, and adjunct faculty will receive a $100 stipend for participation. Better than nothing! (M. Mason, personal communication, August 19, 2003)

Further, Mason described the nature and content of the workshop series, as well as the benefits to students:

The workshop series will include model lessons and practical strategies for incorporating collaborative learning activities into your instruction. The
research clearly indicates that when group activities are carefully structured to include the essential elements of a cooperative lesson, students attain higher level reasoning, greater achievement and intrinsic motivation to learn, and increased retention. In addition, students develop more positive attitudes toward faculty and school. Faculty enjoy being able to meet with other faculty regularly to discuss and share teaching ideas. (M. Mason, personal communication, August 19, 2003)

Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan, who had originally been hired in MCCCD to support faculty development, was instrumental in encouraging faculty involvement in cooperative learning. She “strong armed” people into participating and incorporated cooperative learning directly into the faculty evaluation process with support from the Division Chair Council (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 1). In fact, in materials contributed by faculty member Melinda Rudibaugh as a result of this research, there are reports of residential and adjunct faculty members who had completed cooperative learning foundation training as well as the followup training. By 1992, 16 residential faculty members, or approximately half, had completed the training (M. Mason, personal communication, December 4, 1992). By August of 1994, of the approximately 40 residential faculty, 32 are listed as having completed the foundation training in cooperative learning (Mason, 1994, p. 1).

David Weaver remembered that the Division Chair Council saw themselves as instructional leaders and embraced this form of active learning as a college-wide goal. He recalled:
… we made the decision to pursue or emphasize cooperative learning and we set as a campus goal through the Chairs Council that we’d have 70 percent of our faculty that had gone through training for cooperative learning, and I really think it started some of the trends, for this campus, to really be able to grab an initiative that we thought important, really embrace it as an institution and move it through the years. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Communications faculty member Diane Travers confirmed that the message was clear and pervasive, and that it was easy to get started with these new concepts in classrooms because of the support that was provided. She recalled, “We started hearing about active learning, collaborative learning, and took courses on that and workshops and then started dabbling in it, and through those first few times of being unsure and uncertain, found that it was working” (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005). Barbara Shovers who taught English as a Second Language classes also quickly determined that “the collaborative learning techniques were more effective” (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Faculty and administrative teams went to national workshops to learn more. One group that included David Weaver, Melinda Rudibaugh, Margaret Hogan, and Maria Harper-Marinick from the District Office went to further training by the Johnsons in Breckinridge, Colorado. Another team which included Andy Bernal, Marybeth Mason, Brenda Larson, Pam Davenport, and Barbara Shovers went to the Johnsons training in Minnesota (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 2).
President Ward remembered that initially she was a little skeptical about the faculty excitement, but once she had a chance to visit their classrooms and see students enjoying their learning experience, she was sold on the idea. Ward explained:

I would kind of frown a little bit and say but you have to kind of show me what that it is and sure enough they had it all laid out. “Come to my class!” The first time I have ever been invited to a class. So I’d go and I’d see all this change, students actually talking to one another in the classroom, and the learning and teaching process, and feeling comfortable with everything. That was wonderful. I even went to a national conference on cooperative learning, and it was great. I came back knowing what I wanted to help faculty do. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Marybeth Mason was honored as CGCC and MCCCD Innovator of the Year in 1992 for establishing cooperative learning at CGCC. She taught the workshops herself for several years and then started reaching out to other faculty leaders to teach the workshops. Mason recalled:

Faculty were engaged over the course of the semester and then subsequently we had a level two training to practice – moving students into groups, selecting groups, designing activities where student would work in cooperative groups together. It was a huge shift for many faculty members who had been used to standing up and lecturing and it was a pretty elaborate faculty development model. And I did that for a number of semesters, I do not remember how many. But like anything, I wanted
to move on to Service-Learning and so I got other people to sustain that. Melinda [Rudibaugh] was wonderful. Brenda Larson was wonderful. They both starting teaching the cooperative learning class, multiple levels. (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Faculty found that it was easier to do many of the structured cooperative learning activities when they had longer class periods such as those on Tuesdays and Thursdays which were 75 minutes long, as opposed to the three 50-minute class periods on the Monday-Wednesday-Friday class schedule. Discussion ensued about restructuring the class schedule to make additional longer class periods available. Eventually the college created a class schedule unlike any other in Maricopa whereby classes were held Monday-Wednesday, Tuesday-Thursday, and Friday-Saturday. Additionally, there was a “community hour” built into the middle of the day, when teachers could bring in guest speakers and plan for joint class activities. Librarian Larry Miller remembered when this change was made and described the rationale:

You know one other decision we made that really changed things and made us separate from the other campuses and as faculty we talked about it a lot and that was going to a Monday-Wednesday, Tuesday-Thursday class. There had been so many of us that had done research on how do students learn, what's the best way, that we realized it would really help the students, in most classes if we went to the longer class periods, even though it was only twice a week. (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)
The Self-Study Report of 1996 described the specifics of the alternative class schedule and the community hour:

Since 1991 a primary focus of faculty development has been on cooperative learning. As a result of this emphasis, in 1993, the faculty determined that longer class periods are preferable; therefore, starting in 1994, CGCC offers courses varying in length from 75 to 180 minutes, over a six-day week, rather than the traditional three day a week, 50 minute class periods. Classes meet on a Monday/Wednesday, Tuesday/Thursday, Friday/Saturday, Friday and Saturday, or one day a week format. (Exceptions are certain foreign language and math courses which meet four or five days a week.) In addition to accommodating better teaching practices, the new schedule has allowed the college to expand course offerings and use classroom space more effectively.

At the same time we instituted the new schedule, the college established a “Community Hour” from 12:15 to 1:15 Monday through Friday, during which time classes are not generally offered, allowing for special events and opportunities for students to take advantage of college services, such as tutoring or cooperative study groups; meet with faculty, advisors, or counselors; and use the library and computer labs.

Students are overwhelmingly satisfied with the Monday/Wednesday, Tuesday/Thursday, Friday/Saturday class schedule, with 93% of survey respondents finding the schedule of classes convenient. ("Self-study report 1996," 1996, p. 129)
Over time, the emphasis on cooperative learning and other active learning strategies impacted other areas of the college. Because faculty wanted their students to be able to get knee-to-knee and eye-to-eye for group discussions, there were requests to have more flexible furniture. In fact, many of the classrooms in the C building were built slightly larger than normal classrooms with the idea that students would be encouraged to move around the room, arrange themselves in groups, and otherwise be involved in active classrooms. Mason remembered:

As a result of that movement, furniture was ordered differently on this campus. We got rid of stand-alone desks and you see a lot of tables and chairs. That is one thing we did well in terms of planning space. When you look at this campus it looks like a campus where cooperative learning and collaborative learning is valued, by looking in every single classroom, by the configuration of furniture. (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

In the fall of 1996, when the accreditation Self-Study Team visited CGCC, they concluded:

An active teaching/learning strategy permeates the college’s instructional efforts. This strategy calls for a de-emphasis on the lecture method, the use of collaborative learning activities, the adoption of service learning as a tool of cognitive, behavioral, and affective development, outcomes assessment as a means of quality enhancement, and a focus on the learner as family. The implementation of this strategy is a strength of the college. (Gibson et al., 1996, p. 53)
The cooperative learning initiative established the foundation upon which other innovations have been launched such as service-learning and learning communities. Those will be discussed further in the next sections of this chapter. However, it should be noted that 10 years from the time of the last Self-Study Visit in 1996, residential faculty are still trained in active learning strategies and CGCC faculty continue to teach the active learning courses at CGCC and on a district-wide basis.

It was gratifying to the faculty and administration to receive the results of the 2005 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) whereby CGCC was recognized as one of the nation’s high performing colleges in Active and Collaborative Learning in 2005 ("Annual report to the Governor, 2005-2006," 2006). The goal is still “to inspire and motivate students toward the common purpose of maximizing each other’s learning” ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006, p. 119).

Service-Learning

For his book, *The Learning Paradigm College* (2003), John Tagg researched fundamental changes that were occurring in higher education. His book includes a section on actively engaging students with the curriculum and in their communities. Tagg highlights CGCC service-learning program and explains that the foundation of CGCC’s program had both of those concepts at its core:

There are many excellent examples of developing service-learning programs across the country. One of them is Chandler-Gilbert Community College in Chandler, Arizona, part of the ten-college Maricopa District that serves the city and suburbs of Phoenix. Chandler-
Gilbert is interesting because its service-learning program is an outgrowth of its prior commitment to collaborative and experiential learning. (Tagg, 2003, p. 171)

From those people who were interviewed for this research, it was clear that the service-learning program was considered one of the major successes of the college. Examples of their remarks included:

- I think certainly service-learning is something that we’ve made a name for ourselves nationally. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)
- We’re very big on service-learning, so much that people in colleges in other states are looking at us. (A. Jarvis, personal communication, June 23, 2005)
- I think that our faculty had managed to stay at the forefront of some of the educational trends. I think the college has become well known regarding our participation in service-learning and collaborative learning. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
- Our service-learning and collaborative learning and learning communities, I think, are well known. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)
- Service-learning certainly was a great success, accomplishment for this college, brought us lots of national attention…. I think that the learning communities followed the service-learning and I know both of those programs are still quite strong here. So those are the kinds of things that were really significant. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)
• Established a quality program of community volunteerism and service-learning, and that was a model for the District. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

• Service-learning, of course. I mean that was a real big one while I was there, during my tenure at Chandler-Gilbert. I think that service-learning was a big factor, I think, and a positive one at that. I thought it was a great program. (W. Matthews, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

• CGCC is heavily involved in service-learning. Students get to connect what they are learning with what they will be doing in the real world of work. It helps them to figure out if they’re in the right area of study. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

• I would have to say definitely the service-learning program. We’ve had several mentions in the state legislature for some of the accomplishments of these programs and a variety of these programs have led students to reconsider their academic goals and their professional choices. So it’s always worthwhile when what you do has a visible outcome, and profoundly changes people’s lives. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Governor Board member Nancy Stein recalled the faculty commitment and the student learning that permeated the service-learning program. In regard to college successes, she stated:

The first thing that I can really think of is your service-learning. That brought you to the forefront more than any other college. And I understand that some of the other community colleges do it, but you were
really the first. You believed in it. Your faculty, which are really
wonderful, they believed in it, and it just moved from faculty member to
faculty member. And it grew and it was something that I think the
community wanted. Many students grew with their experiences in the
community. And I think that was the biggest plus that you had. (N. Stein,
personal communication, June 21, 2005)

So why and how did this program get started? Vice President of Student Affairs
Lois Bartholomew remembered the national climate at the time:

On a national level, there was all this talk about students giving back and
the national service agenda that came in the ‘80s and ‘90s. Our
Chancellor Dr. Paul Elsner very much spoke to the engaged student
learner and he had this vision of how that would happen and Maricopa had
made many attempts at that, with some limited success. But because it
didn’t start with the faculty, it didn’t start with how you develop a
curriculum, I think that’s why it was limited. (L. Bartholomew, personal
communication, June 16, 2005)

Bartholomew recalled the start of the program at Chandler-Gilbert Community
College in the early 1990s:

Service-learning really started with two very talented faculty, Maria Hesse
and Marybeth Mason, who in my opinion are just fabulous teachers and
very dedicated to student learning. And they had this wonderful idea to
take students and what they were learning in the classroom and give them
real life experiences in the community that would then bring them back to
the classroom and reflect and help them gain problem solving skills, critical thinking skills, make them aware of the world that they lived in, make them better citizens, and build their self esteem. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

The college had been very involved in community service and volunteer experiences since the first student leadership group was formed in 1988. So through the combined efforts of the faculty and the student services staff, the program began. Bartholomew recounted that “Marybeth and Maria and Duane Oakes who had come as a program advisor in Student Life, our first program advisor here in Student Life, and myself, we got together” (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005).

What distinguished service-learning from other forms of service or volunteerism was an equal emphasis on service and learning. English faculty Marybeth Mason, who had brought cooperative learning to CGCC was the first to implement service-learning at CGCC. In the book Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good, the program was described:

The service learning pilot project completed in fall 93 was a great success with 22 students involved in the project serving 17 social agencies. Social problems studied included topics such as child abuse, drug abuse, employment discrimination, the elderly, gang and youth issues, homelessness, learning disabilities, nuclear power, pesticides, sex education, single parent families, and teen pregnancy. Agencies ranged from the Boys and Girls Club to the National Weather Service to the Special Olympics, and other settings including the courts, national forest,
nursing homes, homeless and abuse shelters, a pharmacy and a physical
therapy clinic. ("Integrating service learning into the curriculum," 1994,
p. 5)

The pilot was a major success. Students helped convince other students of its
value with their reflections. Comments from student journals included:

“I have realized the impact I can have on a person just by taking a few
hours a day to serve my community.” “I have learned that life isn’t really
easy. It requires dedication, support, and understanding.” “I have learned
that giving of myself, I’ve gained back.” “This program has really opened
my eyes.” “What surprised me was how addicting volunteering can be.

Once you start, you can’t stop.” “This is a good way of making a research
class meaningful and exciting. I hope this is used in other classes.”

("Integrating service learning into the curriculum," 1994, p. 5)

By 1994, CGCC had “incorporated the service learning into 15 other course
sections and into the college honors program” ("Integrating service learning into the
curriculum," 1994, p. 5). In spring of 1994, “three sections of ENG102 successfully used
the service learning format” ("Integrating service learning into the curriculum," 1994, p. 5).

Marybeth Mason, English faculty, described how she began the service-learning
program, building on the foundation of the cooperative learning program:

They [the District Office] sent me, as my prize [for winning the Innovator
of the Year award for developing the cooperative learning program], to a
conference for the League for Innovation and it was there that I saw a
presentation on service-learning by Miami-Dade. I knew immediately that that was my next cool thing to implement into my classroom, which had always been an active learning kind of environment where students were engaged in reading, writing and talking. To me the logical next step was reading, writing and talking, and serving in the community, kind of extending the sense of community that you can create in the classroom into the community. So I got really excited and could see immediately an application in my English 102 class and came back and it was just serendipitous that at the same time you, Maria [Hesse], and Duane [Oakes] were interested in the same kinds of things, … You and Duane were involved in student life, student development, and were moving community service into service-learning in the student life ranks and then I was learning about service-learning in the curricular academic side of the house. We just met up and I do not even remember how. We put two and two together.

I remember you guys had a little grant for a small amount of money and you were looking for a teacher, and I was looking for someone who could figure out how to help me place my students. Because the model that I envisioned for service-learning was obviously, like most things I end up doing, the most complex model which was individual placements. Because I was using this career theme where students were researching a social problem in the community, looking at a career-related to that social problem, and then looking at how they could serve to help
solve the problem and also get career related experience. So that meant
that every student’s placement was very individual, based on their career.
How was I going to go about placing 25 students in just one section (if I
was going to deal with one and we did just deal with one section) in
potentially 25 different non-profit sites in order for them to get their
service experience. Now that was a trick.

Duane and Maria and Lois, the Dean of Student Services, said,
“Oh, yeah, cool. We could do this!” And Duane, of course, came into my
class. We explained everything to the students about what we wanted and
got started with making the various contacts, finding 25 different sites to
place 25 students in whatever area they were interested in, based on their
career interest and research. So that was very exciting. That’s how it
started. There was this sense of teamwork and it was so successful that
the problem then became how do we replicate that kind of model for not
only multiple sections, but multiple teachers with multiple sections,
because it was a very time-intensive model of placing students. That’s
how it started and that’s how the interest began. (M. Mason, personal
communication, June 2, 2005)

Director of Student Life Duane Oakes teamed up to support the service-learning
program that Marybeth Mason, English faculty, envisioned. He attended Marybeth’s
class and placed each student in an appropriate service site (D. Oakes, personal
communication, June 1, 2005). Lois Bartholomew, Dean of Student Services, and Maria
Hesse, who was the faculty advisor to the student leadership group, provided additional
support. The program grew quickly to involve many English faculty and eventually faculty from other disciplines, as described in the *Engaging Departments* (2006) book:

With the English 102 model implemented, a service-learning component was also added to the English 101 First-Year Composition curriculum. Centered around the broader theme of creating community in a changing world, the English 101 curriculum required students to participate in Into the Streets, a one-day service event where they served, wrote, and reflected on their learning, choosing from a variety of agencies, such as the Child Crisis Center, Desert Cove Nursing Home, La Mesita Family Emergency Shelter, Save the Family Foundation, the Chandler and Gilbert Boys and Girls Clubs, the Tonto National Forest, the Gilbert Wildlife Refuge, United Blood Services, the Phoenix Zoo, and the Chandler and Gilbert school districts. The coordination of this event was also led by the service-learning leadership team, again with help from student service-learning assistants in coordinating and running this event. Workshops were held to orient faculty to the English 101 curriculum, the theme, the writing assignments, the service-learning component and the Into the Streets event. The college rented buses from a local school district to transport the students to the agencies and provided lunch for the reflection sessions upon their return to campus. Approximately 150 students participated in Into the Streets the first semester. The numbers quickly grew, and in 2005 more than 500 students from a wide variety of disciplines, including 238 from English classes, completed 1,700 hours of
service during what is now a two-day event repeated each semester.

(Kecskes, 2006, pp. 112-113)

One of the unique elements of Chandler-Gilbert’s service-learning model was the team effort between instruction and services in support of the students’ learning experience. Author John Tagg explained that at CGCC, “…service learning has evolved as a joint activity of the academic and student services functions. The faculty and student services staff seem to have approached their work, from the beginning, as a team” (Tagg, 2003, p. 173).

Lois Bartholomew described the value in having a team where members each brought different strengths to the work:

I think that we were lucky that we had four very different people from very different kinds and ways of thinking. Because the four of us, Marybeth, Maria, Duane and I, you know when you think of who we are, we’re not alike at all. You know Maria would be very analytical and just a master teacher. Marybeth would be the passionate speaker and you know the “get on and get it done.” Duane is kind of like the pied piper and you know he can, he could take ants over mountains if he had to. And you know I think my role was just to hope and pray a lot and keep moving [laughs] because there was so much going on. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Duane Oakes was proud that he and others in student services were considered full partners in this initiative. He recalled:
I think that is where Chandler-Gilbert has shone and really stood out nationally. I think the fact that we were able to make service-learning a program that was supported by both houses. Unfortunately, in the academic world, there is a great divide — student services is on one side and instruction is on the other. Because Chandler-Gilbert was a new college, we were able to build the opportunity to have learning supported and valued in both. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Mason also recognized the synergy that occurred. She reflected, “I think it was just an unbelievable coming together of people who could figure out how to get it done, and then sustain it” (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005).

The MCCCD Chancellor at the time was Paul Elsner who was very committed to student engagement and served on the national Campus Compact board. Lois Bartholomew recalled inviting him to visit CGCC’s service-learning program:

And I remember when he [Elsner] came to visit us and we had been at it I think a year or maybe it was two years, I don’t know. It was early in the process because we had so many visitors. We were so excited, we were telling anybody who would listen to us. And I remember he only came out to spend a little bit of time with us and so we did the talking head administrative thing which makes me crazy but, then our goal was to get him in a classroom and have students talk to him. And so I remember all this entourage following him and we put him in a classroom with Marybeth and we closed the doors and we stood in the hall and we hoped and prayed. And he never came out. He was supposed to go on to some
big thing after that but he never did. He stayed hours in that classroom with those students. And when he came out, you could just tell on his face that he had arrived at what he had always dreamed would be service-learning for Maricopa. And what better way to learn than through the voices of students who are living it day to day. And I thought, you know, to be a Chancellor of a system like Maricopa and to go into a classroom and have your students tell you and reflect with you about what they were learning and how it had changed their lives I thought was the ultimate compliment for a Chancellor like Dr. Elsner, so that was a very cool moment. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Margaret Hogan also recalled that Chancellor Elsner was pleased with CGCC’s program and he returned to visit many times thereafter. She confirmed:

Paul used to enjoy coming out here so much because he just loved hearing what we were doing [laughs]. And you and Marybeth used to get him into classes you know where all the crying was going on about service-learning. And he ate that stuff up [laughs]. He really did. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Elsner contributed a chapter to Thomas Erlich’s book on Civic Responsibility and Higher Education (2000). In it he described CGCC’s college-wide effort:

Chandler-Gilbert Community College, one of the newest colleges in the Maricopa system, built a framework for social responsibility very early. Rather than creating a marginalized structure for achieving this goal, they incorporated the whole panoply of student services, activities, functions,
and structures. They hooked up student life with student responsibility. This was not just a lumping together of programs; the entire student activities program moved toward the support of faculty in making carefully assessed appointments and assignments so that students landed in the right volunteer arrangement, one that is consistent with their interests and their developmental stages. This was no small undertaking in that the deployment and logistics of running volunteerism in 87 different agencies called for the complete alteration of the traditional student activities and student services apparatus …. (Elsner, 2000, p. 218)

In an interview for this research, Elsner reflected on the impact of those classroom visits with students:

I think Chandler-Gilbert was unique in that it, one, it invoked in a way its own identity and its own philosophical foundations about what it wanted to do, and what it wanted to be. For example, you took on service-learning with a different kind of zeal than any of the other campuses. I mean it was just incredible, and you believed in it. And you also were able to integrate student life, and councils or student clubs and the general apparatus of how students were involved in the ownership of the college, in not only volunteerism, but just the sense of pride. We were always just thrilled when you’d come down to the board with your student body. They were young and “save the world” impressive, and very, very articulate. I remember when I was as sophomore in college, I couldn’t even believe that I could stand up in front of an audience have two
consecutive thoughts without, you know, tripping over every other sentence, and these young people were so impressive. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

CGCC President Arnette Ward also supported and promoted the program. This researcher recalled speaking to President Ward about the service-learning program for the first time. Ward was concerned about logistics, liability, student reaction, faculty resistance, and costs, but nonetheless, allowed the program to continue. In an interview approximately 13 years later, Ward recalled that this idea was a stretch for her, but she didn’t want to squelch the innovation that was happening at the college. She remembered:

Service-learning was a wonderful program, and now that took a little! I tried not to give negative responses to new ideas and new paradigms, new innovations, because God knows I believed in opening the doors to give faculty the freedom to be creative. They say when you open a door you cannot close it, you have to work with the situation. I took the attitude that as the President, all I want you to do is promise me that you will bring something new that will make our students feel like they could not get it anywhere else and to make them want to stay here for life. That is what happened. I think that happened with cooperative learning, and it certainly did happen with service-learning. And God knows, I didn’t know what that was. I said OK, alright. How will it help the students? Well, well, … so I got all these good reasons. … Then when we started doing programs where we took the students off campus. Oh boy, OK
[sighing]. Well, have you taken care of the situation of what if they really did not want to go off campus or be a part of the off-campus activity. They had an answer for everything. I took a deep breath and said, “Okay.” Then we started changing curriculums to meet the need. I said all of the faculty want to do that? Well, yes. I said, “Okay.” At that time we were connected with universities I did not even think about. I had no reason to think about. Brown University, a Harvard University, a what? Really? Chandler-Gilbert? My, my, my… and all I could do was sigh. Wonderful programs. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

Lois Bartholomew continued to keep the administration informed of progress. She recounted:

We had to have the support of the administration and I think Andy [Bernal], Margaret [Hogan], and Arnette [Ward] were kind of very generous and very kind and just wished us the best. And we would go in and report in every now and then. I’d get sent to meetings with, “Okay here’s the facts. Tell them this.” And we would hope that they would keep supporting things. And so, it just kind of worked out over time….

(L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

During the mid-1990s, as CGCC’s service-learning program was becoming larger and better known, other colleges wanted to learn more. Lois Bartholomew remembered that the team did a few conference presentations and that prompted a series of requests for visits to CGCC by teams from other colleges, as well as requests for CGCC teams to go on consultative visits at their campuses. Bartholomew recalled:
We went and did all these presentations—Marybeth, Maria, Duane, and I—and sometimes Marybeth and Maria would go to these, like the American Association of Higher Education. Then suddenly we had people visiting us, it seemed on a weekly basis. Then Marybeth and Maria were flying out and they were writing these articles and stories and it just, over time, it was planting the seed all over the United States and sort of growing the Chandler-Gilbert service-learning idea around the country.

(L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16 2005)

Duane Oakes served as a service-learning mentor to other colleges throughout the nation as part of an American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) program. The March 26, 1996, edition of *Community College Times* described his role (Robinson, 1996). Oakes credited AACC staff and Campus Compact with promulgating service-learning around the country and said:

Specifically, the two national organizations that probably really moved service-learning for us would be AACC, the American Association of Community Colleges, with Gail Robinson and Lynn Barnett who are just dynamite motivators, organizers. The way they create teams to mentor and work with other people has been a model that has been carried on for over 10 years. The trainings, the national summits, and the opportunities they have created to bring people together and share has been really important.

I think the National Campus Compact Center back at Brown [University] has had a couple national summits. I remember going back to
one in Providence, Rhode Island, and some of the things I was able to gain there. The consistent national trainings and then the chance to bring people over and present has been a really important professional growth opportunity which allows us to always reevaluate and see how we’re doing. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

The momentum continued to build among faculty. Faculty workshops, summer institutes, and dialog days on service-learning were offered through the faculty development program. Faculty members Marybeth Mason and Maria Hesse consulted individually with faculty as needed, and Duane Oakes would help tailor service placements around instructors’ curricular needs. Lois Bartholomew spoke of the many faculty and staff who used service-learning in their classrooms or otherwise provided support for the program:

Then they went into psychology and asked psychology faculty and Pushpa Ramakrishna in biology and Chris Schnick of course was part of English and Teri Moser is in Language and Humanities and Kim Chuppa-Cornell. She also helped with that agenda early on. In fact she did some work, they helped in the Student Life Office. They [Kim Chuppa-Cornell and Chris Schnick] actually served as sort of a program advisor type person. They were like a faculty liaison—I forget now what their official titles were—but they actually did this time in the Student Life Office helping getting the agencies organized with Duane and then with Leslie [Hamlett] because Duane left Chandler-Gilbert to become service-learning faculty at Mesa Community College. And so then Leslie Hamlett, who was the service-
learning program advisor, became the acting Director of Student Life.

Then we had faculty helping out and that was Kim Chuppa-Cornell. And Chris Schnick did that for awhile. And then we hired a program advisor, Russ Luce, who came in and helped with that for awhile, and is still there actually as a program advisor for service-learning. And then Leslie Hamlett left Chandler-Gilbert to move out of state with her family and we hired Mike Greene. Now we have a complete compliment of folks working in service-learning. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Ed Zlotkowski and colleagues wrote a book, *The Community’s College: Indicators of Engagement at Two-Year Institutions* (2004). They credit a number of factors for the robust and long-standing service-learning program at CGCC, including what they call “enabling mechanisms” such as a web site with faculty and student resources, a computerized database, and student service-learning assistants (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, pp. 55-57). Lois Bartholomew described the database which included tracking and reporting features:

Then the other major thing I think that we did initially under Maria’s leadership was all of the data. Creating a database was so fundamentally important and most programs don’t usually develop in the early stages. But Trish Hesse, who’s this kind of genius computer program person, came out and for no money at all basically designed this amazing system that gives us this entire history of data of students and how many and how many hours. And it’s startling when you look over a year now and you
can see how many places we’ve been and how many hours have been served and how many students have served them. So I think that was another hallmark—capturing that early and capturing that in an effective way. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Duane Oakes established the service-learning assistants program whereby students who had taken a service-learning course or student leaders who have been involved in service activities provided support to one or more service-learning classes. Service-learning assistants received a small stipend in exchange for helping to facilitate student placements in local community-based organizations, maintaining the paperwork for the students in a class, and updating the database with class information. Their help with the paperwork was invaluable to instructors who could focus on teaching, while the service-learning assistant kept track of the various forms, some of which pertained to liability issues. The service-learning leadership team created most of the forms which helped structure the placement process. Some were created in conjunction with the MCCCD legal office. Duane Oakes recalled working with lawyers at the Maricopa District Office while the service-learning program was being developed:

Then we had to deal with legal issues with our District Office. We created tons of forms. Marybeth and Maria were the best with the forms and we had more forms than anybody did probably! We had to create those and establish legal partnerships that, to this day, are being used now throughout the country, especially throughout our District. Now we do not do it by individual college, we do it by District. So some of those
foundational processes, that were established, are being used now all over the place. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

It has been mentioned that numerous faculty development workshops were provided and multiple conference presentations were made. In addition to providing information on service learning to faculty and staff, it was necessary to provide students with an orientation to the service-learning program. Initially, Duane Oakes with help from the service-learning leadership team members would support faculty members by attending class meetings where the program was being described. As the program grew, it was not possible to attend every class individually, so a videotape was produced. Collateral materials such as videotapes, books of student reflections, newsletter-style explanatory documents, and other items were developed with students in mind, but they were also used for faculty workshops and at conference presentations. These items helped to communicate the rationale and benefits of service-learning program, as well as provide curricular examples and student and faculty testimonials. Some of these items are described in the Engaging Departments (2006) book:

In addition, a video titled A Commitment to Service was produced to orient faculty in all departments and their students to the CGCC service-learning program. The 10-minute video defines service-learning, illustrates the various models with footage from campus events, and includes enthusiastic testimonials from students, faculty, and staff representing a variety of community agencies. As the program grew and became recognized around the country, this video was and still is, circulated to
other colleges interested in designing and implementing similar service-
learning programs.

Since written reflection has always been an integral part of the
CGCC service-learning program, in 1994, English faculty Marybeth
Mason, with business faculty Maria Hesse and photography faculty Keith
Canham, published a book of CGCC service-learning reflections and
photographs in *Unspoken*. In 1998, a second publication of service-
learning reflections, edited by English faculty Chris Schnick and Kim
Chuppa-Cornell, titled *Small Miracles*, was produced. Both of these
publications have been widely circulated to colleges around the country.

(Keeskes, 2006, p. 114)

Other items which are relevant to the history of the college and the history of the
service-learning program include various recognitions that were received for the program
over the years. The Annual Report to the Governor mentioned that CGCC was in good
company among other institutions of higher education:

Chandler-Gilbert was awarded a $4,000 Teaming Up grant from the
Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) to integrate volunteerism
and service learning into the curriculum. Chandler-Gilbert is a recipient
among seven nationwide, including Notre Dame and the University of

The Spring 1994 edition of the MCCCC Ed Cetera newsletter featured the
program as Maricopa’s Innovation of the Year award winner for 1993-1994. A picture
with many of the faculty and staff who had been involved in the inception of the program
The Arizona Community College Association newsletter featured CGCC’s service-learning program on its front page in March of 1996. The article explained:

At Chandler-Gilbert Community College, service learning is built on a rich heritage of community involvement. Service learning combines community service with academic instruction, focusing on such concepts as critical thinking and problem solving, values clarification, social and personal development, as well as civic and community responsibility. ("Service learning is an important ingredient of Chandler-Gilbert's curriculum," 1996, p. 1)

Further into the article, there was an example of how science education was being reformed by the integration of service-learning into the course. The researcher noted that the description included reference to a Campus Compact grant that was awarded in support of this program:

Science education at CGCC is being revitalized in Biology 181 by Ms. Pushpa Ramakrishna. A Campus Compact mini-grant enables her to integrate curriculum objectives such as ecological and environmental studies, mathematical measurements, teaching and mentoring, and the
study of plants with community service. Ms. Ramakrishna acts as a collaborator and facilitator for the students as they discuss environmental concerns in class. They grapple with the problems and then address the situation by using community service as a vehicle to reach their academic goals. Students work in collaborative groups and will go to the City of Gilbert Reclamation and Water Plant to do their service learning work. … Some students will check the quality of the recycled water and evaluate if the pollutants in the water reclamation plant affect the growth of trees. Others will plant new trees, thus helping bring down the carbon dioxide level in the atmosphere—which directly addresses the problem of greenhouse effect and global warming. A third group of students will mentor children in the planting and care of plants and how they purify life. ("Service learning is an important ingredient of Chandler-Gilbert's curriculum," 1996, p. 13)

As was mentioned in the literature review in Chapter 2 of this research document, there were numerous books and journals that included mention of the CGCC service-learning program, several of which have been quoted in this section of the document. Among those not yet mentioned in this section of the document, The Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education published a series of monographs in conjunction with the now defunct American Association of Higher Education and the American Association of Community Colleges. The monographs were focused on learning communities, and two of them contain information about CGCC. One of those
two volumes focused on learning communities which involved service-learning (Fogarty et al., 2003).

CGCC’s service learning program has grown and improved over the last 13 years. “Overall, in 2004-2005, the CGCC service-learning program placed approximately 2,500 students who contributed nearly 20,000 hours in service to the community” (Kecskes, 2006, p. 115). Author John Tagg marveled at the success CGCC experienced and he stated:

The classroom, imagined in this way, can become a platform for active student performance and hence a forum for different and better learning rather than a cell with four walls that limits and constrains students in so many ways. Chandler-Gilbert students systematically work with real people facing real challenges, from the homeless and children in Boys and Girls Clubs to public agencies, museums, and schools. And they reflect on and discuss their experiences as part of their class work. (Tagg, 2003, pp. 173-174)

The positive impact on the intellectual and personal development of students was and is a driver for the faculty and staff of CGCC. English faculty members, Pam Davenport and Marybeth Mason, who have been instrumental in the development of the program, concluded:

Most importantly, students continually report that service-learning is one of the most valuable components of the curriculum. They express in their writing having experienced a new sense of civic responsibility and multicultural awareness, as well as a feeling of accomplishment at having
actively contributed to the community and to their own learning.

(Kecskes, 2006, p. 117)

Current President Maria Hesse explained that “[s]tudents expect education to be relevant to their lives and want to examine their relationships in and contributions to their community” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 21).

Former Director of Student Life Duane Oakes reflected on the significance of the program:

The ties to the community, the ties to the families in the community, because service-learning and Into the Streets were not only for students, it became a family affair. We had families coming back to do service, families with their kids. We were helping change and teach the value of commitment to community and service. It was one of our values of the college, and everyone at the college had a commitment to making the community better. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

MCC President Larry Christiansen agreed and stated that the community connection was unique at CGCC:

… this whole sense of community was very important. At Chandler-Gilbert it was even more so because it translated then into a deep commitment to volunteerism and service-learning. …in many ways Chandler-Gilbert became the leader of showing how the connect between community and volunteerism and service-learning can be brought together in a very wonderful way, as not an agenda of the few, but an agenda of an
institution. I thought that was a very significant kind of connect point. (L. Christiansen, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

Julie Palinsky was one of CGCC’s first graduates and at the time of this research worked in the CGCC Admissions and Records office. She remembered that the service-learning program met with some resistance with her and other students. It wasn’t always easy or convenient, but she concluded that it was a meaningful education:

I just think at first I didn’t like it, especially when I was going to school because it took up more of my time than I wanted it to, and I was one of those that, I didn’t want to do that and I didn’t, when I was going to school. But I’ve gone “into the streets” and I’ve done other things with community service, and I think if you can incorporate that and open up somebody’s eyes to something else, then I think it just ties into the book of life, and I think that we’ve made a big difference there with the way we do teach these kids, and I think they come out of it with a good experience. (J. Palinsky, personal communication, June 14, 2005)

It was so significant that many student commencement speakers referenced their service learning experiences in their keynote remarks. Duane Oakes recalled that hearing about the impact on students and faculty had the effect of reaffirming the importance of the program for him. Oakes reflected:

I remember sitting and crying and having a lot of tears being shed because of the touching moments where students have said, “This has changed my life forever.” This is what college is about. This is why we do it. This is why I do it. I had the chance to do many other things, but I kept thinking
this is where we are going to make the biggest change for the future. Yes, we can help them get a degree, but if they cannot become better citizens, then this is not going to make a difference in our community. Those are some of the opportunities that we need to continue with. Like graduation, every time a student spoke for many years, the keynote speaker at graduation would bring up service-learning experiences. So I think as we ponder what is it all about, it is first about student growth, and working with faculty, and helping them get excited. I have watched a lot of faculty being reconnected to why they are here and what this is all about. What good learning and good teaching is all about. Service-learning has allowed that for many people. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Vice President Bartholomew joked about the enthusiasm of the service learning leadership team. “Give any of us a minute and any of us can go on for days about what service-learning has done for students and the community, our faculty, our staff. How much work it has been and how it has evolved” (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005). But on a more serious note, she mentioned the far reaching impact of this program, which remains prominent in the history of CGCC: So I guess I think the most significant accomplishment of service-learning is how it changed lives. Our lives, the lives of the students who participated and the lives of our community. … We have changed our community for the better and those students will go on to really understand on a personal level what it takes to be part of a community and
live in a democracy.  (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Learning Communities

Barbara Shovers, who taught English as a Second Language (ESL) and developmental English, is considered to be the initiator of learning communities at Chandler-Gilbert Community College. When she was interviewed for this research, she provided the history of the college’s first learning communities through the more recent work in this area.

Shovers remembered that Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan and some of the faculty had an interest in what was happening at Evergreen State College in Washington. Shovers recalled, “I think initially in 1985 when Margaret came on she had some familiarity with Evergreen State College and learning communities. And I think she sent some faculty in ‘89 to some workshops there” (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

CGCC faculty picked up on some of the ideas and started some pre-cursors to learning communities as early as 1989 or 1990. Shovers said:

I think Melinda [Rudibaugh] and David Weaver had a Calculus and Physics Community. And I believe it was in ‘89. And then there was another one called the Core Community which was Dance, Music and Theater. And I believe that was Sally Jesse and Gordon [Jesse] and I’m
not sure who the Music person was. But that happened, I think, early on like ’89, ‘90. (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Shovers explained that the possibilities for team teaching, for creating interdisciplinary linkages, and for using themes to bring focus to courses was of interest to the more innovative faculty at CGCC. She recalled:

I think in general people started looking at making the curriculum more meaningful and connected. And by choosing a theme and you know bringing in several different disciplines it was possible to carry this theme throughout from different perspectives. Nationally you know the Washington Center led that effort. (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Shovers had colleagues around the District who also taught developmental English. They felt that learning communities might be used to help engage and retain developmental students. Shovers started her own learning community in 1994 after receiving Priority Educational Project (PEP) grant funding from the MCCCD District Office to pilot learning communities for developmental education students. She taught the COMPASS [community participation and student success] learning community that fall along with adjunct faculty Phyllis Filley. The following year, Shovers wrote for and received another PEP grant and directed a district-wide project on learning communities. In 1995-1996, she team-taught the developmental learning community with colleagues Bonnie Ehmann and Vanessa Sandoval. By the fall of 1996, Shovers was awarded a sabbatical by MCCCD to study learning communities nationally and she traveled to
Seattle Central Community College and North Seattle Community College (Shovers, 1999, p. 8).

Shortly thereafter, other CGCC faculty became involved. Shovers recalled:
A lot of people got involved like Pam Davenport, and Marybeth [Mason] and you [Maria Hesse], and Darby [Heath] and you know several people. Chris [Schnick] has been real involved and Bill Mullaney. But from the very beginning I think it was Margaret [Hogan] first bringing this initiative in, identifying a couple faculty like Melinda [Rudibaugh] and David [Weaver], and the Jesses. Then when you came in, it brought in a whole new understanding I think and aspect of administrative support for the communities. (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Marybeth Mason, who had been pivotal in starting both the active learning and service-learning initiative at the college, explained why she thought so many CGCC faculty members were ready to consider learning communities:

The faculty that choose learning communities and get involved with learning communities very often are masterful at cooperative learning and writing across the curriculum and service-learning. And to us learning communities gives them a bigger opportunity to do more of all of those things because you have students for a bigger block of time. (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

In the spring of 1997, CGCC became part of a Maricopa Community Colleges team selected as one of 20 institutions in the nation to be part of a project coordinated by the Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education at
Evergreen State College. This project, called the National Learning Communities Dissemination Project, was supported by the Fund for the Improvement of PostSecondary Education (FIPSE) for three years. Colleagues from other Maricopa Colleges—GateWay, Glendale, and Paradise Valley—also participated. The project’s goals were:

(1) to support the participating campuses as they more fully established, assessed and evaluated their learning community programs; (2) to disseminate information about the learning community initiatives on these campuses to a national audience; and (3) to feature the experience and knowledge gained by these institutions at a national learning communities conference in the final year of the project (1999). (MacGregor, 1999, p. ii)

In addition to sending a team of CGCC faculty to the Washington Center at Evergreen, the Washington Center held a site visit at CGCC. They visited the COMPASS developmental learning community at the Pecos Campus, taught by Barbara Shovers and Chris Schnick, as well as the Creating Community in a Changing World learning community at the Williams Campus taught by Marybeth Mason and Maria Hesse.

The Dissemination Project published a monograph detailing the growth of learning communities at the selected colleges. The chapter on the Maricopa Community Colleges described how CGCC started with one learning community led by faculty member Barbara Shovers, which linked developmental reading and English with a student success course. Over the years of the project, additional learning communities were formed at CGCC’s Pecos and Williams campuses, based on “the coordinated studies model” (Rings et al., 1999, pp. 43-44).
In a subsequent report Barbara Shovers stated that the biggest challenges in the implementation of learning communities were the “misconception that they [learning communities] are extraordinarily expensive,” and finding classrooms designed to hold larger groups of students for team-taught learning communities (Shovers, 1998, pp. 1-2). She reported that benefits for students included “strengthened student involvement in their own learning,” while faculty found learning communities to be “an excellent means of faculty development…” (Shovers, 1999, p. 4).

By 1999, CGCC had incorporated learning communities into its Instructional Philosophy statement that appears in the College Catalog and other publications. The description read:

Sometimes called “block” courses, “linked” courses or “interdisciplinary” studies, two or more classes are connected through content, ideas, or activities such as study groups or field trips, to form a learning community. Students explore a common theme to see relationships between different ideas and subjects. Often these courses are team-taught by college faculty. Students and teachers benefit from having larger blocks of time for sustained discussions and activities about a theme, seeking connections between subject matter, disciplines, and ideas. Learning communities also build a sense of community among students and faculty. This connection contributes to student success in college.


When the National Learning Communities Project began in 2000, Maria Hesse, who by then had become CGCC’s Dean of Instruction or CAO, was selected to serve on
the national project team. The National Learning Communities Project was co-directed by Dr. Barbara Leigh Smith and Dr. Jean MacGregor from 2000-2004. The work was funded in part by the Pew Charitable Trusts and coordinated by the Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education and the American Association of Higher Education. The purpose was to encourage sharing about ways to create more coherent learning experiences for students and to sustain the efforts of college and university faculty and staff by helping to build regional and national support networks. The project’s focus was on interdisciplinary learning experiences and creating student connections with one another, with their instructors, and with the college. As one of the institutions involved, CGCC became nationally recognized for its work in learning communities and was expected, along with the other selected community colleges, to assume a leadership role with advancing learning communities in community colleges around the country.

Subsequently, CGCC became more prominent in the learning communities movement. On February 28-29, 2002, MCCC, with support from CGCC, hosted the Southwest Regional Learning Communities Conference at the Tempe Mission Palms Hotel in Tempe. CGCC learning communities were also featured at a spring 2003 Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) conference, and a Maricopa Colleges district-wide dialog day on October 8, 2004.

CGCC learning communities were also periodically highlighted in MCCC marketing materials. For example, A Tribute to the History and Hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, which was published in 2002, included these descriptions of CGCC learning communities:
American Indians of the Southwest: Voices of the Past and Present couples English and Anthropology; Journeys into American life brings together English Composition and American Literature, while Connections Between Engineering and Mathematics explores the significance of mathematics in explaining engineering feats of the last 50 years. (*A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges*, 2002, p. 21)

In a 2004 report provided to Jean MacGregor and Barbara Leigh Smith, the following facts and stories about CGCC’s progress with learning communities were shared:

- There were 16 learning communities offered in fall 2003 and clearly those that had strong enrollments were those that paired a general education requirement with another course that could also meet one of the requirement areas. Student choices continue to be driven by degree requirements and it is important for faculty to understand that as they look for course linkages. (Hesse, 2004, p. 2)

- Regarding administration or coordination for learning communities, we have learned that there needs to be a sustained effort by learning communities “champions” to market the classes, coordinate the teaching schedule, work with advisors, facilitate faculty reflection, etc. We tried to do this for a number of years with volunteer faculty members who were enthusiastic about their work. It was shared leadership, but there was little accountability.
Further, there was not a specific list of the various logistics that needed to be coordinated. (Hesse, 2004, p. 3)

- For the last three years, we have given a faculty member reassigned time (they are released from teaching one course per semester) to do these things. There is a “job description” per se, or at least a list that provides examples of the types of duties that we need the LC [learning communities] coordinator to perform. It is that person’s responsibility to “market” learning communities via the website, with fliers, and through e-mail messages to various audiences, to maintain the resources on the website, to pull together descriptions and information for the class schedule and other publications, to meet regularly with advisement staff to discuss learning communities as a concept and to describe the current offerings, to do coordinated assessment across all learning communities, to facilitate occasional meetings of the faculty members involved to reflect on what is working well and what needs improvement, to maintain the collection of learning communities materials in the Teaching and Learning Center, and more. (Hesse, 2004, p. 3)

- Earlier this week, I [Maria Hesse] had a chance to hear a young man speak at a special event sponsored by the Chandler Chamber of Commerce, as part of a panel of students at the high school, community college, university, and private graduate school levels. He came as the university’s speaker. He is finishing his bachelors degree having had a long struggle through seven years of study, while working full-time time. He admitted to the audience which included city council members, the chamber board, business leaders, and
others, that he and his sister went to the community college only because their mother made them. They had no clear plans for their futures and no particular sense that they could make it through college, given their financial stresses and their lackluster academic performance in high school. He and his sister enrolled in a learning community because the advisor said they should, not because they had any sense of what it would involve. He cited it as one of the most significant academic and personal experiences of his college career. He spoke to the importance of the relationships he developed in that class and the time he was given to reflect on what was important in his life. He explained that his sister is entering medical school this fall, while he will be deciding between a couple of management job offers in the field of agribusiness.

Obediah was a student that Marybeth Mason and I had in our learning community, *Creating Community in a Changing World*, seven years ago. What a stroke of good fortune that our paths would cross at this event so many years later. We hugged and laughed and caught up on his news as though virtually no time at all had passed. As I drove back to the college, I called and left a message for Marybeth about Obediah, knowing that we were both changed as teachers as a result of our time together and with our students in that learning community. And again, I was reminded of the power of structuring learning experiences that focus on developing relationships, encouraging reflection, connecting learning to what is important in student’s lives, and giving students voice. (Hesse, 2004, p. 6)
CGCC was asked to contribute to a national monograph series that would be published as part of the National Learning Communities Project. One of the monographs focused on efforts being made to integrate “two important innovations in undergraduate education,” service-learning and learning communities, and described the work of several successful models to illustrate “the synergy of building upon and integrating the best of both practices” (Eaton et al., 2003, p. 1). Chandler-Gilbert Community College is described in *Integrating Learning Communities with Service-Learning* (MacGregor, 2003) as having developed a freshman learning community which:

… connected freshman composition, film and literature, and various computer skills courses to explore a year-long theme, “Creating Community in a Changing World.” This learning community met for two intensive mornings each week, allowing for collaborative learning, flexible projects and computer lab workshops. In addition, the students engaged in a yearlong service-learning relationship with the House of Refuge East, a transitional housing program for homeless families. This firsthand exploration of the issues of homelessness enlarged and expanded students’ understanding of community and raised important questions about their surrounding community’s relationship to and responsibility for homeless families. (Eaton et al., 2003, p. 2)

The monograph devotes a chapter to describing that particular learning community, using many student quotes and reflections (Hesse & Mason, 2003). Maricopa Chancellor Emeritus, Dr. Paul Elsner, who visited this learning community at the CGCC Williams Campus described it as an “academic village” that provided “students a reflective
academic context in which they can fully develop their largest capacities as future citizens and leaders” (Elsner, 2000, p. 220).

In another monograph from the National Learning Communities Project, entitled *Learning Communities in Community Colleges*, additional CGCC learning communities were highlighted. One such community, developed by faculty member Brenda Larson, integrated pre-professional and general education courses in a two-semester sequence for teacher education students. “Aimed at incoming freshmen selecting an education major, the course goals are to help education majors become better prepared for the occupational workplace while they become better democratic citizens by learning through service to their community” (Fogarty et al., 2003, p. 35).

CGCC hosted a special day-long workshop for faculty about learning communities on April 22, 2005. Coordinated by faculty members Vanessa Sandoval and Yvonne Reineke, many other faculty including Marybeth Mason, Brenda Larson, Teri Moser, Darien Ripple, Chris Schnick, Pam Davenport, and Kim Chuppa-Cornell described their learning communities and the benefits for students, as well as faculty.

Because the college had had success with establishing so many learning communities and first-year experience learning communities, in 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges requested that college President Maria Hesse submit an article for their national journal outlining the rationale for and examples of learning communities. Hesse co-authored the article with her former learning community teaching partner, Marybeth Mason, CGCC English faculty. Hesse and Mason’s article, “The Case for Learning Communities,” was published in the August/September 2005 issue of the *Community College Journal* (Hesse & Mason, 2005). It reads in part:
Philosophically, learning communities are a good fit for community colleges, given their mission. The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges defined the term “community” “not only as a region to be served, but also as a climate to be created.” In Community College Review, Harlacher and Gollattscheck speak of the ultimate objective of community colleges as not just serving their communities, but developing community. “The ultimate objective of the learning community is the improvement of community life through the renewed ability of individual citizens to participate in the affairs of the community, to cope successfully with continuous social and cultural change, to contribute to the economic stability and well-being of the community as productive workers rather than liabilities, to partake of and contribute to our cultural heritage through worthwhile use of leisure time, and to collectively strengthen the various institutions and organizations that make up the community” (Harlacher and Gollattscheck, 1992). As more colleges are understanding the rationale for and benefits of learning communities, they are moving closer to fulfilling their ultimate vision and mission. (Hesse & Mason, 2005, p. 35)

Faculty Development

Assistant Provosts Andy Bernal and Margaret Hogan were committed to faculty development. Almost 20 years after Bernal began working at the college, he recalled those items that stood out in his mind as truly significant. He stated, “… the most
significant for me, personally, is that we were able to work with faculty and initiate a faculty-driven faculty development program” (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005). He described the impact of the faculty development program on the institution as a whole:

Once we got the faculty-driven staff development program I think it started to evolve from there, and I think there was cooperative learning, there was community involvement with the students [service-learning]. I think that was probably the essence of it; it was just making sure the student could connect by learning with the community. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Hogan was also deeply committed. She had been selected to come to the Maricopa Community Colleges to work for Vice Chancellor Alfredo de los Santos, Jr. because of her background in faculty development. She brought that expertise and commitment with her to CGCC. She recalled that the college was fortunate to have strong leadership for faculty development efforts. “We had wonderful leadership for faculty development. Just high powered people, Sharon [Fagan] and Marybeth [Mason], oh my gosh. And David [Weaver], yes” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005). She also praised the model that became established:

I think that we made great strides because we moved from kind of episodic training to intensive kinds of summer [training], a week in the summer. People would learn and then the next semester they would be mentored by somebody who had been teaching that way for quite some time. And, so you know for a whole year there might be development
going on to prepare people to function well in a cooperative learning environment or to incorporate service-learning into their curriculum. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

While the Assistant Provosts credited the faculty for their work, the faculty credited them for administrative support and leadership. Marybeth Mason explained:

I think that was a really important part of establishing the culture. And that was Margaret and Andy, they really were believers in strong faculty development, more so than any other college in this District because of their background and their interest. Margaret was very interested and that is where her training and background was. When she moved to administration, she had been working in faculty development before that. So that was really important. (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

David Weaver was hired as physics faculty by CGCC in 1987, but he was also the college’s first Staff Development Coordinator (Weaver et al., 2006). He recalled that initially the focus was primarily, but not exclusively, on technology:

When I came in, part of my assignment was to do staff development. One of the things that I had done when Margaret left the District Office, where she had been in charge of staff development, I had actually applied for her old job, so she knew I was interested in doing staff development sorts of things. And that’s something I’ve tried to keep up with throughout my career here—not always being staff development coordinator, but being involved in professional development, being on the staff development
team, or faculty development team now. So part of what I felt my role was, and continues to be, is to play around with, and explore technology, because it’s something I am interested in, and then being able to share that with colleagues. And originally a lot of the staff development we did was around technology, because at the time things were just starting to blossom, in terms of instructional use of technology. So a lot of the work we did surrounded that. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Weaver served in that role for three years, with support from Anne Oehmke, a retiree from Phoenix College, who worked closely with Margaret Hogan and Weaver for several years. Hogan, Weaver, and Oehmke promulgated the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) for innovation in schools. Gene Hall and Shirley Hord (1987) had just published a book, *Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process*, which was considered groundbreaking work in educational environments (Hall & Hord, 1987), and so they asked faculty and staff to attend sessions devoted to becoming familiar with the CBAM (Weaver et al., 2006). In addition, there were numerous workshops on technology. As Weaver began assuming more responsibility for curriculum development in semiconductor manufacturing technology, the search began for a new leader of the staff development agenda.

Marybeth Mason who had been a long-standing teacher and faculty developer in local school districts was hired in the summer of 1990. After discussing the progress made thus far in staff development, she recommended that faculty development separate from staff development and focus on improving teaching and therefore learning (Weaver
et al., 2006). She served as Faculty Development Coordinator from 1990-1995, during which time major initiatives in active learning, service-learning, classroom research, and writing across the curriculum were launched. Brenda Larson remembered the changes that occurred at that time:

And I know at one time, we were doing more staff development that was generic—that faculty, staff, MAT [Management, Administration, Technical staff], you know anybody, could take. And that was more of a one shot type of thing. When we moved from that to more faculty development I thought it was a big turning point for the college. And the first one that I can remember was collaborative learning. There may have been more before that. But that’s the first one I remember. I think that we’re actually known throughout the District for our staff development. We don’t do the one shot, you know we do it right or we don’t pursue that type of thing. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Opportunities were made available to both residential and adjunct faculty. Mason believed that compensation to encourage adjunct faculty participation was important. She stated, “We have faculty both full-time and residential faculty and adjunct faculty stipends. There were always models of some kind of compensation for participation in faculty development in the budget, which was important” (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005). Weaver concurred and stated “regardless of what sort of educational initiative” the college pursued, support was provided “particularly for adjunct faculty” (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005). He added that every effort
was made to adjust training to adjunct schedules and also to “provide ongoing support” (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

Weaver and Mason led a team of faculty and staff who each took responsibility for different components of a comprehensive faculty and staff development program. A memorandum from 1992 provided a glimpse into the workings of the group:

Pam [Davenport] will continue working with English adjunct and full time faculty on a series of workshops begun during fall semester to include assessment of student writing and teaching the revision and editing process. Pam and Melinda [Rudibaugh] will continue to offer full and part time faculty training in techniques as a follow-up to workshops offered in the spring and fall of 92. Deliberate efforts will be made to continue to model techniques for faculty to illustrate the connections between collaborative learning and CR [classroom research]. Marybeth will offer both foundation and follow-up training in collaborative learning for full and part time faculty, as long as the additional release time will be made available second semester. (Margaret, Andy felt fairly sure that the additional release time would again be offered, but we wanted to confirm with you.) Maria [Hesse] has a full schedule of computer training planned to accommodate the needs of all employees to include old and new software packages. Sharon Flury will meet with other PSA [professional staff association] staff developers to make decisions about second semester training and their budget of approximately $1150. Cathy Urbanski and Suzanne Aragoni will meet with other MAT representatives
to make decisions about second semester training and their budget of approximately $950. (M. Mason, personal communication, December 14, 1992)

The college’s commitment to active learning and specifically cooperative learning was addressed in a previous section of this research. The consistent and pervasive training and support mechanisms planted cooperative learning as the foundation for numerous other teaching and learning initiatives. One of those was an emphasis on writing across the curriculum. Marybeth Mason had been the head of the Greater Phoenix Area Writing Project, housed at Arizona State University, for many years. She ran a writing project specifically for CGCC faculty in the summer of 1996 and then again in the summer of 1997. Mason remembered:

…writing across the curriculum came out of our emphasis on cooperative learning. It seemed like a logical next step. So we ran a summer institute modeled off the writing across the curriculum model that was being promoted, and still is promoted, by the National Writing Project where you bring teachers together for a very intensive four or five week, half day or more, summer institute to write themselves and to plan lessons that they can take back to the classroom. Where they go through the writing process, they work in editing groups sharing their writing with other faculty members, and then go back and start to understand the writing process and the way it affects students’ learning and the reading process and the thinking process because critical thinking also is related to reading and writing across the curriculum. That’s what thinking is—reading,
writing and speaking across the curriculum. So all of those things started
to come together and we had a great turnout. We had more than 25 faculty
in that summer institute from all different subject areas, and then we had a
follow up summer institute with about 10 or 12 faculty members. Then
Pam Davenport and Darby [Heath] are continuing that model or
resurrecting that model this summer with a writing project as well. (M.
Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Barbara Shovers was a participant in the original CGCC writing project and
continued to be involved with the other writing retreats which faculty continue to sponsor
through the time of this research. Shovers described that in addition to creating lessons
and deepening one’s understanding of the learning process, faculty camaraderie was built
via the work in faculty development:

The writing project one summer was just wonderful and you were
involved in that. Actually faculty have continued to do some writing
retreats which have really been wonderful. It’s a time of sharing because
you get on a really personal level in the writing retreats and in the writing
project. I’ll always have memories of people from those experiences and
a deeper knowing of who they are in their personal life. (B. Shovers,
personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Administrators were invited to participate in many faculty development events.
By hearing faculty speak about what was happening in their classrooms, they became
aware of challenges and successes, knowledgeable about the issues being faced, and
motivated to support various initiatives. Lois Bartholomew was the Dean of Students
when the service-learning program was being developed. She recalled that faculty
development was a key component to furthering the service-learning program:

Another hallmark was, in my mind, the faculty development. I loved in
the early days how Maria [Hesse] and Marybeth [Mason] would gather
faculty to talk about what was going on in the classroom. The successes
they were having, the challenges they were having. And they would let
me sit in the room and just be quiet and just listen and it was such a
window on how faculty help each other think through the learning and the
growing. ... that kind of connection with other faculty, to share ideas and
to learn from each other and share materials strengthens the program. It
strengthened them to be better teachers and it helped them to develop each
other. And I loved that part of it too. I loved watching those
conversations. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

Sharon Fagan became Faculty Development Coordinator in 1995 and served in
the role for eight years until 2003 (Weaver et al., 2006, pp. 3-4). Fagan was known for
her focus on critical thinking and student learning outcomes assessment. She was also
responsible for coordinating the All-Faculty meetings and adding a program of faculty
development workshops to the agenda each semester. She instituted a new residential
faculty orientation program in 1996 and published the annual *Faculty Guidelines*
document (Weaver et al., 2006).

Chris Schnick took over the position as Faculty Development Coordinator in
2003, after having been involved for years in various instructional initiatives including
service-learning, writing across the curriculum, classroom research, and civic
engagement (Weaver et al., 2006, p. 4). Schnick put together a comprehensive menu of faculty development opportunities and instituted several new programs such as an orientation program for new adjunct faculty in 2005. He also revitalized the Faculty Development Committee, which consists of the leaders of each of the major teaching and learning initiatives, and offers, as of the time of this research, a variety of active learning workshop formats for CGCC faculty each semester (Weaver et al., 2006).

Melinda Rudibaugh has continued to offer active learning workshops every semester for all the Maricopa Community Colleges’ faculty entitled, “Engaging Students in Active Learning” (Weaver et al., 2006).

In the summer of 2003, the Network for Excellence was born. Although CGCC already had a new faculty orientation series that introduced college services, procedures, contact people—the nuts and bolts of how the campus runs, Darby Heath and Kim Chuppa-Cornell determined that a college that valued collaboration in many ways, including learning communities, active learning, service learning, and shared curriculum decision-making, needed a learning community for new residential faculty. As the college grew, they wanted to be sure to foster the spirit of collaboration among all faculty. The Network offered faculty an opportunity to discuss curriculum, to explore CGCC’s instructional initiatives, and to work collaboratively with instructors from various disciplines. After the first year, the participants wanted to continue working together; therefore, Network for Excellence II was created as a second phase of the program for second- and third-year faculty and any others interested in participating in this unique learning community (Chuppa-Cornell, Heath, & Davenport, 2006).
New variations and enhancements to the faculty development program are always in the works. In the spring of 2004, based upon the success of using a college-wide theme to which faculty members and their students could connect, Schnick launched the *SEE Your World* theme. *SEE Your World* is, at the time of this research, in its second year as a college-wide theme which focuses on social, environmental, and economic (SEE) issues. A Day of Learning for all faculty and staff was instituted in fall 2005 and was in its second year of operation during this research (Weaver et al., 2006).

It should be noted that some divisions had extensive discipline-specific faculty development. Melinda Rudibaugh became well-known for her work in organizing math workshops to coordinate curriculum and promote best practices with both adjunct and residential faculty (Weaver et al., 2006). Likewise, Pam Davenport, Sharon Fagan, Chris Schnick, Kim Chuppa-Cornell, Heather Horn, Marybeth Mason, Diane Clark, and others have coordinated English workshops for new and continuing faculty over the years (Weaver et al., 2006).

Meanwhile, there is also ongoing technology training and support for both faculty and staff. The Instructional Computing Committee, among other things, advocates for faculty development in technology which is generally offered by Tom Foster, the college instructional technologist; Bill Holmes, CIS faculty; Tim Keefe, Director of Media Services; Audree Thurman, a computer programmer and applications developer; Sherri Basha, Director of Computer Labs; and others.

At the time of this research, history faculty Paul Petrequin had, along with his colleague English faculty Chris Schnick, and Director of International Education Annie Jimenez, launched a major faculty development effort around global learning. On behalf
of CGCC, Petrequin and Schnick applied for and became part of the AAC&U Shared Futures project. AAC&U described their goals:

This curriculum and faculty development network combines the best theory and practice of general education reform with the transformative promise of global content. Through a grant from the Henry Luce Foundation, sixteen colleges and universities will use global learning goals to organize general education programs and to prepare students for citizenship in a world of global change and interdependence. (Shared futures: Global learning and social responsibility, 2005, p. 1)

An area of emphasis within global learning is sustainability. At the time of this research, biology faculty member Pushpa Ramakrishna was leading a faculty development effort on that topic.

The quality of CGCC’s faculty development program had been known internally at the college for years. In more recent years, the program has also received national recognition. For example, when describing why CGCC has been successful in addressing new learning paradigms, John Tagg in his book The Learning Paradigm College noted, “At Chandler-Gilbert, likewise, a small group of faculty interested in experiential learning began an approach that grew over a period of years with the support of an effective and well-executed professional development program” (Tagg, 2003, p. 304).

Many faculty who were interviewed for this research mentioned the faculty development program as a major success of the college. Business faculty Yolanda Penley recalled:
CGCC advocated for professional development—it was encouraged, not only encouraged, you were rewarded, you were apprised of the programs you could use in professional development to advance yourself within the District. I think that is very important, because if you grow you are much more committed to what you are doing. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Brenda Larson explained that CGCC was considered a leader across the Maricopa District in this area. She stated:

I think that we’re actually known throughout the District for our staff development. … I think our staff development can’t be rivaled. I think the District, the MCLI, does a wonderful job also. … I always felt very supported as a faculty member the whole time I’ve been here. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Marybeth Mason concluded that the emphasis on faculty development had served as an enabling mechanism for the teaching and learning initiatives for which the college was so well known. She summarized:

Faculty development has always been important; we have always emphasized that. We have always kept learning communities, service-learning, cooperative learning and technology training in the forefront. As we have added agendas, we have tried to always provide ongoing opportunities for people to get on board in any and all of these things. I think we have done that really well. (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)
Many interviewees in this study cited the college’s environment for innovation as a major success. Assistant Provost Margaret Hogan, who became Dean of Instruction, thought that the new college attracted creative people who were willing to take risks. She described the faculty as “very creative innovative faculty. We were so fortunate to have people who wanted to be innovative in their teaching strategies and programs” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

English faculty member Alice Conkright believed that it was not just the group who came in the first couple of years, but additional people who had strong personalities, who created change and sparked innovations. She explained:

The real significant changes that happened on campus came when new people came, and brought their new energy and their new ideas, setting up a dynamic that changed the constellation. Everyone said this and recognized this all the time, because it was a new campus, there were no entrenched territories, no people who were hanging on to their own little fiefdom. It was very open and very flexible. This made change possible, very easily. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

The college, although part of a large bureaucratic system, was somehow able to be original. Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner agreed that the college was unusual in its ability to break out of the norm. “You’ve never been not committed to breaking away from normal pattern” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005). Hogan marveled at the fact that the college became a model of innovation:
We became a national model for teaching and learning innovation. And we, largely due to the faculty initiatives, just had wonderful opportunities for students in service-learning, cooperative learning, learning communities. For an entire institution to be dedicated to that model I think was rare and very special. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Persons who were interviewed spoke about an environment which seemed to encourage risk-taking. “You know that’s an amazing thing to be in an environment where it’s okay to take those risks, it’s okay to go ahead and learn from your experience and do things differently” (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005).

Whether it was in technology or in other areas, the individuals interviewed for this research consistently said the college seemed to thrive on creativity and risk. Librarian Larry Miller referenced people “like David Weaver who were always on the cutting, bleeding edge” of technology and “still is” (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005). Because CGCC had those kinds of people at the college, Gil Gonzales, who served as Associate Dean of Learning Resources and CIO, recalled that “… we were turned to sometimes to do pilot projects, to validate or refuse, to set up assumptions on how something might work or should work. And so we had a reputation of trying things” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006). He explained:

… often times we would work with the Chancellor’s office to work on special projects. For example, it’s probably dismantled now, but we actually started a few, we implemented an AV remote system on this campus. We were the first one to deploy that on a community college.
And the Chancellor’s office paid for it. And they were interested in
innovation and in teeing up projects that would help campuses look at
technology differently. We were one of the earlier adopters of using video
conferencing, early adopters of using centralized file services. (G.
Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Gonzales went on to describe many faculty members as innovative including Ana
Jarvis, David Weaver, Brenda Larson, Maria Hesse, Gordon Jesse, and Alice Conkright.
He told a story about faculty member Brenda Larson’s willingness to work in uncharted
waters:

I still recall when Brenda Larson was willing to take some risks with the
IT group to put applications up on the 3Com server. It was a great victory
in the sense that she was, it was a good pilot, because we were taking risks
together. And we knew what some of the implications were, and we were
trying to do things that made us, allowed us, to be a little more flexible in
terms of what we had to do in the long term. (G. Gonzales, personal
communication, June 28, 2006)

It wasn’t always easy to get people to adapt or learn new systems, therefore,
faculty and staff development was key to implementation of innovations. Librarian Larry
Miller remembered that faculty were not always keen to “adapt and adopt all the
technology. They weren’t quite sure what to do with it, and yet we had some really good
staff development here that helped people” (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21,
2005).
Interviewee after interviewee shared a story or comment about the culture of innovation that characterized the college or the support they received to implement an innovation. Here are several illustrative quotations from those interviewed:

- I also have always felt, just as a practitioner of teaching, that here I have had the freedom and flexibility to try stuff. …the fact that I can try stuff is something that I think speaks well of this institution, and speaks well of the atmosphere that we have here. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

- I also feel that we’re known for our innovative teaching methods. We were leaders in collaborative learning and now learning communities. We’re very fortunate to be able to be presented with multiple opportunities for professional growth so that we can learn how to do these up-and-coming things and then many times it turns out that our own faculty become leaders in those areas which is wonderful. I can’t talk enough about how enthusiastic the instructors and the staff are, and how that enthusiasm passes on to the students. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

- …now you can't pick up the newspaper or you can't answer your e-mail without seeing ads from all sorts of private sector institutions that are sort of mimicking things that we were doing 15 years ago. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

- I think our student centeredness also is not rivaled by anybody. We’ve done a lot with collaborative learning and service-learning and learning communities. So I think we’re very pro-active. And I think the reason we are is because we
get to be. And if something doesn’t work it’s oh well. It’s not like well there’s one mark against that person. So and I think a lot of other faculty do envy us at Chandler-Gilbert. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

- We were the first to go into some of the latest teaching approaches—learning communities and collaborative learning. Some of it was hard for people to take on; I, for one, was reluctant. You are used to lecturing and then all of the sudden you are supposed to be doing all of these tactile exercises. It throws you for a loop but, eventually, you become comfortable enough to do it. You have to be willing to try things. Chandler-Gilbert allowed you to try it; they allowed you to do it and if it was not working well, they allowed you to fix it. You were never penalized if it did not work. So people were more willing to say, well OK, let me do it. We did a lot of that sort of thing here. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

It seemed that once innovation began, it built upon itself. In discussing curriculum and pedagogy in the book, *The Community’s College: Indicators of Engagement at Two-Year Institutions*, the authors contend that innovative learning strategies can complement one another. “Programs that combine multiple alternative pedagogies, such as service-learning and learning communities, profit from the fact that faculty members already involved in one teaching and learning innovation are more likely to be open to trying other, related strategies” (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, p. 35).

The model also seemed to cultivate broad-spread leadership. Many different faculty and staff stepped up to provide leadership for various initiatives and, as a result,
continued to grow personally and professionally. Whereas in many colleges, administrators drive new ideas in the organization, at CGCC faculty and staff often pushed ideas up and through the organization. Evidence of this phenomenon is provided in the research interviews as well as in the literature about the college. After a visit by a representative from a national Campus Compact project, a book was written called *The Community’s College: Indicators of Engagement at Two-Year Institutions* (2004). It described CGCC’s culture which was credited for helping innovations such as service learning and civic engagement to take hold:

> At several colleges, including Kapi’olani, Chandler-Gilbert, and Raritan Valley, among others, community-based work has become such a deep and pervasive part of faculty culture that the administration hardly needs to stress its importance. (Zlotkowski et al., 2004, p. 49)

Marybeth Mason explained that the various instructional initiatives built upon each other, encouraging additional innovations. She described that after the emphasis on cooperative learning, service-learning was a natural next step, and that led into the work in learning communities:

> Then we looked at learning communities. Learning communities was the next natural off shoot because if you can do this in one class why couldn’t you do this together with a block of classes in which you had numerous faculty working together around a bigger theme, in many cases, related very relevantly to the needs of the community. So we went from cooperative learning to writing across the curriculum to service-learning to learning communities. The system started to look at building curricula
that were thematic and connected it to the community. (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

There was a synergy created by layering or integrating the innovations. For example, Marybeth Mason spoke to the power of integrating technological innovations into her learning community:

…we could enhance all of those efforts – cooperative learning, service-learning and learning communities – with integrating technology. Having the students be able to publish their work on the web opened the classrooms up even bigger, to be able to share their service-learning experiences through their reflections that they posted on the web, to be able to share their research about the various themes or problems or literature or film that we had been studying in class. … It helped us a lot, in terms of, again, having other faculty see opportunities for any of those initiatives—service-learning, learning communities, technology across the curriculum. (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Numerous awards and recognitions on the local level, at the District level, and eventually at the national level reinforced the willingness to take risks and be innovative. Margaret Hogan recalled, “We won a lot of the Innovation of the Year awards because we were doing things that were so wonderful, that were new and different. And we just were a very innovative institution” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Founding Provost and President Arnette Ward credited the faculty as “the greatest faculty in the system” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005). She remembered that:
People actually wanted to come. When they sat in meetings at different places, they could not say things their peers were saying. Their peers did not have the freedom to be creative about what they actually thought was best for their classroom, for their students. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

The faculty in turn credited Ward and the administrative team for allowing freedom and risk-taking and for providing support. Computer faculty member Cathy Urbanski compared the CGCC environment to other places she had worked and concluded:

I’ve been in many colleges and I still think that this is one of the best places, because the administration is very supportive of employee innovation. We are willing to take risks, which we have, and I think that’s what brought us where we’re at. (Cathy Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Barbara Shovers agreed and stated:

I think that this is a very unique college. That we are innovators and we’re on the cutting edge. And that we’ve always been supported to be on the cutting edge. And it’s been fun to be with a group of people that are innovators and that are excited about new ideas. I think I was an early collaborative learning participant. I was an early service-learning participant and all of the major initiatives of this college have been really personally rewarding and as a teacher extremely rewarding. (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005)
College Culture

Interviewees characterized the college culture as a major success. Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner referenced it as “wonderful, magical” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005). What was this culture and how did it come to be? Three primary areas were discussed repeatedly by those interviewed—a desire to serve the community well, a focus on students and their success, and a collegial and collaborative working environment among employees.

The community had been instrumental in founding the college, and college staff stayed very connected with the community over the first 20 years of college development. “At the heart of Chandler-Gilbert Community College’s mission and values is a commitment to serving the myriad needs of students and the college’s diverse communities” ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006, p. 165). Faculty member Yolanda Penley recalled specifically, “We wanted to address community needs. What did the Chandler and Gilbert area need by way of students who graduated and finished programs and would they be able to find jobs. We were very conscious of the community we served” (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005). To that effect, occupational programs had community advisory councils, the college itself had a President’s Community Advisory Council, numerous community members came to the college to enrich students’ learning experiences, students were taken into the community on field trips, on internships, and in service-learning experiences, and much more ("Self-study report 1996," 1996; ("Self-study report 2006: Connecting to our future," 2006). A number of these specific programs and employee explanations of their commitment to
community needs are described in the previous sections of this document under the headings of “Programs and Services” and “Service-Learning.”

Former MCC President Wally Simpson mentioned that he had hoped for and felt strongly about college commitment to and involvement in the community and concluded, “I think that’s been borne out just superbly” (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006). Founding Provost Arnette Ward stated, “Community needs, community ideas, and community involvement have been the cornerstones on which we have built our college” (Ward, 1986, p. 2).

When community members arrived at the college, they were welcomed and treated with respect illustrated by the following story. Board member Nancy Stein recalled arriving on campus for the first time and being treated pleasantly by librarian Larry Miller. She added a note to her interview transcription that said:

Larry extended his hand to say hello and directed me to the appropriate room, after I toured the library! I never forgot this kind man, a fine representative of the college. Since I was elected to the Board and after that pleasant incident, I always said hello to him—first—before continuing my visit elsewhere on campus. The thoughtfulness, respect and sincerity of this man is so much a part of how people treat each other at CGCC. (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005).

Interestingly, several people described this phenomenon of caring and respect as feminine in nature, but all employees seemed committed to upholding it. David Weaver explained:
I think one of the things that was different that had an influence is that if we looked at the leadership team that it was primarily estrogen-driven. There was a single Y chromosome in the entire leadership group, and I think what that did is it fostered a different way in which we did things. I don’t know how to exactly characterize that, but I think it just meant that the way we dealt with each other was on a different level than if it would’ve been male-dominated. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Alice Conkright felt that culture allowed for good relationships among faculty and administrators:

I think it was significant when Maria Hesse became Dean of Instruction, because of the sort of ethos or culture of the campus which was very collaborative, very open, very caring. We will take care of each other – we are special – we are a little campus. It was very feminine, extremely feminine. The Administration was feminine with the exception of Andy Bernal, so all the traditional stereotypical feminine qualities, nurturing and taking care, were very present and I think they were embodied in Maria. She was a kind of figurehead for all of these values that were present on the campus anyway, where there had not been before. I think faculty felt very taken care of, very comfortable, trusted, and in turn trusted the administration. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

The faculty trusted the administration and the administration admired the faculty.

President Emeritus Arnette Ward enthusiastically described the faculty:
Our faculty were just the pick of the litter, they were just outstanding educators, outstanding when it came to knowing when to change. I remember when we changed from a teaching emphasis to a learning emphasis, although I always thought teaching and learning were hand in hand. I learned so much from our faculty, they switched and made the emphasis learning. Learning drove the teaching. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)

From the first college report, *A Pioneering Spirit*, through the time of this research, the college has been focused on students, their learning and their success. The initial report read, “The administration adopted a strong policy that excellence in teaching is, and will always be, a primary objective. A strong instructional base linked with comprehensive support services results in academic success for our students. Student success is the ultimate goal for which we all strive” (Ward, 1986, p. 3).

Many colleges around the country have documents that contain similar goals, but the faculty and staff of Chandler-Gilbert Community College appeared to embrace this commitment with sincerity.

Former Governing Board member Nancy Stein spoke about the pervasive opinion that the college was very student-centered:

The other [success or accomplishment] is more, I feel, is more local, which to me is just as important. It’s the concern of the student. And it is well known. Oh, Chandler-Gilbert? They really care about their students. Your arms are extended, not only here, but they reach to Williams and they reach to Sun Lakes. And I know that for a fact. You can feel it, at
least I can, and your concern is always for students. (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

Governing Board member Ed Contreras concurred:

One of the things about Chandler-Gilbert is that it seems, or at least it visualizes a caring for students above the other colleges. And there’s really a true, caring individual, not just a credit hour or revenue. I think that has been one of the good things here at the college, one of it’s strong points. (E. Contreras, personal communication, June 24, 2005)

Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner who was intimately familiar with all of the Maricopa Colleges also noted the distinctive environment at CGCC:

The biggest issue, however, was that you were a very caring institution, very caring institution. All the 10 colleges are, but you were really particularly. It was felt by everybody who was even anywhere near you, that you were a very caring institution. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Numerous faculty and staff who were interviewed for this research added their unique perspective to the overall picture that CGCC cared about its students:

- I can tell you that you knew you were from Chandler-Gilbert and you knew you got your degree or your courses from, and that someone cared about you. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)
- I think that fact that we survived and grew and I think have a really excellent reputation. All of the students I have known through the years, who have gone on to ASU or gone to Mesa, almost consistently praise the teaching and
the kind of help and support they got at Chandler-Gilbert. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

- I think our students appreciate the quality instruction we provide, the service, the friendliness, and the dedication of all the staff. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

- I had worked at four-year liberal arts colleges, very well known and well respected liberal arts colleges. I know they were committed to their students, but they did not talk about it. So it was a just a dawning day for me to come to Maricopa County and have all of this discussion and seminars, talking about visions and mission and the students are right in the foreground. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

- I think one of the things that I learned as a professional in the students services area, is that the focus of what we are all about is about students first. I brought with me and have a plaque that still hangs on my wall to this day that says “People before Programs.” The reason we are here is to support students – in student development, student growth and student learning. That was really the main reason I came here. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

- …that’s what we kept saying, how can we make the student more successful, what does it take? Is it something in the facility? Is it something in the room? Is it the strategy of how we teach them? (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005)
• Sometime early on, someone coined the informal motto, “The college with a big heart or a small college with a big heart.” That was said over and over again. I do not know if it was ever an official motto or not, but it stood out there. People recognized us as the small college with a big heart. I think that is why we got students; students wanted to come here and they did. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

• I think the smaller classes and the way that we emphasize the personal touch here has created a lot of faculty-student relationships that have been really special. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

• There were so many things that were so collaborative between Instruction and Student Services while you [Maria Hesse] were the Dean of Instruction that I got so spoiled with that, this whole relationship, because you brought to the table what was best from a teaching perspective and you know I was always about what is the student need from a services perspective. So it was kind of this wonderful hand in glove relationship and how it just seemed seamless. It wasn’t your domain or my domain, it was a student’s domain. (L. Bartholomew, personal communication, June 16, 2005)

• I think the greatest achievement is the fact that we were all focused on students. Students came first, in most instances, I would give a high percentage, to the fact that we were all very much student-oriented. So that to me is an achievement, in and of itself. (W. Matthews, personal communication, June 14, 2005)
Some faculty and staff who were interviewed for this research spoke of the emotional ties that had formed with their students:

- I also like that the last day of class, especially my public speaking classes, many times it’s a teary event where we have an award banquet and they do a special occasion speech and I look at them and the first day I tell them, “You will leave here a different person.” And they’re like yea, yea, yes. But then that last day they really see that they are a different person, that they feel more confident, less anxious, and that they have more skills now, and have a good game plan on what they need to do to continue the development of their public speaking skills. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

- My fondest memories are probably the commencements. I’ve been to commencements at ASU and other institutions and never do students come up and throw their arms around you and say thank you. I don’t know where else you have the opportunity to actually see students make that transition from being a student to being a member of the community, to being a member of a profession, and keep in touch with you and tell you that they’re a good dentist or they have their own medical practice or they’ve served overseas or they’re going into law, because of something that happened during their college experience. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

- To have a chance to watch everybody grow, and the memories. [crying and then laughing] Probably for me to start a year and then end a year with a group of students and watching them grow was huge. (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
This researcher concluded that the focus on students, their needs, their learning, and their success was taken to heart by many employees. Former MCC President Wally Simpson summarized, “…perhaps the strongest element and the one that I could see throughout your [referring to Maria Hesse] tenure, and Arnette’s before you, is this focus on student success” (W. Simpson, personal communication, June 28, 2006). Former Governing Board member Nancy Stein agreed that the college had and has “a wonderful reputation for how you treat students” (N. Stein, personal communication, June 21, 2005). In his interview CIO Victor Navarro seemed glad that the focus on students had not simply become part of the college history, but remains a central tenet of the institution. He reflected, “…a lot of the original values that we established early on for student centeredness, and a focus on the instructional value to education, and all of those values are still applicable today” (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005).

Another distinguishing feature of the college culture was the collegial and collaborative atmosphere among employees. President Emeritus Arnette Ward described that it was built upon a foundation of mutual respect. She said, “Differences, yes, we could work with, but overall that we valued each person and valued what they brought to us and to the student” (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005).

Several specific elements of the culture were detailed by employees during the interviews. They included employee involvement in substantial matters for the college, opportunities for growth and challenge, a pervasive “can do” attitude, a sense of commitment, and a closeness to one another, or what one might call a family bond.

As has been mentioned in several previous sections of this document, many employees assumed leadership for various important college agendas. Librarian Larry
Miller simply stated, “On campus, it has always been the philosophy that everyone was involved” (L. Miller, personal communication, June 21, 2005). Sandra Stuebner, who had served as Faculty Association President in addition to being faculty member in psychology, stated:

I think that the focus on having faculty leadership of programs and curriculum and instruction, and faculty voices on all significant committees is critically important and has been respected at this college. That has been significantly important to us, that we have faculty innovation that is supported and encouraged. And I hope to see that always continue. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

Communications faculty Diane Travers felt that the administration established an inclusive philosophy that encouraged involvement:

I like that this is a place where, if I was interested, as I said, in architecture and buildings and design, that I could request to be on a committee. And I like that you’re either asked to be on a committee or you could let your wishes be known and more likely than not, the person in charge will say, “Sure, we’d love to have your energies. (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005)

This inclusive atmosphere allowed people to better understand areas of the college outside of their normal sphere. Several employees mentioned that being tapped to provide leadership for a major project or committee challenged them and, as a result, they grew personally and professionally. Former Director of Student Life Duane Oakes, in speaking about his leadership of the service-learning program, stated, “This is probably
one of the most important professional growth experiences I have ever had, and it created a foundation that will be forever part of who I am” (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005). Business faculty Yolanda Penley remembered being asked to serve as the Chair of the Self-Study for the college’s initial accreditation. She recalled:

It took a lot of learning on my part to learn all the NCA [North Central Association] guidelines and then show how the college was meeting their goals. We did. Part of my favorite time was when the groups would get together and really get into it and really wanted to work hard and wanted to show off the best of Chandler-Gilbert. There were some trying times and some moments when you wanted to chuck it all. But it was, on the whole, fun and a real commitment on the part of the faculty. That was a great learning and growth experience for me. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Barbara Shovers started as ESL (English as a Second Language) faculty, taught developmental English, provided leadership for the learning communities program, and ultimately became certified to teach alternative medicine, meditation, and spiritual development. She described her personal growth as a result of being able to pursue different paths during her 20-year career at CGCC:

This summer I’m doing a project on spirituality and education, and I’m reading Parker Palmer and you know just that excitement and authenticity in the classroom and really realizing that I have a gift and that teaching is something that I’m passionate about. I love it. And that I have a really good connection with my students and I’m excited about new ideas. I can
never say that I was ever bored here [laughs]. If I was I would write a grant or I would think of an idea that I wanted to explore and I always found like-minded people here to be involved with me and to brainstorm and to create something new. So for me it’s just been a time of tremendous growth and as my personal interests have changed; I’ve been able to pursue them here. And I don’t think there are too many jobs or places that would support that I’m not exactly doing what I was hired to do [laughs], you know. But it’s just been a really wonderful.... (B. Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

Several of those interviewed mentioned the paradox that challenges with budget, facilities, and staffing, produced a “can do” attitude among employees. Physics faculty David Weaver recalled, “I think one of the things that it fostered is a can-do attitude here that we had to work together, we had to be collaborative, we had to do everything together, just to make stuff work” (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

Sharon Flury who served as the Curriculum Coordinator for many years, recalled the spirit of the early years:

I think a positive impact in those early years was there was a strong sense of commitment on the part of all employees – faculty, managers, staff, whomever, to see that this college succeeded. You did whatever it took to get things done. I have never quite experienced that kind of coming together, collaborating and working together to see that the students here were served and I think that just really stands out in my mind as a positive impact. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)
This sense of commitment to supporting one another and dedication to mission was another feature of the culture about which many interviewees spoke eloquently. Diane Travers, communications faculty, described the phenomenon in this way, “…you bring the people on and then this synergy is created where great things happen … when you have their commitment and their energy and their zest is when you see great things happen” (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005). Computer faculty member Cathy Urbanski spoke of the mutual respect:

I think its employees, you know, our employees are so dedicated, so diverse, and so willing to take risks. They have so many innovative things that they do that make us where we are today, even if we have our differences. But we have respect for each other, you know we move on, and we put the institution first, and I think that of all the employees and it makes the major difference. Even if I don’t agree with certain people, but I respect what their opinion is, and I think they do the same, because let’s face it, nobody can get along with everybody, but as long as we respect each other that’s fine. And think our employees did a good job at that. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

The most endearing portions of the interviews for this research were those parts where employees spoke about one another—the work they accomplished together, the time they spent on and off the job together, the kindnesses shown. There was a closeness, not unlike a family bond, that was described. Margaret Hogan reminisced, “We had a wonderful, wonderful time together. And we were a family” (M. Hogan,
personal communication, June 8, 2005). David Weaver spoke of the team spirit and camaraderie that emerged:

One of my fondest memories is, and maybe it’s not an individual memory, but a compilation of memories, that speak to the idea that I’ve always felt more like a family, and more like a team, rather than okay, I’m faculty, and you’re administration, and you know, they’re support services. I remember an early time with three of us going and playing racquetball. I remember lots of times where groups of us would go out and play softball against the other campuses, and it was something that never was there any rank, I mean because you would have people from all job descriptions working together towards a common goal, and I think that that really permeated other kinds of relationships.

I know something about some of the other campuses, due to some of my district work and being at other campuses. I feel like I can go to Media, or I can go to Victor in TSS [Technical Support Services], and I can go and sit down with people and actually talk. I really feel like we do share a goal. And so my fondest memories are that I feel like when I come here I’m home, that I have friends. That I have people that I don’t just have to put up with, or that I will send an e-mail saying go do this for me, but that I’ll go talk with them and say well, how can we work together to accomplish this. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)
At the time of his interview in 2005, Victor Navarro’s son was 17 years old, but he recalled the sense of community he felt when the college threw a baby shower for him and his family 17 years prior:

I do remember, because we’ve always been this small college with a big heart, I remember having a baby shower, for my first child, and just about everybody on campus—it’s almost like the campus closed down—and you know, here we were gathered together celebrating this event. At the time I remember there were even students that had dropped in. You know it really reminds me of, you know, kind of a close-knit relationship. I grew up in a small town so that kind of environment is very comfortable for me, coming from that environment. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Yolanda Penley and her family have moved to Colorado, but she shared that when she returns to the college, she has a sense of coming home:

My fondest memory of what Chandler-Gilbert gave to me was the friendships and the relationships, which I cherish to this day. I am not living here in the Phoenix area, but I can come back and feel like I never left. It is a pretty good feeling. (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Margaret Hogan described the feeling of collegiality and collaboration with fellow administrators, faculty and staff and the desire to not let it fade:

…we were very involved in each others lives. We knew each others families and, and we knew what was going on in everybody’s life and we
were close. We were very close and very caring towards one another. And we were fearful of losing that as the college grew. And I remember lots of conversations. How are we going to keep this family environment, this love for one another when we’re going to be separated by buildings that are clear across the campus from each other? And so, I think that that was a serious discussion. How are we going to keep this feeling going. And, I don’t remember any specific stories I just know the feeling. I just remember the feeling so well. (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

There was a litany of stories and comments, far too many to include, but they provide ample evidence of the collegiality and warmth of the college culture. A few more examples are presented below:

- It has been fun; it was a wonderful place to work. It really was lovely. I had lunch with Ana Jarvis a month or so ago, and she was talking, she was thinking of retiring. She summed it up saying that it is such a nice place to work. It is. It’s nice; it’s just a nice place. It was warm and loving. It was fun. (A. Conkright, personal communication, May 25, 2005)

- My daughter got married Saturday. You were there. Most of my friends now are Chandler-Gilbert people, because I spent so much time here. I did not have time to make a lot of friends that I did not see here. If I did not see people here, then I did not have time. So I made a lot of lifetime friends, here. I come to work everyday surrounded by people that are my friends. That is
the best—that’s the best. (S. Stuebner, personal communication, June 2, 2005)

- We’ve always taken care of our own, which I think is one of the most important elements of Chandler-Gilbert. (R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005)

- I think we’ve done a lot of things right, I think we have some great people, and I think we’re overall heading in the right direction. I think we have the support of the community, and all of that comes from, you know, good leadership. We’ve had great leadership at this college. (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005)

Gil Gonzales described the culture in a nutshell:

I mean Chandler-Gilbert created an identity that was really amazing. I mean, you knew you were in Chandler-Gilbert. You knew about the people at Chandler-Gilbert. You may not agree with everything everybody had to say, but you knew you were there. And in that sense the place was about community. And it’s a big C community, not it’s a community of academics. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

Victor Navarro concurred that the employees have connected on an emotional level that makes it a different working environment than most:

Fondest memories—it’s the people. I mean the people are wonderful in this organization. You feel it. I mean you feel relationships, you feel connected. Some of the examples are our all-employee meeting when
Arnette used to sing and be so emotional that people throughout the crowd were in tears. Those are special moments, to look back and say wow, you know, is this unique to this environment? I just can't imagine [chuckles] that other organizations are that connected and that emotional. (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

David Weaver described his sense of passion and loyalty to the college and its unique culture:

So, I don’t know, it’s been for me anyway, almost a fairy tale kind of job experience. I drive a little bit over 30 miles each way, and I could work a whole lot closer. I was working a whole lot closer to where I lived [near Scottsdale] and I’m now about a mile-and-a-half from GateWay. I could make my commute a whole lot easier, but I wouldn’t do it. It’s one of those things that I think what we have created here is something really special. And I know a bit about unintended consequences, and a bit about science and variables, and that it could be that any one little tweak might have sent us a different direction. So I’m kind of happy with how we’ve ended up. (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Former President Ward explained the pride she feels with how the college has managed to maintain the culture of caring despite the growth over the last 20 years:

That is what is so neat about everything. That we still hold very dear a lot of the educational philosophy and the new employees seem to embrace it. They seemed to grab a hold of the philosophy and own it. (A. Ward, personal communication, May 23, 2005)
Summary

This chapter has provided a history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College through 2005. It includes the findings and results of the research problem and each subproblem.

As one person put it, “The transformation of CGCC has been amazing” (Y. Penley, personal communication, June 1, 2005). And yet the work is not done. In fact, one might look at the first 20 years of college development as simply laying the foundation for what are sure to be interesting times ahead. President Larry Christiansen of Mesa Community College recognized, “all of the work that happened from the mid-‘80’s to now, nearly two decades of hard work to have Chandler-Gilbert positioned” and then added, “in some ways, its kind of the next green flag” (L. Christiansen, personal communication June 6, 2005).

Chapter Five will present the summary, conclusions, recommendations, and implication of the findings.
Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications

This chapter concludes this research study by presenting a summary of the study, a summary of the findings and conclusions, recommendations, and implications of the findings. The summary of the study provides a brief abstract of Chapters 1, 2, and 3. Then conclusions are provided for the research problem and subproblems, along with recommendations for future practices. Topics for potential future research are also outlined. Finally, implications of the study are made which have relevance to the broader higher education community.

**Summary of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to document the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College from its inception through 2005. Some preliminary research indicated that no study had been conducted on the background and establishment of the college. The researcher was particularly interested in identifying and describing the primary events, people, and issues related to the inception, formation, and growth of the college.

Nationally, the emergence of the community college system in the first half of the 20th century has been attributed to several factors. A number of prominent university leaders advocated moving the first two years of higher education away from the research intensive university functions. The nation came to believe that education for the masses was advantageous and several key pieces of legislation were passed that encouraged high school graduates as well as working adults to pursue a college degree. By 1975, more
than 1,200 community colleges had been formed in communities all over the nation. However, after that time frame there is a leveling off and subsequent decline in the number of community colleges nationally, although the existing colleges were able to support more students. They accommodated increases in enrollment by adding buildings, extending instructional hours, using off-campus spaces, opening extension centers, and using adjunct faculty. At first, community colleges offered a two-year baccalaureate curriculum, similar to that offered at a university. Over time, occupational/vocational programming, developmental/remedial education, and special interest/life-long learning programs were offered. The desire to provide opportunities for all citizens to pursue higher education provided a foundation upon which numerous communities advocated for a local community college, as was the case in the metropolitan area of Phoenix, Arizona.

In metropolitan Phoenix, Phoenix College was established in 1920 with a curriculum that paralleled the first two years at the University of Arizona, where students would eventually transfer. Enabling legislation passed in 1960 allowed each county in the State of Arizona to establish its own community college system with an elected Governing Board. Phoenix College became the first of the 10 colleges of the Maricopa County Community College District when the District was formed in 1962.

Shortly thereafter Mesa and Glendale Community Colleges were developed on the east and west sides of the county. Maricopa Technical College, which later became GateWay Community College, was formed in 1968 to meet workforce training needs for the community. Scottsdale Community College emerged in 1970, as the population of the Northeast Valley grew.
When Dr. Paul Elsner became Chancellor, he led an effort to strategically plan for additional colleges to meet the needs of the growing metropolitan Phoenix area. He commissioned a study to plan for additional colleges on the periphery of Maricopa County. The District planned to purchase the land for those sites many years ahead of the formation and development of the colleges. Elsner also recognized the need for the District to meet the needs of other populations of students like working adults and underserved populations such as ethnic minorities.

During Elsner’s reign as Chancellor, five more colleges were developed to address these needs, although they were not started in the order he envisioned. Community politics, funding constraints, and other challenges influenced the District’s expansion. Rio Salado was a non-traditional “college without walls” established in 1978, while South Mountain Community College was opened in 1980 to address the needs of the South Phoenix area. In the 1980s, few colleges were developed nationally, but MCCCD started Paradise Valley Community College on the north end of Phoenix and Chandler-Gilbert Community College in the Southeast Valley. In 1988, Estrella Mountain Community College began as an extension of Glendale to meet the needs of the growing far West Valley communities.

A review of the literature about Chandler-Gilbert Community College revealed a number of books and journal articles which contained information about the college and specifically its programs in service-learning and learning communities. CGCC was mentioned in several published works but there was no published work that addressed the history of the college.
This study used a multi-method approach to examine the “how” and “why” questions about CGCC. Qualitative methods included analysis of 33 interviewees’ responses to questions about the founding of the college, the early years of operation, and subsequent development. Quantitative methods were used to collect and analyze extensive documentation on the college and to draw conclusions that pertain to the research question and subproblems. The methodology of this study has particular significance as few oral histories have been collected on community colleges.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The research problem for this study was to identify and describe the primary events, people, and issues that form the history of Chandler-Gilbert Community College (CGCC) from its inception through 2005. For the problem and each subproblem at least one and sometimes more sample-specific findings and conclusions will be presented.

Inception

The inception of the college was the result of both long-range planning by the Maricopa County Community College District and community pressure to establish a college in the Southeast Valley of metropolitan Phoenix.

The research revealed that consultants recommended that additional campus sites be developed based upon population growth. However, CGCC was established ahead of the consultant’s timeline because community leaders applied political pressure on the Chancellor and Governing Board. They wrote letters and spoke to the press about their desire to have a college in their community. Then at the November 22, 1983, meeting of
the Governing Board, a large group of community leaders appeared in person to lobby for construction to begin.

Therefore, one could conclude that decision makers are swayed by both factual data and personal appeals by constituents. The implication for college leaders is to be aware that lobbying can be effective when one is trying to drive forward an agenda. Furthermore, it is important for leaders to develop their political skills as well as their planning skills as both are generally called into play on a regular basis.

On the other hand, clearly there was substantial data that had been gathered and analyzed by consultants for the District to justify the establishment of a college in the Southeast Valley. Population estimates had been made, potential sites had been examined based upon factors such as proximity to other colleges and transportation corridors, and costs had been estimated. One could also conclude that a variety of factors should be considered in planning for a potential new college such as general population, location, oversight, accreditation, finances, proximity, and more. Thus, a community’s desire in and of itself is not sufficient reason to establish a community college, although it may provide the impetus to mobilize people to take action.

*Formation*

The formation of CGCC was characterized by a lack of resources, a hectic work pace, the need for problem-solving and creativity, and a willingness by the administrators, faculty and staff to do whatever it took to meet the needs of students.

Andy Bernal spoke about the extraordinary effort that was required in the early years of operation and the juggling of a multitude of major tasks that needed to be
accomplished. He says that he recruited faculty members from Mesa Community College to help him with developing the building specifications for the Pecos Campus, given the short timeframe he had for producing those. At the same time he was developing a class schedule, remodeling the Seton site, recruiting students, and hiring employees.

English faculty member Marybeth Mason provided vivid examples of the extraordinary number and wide range of tasks she had to undertake when she was helping to begin the general education program at the Williams Campus. Like many interviewees, she concluded that being part of building a college is very challenging, but positive experience.

Despite a heavy workload, Bernal, Mason, and others looked back fondly upon those years and take pride in their accomplishments. One could conclude that employees enjoy being involved in decision-making and will be creative and resourceful in problem solving. When given sufficient autonomy, they will often step up to even the most difficult challenges at hand.

**Growth**

The years following the initial accreditation of the college in 1992 were difficult ones. Several administrators and faculty left the college. There were conflicts over roles and responsibilities, as well as how the organization should be structured. There was competition for resources. Many programs and services began to be developed, several of which either been disbanded or continue to struggle. In general, this researcher
concluded that the clarity of vision and purpose that inspires people to commit to a team and put aside personal issues was lacking in the years following that milestone.

Multiple interviewees referenced their desire to gain independence from MCC and achieve initial accreditation as a driving force in the formative years of the college. There was a clear goal and a sense of urgency about accomplishing that goal. When that was achieved, there was a sense of crossing the finish line. Curriculum coordinator Sharon Flury recalled that “[t]here was dancing in the streets,” because it had been such “a long haul” (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005). Immediately following the accreditation there was a series of title changes, there were numerous newspaper articles heralding the achievement, and people settled into the next chapter for the college. However, the goal now was not quite as clear and there was no written strategic plan as to what should happen next.

The researcher surmised that lacking the clarity of focus and the articulation of common goals, tensions began to mount. It is natural for organizations to experience some periods of tension and conflict, but often people will lay aside individual differences when they are working towards a compelling common goal. Thus, the researcher was reminded of the importance of having clearly articulated and shared goals in an organization.

The second half of the growth years were focused on facilities development as well as program and service expansion. Student enrollment was growing faster than the resources could accommodate, and CGCC was competing with nine other colleges for allocations. Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner recalled:
I wanted it to be fairly comprehensive, I wanted it to be a collegiate place, and I worried that might not happen because you were … very much starved at the very beginning too, you didn’t have a lot of money. (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005) Therefore, one could conclude that it is important to accurately project financial capacity before undertaking a project or major task.

*Key People*

There were many people who contributed to the establishment and development of the college. Chancellor Paul Elsner’s vision, along with his ability to implement a long-term expansion strategy for MCCCD, was extraordinary, as documented by many of those interviewed and other sources of information. Members of the MCCCD Governing Board were involved and supportive during various phases of college development. Numerous community leaders and members of the Southeast Valley Task Force were instrumental in lobbying for and then guiding the development of the young college. Faculty, staff, and administrators of the college worked hard to be responsive to the needs of the community and the students. One could conclude that it literally “takes a village” to birth a college. The joint effort of many different people and organizations is needed to successfully bring a project of this magnitude to fruition.

Also, it should be noted that Provost Arnette Ward’s influence on the college culture was significant. Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner said, “The neat thing about Arnette that I thought attracted me to her was that she would always have a climate on the campus of celebrating students” (P. Elsner, personal communication, June 28, 2005).
Numerous other interviewees spoke to the culture she created. Gil Gonzales, the Associate Dean of Learning Resources, explained that “Arnette Ward created a community of people who she infected with her care for students” (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006).

One could conclude that identification of the right leader for the right moment in time in an organization’s history is very important. Specifically, the results of this study lead the researcher to believe that Arnette Ward embodied a combination of traits that substantially and positively influenced the culture of the college. She cared about students and their success and significantly influenced the college culture to be focused on student success. She encouraged employees to bring their talents and “heart” to their work and emphasized the need for a collegial and collaborative culture that was focused on responding to student and community needs. Consequently, either people of like mind were attracted to the organization, or once they arrived they understood the clear message from the CEO about the priorities within the organization and responded accordingly.

**College Operations**

The study examined various aspects of college operations including programs and services; students; employees; finances; and land, facilities, and equipment.

**Programs and Services**

College programs and services were initially limited, but as enrollment grew, funds were available to hire faculty and staff, and that resulted in the steady development of programs over the college’s history. Victor Navarro recognized that the college,
“moved beyond just a university transfer focus, to a fully comprehensive college” (V. Navarro, personal communication, June 10, 2005). While expanding course offerings, certificates, and degree options, services were also expanded or enhanced. For example, in 1999 an office was opened to support students who face physical or learning challenges and in that same year, a career services center was opened.

There is an enduring challenge to meet the wide range of diverse needs of multiple communities as they grow over time, but that continues to be the focus and mission of the college. Students must have choice in what they study in order for an institution to be considered comprehensive. Further, in addition to course, certificate and degree options, to truly create an environment of success, a broad range of services must be available to compliment the academic and occupational programs.

**Students**

The characteristics of students who initially came to the college are substantially different than those who attended in 2005. In 1987, only 13% of the student population was 19 years or younger. By 1990, that had increased to 21%; by 1995, it was 27%; and by 2005, 42% were 19 or younger.

There are myriad reasons for these changes, but one could conclude that one variable may be that younger students seem to have different expectations about a college experience, which may include a more traditional campus and the availability of more social opportunities, services, and programs. The researcher did not study cause and effect relationships, but at CGCC there does seem to be a correlation between the average
age of students and adding student life and leadership opportunities, athletics, performing arts, facilities and specialized services.

Employees

Most CGCC employees were dedicated and passionate about the college and its students. Numerous interviewees spoke of their commitment and exuded enthusiasm. They shared stories of students who persisted or succeeded as a result of their efforts, often remembering them by name. They talked about putting programs in place, going the extra mile to meet someone’s special need, and thinking through the filter of how their decisions would impact students. They spoke about the hectic work pace, the long hours, working out of the scope of their job descriptions, and about being stretched seemingly beyond their limits at times. However, in retrospect, there was evidence that they took pride in what they had accomplished and gained a great deal of personal satisfaction from their work.

One could conclude that when employees work together to reach a common goal, and feel a shared commitment to serve students and community, they will go above and beyond the call of duty. There seemed to be a connection between the employees’ willingness to work extraordinarily hard and their sense of the importance and meaningfulness of their work. Thus, in addition to meeting student needs, it met their personal needs for fulfillment.

Also, the employees who had an opportunity to begin during the early years of the college’s formation felt immensely fortunate to have had an opportunity to contribute to establishing a new institution. Employees expressed this in a variety of different ways,
but the message was clear. Diane Travers called it “pride,” Robin McCord said she was “grateful to have been a part of its history…,” Barbara Shovers said, “…it’s just been a joy and a pleasure” (D. Travers, personal communication, June 13, 2005; R. McCord, personal communication, June 6, 2005; Barbara Shovers, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Margaret Hogan summarized her years at the college, “I was very pleased and proud to be made a part of this new institution, and they were some of the best years of my life. Frankly I just had such a good time helping get this college underway” (M. Hogan, personal communication, June 8, 2005). Duane Oakes characterized his tenure at CGCC as, “… one of the most important professional growth experiences I have ever had, and it created a foundation that will be forever part of who I am” (D. Oakes, personal communication, June 1, 2005).

Therefore, one could conclude that being a part of building a college, including hiring staff, designing buildings, creating curriculum, instituting policy, and implementing programs is a unique experience that employees value throughout their career. There is something special about being the first to do something. Employees seemed to inherently value laying the foundation for the college and establishing the legacy of the institution.

**Finances**

Many employees, administrators and Board members felt that the financial resources were not adequate for a start-up institution. Chancellor Emeritus Paul Elsner reflected that he and the District staff should have projected a stronger financial base for
the new college and should have reconsidered the fundamental budget allocation system
to take start-up costs into consideration.

Therefore, one could conclude that schools, much like start-up businesses, need to
more accurately estimate the costs of starting an institution. Fixed and variable costs
should be taken into account when planning. Also, though student enrollments may
initially be small, an appropriate set of standard resources should be initially available.

Land, Facilities and Equipment

First, the initial land purchases were undertaken well in advance of the formation
of a college, and they were chosen with specific goals in mind, such as being near major
transportation corridors.

Paul Elsner explained that his strategy was, “We should build it in the path of
progress and keep them close to the major arterials” (P. Elsner, personal communication,
June 28, 2005). He also considered the location of nearby colleges, population
projections, and other factors before determining the location for additional colleges in
metropolitan Phoenix.

Therefore, one could conclude that other new colleges should give careful thought
to the site where they might locate a college. Consideration should be given to issues
such as relationship to a major transportation corridor, proximity to neighboring colleges,
the path of residential, retail, and industrial growth, and land sites large enough to
accommodate the future growth of the college.

The bond referendums of 1984, 1994, and 2004 were significant in providing
resources for capital expansion related to land, facilities, and equipment. Following the
passage of each of these bonds, there were substantial facilities expansion projects, new construction, and refurbishments undertaken at CGCC. The 1984 bond established the Pecos Campus. The 1994 bond provided for the construction of the Sun Lakes Education Center, the conversion of the Williams Campus into an educational institution, and the development of the Pecos Campus into a much larger and more attractive site, with new classrooms, labs, athletic fields, and service spaces. At the time of this research, proceeds from the 2004 bond had already built additional parking and roadways, and multiple new buildings were either under construction or in development. Employees understood the ramifications of these bond elections, as shared by accounting faculty Sid Ford who said, “I know we were all on pins and needles up until the bonds were passed because we certainly knew that it was going to make a major difference” (S. Ford, personal communication, June 28, 2005).

Retired Vice Chancellor Ron Bleed explained that MCCCD’s three major bond referendums in 1984, 1994, and 2004 were significant in terms of moving Maricopa’s technology systems forward. He stated the bonds provided “capital funds for the large scale expansion of technology” (R. Bleed, personal communication, April 17, 2006).

Therefore, one could draw several conclusions. First, MCCCD may, at a time in the future, have to pursue another bond referendum in order to support significant expansion and refurbishment of facilities, or large-scale technology upgrades. Issues of bonding capacity, financial ratings, and public perception should be monitored carefully as they may impact the pursuit of future bonds. From a broader perspective, all colleges should carefully consider the factors that would impact their own potential for seeking public support for a bond referendum.
Problems and Challenges

Regarding problems and challenges, the emergent themes were difficulties with planning and lack of resources. Despite the problems and challenges that the institution faced, for each problem there was a positive corollary.

Multiple interviewees spoke of problems with planning. As just one example, former Assistant Provost and Dean Andy Bernal said he would have:

…asked the Board and the District administration to give the founding [CGCC] administrators more than 30 days to do the educational specifications. Subsequent to our starting this campus [CGCC] Estrella Mountain Community College, they gave them one whole year without having even to generate enrollment to plan the college. And I think that would’ve made a big difference, a really big difference in the quality of the planning, in the programmatic decisions that were made, and also putting it into place, everything. (A. Bernal, personal communication, June 7, 2005)

Therefore, one could conclude that setting aside adequate time for thinking and planning before undertaking a major project is valuable. It is now more common to hire an educational administrator a year or more ahead of a program or site opening for planning purposes. The scope and complexity of a project would determine how much time would be needed for planning functions.

Many of the people interviewed were frustrated with funding and facilities. One concrete example that led to frustration was the year-long planning meetings that began
in 1989 for buildings that were minimally 10 years from the start of construction and several of which have still not been built.

It can be concluded that when expectations are raised and then the anticipated outcome is substantially delayed or not achieved, people become disappointed or frustrated. A consideration for administrators or leaders would be to set realistic expectations and timelines, communicate consistently throughout a project, and monitor and adjust the expectations as new information is received.

In spite of the challenges, people look back positively on those times. Math faculty Chuck Bedal described a glass half-full scenario when he said, “The fact that the entire faculty/staff could meet around one picnic table and discuss those kinds of things was really an advantage that helped all kinds of things” (C. Bedal, personal communication, May 25, 2005). Cathy Urbanski, former administrative assistant and current computer faculty, spoke of the being cross-functional and learning how to help with virtually all aspects of college operations:

    I got to do registration, advisement, janitor, clean up the machines, repair person, and custodian person because we had those events and we cleaned all the chairs and everything else. You know that was a fun time. I look back and you can't take those away. (C. Urbanski, personal communication, June 21, 2005)

David Weaver, physics faculty, concluded that the challenges, “made us who we are” (D. Weaver, personal communication, June 7, 2005).
One can conclude that a certain camaraderie is created when people face challenges together. Furthermore, one could conclude that challenges should not necessarily be viewed as only negative. Many also have positive outcomes.

*Successes and Accomplishments*

There have been many successes at the college. A unique college culture was created and sustained. Earlier in this chapter, the focus on student success and the dedication and collegiality of employees were noted.

Success breeds success; that is, each success seemed to lay a foundation on which the next success could be built. One example of evidence in this regard is provided by author John Tagg who studied and wrote about CGCC and other colleges that were changing the learning paradigm in his book, *The Learning Paradigm College*. He said, “Chandler-Gilbert is interesting because its service-learning program is an outgrowth of its prior commitment to collaborative and experiential learning” (Tagg, 2003, p. 171).

English faculty Marybeth Mason explained why those with a foundation in active learning and service learning were ready to consider learning communities. “The faculty that choose learning communities and get involved with learning communities very often are masterful at cooperative learning and writing across the curriculum and service-learning” (M. Mason, personal communication, June 2, 2005).

It can be concluded that providing faculty and staff the support and opportunity to be creative and to succeed leads to continued success. Many of those interviewed credited the faculty development program for providing the support they needed to move
into active learning, service learning, learning communities, the integration of technology in their courses, writing across the curriculum, classroom research, and civic engagement.

During the course of the research, there was substantial evidence presented about the extent to which the college was responsive to community needs. From the attempts to address the range of desired programming and services outlined by the Southeast Valley Task Force to the nearly overwhelming demands of beginning an aviation maintenance program, community colleges continue to meet community needs. Long-standing Governing Board member Mrs. Linda B. Rosenthal explained:

I think that in essence this college, as with our other centers, have really responded to communities’ needs in the best way of a definition of what a community college really is. Plunked down in a piece of barren land surrounded by nothing, and then folks going out into the community and saying what is it that you as citizens need and we will attempt to provide it. (L. Rosenthal, personal communication, June 8, 2005)

This section of the document has presented a summary of findings from the research, as well as conclusions that can be drawn from the findings.

An interesting observation of this researcher was the sincerity and passion with which people contributed to this research. It seems that when people give it their all, they have an emotional attachment that is strong and enduring. Curriculum coordinator Sharon Flury reflected:

I guess I just feel real honored to have been part of this college. It has been a ride; just a wonderful experience that I would not give up for the world. It has been fun. It has been a challenge. And I am proud to
participate in this taking down of the history. I just feel real honored to be here. I appreciate the opportunity. (S. Flury, personal communication, June 1, 2005)

Many people choked up or began crying in the interviews—men and women alike—their voices filled with emotion as they recounted what they had accomplished, individually and collectively. As Chuck Bedal recounted a story of a struggling student he helped, who against all odds went on to succeed at the university, he teared up.

Marybeth Mason became emotional as she recounted the history of the development of the service learning program. Duane Oakes cried as he recounted the growth that took place with many students during their years at the college and in particular as a result of their service in the community. Arnette Ward poured out her feelings about the struggles and the joys of starting a college. It was touching and this researcher was reminded of the importance of allowing people to reflect on their accomplishments and to share their stories.

Recommendations

There are multiple opportunities to put the study results to immediate and practical use.

First, it became evident just prior to undertaking and during the course of the study that the college needed to develop and implement a system for ongoing collection and preservation of documents of historical significance. This researcher recommends that college archival policies be widely communicated so that all employees will
contribute to the ongoing collection of materials for the college archives from this point forward.

Second, it would be a worthwhile project for the college to reconstruct the archives, as best possible, for the first 20 years of college operations. Although this study contributes to the body of knowledge about the college during that timeframe, it focused on a particular subset of research problems and was not comprehensive. Therefore, a comprehensive review and compilation of missing materials should be undertaken.

Third, a college website should be established to make components of this research more easily accessible to those who participated as well as others who are interested. For example, the complete transcriptions of the interviews should be made available for review by those who are interested. Such an effort is currently underway at a CGCC history website, http://www.cgc.maricopa.edu/history/.

Fourth, elements of this study such as the significant milestones in the college’s history could be incorporated into employee orientation programs.

Fifth, MCCCD and CGCC administrators should give consideration to reading the history of MCCCD and CGCC, reflecting on how the past shapes the future and the lessons to be learned.

During the course of this research, the researcher became enthused about the possibilities of exploring future research related to CGCC and MCCCD. Consideration should be given to replicating this type of historical overview for each of the Maricopa Community Colleges. Then a cross-case analysis might be undertaken. Another approach to this would be to compare and contrast the founding and early years of
operation at each of the Maricopa Community Colleges. How were they similar? How were they different?

Another recommendation, which would be an extension of this research, would be to interview students who were at the college during the formative years. Interviewing community members, particularly those involved in some manner of community leadership, about the formation and early years of college operations would also be instructive.

There are several histories that have been written about various Maricopa Community Colleges or the District as a whole. Most of these appear to have been done by internal employees. Would an external person have the same findings and conclusions? This researcher would suggest that researchers from other segments of higher education or from other types of organizations pursue alternate approaches or angles of research offering important insights that internal employees might not recognize.

Another variation on this research would be to use focus groups of employees to provide a richer discussion of the history of the college. As one interviewee stated:

I wish you’d almost done this as small group because there’s a lot of things that if somebody would say it, I’d say, “Oh yes I forgot about that.” So I think just being here by myself, I’ve probably left out a million things that could jog my memory. (B. Larson, personal communication, June 10, 2005)

Each of the college’s successes or major accomplishments could be studied in more depth. Possible directions might be to study the college culture in more depth;
study faculty involvement in the leadership of an institution; study college environments that encourage innovation; study best practices in service-learning, learning communities, and other special programs; and study faculty development programs and their impact.

There were several interesting comments made about issues of diversity. Although there were only a few, they were intriguing. A future study could ask more specifically about issues of diversity. Are there distinctive characteristics for institutions that were started by minority presidents? Are more minority students or employees attracted to these organizations?

In general, studying the leadership of colleges is an interesting topic. This researcher would recommend further analysis of the CGCC leadership team. Consideration should also be given to an analysis of leadership styles at community colleges and within the Maricopa Community Colleges. One of the interviewees actually made this suggestion:

I think that over time, work could be done to study this organization, because it really should be studied. Not necessarily, the academic program, but I think the administration, because they tried to do so many things so differently. (G. Gonzales, personal communication, June 28, 2006)

A study of the development of the communities of the Southeast Valley in relationship to the development of the college would be intriguing. What is the economic impact of the college in the community? Specifically, how has the college contributed to the quality of life in the community?
Lastly, this researcher would be particular interested in pursuing, or helping someone else to pursue, a study of the success of CGCC students. Where have they gone and what have they achieved? What has happened in terms of their civic commitment? How were their lives changed by their experiences at CGCC?

It should be noted that accurate and complete recollections of events and activities such as those contained in this study are difficult given almost 20 years have passed since some of the events occurred which interviewees recalled. Individual respondent’s comments were subjective and often anecdotal, therefore should not be generalized as pertaining to all institutions. In the spirit of full disclosure, this researcher has worked at CGCC for nearly 20 years at the time of this writing. There may be unconscious tendencies to seek out answers that support her preconceived notions, but every effort has been made to be accurate, fair, and thorough.

**Implications**

The study has significance for multiple audiences who have an interest in understanding this college’s history with an eye towards applying its lessons to contemporary times, as well as to help anticipate and predict the future. It also has implications for those who administer other colleges or study the development of colleges in this country.

One of the more durable aspects of the college is the culture that focuses on student success, employee collegiality and collaboration, and responsiveness to the needs of the community. This culture provides a foundation for undertaking difficult challenges at CGCC. A thought to be considered for all colleges is the nature of the
college’s culture and the extent to which that allows goal achievement or prevents it. It would seem that when dedicated professionals come together to work on a common goal, are given a sufficient amount of autonomy, and are encouraged to be risk takers, despite the challenges, success can result.

From its humble beginnings as an extension of Mesa Community College, housed in a burned out and vacated former secondary school, CGCC has developed into a large college of more than 12,000 students per year across its three locations. With signature programs in aviation and information technologies, innovative programs in service-learning and learning communities, and a healthy collaborative college culture, Chandler-Gilbert Community College is poised for continued growth and progress.
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Appendices

*Appendix A: The Number of Community Colleges, 1900-1998*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public and Tribal</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B: Checklist of Questions to Be Applied to a Community
Considering Establishment of a Local Junior College

For the use of groups or individuals considering initiation of a junior college program, the
author has prepared a checklist of questions to be applied to the community concerned.
This list, which appears below, is intended as a starting point, not as a definitive outline
or measuring instrument.

1. Is there a distinct need for a junior college program?
   a. Can the apparent need be identified in terms of the number of potential
      students and the services they will require?
   b. Can the interests, goals, aptitudes, backgrounds, and ages of the potential
      students be clearly studied and defined?
   c. Is a junior college program—defined in the broader community college
      sense—the best answer to the observed need?

2. Does enabling or permissive legislation exist, or can it be brought into existence?
   a. Is there positive state legislation providing for the legality of local junior
      colleges, or at least an absence of prohibitive legislation?
   b. Do existing state laws (if any) provide detailed instructions for junior
      college or junior college district organization?
   c. Do regulations specify what steps should be taken in order to qualify for
      state aid, where it exists?
   d. Should the possibility of sponsoring enabling legislation be considered?

3. Are there individuals on the scene who can initiate necessary action?
   a. Are there men or women in the area who possess qualities of insight and
      definite leadership?
   b. Are these people willing and able to work effectively with groups, and do
      they realize the challenges involved?
   c. If they are identified with special groups (labor, industry, or a particular
      profession, for example), can they understand the viewpoint of others?
   d. Will they be able to work with outside experts (from the state education
      department or a university) who may be invited to furnish appropriate
      assistance to the local organizing group?

4. Is strong citizen support in evidence, or can it be developed and maintained?
   a. Are the people of the area aware of the advantages of community college
      offerings?
   b. Are they willing to consider what other communities have done to develop
      locally sponsored higher education?
   c. Are they willing to work for organization of a college and not expect
      outsiders or paid professionals to handle all the details?
   d. Would they go to the polls and vote to authorize and support a college, if
      such action were required?
   e. Do they realize that a good instructional program costs money, and that
      usually over half of the outlay must be met by local sources?
5. Can adequate financial support be assured?
   a. Can the district that the proposed college would serve support a good junior college program, assuming that citizens are in favor of such a program?
   b. Are there provisions for state aid to locally organized junior colleges?
   c. Can equitable sharing of the cost be worked out between the local community, the state, and the students (where necessary)?
   d. Can major cash expenditures be delayed (through use of temporary quarters or bond issues) without damage to the instructional program?

6. Can space be secured and a teaching staff be organized?
   a. Is it possible to obtain space for instruction, offices, and equipment in existing buildings on a temporary or permanent basis?
   b. If not, will the college organization be in a position to acquire a definite site and erect its own plant?
   c. Can a corps of instructors who are successful teachers in their respective fields and who are also in sympathy with the philosophy of the new college be engaged and retained?
   d. If a large variety of instruction is to be offered (in vocational fields, for example), can qualified instructors be secured as needed on a part-time basis?

7. Will students respond to the new educational opportunities?
   a. Is there a realization among potential students of the proposed junior college that there are advantages in attending the institution?
   b. Will adults seize the opportunity to enroll as special students or to participate in evening, extension, or short-term courses?
   c. Finally, can potential students afford to attend, both in terms of payment of tuition (if it must be charged) and in terms of time that would otherwise be devoted to remunerative employment?

If the answer to all or almost all of the questions listed above is YES for the community under consideration, it would appear, on the basis of the preceding six case studies, that success in founding a local junior college can be predicted with a reasonable amount of certainty.

Source: Dr. Elbert K. Fretwell, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954 (Quigley & Bailey, 2003).
Appendix C: Governing Board Elections and Duties

Governing Board Elections

The Maricopa Community Colleges are governed by a county Governing Board of five civic leaders. Board members are elected by voters to six-year terms. Terms are staggered among the five Board members so there is never a complete turnover on the Board.

In the transcription of an audiotaped interview in 2003, Linda B. Rosenthal (Rosenthal, 2003), an MCCCD Governing Board member since 1980 provided background on how the MCCCD Governing Board is elected from her personal perspective. Rosenthal explained:

I was elected in 1979 and took office in January 1980, so I am in my 23rd year. I was reelected in 1984 for a five-year term that, in 1984, became six years. I was reelected in 1984, 1990, and in 1996. In 2002, I stood for reelection once again, and I am there for another six years. (Rosenthal, 2003, p. 1)

Rosenthal stated that the State Board of Supervisors sets the boundaries for the five districts within Maricopa County, and as a result her service area has changed over the years from Central Phoenix and the West Valley, to Central Phoenix and North Phoenix (Rosenthal, 2003, p. 1).

Governing Board Duties

Board duties are defined in state statute (ARS 15-1444: General powers of district governing boards, 2005). “We adopt budgets; we approve curriculum; we determine the location of college campuses; and we approve construction projects. The most important thing that we do is select and monitor the CEO’s performance” (Rosenthal, 2003, p. 1).

In general, board duties include maintaining college classes at least eight months per year, visiting colleges to examine management, conditions and needs, and setting standards for the establishment, development, administration and accreditation of colleges within a district (Lesson 1: History of the Community College, 2004, p. 10).

Arizona Revised Statutes, 2005

15-1444. General powers of district governing boards

A. Except as otherwise provided, the district board shall:
1. Maintain each community college for a period of not less than eight months in each year and, if the funds of the district are sufficient, maintain each community college for a longer period.

2. Adopt policies in a public forum to offer programs that meet the educational needs of the population served by the community college.

3. Enforce the courses of study prescribed by the district board.

4. Visit each community college under its jurisdiction and examine carefully into its management, conditions and needs.

5. Exclude from each community college all books, publications or papers of a sectarian, partisan or denominational character intended for use as textbooks.

6. Appoint and employ a chancellor or chancellors, vice-chancellors, a president or presidents, vice-presidents, deans, professors, instructors, lecturers, fellows and such other officers and employees it deems necessary. The district board may enter into employment contracts with chancellors, vice-chancellors and presidents for a duration of more than one year but not more than five years.

7. Determine the salaries of persons it appoints and employs.

8. Remove any officer or employee if in its judgment the interests of education in this state require the removal.

9. Award degrees, certificates and diplomas upon the completion of courses and curriculum as it deems appropriate.

10. Appoint or employ, if it deems necessary, police officers who shall have the authority and power of peace officers. The police officers who have received a certificate from the Arizona peace officer standards and training board are eligible for membership in and benefits under either title 38, chapter 5, article 2 or the public safety personnel retirement system under title 38, chapter 5, article 4.

11. Determine the location within the district of a community college and purchase, receive, hold, make and take leases of, sell and convey real or personal property for the benefit of the community colleges under its jurisdiction.

12. Obtain insurance or be self-insured, or a combination of insurance and self-insurance, against loss, to the extent it is determined necessary on community college buildings of the district. The local district shall have an insurable interest in the buildings.

B. The district board may:
1. Administer trusts declared or created for the district and receive by gift or devise and hold in trust or otherwise property wheresoever located, and if not otherwise provided, dispose of the property for the benefit of the district.

2. Lease real property, as lessor or as lessee. If a district is the lessee, the lease may contain an option to purchase the property. The district board may adopt policies as are deemed necessary and may delegate in writing to the chancellor or president of the district, or their designees, all or any part of its authority to lease property under this paragraph. A district board shall not delegate the authority to execute a lease that exceeds one hundred thousand dollars per year. Any delegation by the district board pursuant to this paragraph may be rescinded in whole or in part at any time by the district board.

3. Sue and be sued.

4. Contract. The district board may adopt such policies as are deemed necessary and may delegate in writing to the chancellor or president of the district, or their designees, all or any part of its authority to contract under this paragraph. Any delegation of authority under this paragraph may be rescinded by the district board at any time in whole or in part.

5. Construct, remodel and repair buildings.

6. In conjunction with other districts, establish policies for procurement of goods and services.

7. Provide a plan or plans for employee benefits which may include optional retirement programs pursuant to section 15-1451, subsection A, which allow for participation in a cafeteria plan that meets the requirements of the United States internal revenue code of 1986.

8. Accept grants or donations of monies from the United States, or from any of its agencies, departments or officers, or from persons, corporations, foundations or associations. A district board shall deposit the monies into a specific fund or account and a district board shall administer the monies in accordance with the purpose of the grant or donation with specific policies or restrictions as described or stipulated in the grant or donation. In the case of personal property granted or donated to or for the benefit of a community college district, a district board shall immediately transfer possession and ownership of the property to the designated district.

9. Enter into intergovernmental agreements or contracts pursuant to section 11-952.01 for participation in programs offered by public agency pools or separately contract with a trustee or board of trustees that provides a common self-insurance program with pooled funds and risks pursuant to section 15-382, subsection B, paragraph 2. The district board is not required to engage in competitive procurement in order to make the decision to participate in these programs.
C. If a district acquires real or personal property, whether by purchase, exchange, condemnation, gift or otherwise, the district shall pay to the county treasurer any taxes on the property that were unpaid as of the date of acquisition, including penalties and interest. The lien for unpaid delinquent taxes, penalties and interest on property acquired by the district:

1. Is not abated, extinguished, discharged or merged in the title to the property.

2. Is enforceable in the same manner as other delinquent tax liens.

D. From and after December 31, 1988, in a district whose boundaries encompass a vehicle emissions control area as defined in section 49-541 the district board shall require all out of county and out of state students to sign an affidavit at the time of course registration that the student's vehicle meets the requirements of section 49-542. From and after December 31, 1988, the district board on property under its jurisdiction within a vehicle emissions control area shall prohibit the parking of those vehicles which fail to comply with section 49-542.

E. A community college district and a joint technological education district governing board may enter into agreements for the provision of administrative, operational and educational services and facilities.

F. Each district may establish a program for the exchange of students between the community colleges under its jurisdiction and colleges and universities located in Sonora, Mexico. The program may provide for in-state tuition for Sonora students at the community colleges under its jurisdiction in exchange for similar tuition provisions for Arizona students enrolled or seeking enrollment in Sonora colleges and universities. The community colleges may work in conjunction with the Arizona-Mexico commission in the governor's office to coordinate recruitment and admissions activities to provide for in-state tuition for up to fifty Sonora students at the community colleges under its jurisdiction in exchange for similar tuition provisions for up to fifty total Arizona students enrolled or seeking enrollment in Sonora colleges and universities.

G. Each district shall facilitate transfer articulation coordination pursuant to section 15-1824.

Source: (ARS 15-1444: General powers of district governing boards, 2005)
### Appendix D: MCCCD Governing Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Robert M. Jaap</th>
<th>Robert F. Easley</th>
<th>W. James Miller</th>
<th>C. Lester Hogan</th>
<th>Dwight Patterson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Robert M. Jaap</td>
<td>Robert F. Easley</td>
<td>W. James Miller</td>
<td>C. Lester Hogan</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Robert M. Jaap</td>
<td>Robert F. Easley</td>
<td>W. James Miller</td>
<td>C. Lester Hogan</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Robert M. Jaap</td>
<td>Robert F. Easley</td>
<td>W. James Miller</td>
<td>C. Lester Hogan</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Robert M. Jaap</td>
<td>Robert F. Easley</td>
<td>W. James Miller</td>
<td>C. Lester Hogan</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Jeremy Butler</td>
<td>Robert F. Easley</td>
<td>W. James Miller</td>
<td>H.W. Van Loo</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Jeremy Butler</td>
<td>Paul Wright</td>
<td>W. James Miller</td>
<td>H.W. Van Loo</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Jeremy Butler</td>
<td>Paul Wright</td>
<td>W. James Miller</td>
<td>Kenneth Badertscher</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Jeremy Butler</td>
<td>Paul Wright</td>
<td>W. James Miller</td>
<td>Kenneth Badertscher</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Jeremy Butler</td>
<td>Paul Wright</td>
<td>W. James Miller, Roger Brooks</td>
<td>Kenneth Badertscher</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Jeremy Butler</td>
<td>Paul Wright</td>
<td>Roger Brooks</td>
<td>Kenneth Badertscher</td>
<td>Dwight Patterson, Ross Farnsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Jeremy Butler</td>
<td>Paul Wright, Robert L. Robertson</td>
<td>Roger Brooks</td>
<td>Kenneth Badertscher</td>
<td>Ross Farnsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Jeremy Butler</td>
<td>Robert L. Robertson</td>
<td>Roger Brooks</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Ross Farnsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Robert Martinez</td>
<td>Robert L. Robertson</td>
<td>Roger Brooks, William Schindel</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Ross Farnsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Robert Martinez</td>
<td>Robert L. Robertson</td>
<td>Roger Brooks, William Schindel</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Ross Farnsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Robert Martinez</td>
<td>Robert L. Robertson</td>
<td>William Schindel</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Ross Farnsworth, M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Robert Martinez</td>
<td>Robert L. Robertson, Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Robert Martinez</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Robert Martinez, Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Phyllis Muir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Phyllis Muir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Phyllis Muir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Phyllis Muir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>Phyllis Muir, M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Roy Amrein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Barbara Hitchcock, Gene Eastin</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>M. Grant Christensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Gene Eastin</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Nancy Stein</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Scott Crowley</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Donald Campbell</td>
<td>Gerry Walker</td>
<td>Linda B. Rosenthal</td>
<td>Scott Crowley</td>
<td>Ed Contreras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: This table was compiled by the researcher using MCCCD records such as Governing Board minutes.
Appendix E: MCCCD Administrative Organization and Structure

Chancellor

The elected Governing Board has responsibility for selecting and evaluating the District’s Chief Executive Officer (CEO), who in turn has responsibility for all District operations. Initially the District CEO was called a Dean, then a President, and then a Chancellor. The Chancellor has responsibility for all District operations. Appendix F contains names and years of service for the District’s CEOs.

College Presidents

All 10 MCCCD college Presidents report to the Chancellor who in turn reports to the Governing Board. The President is responsible for the operations of a college and seeing that the policies and administrative regulations established by the Governing Board are followed. The President has responsibility for keeping the Chancellor and the Board informed about progress in regard to curriculum, students, employees, finances, facilities and equipment. “The president of the college, as chief executive officer, is responsible for the college’s daily operations including direct or indirect supervision of vice presidents, provosts, deans, division and/or department chairs, and others who organize support for faculty, staff, and students” (Vaughan, 2000, pp. 20-21). The President sets college goals and directions, within the scope of the Governing Board goals. Maricopa’s college Presidents or CEOs are listed in Appendix G. Individually and collectively, these leaders have influenced the development of MCCCD.

Initially, the college CEOs were called Deans, then by 1967 Executive Deans. When Marion Donaldson was appointed Executive Dean of SCC in 1969, he retained the title of Vice-president of the Maricopa District, as well. Other Executive Deans also “added vice-president to their titles,” and “it was noted that this was an indication of the District-level involvement in administration that they would be experiencing” (Hinsdale, 1973, pp. 169-170). In 1977, the college CEO positions had a change in title from Executive Deans to Presidents.

Vice Chancellors

District Vice-presidents, now called Vice-chancellors, were at one point in the District’s development, a powerful influence over District and, therefore to an extent, college operations. In 1966, District President Robert Hannelly reorganized the administration so that college CEOs, called Executive Deans at the time, would report directly to him (Hinsdale, 1973). Today, college CEOs, now called Presidents, continue to report directly to the Chancellor, the District CEO. Vice-chancellors, although on the same salary scale as the college Presidents, serve in support roles, coordinating particular functions for the District, such as academic affairs, student and community affairs, business and financial matters, or human resources.
Chancellor’s Executive Council

Beginning in 1965, Robert Hannelly began meeting weekly with District and campus administrators for PC, MCC, and GCC. This group was initially called the District Administrative Committee (Hinsdale, 1973). By 1966, the group was trimmed to include the District President, Vice-presidents, Executive Deans (of colleges), and the Director of Research and Curriculum. “The new, smaller group was to be known as the President’s Advisory Council” (Hinsdale, 1973, p. 87). Sometime in the 1970’s, the name changed to the Chancellor’s Executive Council, as evidenced by references to this group in minutes of the Governing Board. For example, in minutes from 1978, Dr. Paul Elsner refers to “the work done by the Chancellor’s Executive Council” as part of the planning for future campus expansion ("Governing board minutes, March 14, 1978," p. 2).

At the time of this research, the District Chancellor meets monthly with the Chancellor’s Executive Council which currently includes the college presidents and the vice-chancellors. The President of the District Faculty Senate is often invited to the meetings. This group, still called the Chancellor’s Executive Council, makes recommendations to the Chancellor on major District matters including employee and student policies, facilities, finances, and more.

Source: This appendix was compiled by the researcher using various MCCCD documents such as Governing Board minutes, job descriptions, and historical documents.
# Appendix F: MCCCD Chief Executive Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MCCCD CEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly, John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>John Prince, Al Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Al Flowers, Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Paul Elsner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Paul Elsner, Raul Cardenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas, Fred Gaskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>MCCCD CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fred Gaskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Fred Gaskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Fred Gaskin, Rufus Glasper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Rufus Glasper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Rufus Glasper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: This appendix was compiled by the researcher using MCCCD Governing Board minutes and historical documents.
### Appendix G: Maricopa Community Colleges, Chief Executive Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phoenix College</th>
<th>Glendale Community College</th>
<th>Mesa Community College</th>
<th>GateWay Community College</th>
<th>Scottsdale Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Robert Hannelly; J. Lee Thompson</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>J. Lee Thompson</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>J. Lee Thompson</td>
<td>John Prince</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td>Irwin Spector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>J. Lee Thompson</td>
<td>Matt Hanhila</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td>Irwin Spector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>J. Lee Thompson</td>
<td>Matt Hanhila</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td>Irwin Spector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>J. Lee Thompson</td>
<td>Matt Hanhila</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td>Irwin Spector, Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Marion Donaldson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>J. Lee Thompson, William E. Berry</td>
<td>Matt Hanhila</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Marion Donaldson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>Matt Hanhila</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Marion Donaldson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>Matt Hanhila</td>
<td>John Riggs</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Marion Donaldson, Ray A. Cattani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>Matt Hanhila</td>
<td>Helena Howe</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Ray A. Cattani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>Matt Hanhila, John Waltrip</td>
<td>Helena Howe</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Ray A. Cattani, Mike Svaco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Helena Howe</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Mike Svaco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Phoenix College</td>
<td>Glendale Community College</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>GateWay Community College</td>
<td>Scottsdale Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Helena Howe</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Mike Svaco, Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Helena Howe, Theo Heap</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Theo Heap</td>
<td>Norm Bruemmer</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Theo Heap</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Theo Heap</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Theo Heap</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Theo Heap</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Theo Heap, Wallace Simpson</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Wallace Simpson</td>
<td>Charles A. Green, Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Wallace Simpson</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>William E. Berry</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Wallace Simpson</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>William E. Berry, Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Wallace Simpson, William Holt (interim), Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison, Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Phoenix College</td>
<td>Glendale Community College</td>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>GateWay Community College</td>
<td>Scottsdale Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison, Marie Pepicello</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Marie Pepicello</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Marie Pepicello</td>
<td>John R. Waltrip</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Marie Pepicello</td>
<td>Tessa Pollack Martinez</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Marie Pepicello</td>
<td>Tessa Pollack Martinez</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Marie Pepicello</td>
<td>Tessa Pollack Martinez</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Marie Pepicello</td>
<td>Tessa Pollack Martinez</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Marie Pepicello</td>
<td>Tessa Pollack Martinez</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Fred Gaudet (interim)</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Marie Pepicello, Morris Johnson (interim)</td>
<td>Tessa Pollack Martinez</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Fred Gaudet (interim)</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Corina Gardea</td>
<td>Tessa Pollack Martinez, Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Eugene Giovannini</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Corina Gardea</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Eugene Giovannini</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Corina Gardea</td>
<td>Phil Randolph</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Eugene Giovannini</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Anna Solley</td>
<td>Jean Ann Abel (interim)</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Eugene Giovannini</td>
<td>Arthur W. Decabooter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rio Salado College</th>
<th>South Mountain Community College</th>
<th>Chandler-Gilbert Community College</th>
<th>Paradise Valley Community College</th>
<th>Estrella Mountain Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>These five colleges did not exist in prior years and were created by Chancellor Paul Elsner over a series of years. Also, in 1977, the District President was renamed the Chancellor and College Executive Deans were renamed Presidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rio Salado College</td>
<td>South Mountain Community College</td>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert Community College</td>
<td>Paradise Valley Community College</td>
<td>Estrella Mountain Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Walter Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Walter Morrison, Lionel Martinez</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Lionel Martinez, Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Myrna Harrison, Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Wallace Simpson</td>
<td>Art Decabooter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NOTE: CGCCC operated as an extension of MCC)</td>
<td>(NOTE: PVCCC operated as an extension of SCC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Wallace Simpson</td>
<td>Art Decabooter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Wallace Simpson</td>
<td>Art Decabooter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Wallace Simpson, Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Art Decabooter</td>
<td>John Waltrip (NOTE: EMCCC operated as an extension of GCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Charles A. Green</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>Art Decabooter</td>
<td>John Waltrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Charles A. Green, Linda Thor</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>John Waltrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rio Salado College</td>
<td>South Mountain Community College</td>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert Community College</td>
<td>Paradise Valley Community College</td>
<td>Estrella Mountain Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>John Waltrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas, John Cordova</td>
<td>Larry Christiansen, Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>John Cordova, Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>John Waltrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>John Waltrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>John Waltrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>John Waltrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>John Waltrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Raul Cardenas, Gina Kranitz</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Gina Kranitz</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>John Cordova, Kenneth Atwater</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward</td>
<td>Gina Kranitz</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>Kenneth Atwater</td>
<td>Arnette S. Ward, Maria L. Hesse</td>
<td>Gina Kranitz</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>Kenneth Atwater</td>
<td>Maria L. Hesse</td>
<td>Gina Kranitz, Paul Dale (interim)</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>Kenneth Atwater</td>
<td>Maria L. Hesse</td>
<td>Paul Dale (interim), Mary Kathryn Kickels</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Linda Thor</td>
<td>Kenneth Atwater</td>
<td>Maria L. Hesse</td>
<td>Mary Kathryn Kickels</td>
<td>Homero Lopez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: This appendix was compiled by the researcher from MCCCD Governing Board minutes and college accreditation records.
Appendix H: Overview of the Ten Colleges That Comprise the MCCCD

In Richard Felnagle’s book about the history of the Maricopa County Community College District, he explains his decision to “focus primarily on the founding of each of the District’s 10 colleges because starting new colleges has been the District’s most important (and most revealing) function” but he also explains that the “history of the District is the history of those colleges” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 6). This researcher concurred that it would be difficult for readers to gain a full understanding of the history of the Maricopa County Community College District or Chandler-Gilbert Community College without some understanding of the other Maricopa Colleges. Each college has unique features and characteristics that have been influenced by the moment in history in which it was developed, the communities it served, the leadership style of the CEO, fiscal constraints, and a variety of factors. This appendix provides a brief synopsis of each of the Maricopa Community Colleges, focusing on the founding and those items which the colleges would consider signature programs or unique features.

Phoenix College

The history of Phoenix College is tied to the history of MCCCD and is described in depth in Chapter 2, under the heading “The Maricopa County Community College District.” Therefore, it will not be repeated here.

Unique features of PC include its very diverse student body. “In fall 2002, 15% of its students were immigrants, refugees or foreign visitors. With an Hispanic student population of 30%, PC has been officially designated an Hispanic Serving Institution, gaining access to state and federal funding to assist this growing segment” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 34).

The college is currently known for its programs in Legal Assisting, Tribal Court Advocacy, Model United Nations, and Creative Writing (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 35).

Mesa Community College

“On September 11, 1963, MCC opened its doors for registration in the former LDS Church at 809 West Main, Mesa, as an extension of Phoenix College, with Dr. John D. Riggs as Dean” (Puyear, 1987, p. 4). Riggs who had been born and raised in Mesa, had been serving as the chief student affairs officer at Phoenix College (Felnagle, 2000). In the first year 371 students were enrolled (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002).

A bond election in 1964 provided funds to purchase land and construct a campus. One hundred and sixty acres was purchased at the southeast corner of Southern and Dobson for $3000 per acre (Felnagle, 2000). Groundbreaking ceremonies were held on
October 15, 1965 (Puyear, 1987); meanwhile, classes were being held in multiple sites in downtown Mesa, sometimes in buildings and sometimes in portables. “When Mesa Community College became a separate college on July 1, 1965, offerings were expanded to include business and office education, drafting, electronics technology, and practical nursing. When school began in 1965, there were 1369 students enrolled, and the classrooms and faculty offices were at seven different locations in Mesa” ("North Central Association accreditation review self study report," 1984, p. 10).

“During the summer of 1966 the college moved to permanent facilities at Dobson Road and West Southern Avenue on 160 acres, (since reduced to 140 acres due to freeway and street expansion). When classes began in September 1966, the campus consisted of three permanent buildings—Student Union, Life Science, and Maintenance—and 26 portable buildings” ("Institutional self study report," 1995, p. 3).

Currently, MCC considers International Education to be one of its outstanding programs as described in a book written in tribute in 2002. MCC works with international communities in China, Italy, the Netherlands, and Mexico (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002).

One of the three original Maricopa Colleges, Mesa Community College was the parent institution for several sites that eventually became stand-alone colleges such as Scottsdale Community College and Chandler-Gilbert Community College.

MCC’s east campus at McKellips and Power Roads opened with an enrollment of 700 students in temporary facilities, while new facilities were being constructed. The grand opening of MCC’s second campus, named the Red Mountain Campus, was held on October 3, 2001 (Christiansen, 2005).

In 2004, MCC was the largest of the Maricopa Community Colleges with student enrollment of 27,834 students, two full-service campuses and multiple off-site centers, more than 300 residential faculty, and an operating budget of more than $70 million dollars ("MCC self study," 2004).

Glendale Community College

Glendale Community College began as an extension of Phoenix College with two sites. The extension site on Camelback Road near 16th Avenue was nicknamed “Read Mullan University” after the car dealership of the same name that was located directly adjacent to it. Portable classrooms were moved onto the site, but most classes were held in a gymnasium that already existed at the site. The other site was located in the Jewish Community Center on Maryland and Seventeenth Avenues (Crudder, 1997, p. viii). The two sites enrolled a total of 619 students in the first year (Felnagle, 2000).

Ultimately, it was determined that the two extension sites should be consolidated on one campus. The bond election in 1964 provided funding to purchase the 160 acres of land and build the campus. The site for the permanent campus at 59th Avenue and Olive
was purchased for $3550 an acre from the P.W. Womack Construction Company who owned the land (Felnagle, 2000). Unlike some of the later community colleges in Maricopa, Glendale “opened complete in every detail and strikingly beautiful” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 77).

Felnagle describes the decade of the 1990s as “camelot” within Maricopa and credits Glendale Community College with marked growth and innovations that influenced the entire District (Felnagle, 2000, p. 223). One of the innovations involved the use of technology to enhance instruction, an initiative in which the college has been involved for almost two decades, as of this research.

In 1987, GCC built its first High Tech Center and added a second High Tech Center in 1991. Together, these world-class facilities house more than 500 computer workstations and are open more than 100 hours a week. Each student has access to a computer, a highly integrated system of Windows/Macintosh operating systems, a complete office suite of programs, Internet access, e-mail accounts and even personal storage space on the server. GCC ranked eighth in “America’s Most Wired Colleges 2000” in the two-year institution category by Yahoo! Internet Life and Peterson’s (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 29).

The college takes pride in its academic quality and reported that “Glendale Community College’s single greatest “claim to fame” is its high standards and overall excellence in academic fundamentals” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 28).

**GateWay Community College**

GateWay Community College was founded in 1967. Initially called Maricopa Technical College, it was the fourth addition to the Maricopa County Community College District with a mission “to provide business workforce development in a variety of occupations” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 26).


While the other colleges were dealing with a largely day-time population of high school graduates, the new downtown college “would attempt to serve primarily those individuals who have left high school and are more than 19 years of age or graduated from high school” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 93).

MTC earned independent NCA accreditation in 1971 (Hinsdale, 1973). In 1974, Maricopa Technical College changed its name to Maricopa Technical Community
College. It became “the first community college in the nation to enter into a cooperative working relationship with business and industry in offering courses at the employee facilities” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 12).

In 1987, Maricopa Technical Community College changed its name to reflect a new broadened mission including general education and university transfer programs, as well as career and technical programs. There was some debate about the renaming. “The original choice of name to replace Maricopa Technical Community College was Sky Harbor Community College, but after reviewing the statistics on the growth of the GateWay area and the possibility of Sky Harbor Airport being renamed, GateWay Community College was chosen” (Puyear, 1987, p. 21).

GateWay Community College has strong program offerings in industrial technology fields. A number of unique programs are also offered at GateWay Community College including:

- Diagnostic Medical Ultrasound
- Medical Radiography
- Physical Therapist Assisting
- Health Services Management
- Health Unit Coordinator
- Medical Transcription
- Perioperative Nursing
- Nuclear Medicine Technology
- Respiratory Care
- Surgical Technology
- Surgical Technology First Assistant

(A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, pp. 26-27)

Scottsdale Community College


Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community leaders agreed to lease 160 acres to the Maricopa County Community College District board on September 21, 1969. Scottsdale Community College became ‘the only public community college on an Indian reservation” (Withers, 1996, p. 20). Sixteen portable buildings were moved from Mesa, Glendale, and Phoenix College campuses to the SCC’s present location on Chaparral Road. “The newly formed college opened its doors in September 1970, as an extension of Mesa Community College, with 948 students, 20 full-time faculty and 30 visiting staff members” (Puyear, 1987, p. 5).

In 1975, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools recognized Scottsdale Community College as independent of its mother campus MCC (Withers, 1996).
Hallmarks of the college were aligned with the community of Scottsdale including programs focused on the Native American culture, the desert environment, the performing arts, nursing, equine science, hospitality and culinary arts, park management, interior design, and film and television (Withers, 1996).

**Rio Salado College**

Rio Salado College (RSC) began as a non-campus alternative to more traditional options already available within the Maricopa District. Rio opened its doors in July 1978 “with 22 employees serving the 9,226 square miles of Maricopa County from five locations, and divisions for business and industry and alternative delivery” (A vision becomes reality: The Rio report 1978-1988, 1988, p. 15). At the time, the main office for Rio Salado was located at 2300 North Central Avenue in Phoenix.

In its first year of operation, the college received candidacy status for accreditation from the North Central Association (A vision becomes reality: The Rio report 1978-1988, 1988).

In the 1980s, multiple unique programs were launched including the “It’s Never Too Late” program for seniors, the prison education program, the SunDial network for teleconferencing, a paraprofessional training program in Chemical Dependency, the Homebound Project for disabled students, the Institute for Retired Professionals, the Elderhostel program, and others. By then 44 degrees and certificates were being offered in areas all over the Valley, including shopping malls (A vision becomes reality: The Rio report 1978-1988, 1988).

Flexible, responsive formats were the foundation for many of Rio Salado’s programs. Students were able to register by mail and by phone as early as 1978, and eventually in the 1990s online via internet. Weekend college classes were launched at local shopping malls in 1988. Alternative delivery programs graduated their first completers in that same year. Courses were available by teleconferencing, television, radio, videotape, correspondence, and other formats. Books could be purchased by mail (A vision becomes reality: The Rio report 1978-1988, 1988).

By 1988, Rio offered 56 degrees and certificates, 42 of which were one-of-a-kind in the Maricopa District. Among Rio’s unique features is the demographic breakdown of employees. Compared to most of the Maricopa colleges, there are few full-time, residential faculty. Hundreds of adjunct faculty teach packaged courses which are designed by a team of educational professionals including content experts, instructional designers, and technologists. As of March 2005, Rio had 28 residential faculty, as compared with MCC’s 296 residential faculty (MCCCD regular employee statistics, 2005).

Today Rio Salado’s mission focuses on customized, unique programs and partnerships, accelerated formats, and distance learning. RSC provides special programming for the Department of Corrections, has developed a Dental Hygiene
program in partnership with the Arizona Dental Association and Delta Dental Insurance, and has an online Clinical Dental Assisting program. The eArmyU program provides United States Army soldiers with online education and is now the fourth largest of the Army’s 21 providers and the only one without facilities on a base. Two public radio stations, KJZZ-FM and KBAQ-FM, reach thousands of listeners weekly and Sun Sounds of Arizona provides a radio reading service for the visually impaired (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002).

South Mountain Community College

“The College was officially approved by the State Community College Board in March 1979 ... and ground was broken on August 23, 1979” (Puyear, 1987, p. 13). SMCC was dedicated in November 1981. A year later, approximately 750 students who had been attending classes temporarily held at South Mountain High School, Holy Family Catholic Church and Greenfield Junior High School, occupied classrooms on the new campus. A community advisory committee which had initially advocated for the college to be built, began advocating for a focus on transfer education. They hoped that more minority students would be inspired to go on to pursue bachelors and masters degrees (Felnagle, 2000).

SMCC is more diverse than other Maricopa colleges. “Minority groups comprise 63% of all SMCC students and Hispanic students make up 45% of enrollment” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 40). More than half of SMCC’s employees are ethnic minorities (MCCCD employee demographics, 2005).

In addition to its main campus near 24th Street and Baseline, SMCC has two extension centers, the Guadelupe Center and the Ahwatukee-Foothills Center.

The town of Guadelupe has one of the largest populations of Pasqua-Yaqui Indians, and SMCC initiated a curriculum to help preserve the tribe’s language and culture. With 1994 bond funds, the college built a new Guadelupe Center to better serve town and area residents. The center opened with 125 students enrolled, and now student enrollment has more than doubled with 47 classes offered in general education, computers, English as a Second Language, and Yaqui Indian History, Language and Culture. Yaqui-centered courses support a community effort to pass on the tribe’s culture to young people. (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 41).

Unique offerings at SMCC include the Storytelling Institute and program, which includes courses that lead to an academic certificate, as well as storytelling festivals in the fall and spring of each year. The Dynamic Learning teacher preparation program, in partnership with Arizona State University, is also highly regarded (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002).
Paradise Valley Community College

PVCC began as an extension of Scottsdale Community College in 1985 and secured independent accreditation in 1990. Paradise Valley serves the northern Phoenix area including the communities of Paradise Valley, Carefree, Cave Creek, and New River, as well as unincorporated areas of Maricopa County. In the fall of 2004, student headcount was 8,516 and FTSE was 3,768.

The college campus is located on approximately 90 acres of land. As of 2004, the facilities total approximately 275,000 GSF. The college also has approximately 70 acres of undeveloped land, which is 12 miles to the north of the existing campus at Union Hills Drive and 32nd Street. Eventually, this site will be developed as a satellite campus ("Report of the institutional self study for reaffirmation of accreditation," 2005).

One of the major areas of focus for the college has been to become a more “learning-centered college” ("Report of the institutional self study for reaffirmation of accreditation," 2005, p. 150). In addition to college wide discussions, the college created several internal documents to help guide college efforts in this area. An example of those efforts is PVCC’s well-established learning communities program that is the foundation for its First-Year Experience.

The PVCC Center for International Studies offers a certificate and a degree in international business as well as a variety of other learning opportunities. “The East/West Center at the University of Hawaii has designated PVCC’s International Studies program as a Center for Asian Studies” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 33), while the American Council on International Intercultural Education has honored it with an “International Achievement Award for the Best Practice in Global Education” ("Report of the institutional self study for reaffirmation of accreditation," 2005, p. 175). Another international program “involves a transfer partnership with the Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara (UAG) for students who desire to become bilingual physicians. PVCC’s premedical curriculum of over ninety credits can transfer to UAG where students begin their medical studies” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 33).

Chandler-Gilbert Community College (see Chapter 4 of this study)

Estrella Mountain Community College

Estrella Mountain Community College (EMCC), the newest of the 10 Maricopa Community Colleges, began in 1990 as an extension center of Glendale Community College ("Institutional self-study report 2002," 2002). A Provost was appointed in 1988 to plan the college, which subsequently achieved its initial five-year accreditation from The Higher Learning Commission of North Central Association” (A tribute to the history and hope of the Maricopa Community Colleges, 2002, p. 22).

EMCC serves the southwestern area of Maricopa County including the cities of Avondale, Goodyear, Buckeye, Gila Bend, Litchfield Park, El Mirage, Tolleson and

The EMCC campus consists of six buildings which total more than 200,000 GSF ("Institutional self-study report 2002," 2002). The college has no athletic facilities but has a fitness center which is “considerably larger” than those at PVCC and CGCC (Felnagle, 2000, p. 235).

“A hallmark of the Estrella Mountain campus is the integration of public art” and the college has won several architectural awards ("Institutional self-study report 2002," 2002, p. 73). Felnagle characterizes the campus as “strongly resembling a small business park. The landscaping, public art, and the thoroughly functional design of all the buildings exude an undeniably corporate ambience” (Felnagle, 2000, p. 235).

EMCC has emphasized science and mathematics curriculum with the goal of increasing college completion rates among Hispanics and other underrepresented youth. One unique program is the NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) Center.

Source: This document was compiled by the researcher using MCCCD Governing Board minutes, college accreditation records, MCCCD publications, and other historical documents.
### Appendix I: Milestones in the History of the MCCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date, when available</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona legislators passed an act allowing high schools to offer grades 13-14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix Junior College was founded as part of the Phoenix Union High School District with 18 students in its first year. Classes are held in a one-room cottage on the campus of Phoenix Union High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix College moved to Cottonwood Court on four acres at 7th Street and Fillmore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona authorized local school districts to organize junior colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
<td>A bond referendum was passed for $175,000 for construction of 24 classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix Junior College campus was built for $750,000 on its current site on Thomas Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix Junior College changed its name to Phoenix College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>A conference was held to discuss a possible Arizona state junior college system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>The first State Junior College bill was introduced; HB 238, 2nd regular session of the 23rd legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>March 26</td>
<td>The Arizona Junior College Law was signed by Governor Paul Fannin with an effective date of July 1, 1961.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>July 11</td>
<td>Governor Paul Fannin appointed the members of the state's first board of directors for junior colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>First meeting of the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges was held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>November 6</td>
<td>A District to serve Maricopa County was formed; the vote was 90,000 to 40,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>December 4</td>
<td>Phoenix College was integrated into the Maricopa District as the District's first institution by a vote of 805 to 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>December 12</td>
<td>The first meeting of the Governing Board was held in the Kiva Club of the Westward Ho Hotel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>February 11</td>
<td>A plan to open college extensions in Glendale, Camelback, and Mesa was approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Dr. Robert J. Hannelly was appointed as the first District President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>The first District bond initiative for $9,750,000 failed; the vote was 12,000 to 8,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date, when available</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>The Glendale and Camelback extensions of Phoenix College opened in the West Valley, while a Mesa extension opened in the East Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>The first District Governing Board election was held. Every member of the appointed board ran and was elected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>A District bond initiative passed and provided $4,800,000 to buy Phoenix College from PUHSD, purchase sites for two extension centers, and build on those sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Mesa Community College and Glendale Community College were founded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>The title for the college CEO position was changed from Dean to Executive Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>Glendale Community College was dedicated on Olive Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>Mesa Community College was dedicated at Southern and Dobson Roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Dr. Hannelly retired as the District’s first President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>April 24</td>
<td>Dr. John Prince, former GCC Dean, was selected as new District President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>Maricopa Technical College was dedicated after opening in September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>October 24</td>
<td>A District bond initiative for $9,980,000 was successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Scottsdale Community College offers classes onsite on Chaparral Road as an extension of Mesa Community College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>The concept of supplementing residential faculty with adjunct faculty was introduced in MCCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>The District renamed itself a “community college” district in accordance with House Bill 126.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maricopa Technical College (now GateWay Community College) earned independent accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottsdale Community College became independently accredited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>August 14</td>
<td>Dr. John Prince retired as MCCC President; Governing Board appointed Dr. Al Flowers as interim MCCC President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Maricopa District Office moved to 3910 E. Washington, the current location of GateWay Community College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>Titles changed for chief executive officers. The MCCC President became the Chancellor and Executive Deans became college Presidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>August 16</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Elsner was named Chancellor of MCCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date, when available</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>March 14</td>
<td>Rio Salado Community College was founded and enrolled its first class of students in August 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>The creation of South Mountain Community College was approved by the Governing Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Recommendations from the Aschauer and Hay personnel studies were approved by the Governing Board and resulted in major restructuring of staff and administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>March-May</td>
<td>Upset over the establishment of new colleges, the increase in adjunct faculty, the raises provided to the administration in the Hay Study, and more, faculty members picket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>June 3</td>
<td>Tuition of $3 per credit hour was approved by the Governing Board. Up until this time, there was no tuition but there was a student activity fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>South Mountain Community College was formally opened near 24th Street and Baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>September 25</td>
<td>A $75 million capital improvement bond was passed by voters for MCCCD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two new extension campuses were started. Paradise Valley Education Center was an extension of SCC and Chandler-Gilbert Education Center was an extension of MCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>The name of Maricopa Technical College was changed to GateWay Community College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>Estrella Mountain Education Center was founded as an extension of GCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>The District Office moved from 40th Street and Washington where it had co-located with GWCC to its current location in Tempe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Paradise Valley Community College was independently accredited and became a separate entity from SCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>A groundbreaking ceremony was held for Estella Mountain Community College Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert Community College was independently accredited and became a separate entity from MCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>A MCCCD bond election fails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>August 31</td>
<td>The first classes were offered onsite for Estrella Mountain Community College Center on Dysart Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td>A $386 million capital improvement bond was passed by voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Estrella Mountain Community College was independently accredited and became a separate entity from GCC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Elsner retired as MCCCD Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Raul Cardenas was appointed to serve as interim Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Dr. Fred Gaskin began his term as Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges was dissolved by the Arizona State Legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Fred Gaskin was removed from the position of Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Rufus Glasper was appointed to serve as interim Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>Dr. Rufus Glasper was selected to serve as Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>A $951 million capital improvement bond was passed by voters with 76% approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: This appendix was compiled by the researcher using MCCCD Governing Board minutes and other historical documents.
Appendix J: Interview Guide

Establish date, time and location
1. Opening Phase
   a. Establish rapport
   b. Clarify purpose
   c. Secure written permission to tape the interview
   d. Explain that the tape and transcription will be available to others, as well becoming a part of the college archives
2. Question-Response Phase
   a. Ask questions and record responses
   b. Clarify questions as requested
3. Closing Phase
   a. Review purpose
   b. Summarize process for transcription and verification
   c. Thank participant

Governing Board Members, MCCCDS CEOs, and MCC CEOs

1. Tell the story of how and why you came to Maricopa. Describe your career path at MCCCDS. Tell when and why you left and/or what you are doing now.

2. Please describe the events or situations that prompted the development of a community college in the Southeast Phoenix metropolitan area.

3. What factors influenced the founding and early development of CGCC?

4. How were the founding and early years of CGCC different from and similar to the founding and early years of other colleges within the Maricopa District?

5. What factors most impacted the operations of the college, positively and negatively, in the first twenty years?

6. What national, regional, or local events or trends effected the development of the college?

7. What community members (non-employees) most influenced the founding and early development of CGCC? In what way(s) did these people influence the college?

8. Think about the original plans for the college. Describe the characteristics of CGCC as originally planned. What elements of the plan were fulfilled and what elements remain to be fulfilled or are no longer pertinent?

9. How was the location of the college determined?
10. How were the original employees chosen?

11. What have been the major successes or significant accomplishments at CGCC?

12. What have been the major challenges, struggles, or problems at CGCC?

13. Please describe an event, a meeting, or a conversation that changed the course of history for CGCC.

14. If CGCC could begin again, what things would you recommend be done differently?

15. Tell a story about the early years of the college.

16. Is there anything else you would like to add about the history of CGCC?

**CGCC Administrators**

1. Tell the story of how and why you came to CGCC. Describe your career path at MCCCD and CGCC. Tell when and why you left and what you are doing now.

2. Explain about the naming of the college (first CGEC, then CGCCC, and then finally CGCC) Followup questions: Why did “San Tan Community College” come up in some documents? Why is there sometimes a slash [/] between Chandler and Gilbert and at other times a hyphen [-]? Why, in the same documents does it appear as both an education center and a community college center?

3. What factors influenced the founding and early development of CGCC?

4. How were the founding and early years of CGCC different from and similar to the founding and early years of other colleges within the Maricopa District?

5. What factors most impacted the operations of the college, positively and negatively, in the first five years? And in later years?

6. What national, regional, or local trends effected the development of the college?

7. What community members (non-employees) most influenced the founding and early development of CGCC? In what way(s) did these people influence the college?

8. Think about the original plans for the college. Describe the characteristics of CGCC as originally planned. What elements of the plan were fulfilled and what elements remain to be fulfilled or are no longer pertinent?
9. How did you go about determining what programs to begin with? What faculty and staff to bring on? What services to offer?

10. Which facilities were built first and why?

11. Describe any significant decisions that were made or events that occurred that influenced the development of CGCC’s programs, services, policies and practices.

12. What were the major successes or significant accomplishments of the college during your time there?

13. Identify major challenges, struggles, or problems for the college in that timeframe.

14. For what programs or services was the college best known?

15. What were the major areas of emphasis in teaching and learning?

16. Tell a story about the early years of the college.

17. What led to the decisions to make business/computers and aviation maintenance the first occupational programs?

18. What other occupational programs were considered and to what degree were they pursued?

19. How were the mascot and the school colors chosen?

20. What was the role of technology at the college, and to what degree was technology emphasized?

21. What was the role of continuing education at the college.

22. Please describe an event, a meeting, or a conversation that changed the course of history for CGCC.

23. If CGCC could begin again, what things would you recommend be done differently?

24. Share a favorite story about the college.

25. What are your fondest memories of the college?

26. Is there anything else you would like to add about the history of CGCC?
CGCC Faculty and Staff

1. Tell the story of how and why you came to CGCC. Describe your career path at MCCCD and CGCC. Tell when and why you left and what you are doing now.

2. What do you recall as significant decisions that were made or events that occurred that influenced the development of CGCC?

3. What factors most impacted the operations of the college, positively and negatively, in the first five years? And in later years?

4. What national, regional, or local events or trends effected the development of the college?

5. Think about the original plans for the college. What elements of the plan were fulfilled and what elements remain to be fulfilled or are no longer pertinent?

6. Describe any significant decisions that were made or events that occurred that influenced the development of CGCC’s programs, services, policies and practices.

7. What were the major successes or significant accomplishments of the college during your time there?

8. Identify major challenges, struggles, or problems for the college in that timeframe.

9. For what programs and services was the college best known?

10. What were the major areas of emphasis in teaching and learning?

11. What occupational programs were considered and to what degree were they pursued?

12. What was the role of technology at the college, and to what degree was technology emphasized?

13. Please describe an event, a meeting, or a conversation that changed the course of history for CGCC.

14. Share a favorite story about the college.

15. If CGCC could begin again, what would you recommend be done differently?

16. What are your fondest memories of the college?

17. Is there anything else you would like to add about the history of CGCC?
**Appendix K: The Interviewees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bartholomew, Lois</strong></td>
<td>Lois Bartholomew came to MCCC in 1980 as the Director of Student Life at Mesa Community College. In 1989, she became the Associate Dean of Student Services at CGCCC. In 1992, when the college became independently accredited, she received a new title, Dean of Student Services. Her position was titled Vice President of Student Affairs in January of 2005. Lois has served as the Chief Student Affairs Officer for 17 years at the time of this research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedal, Charles</strong></td>
<td>Charles “Chuck” Bedal started teaching in MCCC in 1969 at GateWay Community College, which was then called Maricopa Technical College. In 1984, he was elected President of the Faculty Association at GWCC and therefore was regularly attending meetings of the Governing Board, where he heard about the plans to build a college in the Southeast Valley. Chuck was one of three founding faculty members of CGEC in 1985. He taught math and computer science and also served for several years as Division Chair of Mathematics and Sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bernal, Andrew</strong></td>
<td>Andrew “Andy” Bernal was born and raised in Gilbert. He worked at McClintock High School, Arizona Western College, and Central Arizona College before coming to MCCC. After gaining experience in cooperative education at Rio Salado College, he came to CGEC in 1985. He was at CGCC from 1985-1993, serving first as Assistant Provost and then as Dean of Occupational Education. He was the Dean of Instruction at GateWay Community College from 1993-1998. He has retired but remains active in the community, particularly in helping Hispanic youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campbell, Don</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Donald Campbell was first elected to the MCCCD Governing Board in 1982. His current term ends in 2007. Don’s degrees include an associate’s from Phoenix College, and a bachelors and doctorate from ASU. He was an employee of Arizona State University for 20 years, from 1969-1990, before pursuing his interests in real estate. He has also served as the commandant of Project Challenge, an in-residence program for at-risk high school youth. Dr. Campbell has also served on numerous community committees and task forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christiansen, Larry</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Larry Christiansen started his career at MCCCD at Glendale Community College as Associate Dean for vocational programs and eventually became the Dean of Administrative Services. In 1988, he became president of Mesa Community College, when CGCCC was an extension site. Provost Arnette Ward reported to Dr. Christiansen until 1992 when CGCC was independently accredited. Dr. Christiansen was also instrumental in securing the Williams Campus for MCCCD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conkright, Alice</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Alice Conkright began her career in MCCCD in 1981 at South Mountain Community College as a librarian and staff developer. In 1985, she became one of the founding faculty members of CGEC. She helped establish the Learning Resources Center for CGCC, and taught English and Humanities. She was the Honors Program Coordinator and she served multiple terms as Chair of the Language and Humanities Division before retiring in 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contreras, Ed</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Ed Contreras was first elected to the MCCCD Governing Board in 1994, following several years of service on CGCC’s President’s Community Advisory Council. He is a graduate of Central Arizona College and Arizona State University. In addition to his career in accounting, he has been active in numerous community organizations such as the Boys and Girls Clubs of the East Valley and the East Valley Hispanic Leadership Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elsner, Paul</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Paul Elsner is Chancellor Emeritus of the Maricopa County Community College District. He was a Vice Chancellor in California for many years before taking the Chancellor’s position in MCCCD in 1977. During his tenure he grew the system from five to ten colleges and was considered by many to be one of the nation’s most prominent higher education leaders. Dr. Elsner retired from MCCCD in 1999, after 22 years as Chancellor. In his retirement he founded and is now President of Sedona Conference and Conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flury, Sharon</strong></td>
<td>Sharon Flury moved to Arizona in 1986 from Minnesota where she had worked at 3M headquarters and St. Olaf and Carleton colleges. She began working as the Office Coordinator for CGEC’s two Assistant Provosts in 1987. She became the Curriculum Technician, then an Administrative Assistant, and eventually the manager in charge of curriculum. As Curriculum Coordinator, she produced college catalogs and handled the development of curriculum. She retired in October 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ford, Sid</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sidney “Sid” Ford came to Arizona in 1982. He taught as an adjunct faculty member at Scottsdale and Mesa Community Colleges. After running his own restaurant, he started teaching accounting full-time at CGCC in 1987. Sid served as Division Chair of the Business/CIS Division, in addition to coordinating the faculty travel arrangements for many years. Currently, he develops and teaches on-line accounting courses for CGCC. |
| **Gonzales, Gilbert** |  
Gilbert “Gil” Gonzales taught history for CGEC on an adjunct basis and then in 1986 became the Director of Learning Resources, which included the library, tutoring, and computer services. He soon was retitled the Associate Dean of Learning Resources (CIO). In 1992, he left CGCC to pursue an opportunity at the Maricopa District Office, then in 1994 became the Dean of Information Technology at MCC. Gil currently serves as the Chief Information Officer at Cal State Monterey Bay. |
| **Hogan, Margaret** |  
Margaret Hogan was an English teacher, Division Chair, and Faculty Development Coordinator at a college in El Paso, Texas. She came to MCCCD as a Faculty Development Specialist. She was selected as Assistant Provost for CGEC in 1985, and then named the Dean of Arts and Sciences when the college became independently accredited. Shortly thereafter she became Dean of Instruction and stayed until 1998. After 13 years at CGCC, she returned to the District Office until her retirement. She remains active in numerous community organizations. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jarvis, Ana</th>
<th>Larson, Brenda</th>
<th>Mason, Marybeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ana Jarvis taught Spanish for several California community colleges and the University of California for 20 years before moving to Arizona. She was hired at CGCCC as Spanish faculty in 1987, and continues to serve in that role. In addition to building CGCC’s Spanish program, she teaches and has been involved in numerous college committees over time, including the International Education Committee. She is a noted author of the best-selling textbook series, <em>Como se Dice?</em>, published by Houghton-Mifflin.</td>
<td>Dr. Brenda Larson began her CGCC career as a teacher of office automation and personal computers in 1987. Previously, she taught at Greenway High School for approximately 13 years, and adjunct faculty for Glendale Community College. In addition to her teaching, she provided leadership in the cooperative learning program. When the college began a teacher education program, Brenda transferred into an education faculty position, which she holds today.</td>
<td>Marybeth Mason taught in the Chandler, Apache Junction, and Mesa school districts, before coming to CGCC in 1990. She taught English and Humanities, and served as Faculty Development Coordinator from 1990-1995. Marybeth is considered the founder of both the cooperative learning and service learning programs at CGCC. She was and continues to be very involved in the learning communities and civic engagement programs. Currently, she handles special projects for the college President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No picture, telephone interview)</td>
<td>Matthews, Wanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda Matthews was a junior high school teacher in the Roosevelt School District before coming to CGCCC when the Pecos Campus opened in 1987. She taught reading for the college for 10 years and also served as the Honors Program Coordinator for several years. Upon the passing of her husband, Wanda returned to Florida to be near her family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McCord, Robin</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robin McCord began her career at CGCCC in 1987, transferring from Glendale Community College where she had been working since 1982. She taught physics, engineering, and astronomy. In addition, Robin wrote and received several major grants from the National Science Foundation. Over the years, she has served on the International Education and Instructional Computing Committees. Currently, in addition to her teaching, she provides consulting services for a university in Kosovo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miller, Larry</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Larry Miller came to MCCCCD from Chicago where he was at Moraine Valley Community College. He began at Glendale Community College in 1984 and then came to CGCCC in 1987 as the college’s first librarian. He continues to serve in that capacity, but has also been Chair of the Library Division. During his time at CGCC, Larry served as the Faculty Association Vice President and Secretary, on the Library building committee, and as advisor to the Phi Theta Kappa organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navarro, Victor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Navarro has spent most of his professional career in the Maricopa Community Colleges. He started at South Mountain Community College as a student worker and then became an Admissions and Records Technician. He spent eight years at the District Office in technical services, before coming to CGCCC in 1987. He has progressed from Telecommunications Technician to Coordinator of Computer Services to Manager of Computer Operations. Since 2005, he has been the Director of Information Technology or CIO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Oakes, Duane</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duane Oakes attended Mesa Community College where he served as student body Vice President. After receiving bachelor’s and master’s degrees from Brigham Young University, he returned to Arizona as a Program Advisor in CGCC’s new Office of Student Life in 1991. Soon he became the Director of Student Life. Duane was a critical part of the team that began the CGCC service-learning program. He accepted a faculty position in charge of the service-learning program at Mesa Community College in 2000, where he continues to serve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Palinsky, Julie</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julie Palinsky was one of CGCCC’s first graduates in 1987. She was a resident of Chandler and a graduate of Chandler High School when she returned to college. Julie worked full-time at the college in the computer lab for many years before moving into the Admissions and Records Department. Currently, she handles graduation checkout and other duties for the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penley, Yolanda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rosenthal, Linda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shovers, Barbara</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittner, Carolyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein, Nancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stuebner, Sandra**

Sandra Stuebner started teaching part-time for CGEC in 1986. Later that year, she was hired as a residential counselor to handle advisement, assessment testing, orientation, and counseling for students. In 1988, she became psychology faculty and was the first Chair of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division. She has served two terms as CGCC Faculty Association President, and has also served as the MCCCD Faculty Senate President. Currently, she has returned to teaching psychology and serving as Chair of her division.

**Travers, Diane**

Diane Travers first met Arnette Ward as a student at MCC. After earning her degrees, she returned to Arizona and began working at the District Office in 1985. In 1986, she was hired as a residential faculty member at CGEC teaching communications. She served as advisor to the student leadership group for several years and on multiple building advisory committees. In 2003, she received the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development Excellence Award.

**Underwood, John**

John Underwood retired from the Air Force in 1988 and became the college’s first faculty member in aviation. He became Aviation Program Director and then eventually Associate Dean in charge of all occupational and continuing education programs. In 1998, he became the Senior Associate Dean at CGCC. In 2003, John took a promotional opportunity and became the Executive Director of the Maricopa Skill Center, which is a unit of GateWay Community College.
| **Urbanski, Cathy** | Urbanski, Cathy  
Cathy Urbanski was the secretary for the President of GateWay Community College in 1985 when Arnette Ward was looking for a secretary to help her begin CGEC. Cathy worked as Ward’s assistant, then became the Institutional Research Specialist for several years. With the completion of a graduate degree and several years of adjunct teaching experience in computer applications at MCC, she became residential faculty at CGCC teaching computer software, where she continues to serve. |
| | Ward, Arnette  
Arnette Scott Ward served as the founding Provost of Chandler-Gilbert Education Center, which later became Chandler-Gilbert Community College Center, and then eventually Chandler-Gilbert Community College. In 1992, she became the founding President of CGCC, where she served until her retirement in 2002. Arnette had previously served as a counselor and Dean of Students at Mesa Community College. In addition to serving on numerous community boards during her tenure as Provost and President, Ms. Ward is also an accomplished performing artist. |
| | Weaver, David  
David Weaver began at CGCCC as physics faculty in 1987. Prior to that, he had taught at Scottsdale Community College since 1982, and had served as SCC Faculty Association President. David developed curriculum in semiconductor manufacturing technology for the college, and was the CGCC Faculty Development Coordinator until 1990. He has served on the Instructional Computing Committee, building committees, and numerous other projects for the college. Currently, he is very involved with the American Association of Physics Teachers. |

Source: This appendix was compiled by the researcher using information provided by the interviewees and records provided by the MCCCD Human Resources Office.
Appendix L: Milestones in the History of CGCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date, when available/applicable</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges approved the concept of expansion into Southeast Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>March 10</td>
<td>The MCCCD Governing Board approved the purchase of an 80-acre site near the corner of Pecos and Gilbert Roads, with some conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges approved Maricopa District's request to purchase the 80-acre site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>MCCCD purchased 80 acres of land on Pecos Road in Chandler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>November 22</td>
<td>Community officials from Chandler and Gilbert lobbied MCCCD for the establishment of a branch campus, sooner than originally scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCCCD passed a $75 million bond of which $5.6 million was provided for the construction of CGCC's Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>June 26</td>
<td>The Southeast Valley Task Force reported on their recommendations at the MCCCD Governing Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Arnette Ward was appointed as Provost of Chandler-Gilbert Education Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Two Assistant Provosts, Andy Bernal and Margaret Hogan, were hired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chandler-Gilbert Education Center opened as an extension of Mesa Community College in rented facilities on Chandler Boulevard, at the site of the former Seton Catholic High School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>The initial facilities master plan for the Pecos Campus was completed by Lendrum/Sasaki Associates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Construction began on the Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>September 25</td>
<td>Groundbreaking ceremonies were held for the CGCC Pecos Campus, with the theme of Pioneering a New Beginning, a tribute to the roots of the Chandler and Gilbert communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>CGCCC offered a summer session for the first time, with more than 300 students enrolled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date, when available/applicable</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>The CGCC Pecos Campus opened for classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>October 10</td>
<td>A dedication ceremony was held for the Pecos Campus featuring the theme “Pioneering New Horizons.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>An honors society was established with 18 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>The CGCCC student records system was separated from MCC’s student records system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>The class schedule was expanded so that all classes a student needed to complete an associate’s degree were offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>A student leadership program was initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>June 18</td>
<td>The State Board of Directors for Community Colleges approved the aviation maintenance program after compromise agreements were reached with Cochise College in Douglas, Arizona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>An updated facilities master plan for the Pecos Campus was completed by Smith, Hinchman &amp; Grylls/Southwest, Inc..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td>CGCC was accredited as an independent college by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>Arnette Ward was named founding President of CGCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>CGCC’s Collaborative Learning program was recognized as the MCCCD Innovation of the Year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>The first service-learning course was taught (English 102).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>CGCC service-learning program won the MCCCD Innovation of the Year award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>The first learning community was taught (COMPASS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td>MCCCD passed a $386 million bond. Approximately $31 million was provided for the expansion of CGCC’s Pecos Campus, as well as enhancements to the Williams Campus and the development of the Sun Lakes Education Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>The Center for Computer Training was established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Williams Campus opened and the Aviation program moved on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date, when available/applicable</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>January 13</td>
<td>CGCC purchased an additional 40-acre parcel of land to the east of the original 80-acre parcel at the Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>The groundbreaking ceremony for the Sun Lakes Education Center was held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>August 27</td>
<td>At an MCCCDD Governing Board meeting, Chancellor Paul Elsner made the Williams Campus an extension of CGCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>The partnership with ASU East (now ASU at the Polytechnic campus) began at the Williams Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>A ten-year accreditation was received from the North Central Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>The ribbon-cutting and building dedication for the Sun Lakes Education Center was held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>A groundbreaking ceremony was held for new buildings at Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>The publication of the <em>Connection</em> newsletter began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>The athletics program debuted with women’s volleyball, men’s and women’s soccer, men’s and women’s basketball, and women’s softball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>The library and learning resources building opened at the Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Classrooms, faculty offices and science labs opened at the Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>The disabled student services office opened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Learning Assistance Center opened in the Library building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>A groundbreaking ceremony was held for the Performing Arts Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>The baseball program debuted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher education, engineering, and digital imaging programs began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>July 3</td>
<td>Arnette Ward retired after seven years as Provost and ten years as President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>Maria Hesse became President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>The electric utility technology program began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date, when available/applicable</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>A grand opening ceremony was held for the Performing Arts Center, the Student Center, and the baseball field at the Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Career and Placement Services office opened at the Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Administration of justice programs began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>An International Student Services Office opened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Arizona University opened an office at the Pecos Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>A bond referendum passed for $951 million of which $83 million was designated for CGCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>CGCC was presented with the Chandler Chamber of Commerce Industry of the Year award for its contribution to the growth of the local economy and service to its community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>The nursing program began at the Williams Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s and women’s intercollegiate golf debuted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>August 11</td>
<td>The name of the Sun Lakes Education Center was officially changed to the CGCC Sun Lakes Center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: This appendix was compiled by the researcher using MCCCD Governing Board minutes, college accreditation records, and other historical documents.
### Appendix M: CGCC Enrollment from 1987-2005, Headcount and Full-Time Student Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FY CREDIT Unduplicated Headcount</th>
<th>FALL 45 DAY</th>
<th>SPRING 45 DAY</th>
<th>NON-CREDIT</th>
<th>TOTAL COMBINED</th>
<th>FY CREDIT &amp; NON-CREDIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>3,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>5,078</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>5,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>Voc =</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avoc =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>3,431</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>5,538</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>6,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td></td>
<td>988</td>
<td>6,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>7,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>5,764</td>
<td>3,527</td>
<td>3,171</td>
<td>Voc =</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>8,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avoc =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>6,113</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>9,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>6,872</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>13,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>4,604</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>15,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>9,377</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>5,033</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,711*</td>
<td>17,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>10,038</td>
<td>6,217</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,405*</td>
<td>18,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>10,712</td>
<td>6,760</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>13,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>12,179</td>
<td>7,513</td>
<td>6,926</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>14,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>12,416</td>
<td>8,025</td>
<td>7,043</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>16,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>12,707</td>
<td>8,663</td>
<td>7,271</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>17,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that from 1985-1987, CGCC enrollment statistics were not separated from the MCC statistics. The first year in which statistics for Chandler-Gilbert Education Center were kept was 1987.

FY Credit Unduplicated Headcount counts each student enrolled for a credit course between July 1 and June 30. It is a measure of how many individuals attended the college in a fiscal year.

Fall and Spring Headcount includes anyone registered on 45th Day. It also includes students in Short-Term and Open Entry courses, plus those registered for courses that may have not started. It is not strictly a measure of those registered in 45th Day Courses, though it is usually treated as if it is.

Non-Credit figures count people one time if they take a vocational non-credit course and a second time if they take an avocational course. If the student is also taking credit courses, they could be counted a third time. Prior to FY 2001-02, non-credit enrollments were not broken out into vocational and avocational courses. Therefore, the non-credit enrollments may seem inflated for these years (marked with an asterisk *).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR FTSE</th>
<th>FALL FTSE</th>
<th>SPRING FTSE</th>
<th>AVERAGE FALL/SPRING FTSE</th>
<th>NON-45 DAY FTSE</th>
<th>SHORT TERM</th>
<th>OPEN ENTRY</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>490.2</td>
<td>548.3</td>
<td>519.3</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>799.4</td>
<td>871.3</td>
<td>835.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>1,119.3</td>
<td>1,114.2</td>
<td>1,116.8</td>
<td>135.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,302.7</td>
<td>1,282.6</td>
<td>1,292.7</td>
<td>185.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>122.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,438.5</td>
<td>1,399.8</td>
<td>1,419.2</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>1,549.9</td>
<td>1,386.1</td>
<td>1,468.0</td>
<td>175.4</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>101.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,508.6</td>
<td>1,322.1</td>
<td>1,415.4</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>106.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,510.3</td>
<td>1,367.2</td>
<td>1,438.8</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,562.2</td>
<td>1,417.5</td>
<td>1,489.9</td>
<td>160.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>115.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,585.4</td>
<td>1,490.9</td>
<td>1,538.2</td>
<td>202.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>153.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>1,693.1</td>
<td>1,640.3</td>
<td>1,666.7</td>
<td>246.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>176.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>1,993.5</td>
<td>1,864.9</td>
<td>1,929.2</td>
<td>242.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>171.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>2,399.3</td>
<td>2,051.6</td>
<td>2,225.5</td>
<td>277.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>198.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>2,718.3</td>
<td>2,443.8</td>
<td>2,581.1</td>
<td>346.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>3,159.3</td>
<td>2,819.6</td>
<td>2,989.4</td>
<td>368.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>275.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>3,849</td>
<td>3,586.6</td>
<td>3,207.1</td>
<td>3,396.8</td>
<td>452.0</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>339.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>3,948.5</td>
<td>3,483.2</td>
<td>3,723.4</td>
<td>506.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>398.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>4,277.5</td>
<td>3,583.7</td>
<td>3,930.6</td>
<td>500.9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>398.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FTSE Calculation:** Fiscal Year FTSE = Credit Hours/30. This is based on the requirements of state law and used as the basis for budget allocations.

Fiscal Year FTSE = Average of Fall and Spring + Non-45th Day FTSE.

Non-45th Day FTSE = Short-Term + Open Entry + Summer.

Non-45th Day FTSE is calculated at year end; so FTSE for Short-term, Open Entry, and Summer = Credit Hours/30.
Fall and Spring FTSE = Credit Hours/15. This is also based on the requirements of Arizona Law. The assumption is that a full-time student will take 15 credits in the Fall and another 15 in the Spring. It is then averaged at the end of the year. This means it is divided by 2, so it conforms to the rule that 1 FTSE = Credit Hours divided by 30. [Mathematically \( \frac{x}{15} + \frac{y}{15}/2 = \frac{x + y}{30} \)].

Since FTSE is calculated by dividing one number by another, the addition of Short-Term, O/E, and Summer may contain some rounding error.

### Appendix N: CGCC Facilities and Land

#### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/ Building</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Size (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pecos Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (first part of L, excluded from total below)</td>
<td>The Smith Group, Inc.</td>
<td>Arizona West Contracting Corp.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L (with D)</td>
<td>Durrant</td>
<td>Connelly Swinerton Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>60,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Durrant</td>
<td>Connelly Swinerton Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>41,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Durrant</td>
<td>Connelly Swinerton Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>20,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Durrant</td>
<td>Connelly Swinerton Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>17,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_N</td>
<td>Durrant</td>
<td>Connelly Swinerton Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Gould Evans Associates</td>
<td>Layton Southwest, Inc.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>31,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Architekton</td>
<td>Brignall Construction</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>Architekton</td>
<td>U.S. Modular, Inc.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Gabor Lorant Architects, Inc.</td>
<td>Modular Solutions</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Building</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Size (GSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Williams Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEC (470)</td>
<td>Haver, Nunn, &amp; Jensen Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>23,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC (480)</td>
<td>Benham, Blair, Ditzler &amp; Sayler</td>
<td></td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>10,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC (410)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>92,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC remodel of Section 100</td>
<td>In-house</td>
<td>TDH Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC remodel of Section 200</td>
<td>Kenyon De Valeria Architects, LLC</td>
<td>Howard S. Wright Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB (481)</td>
<td>Drover, Welch &amp; Undlan Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>8,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLB (477)</td>
<td>John E. Stevens &amp; Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>10,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLB remodel</td>
<td>Durrant/Robert Dinsmore</td>
<td>Brignall Construction</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSB (426)</td>
<td>Mather Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSB remodeled</td>
<td>Dick &amp; Fritsche Design Group</td>
<td>Triad Technologies</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS (415)</td>
<td>GSAS Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Lab</td>
<td>Gabor Lorant Architects, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location/Building</strong></td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Size (GSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sun Lakes Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First floor</td>
<td>Cornoyer Hendrick Architects</td>
<td>SDB Inc.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second floor and main lobby</td>
<td>Deutsch Associates</td>
<td>Caliente Construction Inc.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Acquired</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pecos</td>
<td>Original parcel</td>
<td>July 15, 1981</td>
<td>Dwight and Ruby Patterson, Clifford Dobson, Carolyn Dobson</td>
<td>$1,088,435</td>
<td>79.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dwight and Ruby Patterson</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>37.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecos</td>
<td>East parcel</td>
<td>January 13, 1995</td>
<td>Americorp Development, LLC</td>
<td>$567,293</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City right-of-ways</td>
<td>Sold to City of Chandler in 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Acquired</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Parcel G</td>
<td>Conveyed to the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona on behalf of MCCC on November 13, 1995; State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona quit claim deed to the Governing Board of MCCC on December 12, 2002</td>
<td>U.S. Air Force</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>47.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>Acquired</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Acreage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Lakes</td>
<td>Original parcel</td>
<td>June 28, 1996</td>
<td>Community Hospital of Chandler, Inc., Chandler Regional Hospital</td>
<td>$500,000 included the ground footprint, completed building, and permanent easements</td>
<td>0.2742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>All parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CGCC Facilities Services Office.
Appendix O: CGCC Archives Policies

CGCC Archives Policies

1. Archives are made up of artifacts (text, graphic, audio, and video materials) that preserve the purpose, structure, and history of the CGCC.

2. All materials given to the CGCC Archives are the property of CGCC. CGCC can make available for publication any material in its collection but credit to the Archives and any creator, if known, must be made.

3. The Archives Librarian shall be responsible for managing the organization and description of materials deposited in the Archives.

4. The Archives Librarian shall be responsible for managing the preservation and safekeeping of material deposited in the Archives.

5. The Archives Librarian shall be responsible for the management of access to the Archives. Anyone with a legitimate reason to use Archive materials shall be granted the ability to do so unless the material requested is (a) judged by the depositor or, where no instructions have been given, by the Archives Librarian to be of a sensitive and restricted nature, (b) judged by the Archives Librarian to be insufficiently processed to give easy access, or (c) judged by the Archives Librarian to be too fragile to handle safely.

6. Archive materials may not leave the Library. Archives Librarian may waive this rule in order to get materials reproduced, protected, or displayed in another location.

Criteria for Collecting Archives Materials

The Arizona Department of Library, Archives and Records has standards for records retention and disposition for Arizona Community College Districts. These records typically include personnel, student and financial records which are and will continue to be stored in the departments that manage this information. CGCC Archives collects other kinds of materials including the following:

- MCCCDD Governing Board Minutes since the beginning of CGCC
- CGCC and MCCCDD Policies (now on the MCCCDD web site)
- CGCC statements of philosophy, strategic plans, and organizational charts
- CGCC past budgets and financial reports
- CGCC architectural plans and facilities planning reports
- CGCC fact books (statistics about the school and the community)
- CGCC class master lists, course schedules and course catalogs
- NCA accreditation materials and CGCC Self-Study Reports
- CGCC calendars
- CGCC procedure manuals
- Historical scrapbooks, photos, videos and memorabilia relating to CGCC
- Newspaper clippings about CGCC
- Graduation and Convocation brochures
- CGCC promotional brochures

Source: CGCC Library
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