Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
Friday February 4th 2011  
Community Campus  
12:45 – 3:00pm

Present: Lynta Thomas (CC); Steven Croft (DC); Dolores Duran-Cerda (DC); Josie Milliken (DC); Diann Porter (DC); Gene Gotwalt (DC); Sterling Vinson (DC); Susan Pritchett (DC); Tommy Salazar (DC); Jeannie Arbogast (DV) proxy for Patricia Townsend (DV); Susan San Jule (DV); Pollyanna Wikrent (DV); Terri Hamstra (DV); Patricia Townsend (DV); Patricia Figueroa (EC) proxy for Kimlisa Duchicela (DC); Rita Flattley (EC); Doug Holland (EC); Mary Mitchell (EC); Rob Modica (EC); Barbara Armenta (EC); Kathy Feuling (EC); Cheryl Blake (NW); Donald Bock (NW); Greta Buck-Rodriguez (NW) proxy for Erin Eichelberger (NW); Randy Munsen (NW); Shelby Goldberg (NW); Ellen Caldwell (WC); Ceanne Alwine (WC); Carol Christofferson (WC); John Kordich (WC); Debra Kaye (WC); Steve Mackie (WC); MaryKris Mcilwaine (WC); Jack Mertes (WC); Karie Meyers (WC); Rosa Morales (WC); Erich Saphir (WC); Tom Speer (WC); Joe Labuda (Dist-W)

Absent: Matej Boguszak (CC); Rick Manganiello (CC); Mike Schuetze (CC); Earl Garrick (DC); Ron Hale (DC); Linda Marks (DC); Nadia Villalobos (DC); Andrea Henderson (DV); Olga Carranza (DV); Randolph Wright (EC); Donald Roberts (EC); Sandy Niederriter (NW); Rebeca Bennett (WC); Joseph Dal Pra (WC); Jake Elkins (WC); Lazaro Hong (WC); David Katz (WC); Sarah Marcus (WC); Catherine O’Brien (WC); Melinda Franz (Dist-W)

Guests: Becky Pallack (AZ Daily Star); Debbie Yoklic (DO); Chancellor Roy Flores (DO); Jose Leyba (DO); Scott Collins (PCCEA)

1.0 Introductions
Faculty senate president Diann Porter welcomed the faculty and confirmed a quorum of senators with the secretary.

2.0 Approval of Minutes
The December minutes were reviewed first, as they were put on hold until the February meeting. MaryKris Mcilwaine made preferred changes to her open forum item presentation that Diann Porter sent to the faculty yesterday. Rita Flattley stated that when she read the PCCEA report, the Meet and Confer team names were not included in the minutes. She stated she would like to send them to the secretary. A motion to approve with the corrections and additions was made by Barbara Armenta and seconded by Rob Modica.

The January minutes corrections included the misspelling of MaryKris Mcilwaine’s name and the miss-titling of the document labeled ‘December’ instead of ‘January’ noted by Diann Porter. Rob Modica noted the reversal of Lynta Thomas' name as well as the misspelling of Pollyanna Wikrent’s name. Lastly, he noted the misspelling of Jenny Scott’s name and stated that he found the minutes to be very thorough.

Gene Gotwalt was present for the January meeting not absent as noted. Kathy Feuling’s name was also
misspelled. Erich Saphir moved to adopt the minutes as corrected, Rita Flattley seconded. The motion was approved.

3.0 Announcements
There were no announcements.

4.0 Agenda Modifications and Open Forum Items
Rob Modica wished to address the faculty regarding student use of e-mail in open forum.

5.0 Business
5.1 Preparing Presentations for a viewing audience
Debbie Yoklic presented guidelines to the senate. When a faculty member presents a presentation to the senate via power-point, the following guidelines are recommended:

- Use the power-point rulers for 1” margins on all sides.
- Use sans serif fonts such as Arial or Helvetica.
- Use a minimum of 24 point font size. The larger, the better.
- Use bullet points, not long sentences.
- Do not use more than 5-6 bullet points per slide.
- Use a line thickness not less than 2 points.
- Use dark text on a light background, or a light color on a dark background.
- Don't use orange-red colors.

Submit power-points to Julie Hecimovich and Diann Porter the Wednesday prior to the meeting so they are ready for you. Be sure to bring your own copy.

5.2 SPG 3501, Admissions and Registration
Debbi Yoklic presented to the senate regarding the draft revised SPG. This revision came out of the discussions that the Chancellor and the planning committee have been having about minimum entrance standards at PCC. Currently the college does not require an enrolling student to have a GED or high-school diploma. Beginning spring 2012 the college will require a student to produce a high-school transcript or documentation of passed GED. In addition, students will have to take PCC assessment exams and will have to place at a minimum level which will be decided in conjunction with the CDACS.

If the student does not have a high-school diploma or GED, they will initially be encouraged take the GED exam. If they do not wish to take the GED, they will have to prove (through the PCC assessment exams) that they are 'college ready' by the not yet determined minimums.

When a student comes to register at Pima for the first time, they will be permitted to register, just as they are now, but they will get a message stating that they have two months to produce documentation of a GED or high-school diploma. They will continue to get reminders. Nothing will happen after two months if they don't produce documentation, at least for that semester. However, when they come back to register for the next semester, they won't be able to if they still haven't produced the documentation. This standard will become effective November 6th. This date was selected because the previous Thursday to November 6th is the first day of the 3rd five week session, with Friday being the add date and Tuesday November 7th being the start of spring registration. November 6th is the date after a student would register for fall and before they would register for spring.
Other revisions in the SPG update PCC practices regarding under-age students.

The third change regards the minimum TOEFL scores. Pima will now adopt the same TOEFL scores as the U of A. Previously a score of 450 was required on the written TOEFL, now it will be raised to 500. This change was done in conjunction with suggestions by the International Student Center.

The changes will be posted next week for 21 days along with the announcement in Pima news. This time period can be used for faculty to submit comments and suggestions.

Rita Flattley asked if Debbie Yoklic meant that the effective change regarding the two month deadline for documentation presentation was for this November of 2011. Yoklic replied that the change won’t affect students registering for Fall 2011; it will affect those registering for Spring 2012. If a student is new and they come in and register on Nov. 7th 2011, it will be apply. They will be allowed to register, and they will receive notice letting them know they have 60 days to produce said documentation.

Rita Flattley asked what the game plan was for outreach regarding the new change to students and high-schools. Yoklic replied that Dr. Flores is in the process of writing letters to all the superintendants of schools and that in general, there will be a plan to inform all appropriate parties.

Rob Modica noted that for students who enroll November 7th, their deadline for documentation will be January 7th, less than two weeks before the start of classes, so why let them register for classes? Yoklic replied that those two months are a special case. The deadline is two months from the time the student initially registers. Rob Modica stated that if they register just before classes start, the deadline won't be enforced. Yoklic replied that the student is allowed to not produce the documentation for one semester and will not be removed, but they will not be allowed to enroll in the subsequent semester. If a student registers for an eight week semester they will have to provide documentation in the middle of the semester.

Rob Modica suggested to Yoklic that the revised document define what kind of I.D a student must provide to the admissions application procedure, as listed in the SPG. Yoklic supported this idea.

Rob Modica also mentioned section 4 of page 4; International Student Admissions Process. The SPG states that all international students must provide proof of health insurance. Modica inquired as to whether all PCC students have to provide proof of health insurance, and if not, why just international students. Yoklic replied that she could not answer that, but would look into producing an answer.

Rob Modica mentioned section 6 and asked if the college was still exempting home-school completion proof from all of the requirements. When a student completes home-school, they have a document that states they have completed. This is not an equivalent to a GED. It is a different kind of high school diploma, but not a high school diploma, rather, it is a third valid form of completion. Modica suggested this should be delineated in the document and made clear, Yoklic agreed.

Erich Saphir responded to Rob's inquiry regarding international students being bound to providing proof of health insurance. Saphir stated that he believed that the requirement is implemented as a federal standard. Yoklic replied that she would look into it.

Saphir then asked about Section 1, sub-section 9 on page 2. This section exempts these standards of minimum requirements from students wishing to take courses for enjoyment, as well as for workforce
development. Saphir asked if a student could take numerous courses and label them as enjoyment courses, then matriculate. Yoklic asked Saphir to send her language that would distinguish between students who were taking a class such as basket-weaving, those taking workforce development courses, and those taking transfer courses but have not yet specified that they are in a transfer program.

Saphir stated that there probably isn't an easy way of saying that.

Barbara Armenta asked Yoklic about home-school standards. Yoklic reminded the faculty that if a student can place into the 'college ready' bracket, the point is moot as they are the same as any other student without traditional documentation.

5.3 Adjunct Faculty Senate Vacancies and Subcommittees
Diann Porter read the proposal for filling adjunct faculty senate vacancies.

“Only current PCC employees, adjunct or regular faculty in this case, may serve as faculty senators. When an adjunct faculty member is not teaching in a particular term, sixteen week, eight week or other, he or she is not a current employee. If an adjunct faculty member is serving as a department senator and is either not teaching or is unable to continue a term, then the department will appoint an interim senator until the adjunct faculty member returns, or for the remainder of the term. If an adjunct faculty member is serving as the adjunct at-large for his or her campus and is either not teaching or is unable to continue a term, then the senate president will appoint another adjunct faculty member to be senator until that adjunct faculty member returns, or for the remainder of term.”

Rita Flattley inquired as to which portion (if any) of a term constitutes employment. Diann Porter replied that if said person is not an employee, they are not an employee. Confusion was expressed regarding instructors teaching portions of a semester and their status as employed.

Flattley further inquired, in short, by asking, if you teach any class within a semester, are you an employee?

Chancellor Flores replied to this question by saying “you're only an employee for which the time you are employed.” He went on to say that the question seemed to be “Should an employee who is not employed during the time they are serving on the faculty senate, be on the faculty senate?” The college does not have an official position on this, Chancellor Flores told the senate, further noting that he believed it to be the senate’s call.

Rob Modica said that for most adjunct faculty, the only time this issue could pose a problem would be during the first meeting of the spring and of the fall. Modica also said that trying to enforce the proposal would pose a huge book-keeping disaster. Diann Porter disagreed.

Rob Modica clarified his position by summarizing that a faculty member may be in the calendar, scheduled to teach classes, but has not yet signed their contract, but still might be a senator. Keeping track of this would be difficult.

Carol Christofferson asked the faculty to consider adopting a position that reflected language in the proposal to say that an adjunct faculty member is allowed to serve as a senator if they are employed anytime within a semester. Diann Porter agreed, but suggested that the language could state, “with the expectation” that one was employed throughout, especially considering that a class may be canceled.
Erich Saphir stated that the real issue was that a senator would in general, be around. The senate should expect a given senator to contribute, if they are not currently teaching. Erich Saphir also stated that an adjunct faculty member who is scheduled to teach but whose course gets canceled bears full responsibility for letting the senate president know.

Two trains of thought were present. One; to not worry about it too much. Two; to be strict about determining who is and who is not an employee. Jack Mertes spoke up say that the hardest potential issue could be the senate president being responsible for replacing an adjunct faculty member considered not an employee by the proposal standards.

Diann Porter asked the senate as a whole if there was a liability issue if someone was not an employee and served as a senate member. Carol Christofferson suggested combining the language to say “adjunct faculty employed within a semester with the expectation to maintain contact with their constituents or finding a suitable replacement if unsure of future employment.” This would make the adjunct faculty member in charge of finding a suitable replacement. This would be part of the stipulation that one accepts with the duty of being a faculty senate member.

Diann Porter noted that that would bring up the need for an additional policy. Ceanne Alvine asked if there were a lot of adjuncts who don't teach the entire term. The general response was yes. Ceanne Alvine proposed the option of implementing a stipulation that stated that an adjunct could agree to serve as faculty senator for the entire term or year. It was stated that adjuncts are not hired for a year, but for a semester.

Ceanne Alvine went on to say that she was uncomfortable with having an adjunct find their own replacement and would rather support the idea that the president would be in charge of appointing one who was appropriate. Patricia Figueroa agreed and suggested that the department should be in charge of finding a replacement.

Terry Hamstra, an adjunct herself, stated that she was uncomfortable finding her own replacement should something happen. She stated that there might be more than one nominee for a particular department and the senate could look to the second choice to replace an adjunct.

Erich Saphir touched on liability and stated that in theory, the liability would fall upon the adjunct member and as Chancellor Flores already stated; the college has no official position. In short, if the college is not worried about this issue then senate should not be either. As for replacement adjuncts, Erich Saphir said that outreach for finding a replacement could be streamlined and fairly simple, such as posting fliers.

Rita Flattley proposed that the president, the president-elect and the vice president consolidate the various suggestions, combine them, and the faculty may vote on a revised proposal. Diann Porter agreed, no one objected and the meeting moved forward.

6.0 Reports
6.1 PCCEA Report
Scott Collins gave the PCCEA report to the senate. In the last month PCCEA has focused on providing direct support to the full-time faculty members who had interactions with the alleged shooter in the Gabriel Gifford's tragedy. Part of those efforts included PCCEA's hosting of a Q &A session at Northwest campus.
Scott Collins praised the faculty for their efforts and decision making skills before the incident, as well as after.

A PCCEA session was held the morning before this meeting and was as Collins put it “productive.” This Wednesday PCCEA will be presenting its proposal to the Board. Collins welcomed the faculty to come and hear Ana Jimenez address the Board. The draft proposal is at pccea.org. Scott Collins welcomed questions from the faculty.

Jack Mertes asked if the 'tenor' or 'tone' of the Meet and Confer team sessions has changed with the addition of a legal representative present. Collins replied that he is not officially on the team and stated that the tenor was “a little uncertain.” Collins was not at the meet and confer session today but understands that it went well.

6.2 Board of Governor's Report
Patricia Figueroa addressed the senate. A recap given by Figueroa of the December 8th 2010 meeting of the Board of Governors:
Chancellor Flores recognized retiring member Tamas Zsitvay for 40 years of service to the college. Michael Racy was introduced by the Chancellor and he reported on the state’s political climate. Highlights of this report include: Out of 90 current legislators, 37 are freshman, a very high turnover; Republicans have two thirds majority in both house and senate; many new committees make the legislative process less predictable; higher education was split off from the rest of the education committee; The one percent sales tax passed; other revenues are much lower than expected; other cuts will have to be considered. The largest items in budget cuts might be K-12 education, colleges and universities.

Chancellor Flores stated the college has anticipated economic hardship and hopes to hold PCC employees harmless from pay cuts or health insurance changes.

Debbie Yoklic and Darla Zerbes polled fifteen students participating in a focus group regarding “General Education Fridays” to which the responses were positive.

Chancellor Flores presented details about how differential tuition would work. Courses that cost 2 to 4 times the amount of average courses would be candidates for differential tuition. The Vice Chancellor reported that the college’s financial situation is on track and as expected.

The Board of Governors meeting on January 1, 2011: The board first addressed the shooting tragedy. Chairwoman Marty Cortez read a brief statement. In addition to that statement, a memorial scholarship is being established in honor of all those lost in the tragedy. The scholarship intends to assist students who are pursuing goals in public service.

Chancellor Flores stated, “We did the best we could and behaved in a professional manner at all times.” Downtown Campus President Suzanne Miles gave a report on the standardized course numbering system. It is a shared unique number system which attaches a four digit number at the end of a course number that remains consistent to its content with other courses. Proposals will be voted on by Community College presidents.

Flores reported on the proposed new entrance requirements. David Bee noted that finances remain as expected.
6.3 Provost's Report

Jose Leyba addressed the senate, thanking the faculty for participating in the community college study of student engagement. All of the 98 faculty members asked to participate did. Through this survey, data was collected to better serve students and to compare Pima to other community colleges similarly situated. Over 200 other colleges participated in the survey.

Secondly, PCC has been offering a variety of training sessions for staff. Counselor Amy Davis has developed a session. Some training events included classroom management and specifically, the student code of conduct. Input is welcome for additional needs. Tweaked training for front line staff is being examined to help them identify signs of distressed students. The Southern Arizona Center for Mental Health provided sessions recently. They have invited the college to participate and to identify three staff members to serve as 'identifiers' of mental health issues.

Lastly Acting Provost Leyba told the faculty that the My Degree plan is now on-line. Starting in 2009 there were about 1,900 students using it, Today, he was happy to report there are 8,200 students using the on-line service.

6.4 Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Roy Flores addressed the senate. The financial challenge the college is now facing necessitates new approaches. The economy is in bad shape and it looks as if it will be that way for a while. Thus, the college cannot operate with the expectation that the state will restore funding to levels from 10 years ago. If revenues are as expected, we cannot expect to maintain the size of the college. PCC simply does not have the resources.

The response to new measures such as the revised admissions requirements has been very positive. Significant financial implications will arise from this change. The enrollment requirements change will decrease enrollment by a significant percentage, perhaps amounting to three to four thousand fewer enrollees the first year.

In light of these changes PCC is going to be a different college. Rather than diminishing PCC's role in the community, the changes may well increase PCC's role. The careful selection of services offered will reflect intention and quality.

Short term adjustments will not solve the financial problems. Furlough is not the fix. All furlough would mean is a pay-cut for everyone, labeled something other than a pay-cut.

Changing the size of the college is meant to “preserve quality.” Immediate as well as extended tough decisions regarding programs will have to be made. The cost of the college has to be adjusted to the revenues to lead to more normality and a healthy organization.

Chancellor Flores further stated his appreciation for faculty response to the shooting tragedy. The college is responding to the demand to produce thousands of documents. The trial will bring another set of demands to the college. People by and large think the college has done a wonderful job.

Debbie Yoklic continued the report with a presentation to the senate regarding differential tuition. The following is a breakdown of that presentation:

Disciplines are considered for differential tuition if the cost per FTSE is greater than 2 times the college median cost. A higher differential may be applied in cases where the cost per FTSE is greater than 4
times the college median cost.

Looking at the cost per FTSE, four categories were developed based on the median. With the median being “1” there are 47 credit courses that fall in the 0.1-0.9 bracket, 81 courses in 1.0-1.9 median, 96 in the 2.0 – 3.9 median and 104 in the 4.0 – 8.6 median.

To summarize, there are only several courses the college is really looking at for differential tuition. All the others are likely to not be considered. Current tuition is $53.50 per credit hour.

Looking at the Nursing Program:
Standard credits require 36 Nursing, 49 other (85 total)
Approximate program cost is $4547.50. Under differential tuition, with a 30 percent increase to the nursing program, tuition would cost $5125.30. It would not cost the student 30% more, rather, 13% more. The reason being, nursing students still take numerous courses which do not have a premium on tuition. With a 40% differential it would cost the student a 17% tuition increase.

Looking at Machine Tool Technology:
39 MAC, 26 other (65 total) $3477.50 is approximate program cost. Under 20% differential tuition, a 12% hike would be applied, making the approximate program cost $3894.80. At 30% differential, it would cost the student 19% more.

For Veterinary Technician:
44 VET, 25 other (69 total) $3691.50 is approximate program cost. Under a 20% differential, $4162.30 would be the program cost at a 13% increase to the student. A 30% differential would raise the program cost to 4397.70 at a 19% hike to student cost.

The next step in differential tuition is to meet with faculty who offer high cost courses for feedback. The purpose of this research and impending change is not to eliminate occupational programs, but to keep them.

Rob Modica asked Chancellor Flores if he had any idea what kind of revenue would be generated. Flores stated it probably wouldn't produce a lot of money, but that it would be significant.

Barbara Armenta asked if any of the courses included in the data were not program courses. Yoklic replied that a few disciplines are not thought of as programs and almost all of the courses included in the data are thought of as programs.

Gene Gotwalt asked why the college was looking at just the supply side and not the demand side. (i.e., highly sought after courses) Flores answered by stating that the college does not discriminate and charges based on residency.

Scott Collins stated that he assumed that differential tuition would apply to in and out of state tuition rates the same way. Flores replied that it would.

Rita Flattley asked what the effect would be on students who repeat courses again and again. Years ago, the college had a repeat fee, wherein upon the third time the course was taken by the same student, an additional fee was included. Flores replied that it could be looked into and added that college could not afford to be a recreational vehicle.
Jack Mertes backtracked to economics and asked if the “head officers” of the college foresee a time when the state would perhaps just abandon community colleges altogether. Flores explained that PCC does not have what is known as 'equalization', which many colleges do. Overall, a better solution would be to have an orderly withdrawal from state funding. The idea would be that PCC would be totally responsible to the people in Pima County and that the people would be the ones that determined funding, as well as the rules and regulations of the college. State legislators have proposed giving faculty and students weapons, rather than addressing other key issues. Flores reiterated that he would prefer for the people of Pima County to make decisions, rather than legislators from another area of the state.

Rob Modica stated that his classes have held budget discussions and he found that the students in his classes showed no negative reactions to the potential increases in tuition. More expensive and inconvenient alternatives to PCC do exist. Flores does not foresee a revolt by the community or the students.

Terry Hamstra wondered if PCC’s shrinkage will also apply to the shrinkage of faculty. Flores replied that many disciplines have adjunct faculty teaching half of the semester credit. Before any faculty (in most cases) would be terminated, adjunct faculty would just not be hired. Flores observed community college faculty in general to be very flexible and likely to keep their jobs if program reviews removed a certain program, as a given faculty member might well be able to switch programs.

Rita Flattley thanked Chancellor Flores for his presentation on Arizona Illustrated which aired the previous night.

6.5 Faculty Senate President's Report

Diann Porter presented to the faculty. Ceanne Alvine will be giving the next lecture in the speakers series, February 22nd at 6pm in the District Office. She will be speaking on health care reform and community based health care. Debbie Yoklic organized a special session for the senate on the Grand Canyon Diploma Bill which will be held February 18th from 10 – 12 in room A109 at Community Campus. Last November the reading statement was passed and is set to be reviewed by the Academic Standards Committee scheduled for the March 23rd meeting.

Rita Flattley stated that she would be in meet and confer during the Grand Canyon Bill meeting and hoped that good notes or a video recording could be made.

Open forum Items

MaryKris Mcilwaine requested that the President consider changing the issue of disruptive students from the open forum session and move it into the executive session.

Diann Porter polled the faculty and the open forum item on disruptive students was moved to the executive session.

Rob Modica brought up the final open forum item. The college is operating on the idea that students check their Pima college e-mail as a primary source of information from the college to the student. Rob Modica did a brief survey on his students. He e-mailed 25 students stating that there was a mandatory meeting, and only 7 showed up. When he asked students how many check their e-mail and how many know they can forward the e-mail to their personal e-mail, less than 25 percent are aware.
Barbara Armenta agreed with Rob Modica. Her thoughts reflected the college pushing the importance of the Pima e-mail more. She also stated that she tests her students on their understanding of Pima email. David Iadevaia felt this issue to be simply about classroom management. Jose Leyba told the faculty that students receive information about Pima e-mail during orientation.

Rob Modica said that email, to the student is passé; that they rely on twitter or text messaging. Rosa Morales recommended sending students to the computer center to get trained and that the best way to do this is to reserve a class period where the whole class visits the center and can go over registration for My Pima. Many students are returning adult students, not as savvy in computer technology as their younger colleagues.

Erich Saphir said that a division secretary or registration folks that have a higher access level on banner can provide phone numbers for students. Unless there is a security reason, he hoped that instructors could have access to student phone numbers. Jose Leyba said that he would check on it.

Vice President Lynta Thomas noted that in hybrid and on-line classes, this problem poses much less of a challenge. Rob Modica said that in the case of an emergency, he is not going to call 150 students, rather, he would e-mail blast them. But according to his small survey, 75% would not see the e-mail. He sees the college’s primary way of communicating with students to be inefficient. The discussion ended here.

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and approved.

The next meeting will be held in Community Campus at 1:00 March 4th 2011.