

Faculty Senate Minutes
October 2nd, 2015
Amethyst Room Downtown Campus
1:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

1.0 Introductions and Call to Order

Attendance taken by Faculty Senate President, Kimlisa Duchicela (DC)

In Attendance: Robert Foth (CC); David Kryder (CC); Teddi Schnurr (DV); Pollyanna Wikrent (DV); Bob Cunningham (DW); Joe Labuda (DW); John Archuleta (DC); Barbara Fox (DC); Skylar Webb (DC); John Gerard (DC); Lisa Jurkowitz (DC); Vivian Knight (DC); Gwen Gorbette (DC); Josie Milliken (DC); Steve Olson (DC); Fred D'Angelo (EC); Rita Flattley (EC); Mays Imad (EC); Taliesin Sutton (EC); Donald Bock (NW); Carlo Buscemi (NW); Erin Eichelberger (NW); Noah Faye (NW); Matt Hinojosa (NW); Jerry Cherrington (NW); Carol Christofferson (WC) Proxy for Joseph Dal Pra (WC); Pamela Coker (WC); Meg Files (WC); Paul Flasch (WC) Proxy for Lazaro Hong (WC) and Steve Mackie (WC); Kathy Fraychineaud (WC); Jacqueline Kern (WC); MaryKris Mcilwaine (WC); Rosa Morales (WC); Catherine O'Brien (WC); Michael Parker (WC); Margarita Youngo (WC); Patricia Figueroa (EC) Faculty Senate Secretary; Bardo Padilla (DC) Faculty Senate Vice President; Kimlisa Duchicela (DC) Faculty Senate President

Absent: Anthony Sovak (CC); Olga Carranza (DV); Joel Dworin (DV); Timothy Cruz (DC); Trisha Miller (DC); Susan Pritchett (DC); Chris Chulak (DC); Brooke Hundtoft (EC); Wright Randolph (EC); Don Roberts (EC); Mary Shelor (EC); Blake Cheryl (NW); Rita Lennon (NW); Debra Kaye (WC); Sarah Marcus (WC)

Guests: Deborah Yoklic (DO); Dolores Duran-Cerda (DO); Bruce Moses (DO); David Dore (NW, DC); Ana Jimenez (EC); Jon Howe (DO); Ana Jimenez (EC); Matej Boguszak (DC); Scott Collins (WC); Karie Meyers (DO); Nic Richmond (DO); Kate Schmidt (CC)

1.1 Announcements

- Kimlisa Duchicela welcomed Michael Amick (CC), new Vice President for Distance Education

2.0 Minutes Approval May 2015 and September 2015

- Approval of May minutes will be tabled for next meeting
- Tal Sutton (EC) moves to approve September 2015 minutes. Motion was seconded by Joe Labuda (WC) and passed with unanimous support

3.0 Agenda Modification and Open Forum Items

- Dolores Duran-Cerda and Bruce Moses will give the Provost Report
- David Bea will give the Chancellor Report
- No open forum items requested
- Joe Labuda (WC) requested an Executive Session

4.0 Business

4.1 Policies - Debbie Yoklic

- ❖ **BP 1.19 Naming Opportunities**
- ❖ **AP 1.19.01 Procedures for Naming Opportunities**

Better structure is set for when people give significant funds to the College. It will be posted after the Oct 21st board meeting.

Debbie Yoklic is retiring and this will be her last Faculty Senate meeting. Angela Wesson (DO) and Jeff Silvyn (DO) will handle policies. She thanked everyone for all they have done for the College. Kimlisa presented her with a gift.

4.2 Department Chair Taskforce - Pollyanna Wikrent

- ❖ Pollyanna is co-chairing the taskforce with Dolores Duran-Cerda (DO) and there are 12 people in the taskforce.
- ❖ They were given a charge by the Chancellor in March to look at the Department Chair structure and benchmark other institutions to see how they could improve it.
- ❖ Their main goal is to promote student success and develop a framework so that faculty may feel they have a voice.
- ❖ They have come to a conclusion, but discipline experts will be needed for feedback. Faculties will receive an email from the Provost's office with these details as well as the rooms. Meetings will be held to discuss the details of their proposal and benchmarking during the following dates and times:

October 30th, 2015

1:00pm - 2:30pm at Desert Vista Campus

3:00pm - 4:30pm at West Campus

November 2nd, 2015

9:00am - 10:30am at Community Campus

November 4th, 2015

8:30am - 10:00am at Northwest Campus

1:00pm - 2:30pm at East Campus

5:30pm - 7:00pm at Downtown Campus

- ❖ After the meetings they will collect the information and come back to senate at a later time.
- ❖ Pollyanna handed out a diagram of the general structure they are working on. Department Chairs would still have the same duties working with adjunct faculty but also adding an evaluation process. They would like to have a district wide person that would be above the Department Chairs. It would be a faculty person making sure the department is running as smoothly as possible. This person would be in charge of the evaluation process, in conjunction with an administrator. The faculty members would not move to district. They would like it to be a hired position instead of an elected position so they can have people that really want to do the job. They would as the faculty member in a smaller division to visit adjunct faculty at other campuses.

Rita Flattley (EC) asked what the hiring process would be and who would be involved in the hiring. She also questioned what the term of office would be. Pollyanna responded that they are still working on the process but they would like a faculty member and an administrator to be involved in the hiring process. The positions would be 3 year positions for both jobs.

Barbara Fox (DC) questioned what the financial impact would be of adding another level of bureaucracy. Pollyanna responded that they spend approximately \$1 million for Department Chairs and Lead Faculty, including Adjunct Faculty work for reassigned time. The goal is to keep it there but if the job is more work they will propose to have more compensation.

John Archuleta (DC) feels they are creating another bureaucratic level at a time when the position between Fulltime and Adjunct Faculty is shaky. It seems to him that they are driving another wedge between them. Pollyanna responded that it is not at all what they wanted to do. She apologized that it seemed like that. Patty Figueroa (EC) clarified they are only shifting the responsibility and accountability. The Division Chair will be overseeing the Full-time Faculty and the Department Chair will be overseeing the Adjunct Faculty.

Fred D'Angelo (EC) questioned how it would affect the responsibility of the Deans. Pollyanna responded that they don't know the answer to that question right now. They were tasked with the faculty and department chair aspect of it. There are two VPI's and one dean on the task force. They have met with the presidents to discuss that but the structure on how it will be in the future has not come out yet.

Kimlisa Duchicela (DC) asked if the PimaOnline would be part of this or if they would be separated. Pollyanna responded that two members from PimaOnline are on the task force. Each division has a spot for a PimaOnline Department Chair. They hope to mold into whatever happens after the pilot.

MaryKris Mcilwaine (WC) questioned if any faculty member would be forced into one of the quasi administrative positions. Pollyanna responded they want to put out there that it is a hired and manageable position. They can't force anyone into the position but she does understand her concern.

Matej Boguszak (DC) questioned if the department chairs would still be doing scheduling and what else would the division heads do. Pollyanna noted that the taskforce would address those questions during the meetings.

Michael Parker (WC) asked if they were assigning SLO and curriculum activities to either position. Pollyanna responded that the Division Chairs would be responsible for making sure SLOs were getting done in their division. Department Chairs would have to make sure SLOs activities were being done in their classes.

Mays Imad (EC) questioned if they will send an email to people who can't make the meetings to get feedback and when the structure be implemented. She also asked what the rationale was for dividing the review process for the adjunct versus the full-time faculty. Pollyanna responded that they are developing material to give out at the meeting and will also provide a College-wide email to send as much information as they like. They will start that process after the first meeting.

They do not have any information on when the structure will be implemented because they are still developing it. Their goal is to have the Department Chair Taskforce done by this fall. After they meet with faculty they will meet with Staff Council, College Council, presidents, and administrators to gather information. They will then have to go

to the Chancellor after that. **Dolores Duran-Cerda (DO)** added that they are thinking of developing an Intranet web page to have all the materials available for all College employees. They will also have an email specifically for Department Chair Taskforce issues. **Patty Figueroa (EC)** added that the division chair needs to have at least one content area of the disciplines where the department chair is going to be a subject matter expert. Pollyanna added that the major issue is the amount of workload for evaluating any faculty and that is why they broke it up. Mays questioned if they plan on training the Department Chair in leadership and management. Pollyanna responded a major part of their recommendation is to have extensive training.

David Kryder (CC) questioned if this was aimed primarily at the evaluation of adjunct faculty. Pollyanna responded that it was aimed toward looking at the department chair structure. Their major duty is working with adjunct faculty and scheduling classes with adjunct faculty. There is a new full-time faculty evaluation that from his understanding it will happen for adjunct faculty. David added that reimbursement is one of the things they need to look at.

Kimlisa Duchicela (DC) questioned if division chairs would only be coming from faculty ranks or would the position be open to anyone at the College. Pollyanna responded that they are recommending the department chair to be fully certified in the discipline they would be in charge of. They expect it to be from faculty ranks but there are administrators who were faculty and may be able to apply as well.

4.3 Mission Statement - Nic Richmond

Kimlisa noted that the mission statement has been approved because there is a pamphlet. The College would not have made a pamphlet if it wasn't approved. There are some concerns.

Nic Richmond discussed the process used in developing the mission documents. The process started October of last year with a kickoff meeting involving the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Cabinet. A meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was held after that and it included faculty, exempt staff, non-exempt staff, two board members, community members, administrators, and two students. They held open sessions across the district for several months through April. In April they had the second Futures Conference where all the input was taken and they drafted a vision and mission statement. Based on that input Nic convened three meetings of the Strategic Planning Committee. The committee took the results and drafted a vision and mission statement, values, cores, themes, and objectives. It was then submitted forward to senior administration. There were recommended changes from senior leadership, and there was a work session with the board at the end of July. There was then a final discussion with executive council on August the 10th. It was then submitted to and approved by the Board for approval in August.

Nic realizes there is concern regarding BP 106, Shared Governance. She explained the mission statement is not a policy document or an administrative procedure. While it is subject to the principles of shared governance, it is not required to go through the same review process. They can certainly move it through the shared governance process moving forward. The fact that they did not this time does not make the process wrong. As continuous improvement, they can build that process in the next time they do a mission review. It was recommended by faculty senate, staff council, and all College council to share the information to be shared with those same groups at the beginning of the academic year as well as having input at the tail end of the year.

Kimlisa Duchicela (DC) respectfully disagrees with the issue of it being a policy or not. It is the overarching thing of everything they do. Her issue is that it was approved over the summer and then rolled out. She read the BP 106 and she still strongly believes that it should have come to the employee groups. Especially in light of the criteria for HLC, they have to show that faculty, staff, and students understand and support the organization's mission. It did not go to any those groups and they are tasked by HLC to have a larger and wider discussion. She's read the mission statement and it looks good but they were left out of the conversation.

Joe Labuda (EC) added that 1.06 is sufficiently ambiguous and if they wanted to include the groups they could have done so. He has been through a number of processes. A mission process becomes a team building exercise. It brings cohesiveness to each campus and is the kind of thing you don't want to rush through. It is an opportunity to get buy-in from faculty, students, and staff and it is better to do things right the first time. In terms of whether it was required by board policy or not, it was required by common sense to do it. If they are going to be stuck in the logistic environment where they have to find a spot in every board policy to get everything done, they are pretty much screwed. If they don't get back to some kind of common-sense contact, they are really missing the boat. Whatever good that came out of it, they have done damage due to the fact they blew a whole lot of people off. It may just seem symbolic but they blew the chance to do it as a group and a team-building exercise. He humbly disagrees.

Mays Imad (EC) stated that she recalls a community member, at the last board study session, who had the same concerns as Kimlisa and Joe. Mark Hanna requested that they revisit the mission statement to include the community and recalls the Chancellor not being in favor. She questioned what has happened since then.

Nic explained it was recommended in the last study session that the mission would be an agenda item at the October 21st meeting. At that point it would be up to the board on how they choose to proceed. Nic apologized that they felt excluded. The intention was to take a year-long and have meetings as widely as possible so they could gather as much input as they could. They held sessions at different campuses as well as sessions with the community. It was never their intention in this process to exclude input. They can change the process and make sure the governance groups are included in the process the next time around. She encourages everyone to share their perceptions at the board meeting should they wish to.

Michael Parker (WC) stated he was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee. He was able to attend all of the meetings and feels he was able to influence the end product. He agrees with Joe and Kimlisa that it would seem self-evident to bring it before the Faculty Senate. He questioned if there was a particular reason as to why they chose to bypass the senate.

Nic responded that there was never a discussion to bypass particular groups. The decision was made earlier in the process to involve the Strategic Planning Committee because it was extremely broad based in membership. The same committee members, who developed the 14-17 strategic plans, were part of the planning committee. It was a group from the College representing different groups who had extensive experience through the Futures Conference and through the development of the strategic plan.

David Kryder (CC) questioned if the message that it wrinkled a lot of people's noses got through. Nic responded that she understood and they could do things differently next time.

Kimlisa Duchicela (DC) expressed that the buck did not stop with Nic. It stops higher up the pay scale. She feels they need to ask the board to go back do this right.

Mays Imad (EC) asked if it was possible to reopen this. Nic responded that it was the board's decision as to what happens next. They have two HLC requirements that need to be completed for the report in July. There is a timeline issue about how long that revisiting would need and whether that leaves them with adequate time to complete the process.

Kimlisa Duchicela (EC) feels there are other things in the HLC letter that could also damage about communication.

Joe Labuda (WC) added that they did not mean for this to come across as shoot the messenger. It is a broader comment of on an institutional ethic of how they do things. He feels at the end of the day the mission statement is supposed to be for PCC. When we rush through things, there is a lot of collateral damage.

Rosa Morales (WC) encouraged everyone to contact the board members and let them know about their concerns.

5.0 Reports

5.1 Provost Report

Dolores Duran-Cerda explained the provost had left and thanked her for her service at the College. Dolores started her new role and will have office hours at the different campuses. It is a way to communicate directly if there's anything you'd like to share with her through faculty perspective, teaching, learning, or other issues.

Bruce Moses (DO) gave an Accreditation Improvement Initiative update. The College has been charged with specific things they need to do as an institution. They have been ongoing and happening over the course of the last academic year. There were eleven items identified by the HLC reviewers and it generated about 27 initiatives out of that. Bruce put together a dashboard showing what has been completed and what is still in process. He is working with Paul Schwalbach to make it public and in a more readable version.

Matej Boguszak (DC) asked which items still have the most work to do. Bruce explained that the mission and vision will be the most challenging if they decide to pull it. The mission and vision move the unit planning and institutional effectiveness forward. They have the responsibility to show effectiveness of the outcomes from the mission and vision by July 2016. If they approve the mission and vision in January 2016 it will send a message that it wasn't a sense of urgency. They need a consistent way of making sure they are documenting all of their efforts and centralizing the documentation so that the people who get asked about documentation by reviewers can disseminate to the reviewers what it means.

Jon Howe presented on starting a faculty advisory group for ADR. They are looking for a way Access and Disability Resources can be a valuable resource and support for faculty, be more available, provide services to faculty to accommodate students in class, and make more

accessible classroom environments. If anyone is interested in exploring a faculty advisory group for ADR please email Jon Howe. The goal is to start creating parts of access and disability resource in support to faculty and supporting students with disabilities in the class.

5.2 Chancellor Report - David Bea

Dr. Bea gave an update on expenditure limitation.

- ❖ The study session committee that has been reviewing the expenditure limitation has met three times. Serving on the committee is Lee Lambert, four community College based reps, four to five legislative folks, and a couple of people representing tax payers.
- ❖ The group is looking for a series of recommendations. They are trying to get them to recommend a different type of measure for enrollment, either weighting for high-cost programs or a different inflationary measure.
- ❖ They are also trying to get exclusionary language for entrepreneurial programs.
- ❖ The budget is structure on a 22,000 FTSE expenditure limit. They were going to ratchet down their expenditure limit numbers by a thousand per year with the exception of bumping up their actual enrollments by a thousand per year and building a plan on that. They were looking at budget reductions of about 2.5 million for the next three years. They met their goal last year but their enrollment has not turned around to that degree. Looking into next year's budget, the 2.5 million might be a bigger a number since they are not at the enrollment increase they were hoping to be.
- ❖ They are having success with salary savings from hiring freeze and slowing down hiring. Eliminating vacant positions is easier than eliminating positions with people in them. They are trying to minimize the impact of individuals. This next year will be their toughest budget year because they have to figure out how to increase enrollment.
- ❖ An email will be going out on the second phase of the campus reorganization. They are looking for constructive feedback on the two conceptual structures.
- ❖ There will be a task force put together to select a firm who will be reviewing the provost area functions. They will also be working with the firm through that three month process.

Kimlisa Duchicela (DC) questioned how much was being spent on external consultants and how many more are coming. An RFP for the provost was mentioned and there's a consultant for financial aid. She questioned if they were paying that. Dr. Bea responded they are paying but it is a different situation. The financial aid person is a consultant but they are also acting in the role of their executive director. Kimlisa also questioned the service excellence program for fall 2015. Dr. Bea explained that it is a firm that is a train-the-trainer model and the dollars are relatively small. Their intent is to minimize the expenses for the external consultants and internalize the support and the ongoing quality of them.

Kimlisa asked if they budget for vacant positions in case they should be filled. Dr. Bea explained they do and they also budget for expected amount of salary savings. Kimlisa questioned if they fill the vacant position, does not it increase their expenses. Dr. Bea explained it would increase as opposed to leaving it vacant.

Mays Imad (EC) questioned if they are keeping track of the money the reorganization is saving. She is concerned the money being saved is going towards vendors. She would like see numbers of how much they are spending. Dr. Bea explained they are working on

dashboard measures related to vacancies that will be available on the web. They would also like to have it longitudinally to see how they are making progress. They're not ready for prime time yet but it will be public information. Information on various cost saving measures will also be made public.

Rita Flatley (EC) questioned if the campus budgets were based on enrollment, what was the basis for the district budget which has no enrollment. Dr. Bea explained that it looks at positions, proportions of positions, and salaries. Rita questioned if it was based on employee salaries and benefit costs. Dr. Bea explained that this is how they distribute the target for salary savings, because it is tied to salaries. She asked when they are going to have resources on the campuses. Dr. Bea explained things will look substantially different in a year.

5.3 BOG, Adjunct and/ or PCCEA

Mays Imad explained that she sent an email to faculty members for feedback and took the feedback to the BOG. Both the Chancellor and Sylvia met with Mays and they wanted to hear feedback from the faculty. Some things brought forward were not having feedback to the SLOs. C-FAIRR put out a letter in response to that report and both the Chancellor and Sylvia communicated to Mays it was not the faculty's' or Mays fault that C-FAIRR put out that letter. It was never her intention to harm Pima or the senate. She felt it was her duty to listen to the faculty. She heard a lot of negative comments from faculty that they were not being heard and did not matter. That is what prompted her to send the email and get feedback from faculty. She encourages everyone to come to the board meetings, study sessions, or watch the videos that are posted.

Rosa Morales (WC) appreciated that she was asking feedback from faculty and not just distributing information. She hopes that more people start doing that.

Kimlisa Duchicela (DC) was surprised to hear that Sylvia Lee and Lee told Mays no one had brought this to them. Kimlisa sat in a monthly meeting with the Chancellor, Erica Holmes and other who told them over and over again exactly what Mays said in that group. She is stunned that he acted as if they had not said anything. A year ago, the Faculty Senate leadership went to the Chancellor and told him there was a serious issue in the Provost's office. Kimlisa is very furious of the 150K payout. The Chancellor told them he was going to bring in a consultant who was going to look at the situation in the provost's office. It was scathing in the faculty meeting that there were major systematic issues that were going to haunt them. She went to the Chancellor after and asked for the report. There was no report written at all. It was just her impressions from the meeting and that it wasn't the provost; it was some whiny people in the provost's office. He then went to the news and called us whiny faculty and now she's gone. There was no apology or retraction. She can't say anything bad about the Chancellor and he can't say anything bad about her. Kimlisa has had enough. They have said that to the Chancellor over and over again. They have sat in his office and for that they are not leaders. They are whiny and not doing their jobs because they chose a nonpublic forum because of HLC to try and give some kind of concession so he could get things right. She's about done because they can't pretend like they were not told. It is unconscionable and unethical.

Rosa Morales (WC) explained that she never got anything in writing about any of those issues. They discussed in an executive session that there were concerns. She's glad they were brought up because it was the right thing to do. She's glad that Mays brought it to the public. Mays agreed with Rosa that sometimes if doing things behind the scenes is not effective then

you take it to the public. They are seeing changes that leadership wants them involved and she hopes it continues.

Kimlisa hopes that it continues but does not know that leadership wants them involved. She explained that on March 27th Sylvia Lee was in the audience. She spoke and again she did nothing. They told her about the provost and she did nothing. She saw the tape and she couldn't believe they looked so surprised. Mays explained that Lee did not see the report because she submitted the report to the board beforehand.

Mays added that they cannot afford to sit here as a College and say they don't want to work with us. It is going to continue to divide them further and further. They will be hurt, the community, and the students. She encourages everyone to turn the page and open a new chapter.

Patty Figueroa (EC) began by explaining that she admires everyone's eloquence and leadership skills judging by the recent email communications regarding this issue. She continued by saying that because ideas differ, faculty should not bash each other when they do not agree. She explained that all ideas are valid, and should be listened to and respected. Patty explained that Mays' report should have been given at public comments and not as the BOG report because it was not reflective of all faculties' opinion. She thanked Kimlisa for sharing because it is very important they are all on the same page.

Bardo Padilla (DC) thanked Mays for what she did, but agreed that he would have liked for her to present it to senate before so they could know what was going on.

Rosa Morales (WC) added that they need to create an environment that allows them to speak. When they want to speak.

Margarita Youngo (WC) feels they should show respect and if you feel emotional, take a step back and think it clearly before they state it. She feels people should respect each other and do it in a proper, professional way.

Kimlisa Duchicela (DC) remembers drafting the vote of no confidence letter against the board. It was an eloquent and beautiful letter. She feels they should do more of that and speak more with all of their voices. She felt they were absolutely together.

Jerry Cherrington (NW) represents the social and behavioral science department as their steward. He gives them an invitation to provide him with information if they wish him to bring up any topic. The senate's BOG representative is the steward of the senate and he congratulates her on having done an exceptional job on their behalf.

Ana Jimenez (EC) PCCEA will be sending out a faculty survey. Everyone will be reporting their feedback to the board. She will also be sending out an email asking what faculty would like to see on the survey.

5.4 President's Report

- ❖ **Emeritus** - Emeritus is open. If you would like someone forward on Emeritus you can click on the link and do that. Some people put Rob Modica forward but he's a year short. Denise Meeks was also short.
- ❖ **Need 3 more Speakers for Speaker's Series-** If you know anyone who would like to be speakers, please let Tal know.
- ❖ **Newsletter** - Kimlisa thanked Chris Bonhorst for getting them a faculty senate email. They will continue to send out the newsletter and will be able to use Mail Chimp.

6.0 Open Forum - Not requested

7.0 Executive Session - requested

Adjournment was motioned and seconded.