

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, March 6, 2015**  
**Amethyst Room Downtown Campus**  
**1:00 pm – 4:30 pm**

**1.0 In Attendance:** Matej Boguszak (CC); Duff Galda (CC); David Kryder (CC); Sterling Vinson (DC); Roman Carrillo (DC); Vivian Knight (DC); Lisa Jurkowitz (DC); Timothy Cruz (DC); Tommy Salazar (DC); Josie Milliken (DC); Teddi Schnurr (DV); Lloyd Sandmann (DV); Pollyanna Wikrent (DV); Olga Carranza (DV); Don Roberts (EC); Odile Wolf (EC); Mays Imad (EC); Taliesin Sutton (EC); Rita Flattley (EC); Carlo Buscemi (NW); Donald Bock (NW); Rita Lennon (NW); Jerry Cherrington (NW); Matt Hinojosa (NW) Proxy for Anthony Sovak (CC); MaryKris Mcilwaine (WC); Steve Mackie (WC); Catherine O'Brien (WC); Paul Flasch (WC); Jacqueline Kern (WC); Carol Christofferson (WC); Karie Meyers (WC); Margarita Youngo (WC); Rosa Morales (WC); Lazaro Hong (WC); Joseph Dal Pra (WC); Meg Files (WC); Bob Cunningham (DW); Joe Labuda (DW); Kimlisa Duchicela, Faculty Senate President (DC); Bardo Padilla, Faculty Senate Vice-President (DC); Patricia Figueroa, Faculty Senate Secretary (EC)

**Absent:** Karen Lutrick (CC); John Archuleta (DC); John Gerard (DC); Susan Pritchett (DC); Trisha Miller (DC); Linda Marks (DC); Maggie Golston (DV); Joel Dworin (DV); Mary Mitchell (EC); Mary Shelor (EC); Wright Randolph (EC); Brooke Hundtoft (EC); Cheryl Blake (NW); Erin Eichelberger (NW); Noah Faye (NW); Pamela Coker (WC); Debra Kaye (WC); Sarah Marcus (WC); Michael Parker (WC); Kathy Fraychineaud (WC)

**Guests:** Dee Lammers (WC); Jeff Thies (DO); Deborah Yoklic (DO); Nina Corson (EC); Bruce Moses (DO); Jeff Silyvn (DO); Erica Holmes (DO); David Bea (DO); Lee Lambert (DO)

**2.0 Announcements:**

Rosa Morales (WC) is proxy for Patty Figueroa (EC).

**3.0 Approval of February 2014 Minutes:**

Michael Parker (WC) was absent but had a proxy.

Sterling Vinson (DC) moves to approve February minutes. Motion was seconded by Rita Flattley (EC) and passed with unanimous support.

**4.0 Agenda Modification and Open Forum Items:**

College Council will give a few brief comments

Mandatory Orientation presentation

David Bea will present his budget presentation as soon as he arrives.

5.5 All Faculty Day

Provost Report will move up first in Reports.

**Litigation- Jeff Silvyn** explained that a former PCC employee, Dr. David Katz, filed a lawsuit against the College in Federal District Court. The College is in the process of drafting their response, after which there will be in a litigation process. Dr. Katz sent an email to members of the Faculty Senate and Jeff wanted everyone to understand the

environment of the communication. He also wants to give everyone a better informed decision of what they want to do and what could or could not happen with regard to the emails. Every piece of communication from, to or about Dr. Katz and anyone who has interactions with him are potentially pieces of evidence that may or may not be used at some point in the litigation. Anyone at the College who has had some level of involvement with Dr. Katz may be identified as a witness and may be called to testify. Those who have access to legal consultation can take advantage of the service if further advice is needed.

**Odile Wolf (EC)** stated that the emails sent from David Katz were not requested and feels he is trying to involve them in something they do not know anything about. She questions if there is any way they can stop him from sending emails to their work emails, which is not appropriate. Jeff responded that the email is from a personal account to College employee's work email accounts. He is a little reluctant to put a block on his personal email account. Some other options are to email him and request that you do not want to receive emails from him. You can also choose to block his emails through your settings on your email account or send them to your trash. It has happened in the past where College employees did not want to receive emails and these were some of the options that were given to them. Odile asked if we receive these emails does it mean that he is managing to put us in a position where we would be witnessing anything. Jeff responded that during litigation either party can identify anyone as a potential witness and they have to disclose what they think the testimony might be about. It is up to either side to contact that individual and question them or try to have them deposed. Receiving an email from someone does not make you a very interesting witness. However, it does not mean definitively that you will not be listed as a witness.

**Rita Flattley (EC)** explained that many receive political emails. She is UA alumni and is receiving emails about defending the cuts to higher education. She questions what is wrong or right on how to respond and if they should respond using their home email. She does not feel like she is doing anything wrong just because she received the email. Jeff responded that you should not worry just because you received an email. If the topic of the email is political in nature it is important to express your views or opinions clearly as a private citizen and not someone who is representing the College. If you decide to write to a legislature, it is safer to do it from your personal email and not the College email account. It is not confusing for the person on the other end in what capacity you are acting. Rita added on your personal computer. She questioned if Jeff is at liberty to share the Colleges' position on what is going on in Phoenix with the state budget. Jeff responded that as a general matter the chancellor and a few others have been involved in conversations trying to influence the direction of the conversations. They have been pursuing a quiet and behind the scenes approach. The chancellor has been meeting with key legislatures and groups that might have some influence to see what is possible. Kimlisa stated that David Bea would be here to answer more of those questions.

**Rosa Morales (WC)** explained that she let her university know that she prefers to receive emails to her personal email. She previously requested that the chancellor distribute a statement to the students informing them of legislatures that are making decisions that make affect them in the future. He responded saying that they were working on it.

**Duff Galda (CC)** stated that she has never experienced anything like this at the College where people send them actual copies of court proceedings or filings of his own and of other people. She questions if the College has a place where it keeps litigations filed against the College that is accessible or if it is something you would have to delve in the public records for. Jeff responded they do not keep an open repository of court filings. If someone wants to see any document they can visit the Pima County Superior Court website and search a case. Through the federal system, you need to create a user account and there is a small fee.

**Joe Labuda (DW)** questioned if Jeff is representing the College in the Katz litigation. Jeff stated that he is because he represents the College, but the matter was tendered to the risk retention pool. Through that, they have outside counsel that is doing the bulk of the litigation work. He is involved and represents the College, but when they go to court he will not be the one doing most of the work. Joe questioned how much that was going to cost the College. Jeff responded generally speaking on matters such as this, the defense is provided by the risk trust. So there is not an out of pocket cost for the College. He does not know what the ultimate cost is. If the matter gets settled in one way or another, in some situations the College contributes to a settlement payment. It sometimes through the risk trust and sometimes it is a combination of the two. Joe questioned how much litigation we are involved in beyond the Katz case. Jeff responded that there are three other pending litigations. Joe questioned if there was still a lawsuit with former Chancellor Flores. Jeff stated there has never been a lawsuit with Chancellor Flores. Flores had issued a statement to the College asking to retract certain statements and they declined to do so. Jeff has not had further communication or on behalf of Flores. Jeff stated that there was one other case that does not involve a student or a former employee. The College is involved in litigation because they were identified as one source of many that contributed hazardous waste disposed at the Pantano / Broadway landfill. There is litigation related to the cleanup of the landfill.

## **5.0 Business**

### **5.1 Mandatory Orientation Presentation – Bob Cunningham and Perry Higgins**

Many people were involved in making the initiative move forward. PCC previously offered new student orientation on an optional basis. This semester was the first semester that it was brought back full steam. Bob recognized the people who served on the committee and thanked them. It was a huge undertaking. Suzanne Desjardin presented to Faculty Senate on May of 2013 advocating bringing mandatory new student orientation back at Pima. He is happy to report that they are now doing mandatory new student orientation and thanked Faculty Senate, administration, staff, and everyone who helped moved it forward. They really wanted to ensure that when students came to new student orientation that they left orientation feeling like they got value from it. As counselors, they are always interested in making human connection so students feel like they have a home base to go if they feel their needs are not being met.

The feedback they have received from students was overwhelmingly positive. They are open to feedback about how they can improve in moving forward.

### **What is New Student Orientation?**

- New Student Orientation is a group activity, minimum of two hours. They will expand it to three hours starting with the next cycle of new student orientations. There is a lot of information to cover in two hours and they found themselves constantly running late.
- One to three NSO's scheduled per day College-wide during "peak" times.
- Students should do their basic assessments before attending their NSO
- Students register for NSO via MyPima
- At conclusion of NSO, students are registered for their classes
- Optional activities vary by campus
- "Specialized" orientations for given programs

### **Content of NSO:**

- 10 SLOs which include...
- Attendance Policies
- Good Academic Standing/ SAP
- Time Management
- Programs of Study
- Financial Aid
- Navigating the Online Schedule of Classes
- Registering for Classes
- Code of Conduct, Clery, etc.
- They ask students to fill out a form ask them if they would like to be contacted later the semester to sit down one on one with somebody and fill out their educational plan for future semesters at Pima. Out of 200-plus students at Downtown Campus, about 60% said they would like to be contacted. Those appointments are in process right now. That is about 130 students who last semester would have not occurred to most of them to have that one-on-one meeting.

### **Statistics for spring 2015:**

- Enrolment for Spring 2015 started in November 2014
- About 3500 people who applied to Pima for Spring 2015 self-identified as "new to College"
- 87 orientations held Nov-Jan for slightly more than 1000 students
- About 16% did the online orientation
- A hold would happen only if the student identified themselves in their application as being completely new to College. Otherwise they would not get the hold. An online orientation is available for students who may have trouble finding an orientation that will fit their schedule but they do encourage students to do the face-to-face.

- They are open to feedback on what may or may not be working, faculty is welcome to attend the orientation and participate if they want to. Contact the counseling coordinator at your campus to give them a heads-up that you'd like to participate in some way.
- They are also working on the online orientation hold that is removed in a manual sense. They are working on having that automated, so that if a student completes the orientation online, the hold will be expired automatically.

**Counseling and Advising Coordinators:**

- CC Amy Davis, acdavis6, 6408
- DV Jacqie Allen, jallen24, 5101
- DT Sandra Paulick, spaulick, 7260
- EC Delisa Siddall, dsiddall, 7662
- NW Melania Federico, mfederico, 2233
- WC Teresiana Zurita, tzurita, 6699

**Odile Wolf (EC)** noticed they have an online orientation but do not have a part of the orientation online about online education. She questioned if they would consider adding a part about what it means to be an online student. Teresiana Zurita (WC) stated there is a separate work group developing an orientation to what it is to be an online student, so stay tuned.

**Rosa Morales (WC)** recommended they expand their committee composition to include some faculty, potentially some student service individuals. She was surprised to learn that all individuals working on the NSO have been counselors. Having a diverse group would provide additional information. As a faculty and a department chair, some of the things listed in the outline would not be her priority. She would focus on other things because of her experience with the students. A lot of her returning adult students, who are participating with DSR, are not knowledgeable of technology. They had a lot of problems in dealing with this type of information. When she talked to student services individuals to get feedback she learned they were not involved and were not very pleased with how it happened. They think the NSO is transactional based. She does like the fact that they invite students to set up an appointment to get additional counseling. She hopes they consider those aspects in the future and she would be very much interested in being part of the committee.

**Teddi Schnurr (DV)** stated it was mentioned that when students come in and take assessments that there is an opportunity for the staff members to let the students know about signing up for the orientation. She questions what other means of communication are we going to get the word out to students once it goes into a mandatory status where all new students have to take it. Perry responded sometimes it is just them discovering a hold and they want to find out what the hold is. Under the home page of MyPima and the future students tab, there is a five or six-step sequence how to become a Pima student. NSO is on the list, and it does

mention that it is mandatory there. If they come into the center and talk to someone one to one, they will find out that way. Teddi also questions if they have enough staffing in student services to handle the follow-up for educational plans with the counselors. Perry stated that 132 appointments will probably be about two months' worth of appointments for them but they decided they could handle it this semester. They will have to reassess for the fall and ask if the advisors could do some of that with them as well. But they are committed to try and do that one-on-one meeting with every student who requests it.

**Duff Galda (CC)** suggested an electronic link between the application to attend Pima and maybe directly sending students straight to a signup place for the orientation. Teresiana Zurita (WC) responded that there is. One of the subcomponents of this project that the workgroup took on was revising all of the written communications that students receive. They did it in a way that the admissions and registration process would be consistent and appear consistently to students no matter where they accessed it in terms of time or place. They students receive two letters when they do the application online. They receive an online letter of acceptance that includes the mandatory NSO. They also receive a letter in the mail that was rewritten to include the process. They also have printed materials that outreach folks take and distribute.

Kimlisa asked if they could come back in the fall and give statistics on how it is working.

## **5.2 Gmail Update - Chris Bonhorst**

Faculty will be able to sign up for Gmail from what date you to migrate. It is encouraged to try and coordinate with the people you work in groups with or share calendars with to schedule you on the same date. It is first come, first serve and is open from now until the end of May. Log into MyPima and go to the At Work tab and you will see a faculty signup page.

**David Kryder (CC)** questioned if everything shifts over. Chris responded that on the day of migration they back up your existing e-mail for you just for a precaution. Depending on how much email you have it could take 10 minutes. They have seen it take 36 hours. They will start it the night before so when you come in the morning you will see e-mail in there. Throughout the day, your older e-mail will start populating. You can use it the morning of that day. You can schedule seven days in advance. You will get an email a week before reminding you that you were migrated. Your email address will not change and will be transparent on syllabi and business cards. Your mail gets migrated and your contacts as well. If you have archived mail it will not get migrated but you can still use outlook to open those archives.

**Jerry Cherrington (NW)** stated that when they went on the site, they went directly to the Google Drive that they have through the College, although they do not have an

email address. What should they do? Chris responded that on the At Work page, there is a place on the right-hand side for signup, and that shouldn't take you to Google Drive at all. If it does, they'll need to talk to IT or shoot him and e-mail. Jerry responded that he would do that. Chris stated it should open a page with a little calendar and you select the date.

On that same page there are training videos. It is highly encouraged to watch those. They are really good videos and will be captioned next week. There will also be in-person training at each campus coming shortly. It will be announced on Pima News when those will be scheduled. The in-person trainings model the videos; therefore, if you watch the videos first, the in-person training will be a lot of repeat, but you will have that personal contact for questions.

**Carol Christofferson (WC)** questioned if there is any interface connection with Android devices for other Google accounts that are existing on those devices. Chris responded that you could have a personal Google account and a Pima Google account and switch back and forth. You can add a new account on the device and have two completely different accounts on the same device. There are instructions on the web on how to do it and IT can help as well.

### **5.3 Faculty Emeritus**

Kimlisa sent out the list to everyone that was forwarded to her. There was a name that was added to that, which was Laura Valdivia. Kimlisa will wait until the 13<sup>th</sup> to get in as many nominations as possible and then send the list out to everyone. They need the list to go out to Debbie by April 1<sup>st</sup>. **Carol Christofferson (WC)** questioned if she got her email on Liz Bailey. Kimlisa will add it to the list. Anyone who does not get in on April 1<sup>st</sup> can be put in November during the fall.

### **5.4 SPG/Board Policies- Debbie Yoklic**

There are four board policies that are going to the board for the first reading, BP 3604, Library Services; BP 3103, Student Attendance and Participation; BP 3105 Curriculum; and BP 1101, Prime Policy. They went this morning to Staff Council and will go to Governance Council on Monday. They will then go to the study session on Monday afternoon.

**Rita Flattley (EC)** questioned if they had taken out the flexible fee structure and hiring practices in BP 3105. Debbie responded yes. In 3105 curriculum the only thing that was added was something that should have been in it, the last rendition just a month ago. 3116, Educational Contract Training and Services, and 3201, Occupational Program External Advisory Committees are not being deleted. The information from those two policies is no longer included in 3105.

**Joe Labuda (DW)** thanked Debbie for working on the library directors on the Library Board Policy. Debbie appreciated that the library directors were open to suggestions that Jeff and herself made. It was a good process overall.

They are ending the first stage of the policy review. There is a few still lingering but they are mostly done. They have until June of 2016 to take all the Regs and SPGS and covert those to administrative procedures. Some will be just a change of number, but there will be a significant number that will come to Senate. It is suggested for Senate to form a smaller group or groups to look at those so the only things that is needed to discuss in this larger group are the ones that you have concerns about. Otherwise, it will take a great deal of time. Kim is working on that and she really encourages people to step up for that. Kimlisa stated they had talked about bringing a few people from staff council and from Senate. She will be sending an e-mail requesting for anyone who would like to look at these, because there is going to be a lot.

### **5.5 All Faculty Day**

Julia called for a vote to determine the day for All Faculty Day. It was suggested to be the second day of accountability, which would be Wednesday.

**Rita Flattley (EC)** moved to approve and hold All Faculty Day on Wednesday of 2016. Motion was seconded and passed with unanimous support.

## **6.0 Possible Reports**

### **6.1 Chancellor Report- David Bea**

- Budget: The Governor’s budget proposal reduced the College’s budget state appropriations for operations in stem funding by half. It is a decrease of \$3.5 million. The College is currently receiving \$7.1 million from the state. They knew they would lose just under \$500,000.00 due to enrollment. The legislature came out this week with the budget bills which zero out all funding to Maricopa, Pima, and Pinal County Community Colleges. The Universities, K-12 Districts, and a number of business entities have come out in opposition to the cuts. The College is working behind the scenes to try and minimize the impact. They are working on having it delayed so the College will not have the impact this year. The College is working on something where they are phasing in over the course of the next 18 months what might be more significant budget impacts. In the short run they are working on minimizing the impacts and disruptions as much as necessary. The College needs to do everything they can to turn enrollment around. If the College can successfully move enrollment up it will solve a lot of the problems they are worried about.
- Expenditure Limitation: They have been working with the senior state leadership and the sponsor of the bill. The College worked on some language that would be found acceptable by the sponsor and the Arizona Tax Research Association but would also work for the College. It was received well by the parties because they came with something while the other Colleges just threatened to kill the bill. It is setting a good foundation with some of the leadership at the State. The bill was changed to take out the actual language. The College proposed the enrollment level to be based a peak level that the Colleges could hold on to for a period of years.

Once you exceed a five year period it would be the peak enrollment during that 5 year period. They felt it would be enough time to turn enrollment around or make changes needed at the College. ATRA appreciated the language but they weren't on board with it because they were concerned it would set a precedent for cities and counties. The bill is looking like it might be tabled or killed. They are hopeful for it to turn into a study session over the summer where they can talk about the different issues related to expenditure limitation.

- One percent cap Homeowner Rebate: There is a constitutional provision stating that homeowners can't be charged property taxes in excess of 1% of the fair value of their property. The state has picked up the tab for the counties where it has gone over the 1%. As part of the budget bills they are trying to free up the general fund allocation at the state level that is going locally to cover that. Pima and Pinal are the two counties that have this issue. The State would save 29 million by pushing the problem back to the counties. Yesterday there was a provision added to the 1% cap bill that said it would exclude agencies whose tax rates are below their peer jurisdictions and PCC actually fair well on this. Compared to the tax rates of peer institutions PCC is on the very low end of the spectrum. Trying to work with compromised solutions instead of just fighting them on everything seems to be having a positive impact.
- Tuition: Two main tuition proposals will be brought to the Board next week. One is an increase to tuition in fees for in-state, and there are going to be three scenarios: \$3 increase, \$5 increase, and \$10 increase. They are also working to eliminate the graduation fee and increase the semester processing fee from \$10 to \$15 and absorb the lost revenue from the graduation fee by making that change. Having a fee that students have to pay before they graduate is not going to incentivize graduation. They met with the student government leadership the following day and talked about the different scenarios. The students were totally fine with the processing fee. They also talked about the idea of increasing the differential tuition more, which they were not supportive of with the information that they had. They were uncomfortable with the idea that not too many of them were individually familiar with it.
- It was also discussed with the board about decreasing the out-of-state tuition rate for distance education. It will be looked at in the future to generate more distance education enrollment and will eventually increase enrollment. The board indicated concerns about not having marketing ready to increase revenues and increase enrollments. Mateo is working on the distance education initiative and the infrastructure for distance education. Tuition will not be decreased until PCC is ready and capable of building enrollment in that arena. It is a likely scenario so that PCC is competitive out of state and competitive with Phoenix in terms of distance education.
- They acknowledge that the infrastructure is not aligned with current enrollment levels. Presentations are being held at several campuses and everyone is encouraged to attend for the most recent information. When they are discussing the budget they are talking about the infrastructure being out of whack with enrollment. The College needs to start being financially responsible. If enrollment does not

increase, they'll have to talk about real reductions. The priorities of the College are to turn enrollment around next year and then work on follow-up with HLC conclusions.

- There will be a College-wide meeting on March 27, 2015. There is an immediate issue with the budget and they are doing everything they can to minimize the impacts of that. The meeting is to talk about where the College is going short and long term, getting everybody engaged in dealing with tuition, and getting enrollment turned around. We need to provide extraordinary service to students so we are able to retain them and give strong student experience and make them successful in what they want to do.

**Matej Boguszak (CC)** questioned if there was a committee looking at restructuring that Dr. Bea would be a part of. Dr. Bea responded that there are multiple committees looking at multiple things. They are looking at a model that has four presidents and restructuring the College throughout in different ways. Exec council is looking at that mostly on the high level. The budget planning group is working on identifying a set of criteria by which budget decisions should be made. They will not be making decisions on the budget but they will be prioritizing. For example, ensuring compliance issues are met, and meeting the needs of the HLC. Another priority would be meeting the College's missions, goals, and strategic plan. The HLC stated we needed to have budgetary processes that are more connected to strategic planning and the mission of the Colleges. Once there are a series of budget recommendations the group will review how well those recommendations meet those criteria. The College is transitioning to be more open about how these processes happen and making sure that everybody is involved at different stages of it. Matej questioned if faculty would be involved. Dr. Bea responded yes, they are definitely in that group. The intent of the four campus presidents will be rolled out before faculty leave so you are aware of that before summer starts.

**Patty Figueroa (EC)** asked where and what time the meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup> would be held. Dr. Bea responded that the details would be coming out. It will be held in the afternoon at WC.

**Rita Flattley (EC)** is concerned with the boom in hiring administrators at the District while at the same time they are cutting campus presidents and campus administrative positions. It is her understanding that when Lee Lambert came to PCC, he spoke about moving more resources to campuses. Dr. Bea responded that there will be some other reductions in administrative positions. It may not be a total reduction in the total number of administrators. There will probably be fewer higher-level administrators and more of the dean-level administrators. In addition, there are a lot of things that are about to move from District out to the campuses over the summer.

**Kimlisa Duchicela (DC)** stated the approach that Pima is taking in Phoenix seems a little unilateral. She questions if we are going to still be welcome in the sandbox with our brethren up there. If they are trying to kill it and we are saying we want to do this. She is assuming we might need them down the road. She questions if they are burning any bridges. Dr. Bea responded it is an interesting dynamic but they are not burning bridges. They have been talking with Maricopa and Pinal and trying to work

collaboratively. They are the ones most concerned right now about the state cuts. The concern was that you couldn't kill the bill and because it had drastic ramifications to the College, they were looking for a compromised solution. A compromise was worked out, which was in almost all the other Colleges' interests and it helped some of them. They are working with them because at some point we may need them. They are good to have in your court.

## **6.2 Provost Report- Erica Holmes**

Provost Holmes introduced two new employees. Jeff Thies, the new Executive Director of Developmental Education and Bruce Moses, the new AVC of Accreditation, both gave a brief background history of themselves.

It is important to keep focused on all of the new policies and procedures that are put into place in our HLC report. We need to make sure that we are working on carrying out what we prescribed in that report.

Provost Holmes attended the State of the City Address. Pima Community College received the Tucson Chamber Legacy Award and will be displayed in the Chancellors office. They will also be attending the Tucson Urban League event.

Each year the College selects students who demonstrate outstanding academic achievement and leadership of the Arizona Academic Team Scholarship. It provides full tuition for two students from each campus. They had 12 representatives who attended the event in Mesa. The report along with their pictures is available. If you see these students, please take a moment to congratulate them.

The marketing department is releasing a new marketing plan for the College very soon. Some of them may be visiting you in focus groups. You may also submit an idea that you think should be marketed. All input is encouraged and will be appreciated. They want to re-emphasize to students and the community the status of our accreditation, that we have programs of value, and that the College is still the best choice for education.

They are working on announcing events consistently and timely so that campuses are getting the same information and they get it as much as we can at the same time.

## **On-time Registration- Nic Richmond**

Nic gave a PowerPoint presentation on data related to On-time Registration.

The Unduplicated head count for spring 2011 to spring 2015 chart showed the function of the days before or after the start of traditional classes this semester. A head count around the start of classes was about 22,000 students. Looking at the day to day change in unduplicated headcount there was a 3% increase for the current semester. It was quite a bit lower than the previous semesters which had a 5% increase.

The additions of more late-start classes were put into place as a part of the on-time registration. Students who weren't ready had alternatives they could register for 14-

week sessions. This semester there were over 300 14-week late-start classes; whereas in previous semesters they have had closer to 150.

In looking at the 14-week update for this semester, on the 13<sup>th</sup> day, the day before the start of the 14-week sections, there was an increase in enrollment on that day which we did not have in previous semesters. On the first day of classes, the range is from about .3 down to minus a tiny bit in terms of enrollment for the semesters. The current semester is kind of in the middle of those, maybe slightly lower. To get a full picture they need to look at the end of the semester. They have the 8-week classes, 2<sup>nd</sup> 8-week, and 5-week classes that they need to look at.

One of the driving factors behind this is that we know students are more successful if they register for their class and are there from the first day of class. They also need to look at the student success during this semester to see how that may have been impacted by the change in process.

Nic shared the same information with Staff Council and they had students comment that they had contacted faculty members to be able to get into some of the classes and did not hear back from the faculty member. They were concerned that we were losing students because they weren't hearing back from the faculty for how to get into the classes.

Kimlisa Duchicela questioned if by the end of the semester, Nic would have some kind of direction for department chairs about the numbers of 14-weekers that we need to do or if we should not concentrate so much on 14-weekers. Nic responded that they would have information later in the semester about what number of students registered for the different 14-week sections and which 14-week sessions were canceled. They can also look at those 2<sup>nd</sup> 8-week classes to see what the enrollments look like. They hope to have some preliminary information during April and would have something more definite when they come back after the summer.

Kimlisa also questioned if they would get any data to see how successful students were with this on-time registration. She also questioned if we would know if we lost any students that just tried to register and just never came back. Nic responded that she would look into finding out about losing students who tried to register. They can provide comparison information looking at student success.

**Rosa Morales (WC)** stated that she received very good data about the progress with social services. She learned that enrollment has been steady for their department and it would be helpful for department chairs to receive that information every semester. Nic responded that they are working on a new kind of report that will give more access to enrollment trend information.

**Tal Sutton (EC)** noticed there was a significant uptick in 14-week registration because of the on-time registration. He questions if there was a big enough uptick that we could statistically tell whether or not letting a student that misses the first week of class sign into a 16-week class is actually a detriment and tell them they should sign up for a 14-week. He wonders if there is going to be enough data to support that. Nic hoped so but

without checking the numbers she can't tell us for sure. They will take that into account as they are looking at the data.

**Olga Carranza (DV)** questioned if a department were to ask for information to see what the trends are, could they receive the information from her. Nic responded yes. Nic stated that there is a dashboard that will be available and posted to the PIR website soon. It is also available through the institutional response document because it is one of the pieces of evidence they provide to the HLC. If they get it they could e-mail it for distribution.

**Mays Imad (EC)** heard from some students that when they went to register past the registration deadline they weren't given options by the staff. She questions if there is any data being collected on where the problem might be. Nic responded that it is difficult to get to some of that but she agrees completely. They need direct student input on what worked, what issues they had, and where the challenges were with the changes in the process. They can get that through holding focus groups and also survey students who registered for classes this semester and ask them. Mays suggested surveying students who registered and then dropped. Nic responded that it was a great idea.

### **Program Review- Carol Hutchinson**

Program Review is going through a transition this year and they're looking at a lot of new data. They are working with Program Planning and institutional research to get this data out to everyone more. Most of the data they are looking at is 45<sup>th</sup> day data.

This year there are now six key areas they will start focusing on with program review and they are looking at five of them this year. They are enrollment, persistence, retention, graduation, student learning outcomes and job placement. Another new report they are working on is a faculty report that gives by discipline, the faculty, credentials, and some courses they have taught. They are required to report on the website all of the faculty and their credentials.

April will be where they are looking at the action plans and asking for signatures from administrators this year.

### **District-Wide Scheduling Summit- Ted Roush and Mary Beth Ginter**

The summit was held on February 12<sup>th</sup> and is part of the schedule development process. There is a chart done on that and gives phase times for development of the schedule. The vice presidents of instruction will come together and review the College-wide schedule and make adjustments. They changed it this year to include the academic deans for a richer picture of how things are looking. They are looking at a richer picture because there is a decline in enrollment and budget challenges. The VPIs and deans got

together to look at trends from one semester to another and see where there were opportunities to improve. They look at classes where normal seating capacity is at 25 and there are 18 enrolled. A lot would say that 18 is a good class. If they are enrolled at 18, they might be able to pull one or two out of there and get them closer to their seating capacity. That saves money for adjunct faculty or allows using full-time faculty in a better way more effectively.

The overall FTSE rate for the College is 21.1. That is the goal all campuses are funded against. When you are at your campus and talk about what's break even the general break-even point is about 18 or 19 for standard classes. Labs, nursing, and aviation classes are different but standard three credit classes that have less than 18 are losing money. They want to be as efficient as possible to be able to keep as many people around and still serve students in the best way possible.

No one is canceling anybody's classes so that they will not have a job anymore. Some people have come to that conclusion but that is not what anybody wants.

There's also conversation on how we will determine the programs are effective. For example, are we spending a tremendous amount of money for three students in a program? It is not something they talked about at the summit, but it is something on the horizon.

Kimlisa questioned if this is going to be a guaranteed schedule. Ted responded that one of the long-term goals given to them by the chancellor is to be a more student-friendly College. Having schedules that don't have classes canceled in them. They want to start testing some models at DV with a couple of cohorts that will offer standard degrees and guarantee them and see where that goes. Very little of what they are doing in the fall schedule is going to be guaranteed schedule.

Mary Beth Ginter stated that when Jerry Migler was here he came into the dean meeting and said that scheduling was not 100% effective and charged a group to tear apart and look at how we did scheduling. It was a lot of work and a lot of valuable findings came of that. She regrets calling it a summit because she thinks everybody is thinking this is a big formal thing. It made sense for folks who work with you on scheduling to sit and look at these together, like a working meeting. It was very positive. Ted added that it is expected that they come back and visit with department chairs, leads, and faculty in those areas to talk about what the plans are. It is not as if we stop there.

**Duff Galda (CC)** stated that prior to the HLC; one of the problems that discussed was the tendency to schedule online classes and that not coming out of faculty. She personally believes that it should be part of faculty oversight. She questioned if they discussed the scheduling of online classes and how that is affecting face-to-face classes in areas where faculty think that is not the wisest modality of delivery. Ted responded that they did not discuss that at the scheduling summit. Kimlisa added that they are trying to do it in a deliberate way where they only schedule a certain number of classes, see how they feel, and then adding classes. A class shouldn't go online just because, it should go online at the discretion of the CDAC. That being said, if they have a program

that can be completed online they ought to make it completely online. Before they put that program out there they really have to check with the faculty. They are piloting it in a couple of CDACs in the fall to see how the schedule works and make sure they are working across district.

Duff responded that she is never heard the College in a whole scale manner asking students what their preferred modality is. She would hope when they are looking at scheduling that they would consider those questions.

### 6.3 PCCEA Report- Julia Fiello

- 1) All Faculty Day
  - a) Survey results posted at <http://pccea.com> → Announcements → AFD
    - i) Majority of faculty do not prefer Friday
    - ii) Majority of faculty do prefer the one-site model
    - iii) Many other comments re aspects to keep, modify; discuss format details in the fall
  - b) PCCEA Executive Board recommends moving AFD to Wednesday (our second day of accountability)
  - c) Need Senate vote
- 2) Step Progression
  - a) PPP reports due last Friday in March (March 27, 2015)
  - b) BOG direction clear: no step or lift this year
  - c) Absent change to existing policy, steps held in abeyance (Appendix A, II B 3) “If, for any reason, the Board does not grant step advancement to Faculty group, all Faculty members who were approved for step advancement are automatically approved for step advancement in the succeeding year. Any Faculty members not approved for step advancement will have the opportunity to apply for step advancement the following year.” *Other language confirms that though step advancement is approved on a person-by-person basis following PPP completion, this does not mean that the Board has granted a step to the faculty as a whole.*
  - d) E.g.: We went 3 years without a step (2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12) and in 2012/13 when the steps were again granted, faculty who had been approved in any of the prior years received one step; See FPPS Appendix N page 149
- 3) BOG Study Session- Monday, March 9, 5:00 – 6:00 p.m.
  - a) BP 1101 discussion
    - i) PCCEA supports inclusion of affected constituents in policy drafting phase
  - b) Feedback from employee groups regarding Baker Tilly analysis
    - i) PCCEA handout will be posted on <http://pccea.com>
    - ii) PCCEA supports or remains neutral re many conclusions/recommendations
    - iii) PCCEA does not agree with conclusions re meet/confer

- (1) Some concerns may be tied to last year's unique format that included transitioning to a "new" interest-based collaboration system (e.g. "lack of guidelines')
  - (2) Some concerns may be specific to other groups
  - (3) Some concerns may be tied to a misperception regarding negotiating options in a "right-to-work" state
  - (4) Reminder: meet/confer solves College-wide problem
- 4) Meet and Confer
- a) PCCEA is in close contact with AEA's lobbyist to ensure that we understand fiscal ramifications (e.g. current budget debates and HB 2442 proposals); also receive support from our lawyer and association contacts
  - b) Financial parameters clarified in February 20 meet/confer and in follow-up conversations with Chancellor Lambert
    - i) All topics must address HLC concerns (18 month timeline) and budget challenges (PCCEA believes most of our proposal already does the former; other items are clerical clarifications)
    - ii) In addition to no lift & step, budget challenges *may* result in cuts at some point
    - iii) Teams asked to help identify options; we're working to prioritize and **suggest options to the faculty at large for feedback/consensus** (which we would then discuss with Management); some are 'solutions' that have been used in the past; topics include:
      - (1) Suspension of sabbaticals, professional enrichment
      - (2) Use of Campus Enrichment Funds for other purposes
      - (3) Incentives for Active/early retirement
      - (4) Moving faculty to different sites or disciplines to balance FT/adjunct ratios
      - (5) Other options were suggested that PCCEA would oppose
    - iv) Note: 14 faculty positions are already frozen and we are filling open faculty positions
    - v) Teams asked to review retrenchment policy (FPPS Art. XI) to ensure that we have a strong policy that addresses:
      - (1) Program reduction
      - (2) Enrollment decline
      - (3) Financial exigency
  - c) Reminder:
    - i) 5-minute public comment begins each session
    - ii) M/C proposals, meeting schedule, information, agendas, notes at <http://pccea.com>
- 5) 5. Reminder: PCCEA Open House (or All Faculty Meeting) - Friday, March 27, 3:00-5:00 p.m.; site TBD

- 6) 6. Monthly meetings with PCCEA leadership and the Chancellor, Provost and Chief Human Resource Officer are scheduled.

#### **6.4 BOG Report- Mays Imad**

There was a study session held since the last meeting. Duff Galda took notes for her at that meeting. The two things that were discussed at the study session were the budget and the program review. Mays will be soliciting an email asking for questions or statements they would like her to convey to the board.

#### **6.5 Governance Council- Joe Labuda**

BP 1401 established the Governance Council and SPG 1401/AA kind of flushes it out. There are a couple of problems with it from the Senate point of view. One is the membership. According to BP, in terms of the faculty membership, there is an adjunct member who is also the Senate's adjunct faculty representative to the board would be the person who also represents the Senate at the Governance Council meeting. Our board rep would also serve as one of the representatives to the Governance Council. The Senate point of view is essentially that it should be a Senate option. If the same person is wanted to represent both at the Governance Council and the board, fine. If not, we should be able to have two different people. It is a large obligation to be a board rep and that person might not be able to handle both tasks. They would like to leave that as a Senate option.

They are basically asking for two representatives from the regular faculty and one representative from the Adjunct Faculty Senate. The term is one year, but you are term limited after two years. They have had a number of instances where the representative to the governing board served multiple years. It is an advantage to have that kind of person. If you have someone who is really good at representing us in a particular arena you should let them run with it. If we are unhappy with them, we can vote them out after a year.

Being that the council is fairly new, it is important for the Senate to assert itself at this point. We are going to want structure that we can live with going down the road. The next meeting is this Monday. He will take it forward, and will leave it right there unless there are any questions.

**Duff Galda (CC)** asked that when he says "the Senate feels," is he talking about all of us or just the Senate representatives. Joe responded the Senate representative to the council and the leadership. Duff feels it is only fair that this be discussed in front of the full group before anything goes on and be represented at the meeting as the full Senate behind any perspective. Until it is discussed with the full Senate and perhaps even call for a vote, she does not think it is appropriate for them to be represented in that manner. Joe responded that the Senate put in people to represent us at the Governance Council. They took forward a position, because this is of a timely nature. On this

particular issue he does not see the downside to the Senate in terms of going forward with this position. If we want to keep the same situation we can but if we don't it gives an option to have multiple members. In terms of the term limits. They are willing to come back with the issue but if there is a specific part that you don't like it would be helpful to know.

Kimlisa suggested they could put it out in an e-mail. It is important to understand the Governance Council is becoming a body that legislates in many ways for the College and makes serious decisions. The Senate should put on the Governance Council the person that is best positioned in the College to represent the faculty on making major decisions. The BOG and the Governance Council are two very different jobs. The term limits are definitely a problem. She agrees the rest of the group should look at it, but is in favor of changing the policy so that the Senate decides who represents the Senate on the Governance Council. The point is that we had a position on our charter and the board changed it on us. The Senate did not say that we wanted our BOG rep to also represent us on this big Governance Council. You need to know HLC policy and the mechanics of the College. We have a new board so there is an opportunity to open the dialogue again about this important position.

After discussion Kimlisa stated that at the next meeting they will do the charter and not so many people reports. The charter is online to look at and we can look at taking care of the charters situation.

**6.6 Senate Adjunct Faculty Committee- Carlo Buscemi** No report given

**6.7 Faculty Senate President's Report- Kimlisa Duchicela**

DC has a student tech corner in the learning commons. If you are at the downtown campus you should check it out.

**7.0 Open Forum:** Not requested.

**8.0 Executive Session:** Not requested.

Adjournment was motioned and seconded.