Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
March 4, 2011  
12:45 – 2:30  
Community Campus

Present: Matej Boguszak (CC); Rick Manganiello (CC); Lynta Thomas (CC), Steven Croft (DC); Kimlisa Duchicela (DC); Earl Garrick (DC); Ron Hale (DC); Josie Milliken (DC); Diann Porter (DC); Gene Gotwalt (DC); Sterling Vinson (DC); Susan Prichett (DC); Tommy Salazar (DC); Jeannie Arbo gast (DV); Andrea Henderson (DV); Pollyanna Wikrent (DV); Terri Hamstra (DV); Olga Carranza (DV); Patty Figueroa (EC); Rita Flattley (EC); Doug Holland (EC); Mary Mitchell (EC); Barbara Armenta (EC); Donald Roberts (EC); Cheryl Blake (NW); Greta Buck-Rodriguez (NW); Erin Eichelberger (NW); Randy Munsen (NW); Shelby Goldberg (NW); Ellen Caldwell (WC); Ceanne Alvine (WC); Carol Christofferson (WC); Lazaro Hong (WC); David Katz (WC); Steve Mackie (WC); MaryKris Mcilwaine (WC); Jack Mertes (WC); Karie Meyers (WC); Rosa Morales (WC); Catherine O’Brien (WC) Mic Denfeld (WC); Joe Labuda (Dist-W); Melinda Franz (Dist-W)

Absent: Mike Schuetze (CC); Dolores Duran-Cerda (DC); Linda Marks (DC); Nadia Villalobos (DC); Susan San Jule (DV); Patricia Townsend (DV); Rob Modica (EC); Randolph Wright (EC); Kathy Feuling (EC); Donald Bock (NW); Sandy Niederriter (NW); Rebeca Bennett (WC); Joseph Dal Pra (WC); Jake Elkins (WC); John Kordich (WC); Debra Kaye (WC); Sarah Marcus (WC); Erich Saphir (WC)

Guests: Mary Ann Martinez Sanchez (DO); Steve Kranock (DC); Scott Collins (PCCEA); Becky Pallack (AZ Daily Star); Deborah Yoklic (DO)

1.0 Introductions
Diann Porter welcomed the faculty and confirmed a quorum with the secretary.

2.0 Approval of Minutes
MaryKris Mcilwaine remarked on the February Minutes. She asked that the term “teachers” used on page 4 of section 5.3 be changed to “instructors”. She also remarked on section 6.3 and noted that there was 100% participation in the faculty survey. Patty Figueroa remarked on item 6.4 regarding a grammatical issue. The February minutes were approved with the amended corrections.

3.0 Announcements
Melinda Franz told the faculty that the graduation committee has been working since January to ensure a successful graduation ceremony. She asked faculty to recommend student speakers. The application requires two faculty signatures and the student is required to write a 50 word essay identifying themselves and their interests.

Diann Porter told the faculty that the Grand Canyon Diploma session previously postponed is rescheduled for Friday March 25th 1-3pm at the District Office in the community board room.

An executive session was requested; Diann Porter asked the faculty to be present for it. Diann Porter welcomed back David Katz. Porter mentioned the absence of the President Elect, Dolores Duran-Cerda currently at the Yellow Ribbon event for her husband’s deployment.
Kimlisa Duchicela gave the faculty senate an update on the replacement of Blackboard Vista. It is expected that the final four choices will be decided by April.

4.0 Agenda Modifications and Open Forum Items
There were no agenda modifications or open forum items

5.0 Business
5.1 Course Repeat Fees
Rita Flattley addressed the senate. Last senate meeting the question of course repeat fees was raised. Rita Flattley enrolled the help of a PCC librarian in assistance with research. PCC catalog records show that the 2001 catalog employs a course repeat fee. At that time the course repeat fee was $35 per credit hour, with a cost of $36.50 per credit hour. In 2001, the fee was enforced when a student enrolled for a third time in the same course.

Rita Flattley stated that a student consistently repeating the same course is not something she agrees with pedagogically. There were exceptions to the course repeat fee, such as fitness activity classes, which were exempt. Flattley recommended that the college seriously consider re-instituting the course repeat fee.

It was asked what the fee now would be if re-instituted. Flattley stated that ten years ago, the fee reflected the credit hour cost. Today perhaps, it should be the same.

Terry Hamstra asked if students who withdraw from a course and take it again would be held to the standard. Rita Flattley responded that the fee would be enforced the third time a student registers for the same course. Barbara Armenta stated that the impetus of the initial course repeat fee was to keep students from consistently enrolling in a course, withdrawing, enrolling and withdrawing again, which takes space away from students who do not use the system that way.

Susan Prichett stated that the fee was only valid if a student stayed after the drop/add period, and then withdrew. Prichett went on to say that she had students in work study programs and wondered of their consequence. Flattley remarked that they too would of course be exempt.

Jeannie Arbogast asked Rita Flattley what exactly she was proposing the senate to do. Flattley stated that if the faculty found this to be an academically sound concept that it would be sent forward administration.

Diann Porter polled the senate. First, it was asked if senators thought it was a good idea for the college pedagogically and secondly, if they found it good for the college financially. Overwhelmingly, the faculty found it to be a good idea on both fronts.

Scott Collins remarked that it might be worth asking the college to research why the policy was dropped in the first place.

Barbara Armenta commented that she found it important that it be clear that the fee is only enforced after the third time a student enrolls, not the second enrollment. Rita Flattley agreed and suggested the possibility of professor or student services waiver for special circumstances.
5.2 Educational Institutions and Concealed Weapons.
Diann Porter addressed the faculty. Senate bill 1467 passed the judiciary committee of the State Senate by a vote of 5 to 3. It is now pending action by the Committee on Rules.

The bill “Prohibits the governing board of an educational institution from adopting or enforcing any policy or rule prohibiting the possession of a concealed weapon by a person who possesses a valid permit or for the lawful transportation or storage of a firearm.”

ASU faculty senate put out a communication regarding the bill stating their “Unqualified opposition to SB1467… and find it to be a clear danger to the safety, security and sense of well-being to faculty, students and staff.”

University of Arizona President Robert Shelton stated,

“Bringing guns into classrooms creates enormous problems for law enforcement, which is why all the university police chiefs in Arizona have spoken vigorously against this idea. The danger posed by guns is real and well documented. Bringing guns into classrooms simply increases the threat to those on campus. That is unacceptable. Universities provide a unique environment that is dependent on open and vigorous debate. Introducing guns into classrooms would dramatically and negatively impact the ability to engage in the exchange of ideas. Instead, we would see the intimidation inherent when guns are present, something that is antithetical to the very idea of a university.”

Diann Porter read a potential statement for the PCC faculty senate to consider.

“Forcing students to be in the presence of armed faculty members or forcing faculty members to be in the presence of armed students is unhealthy to the learning environment. It has the potential to stifle passionate debate and the in-depth exploration of controversial ideas. If SB1467 becomes the law in Arizona, the faculty senate asks that PCC put in place measures to separate students, faculty and staff in cases where sufficient threat exists.”

Discussion and questions were opened to the faculty.

Barbara Armenta stated that if there was an armed student in her classroom, she “didn't know if she would stay.”

Diann Porter said that she did hope to find some sort of qualification for the suggested separation.

Terry Hamstra told the faculty that the state of Colorado does not require colleges and universities to ban weapons, but the law Arizona is facing takes away the choice for an educational institution to do so. Hamstra stated that she would prefer to have the statement read that PCC does not support the law, period.

David Katz said that “Under no circumstances would I ever tolerate a student having a firearm in my classroom, law or no law.”

Jack Mertes stated that for years he has said, “When they start letting students bring guns to classes, it's time to retire.” (Jack Mertes is retiring in May.) He went on to say that perhaps the law could be amended to say that the only gun one could bring to campus would be the new state pistol.
Erin Eichelberger wondered if a statement reflecting all sentiments spread across all the districts could ever be approved. She went on to say that restaurants and bars were given a choice, yet educational institutions do not have one. Including the element of choice in the statement might create something everyone could agree upon.

Terry Hamstra said that one of the arguments put forth in favor of the law; is that it allows students to arm themselves in self-defense. Hamstra stated that PCC has many students whom are under 21, which is the age one has to be to legally have a firearm, consequently making those students under 21 defenseless.

Scott Collins said a high-school student in Phoenix recently brought a gun to school. Because the student did so illegally, there was intervention. This law makes intervention a non-option. Collins stated that even if worst case scenarios never happened, the impact it would have on the learning environment could not be ignored.

Diann Porter brought up the potential impact on grades.

Kimlisa Duchicela said that in her teaching, a variety of ideas are always present in the classroom, some upsetting. If students in her classroom had guns, she may not want to bring up certain topics. In short, it would change the way she operated as an instructor. She concluded that she has the right to be safe and that the bill is violating her rights.

Randy Munsen noted the potential for accidents.

Gene Gotwalt said that the argument implying a student threat to faculty around grades or conflict is moot, as a student could harm faculty anytime they wanted, off campus or not. Gotwalt was teaching in Virginia during the Virginia Tech shootings. He told the faculty that whenever these conversations come up, he thinks of the professor who tried to protect himself and his students by putting a table against a door. Gotwalt said that he always thinks about what would have happened if that professor could have defended himself and his students with a gun. Gotwalt went on to say that the student who wants to do harm is not going to be worried about the law.

Olga Carranza spoke up to say that SB1070 had been discussed previously by the senate and the senate did not want to support a statement opposing the law. She said that the tenor of this new legislation has been hateful and stupid. Much discourse has gone on regarding students who are developmentally disturbed. Carranza said that she did not need the added pressure of knowing that a student had a gun in their backpack and that she is already afraid that they might. Carranza mentioned that at a previous job she had, a student pulled a gun in front of a teacher, set it on a table and demanded to the teacher, “Teach me.” She does not want to see this at PCC.

Earl Garrick expressed current feelings of non-safety leaving Downtown Campus in the evenings.

David Katz suggested altering the proposed PCC faculty senate statement to read, “The faculty senate of Pima Community College is opposed to SB1467.”

Kimlisa Duchicela mentioned that Virginia Tech came out with a statement against guns on campus. She also suggested moving Katz's suggestion to the beginning of the document.

MaryKris Mcilwaine suggested the word “an” replace “the” before the term “learning environment.”
David Katz made a motion and a vote was called to adopt the statement with said amendments. The Vote results were 34 yea, 1 nay and 2 abstain.

Scott Collins wished to make a closing comment. He stated that he greatly appreciated the comments made by Gene Gotwalt, as it is important to imagine the possibilities of this bill’s impact from all angles.

5.3 Adjunct Faculty Subcommittees
Diann Porter told the senate that the adjunct faculty subcommittee has not been meeting for the past year and wished to ask the adjunct faculty present if they would like to re-form the committee. Five adjunct members were present. Diann Porter explained that the old group use to meet on Community Campus at Noon before the faculty senate meeting to consolidate the opinions and concerns of adjunct faculty members.

Terry Hamstra stated that in speaking to fellow adjuncts she was well received in the likelihood of representing them. Diann Porter stated that she would reserve a room for the next scheduled meeting for the adjunct faculty members. Terry Hamstra, Mary Mitchell, Rick Manganiello, Shelby Goldberg, and Sterling Vinson are the adjunct members of the faculty senate.

6.0 Reports
6.1 PCCEA Report
Scott Collins addressed the faculty senate. An electronic packet produced by the U of A was distributed to all full time faculty by PCCEA. The packet covers destructive and threatening student behavior. As it is a U of A publication, contact information in the packet is not relevant, however the email sent to PCC full time faculty offers relevant information.

PCCEA is gearing up for the bi-annual book drive. Two years ago the drive was a success. A further announcement will be sent. The books will be donated to the local charity Read Between the Bars.

Meet and Confer sessions are ongoing. Since the last faculty senate meeting, the board’s proposal included eight items and PCCEA's included 20 proposals. Scott Collins stated that “Good progress is being made.” Numerous MOU’s have been signed, generally representing easier items. The more substantive heavy issues, that require more discussion and debate, are still pending.

Regarding SB1467, a very short survey will be distributed to full time faculty. PCCEA is in a position to ask the faculty at large what their sense of the bill is. Results of the survey will be presented to the board.

Matej Boguszak asked why the survey would not be sent to the adjunct faculty. Collins replied he did not have the capacity to do so.

6.2 Board of Governor’s Report
Patty Figueroa addressed the senate. The Board of Governor’s Report to the faculty senate, February 9th 2011.

Chairperson Marty Cortez recognized staff member Sherry Dill for valued service and presented her with an appreciation plaque. PCCEA president Ana Jimenez presented the meet and confer proposal to the board of governors. The proposal categories included:
Aligning policy to practice, continuing work from previous years, focusing on district wide
consistencies, supporting fiscal sustainability for campus faculty enrichment funds and initial placement of new faculty hires.

Chancellor Roy Flores introduced Virginia Ortega, assistant chief steward of the American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees, who then introduced the other members of meet and confer.

Dr. Flores also introduced the staff of the Association of Classified Exempt Staff and their President Brian Baskin, who introduced their officers to the Board of Governors.

Highlights of Baskin's report consisted of;
194 members and seven committees, the meet and confer process which began September 2010, and their social activities.

Brian Baskin thanked meet and confer, Dr. Flores and the Board of Governors. He commended the administration for handing the academic perils in spite of the challenges.

Dr. Flores reported that the college will continue to enrich relationships with the universities. In order to close the 1.2 million gap between revenues and numbers, the real challenge will be to establish ongoing measures, such as redefining PCC. Furloughs and payment cuts will not solve the economic predicament. However, the decision to reduce positions will have to be made. The need for adult education is critical, and there is an urgency to continue support to the program.

Vice Chancellor David Bea reported that the college’s financial position is consistent with expectations. Information and action items were passed.

6.3 Provost's Report
Vice Provost Mary Ann Martinez Sanchez addressed the senate. Dr. Leyba wanted Sanchez to share the community college survey of community engagement results. The faculty version of the survey has gone out, date of contact February 28th. PCC itself is not selecting the faculty that participate, the organization is. When the results come back, faculty and student perspectives can be compared.

Scott Collins asked how many faculty were selected to participate and what the mechanism for selection was. Sanchez replied that she did not know, but would find out and relay the information.

6.4 Chancellor’s Report
Chancellor Roy Flores addressed the senate. Chancellor Flores told the faculty that the overriding concern is still the budget. The decisions regarding the budget woes have been made early to begin implementation as quickly as possible. Flores stated that he hoped to do things in a way so that employees will not lose a paycheck, in order to do this, positions have been kept vacant. There are some programs that will not be carried forward.

Chancellor Flores said that he was optimistic that 99% of staff would be accommodated. The new budget will be balanced with minimal disruptions. Administrative positions have been reduced another 8%. 13 or 14 faculty positions will remain vacant for next year. Those positions need to be restored. Next year’s budget strategy includes their restoration. State contributions are now only 3%, or 7 million dollars annually.

Open access changes (the requirement of GED or diploma for enrollment) will be instrumental in the redefinition of PCC.
Regarding remediation, data shows PCC has not been very successful with those students. Chancellor Flores said that “We are one of the best community colleges in the nation…but we are not one of the best middle schools in the nation.”

With respect to the college plan now in the final phase, initiatives have been identified. Remedial education is at the top of the list, along with improving college operation and retention rates.

Chancellor Flores moved onto SB1467. Flores stated that he has “Yet to discover those sets of circumstances where arming everyone makes everyone safer.” The college has to conjure up the average scenario, not the extreme scenario. Chancellor Flores sent a communication to the local press opposing SB1467.

“The Arizona legislature is debating SB1467, which would allow persons possessing a valid permit to bring firearms onto the campuses of institutions of higher education, including Pima Community College. I believe that this legislation will not make PCC’s campuses safer and might have undesired negative consequences. Police chiefs from higher education institutions throughout Arizona have said they believe that allowing firearms on campus will make the campuses less safe. I wholeheartedly agree with these experts who are trained in the use of firearms and dedicated to ensuring safety at higher education facilities. Additionally, I believe that the bill interferes with the autonomy of the Pima Community College governing board. Board members have been elected by the people of Pima County. A locally elected board should have the authority to decide this issue.”

Flores went on to reiterate that PCC is governed by a locally elected board, accountable to the public of Pima County. Flores stated that if Pima County wishes to allow the bill, so be it. Highlighting his point, he suggested that non-locals should not be making the decision. In short, he stated that the bill does not help the enhancement of education, the utmost mission of an educational institution.

If the bill is enacted, Flores told the faculty there would be workshops instructed by experts, hopefully informing the best course of action for PCC to take.

Flores closed by saying that the college’s relationship with the state of Arizona should change. The state has so little financial stake now; a new discussion must take form.

6.5 Faculty Senate President’s Report
Diann Porter addressed the senate. The standing committee volunteer form is now available. The announcement was posted on PimaNews. The forms are due by March 24th. The results will be presented by Debbie Yoklic by May 13th.

MaryKris Mcilwaine asked to be reminded of the requirements for faculty serving on standing committees. Diann Porter stated that there aren’t enough committee spots available for everyone.

Scott Collins was asked about the rules regarding volunteering for standing committees. Collins quoted the policy as saying that “You cannot be compelled to serve on more than one committee or group.” The language is awkward and the board has a proposal to revise the language.

Seemingly, the agreement is that a faculty member can be compelled to serve on one, but not more.

Diann Porter moved on to vacancies on the academic committees. As follows they are; academic
standards, academic calendar, dual enrollment, human subjects, information technology, student financial aid and scholarship, the CCC, copyright diversity, marketing, professional development and safety.

Rosa Morales said that last year she filled out the forms to serve on a committee and was met without response. When asking around, she was told, “They probably didn’t want you.” Now she is questioning if she should attempt to volunteer again.

Debbie Yoklic stated that all the volunteer forms are collected, sent to senate - which then makes recommendations. Yoklic stated that everyone who attempts to volunteer this year will be communicated with in some way.

Diann Porter wondered if everyone who volunteered and indicated that they would be willing to accept a position outside of their top three choices was recommended. Erin Eichelberger stated there are too many volunteers and too few spots.

Some committees are much more desirable than others, such as academic standards and information technology. Others such as dual enrollment, are under served. Faculty has the option of checking a box that indicates a willingness to serve on any committee.

Rosa Morales asked if there was a way to provide feedback to faculty that are eager and willing to participate but haven’t been communicated with. Rosa Morales mentioned that two of the vacant committees that Diann Porter mentioned were ones she volunteered for.

Diann Porter read an e-mail from the state universities in Minnesota.

“On behalf of faculty of the Minnesota state universities and colleges system, we express our sincere sympathy to the victims and survivors of the recent tragedy, to the Tucson community and to the faculty at Pima Community College. The trauma and sadness you have experienced has echoed in communities throughout the nation. We hope that you find strength to help you in these difficult times. We offer a special message of support to the faculty at Pima Community College. Even though Minnesota is at the other end of the country we empathize with the dilemma of faculty members balancing the commitment to educating all students with the need to preserve the safety of the classroom. As you have been in the focus of the public eye, please remember that we support you in your attempt to be good stewards of public education.”

Signed,
Don Larson President of the Inter-faculty Organization

Lastly, Diann Porter mentioned that the faculty’s statement on reading is going to the academic standards committee this month.

The next meeting will be Friday April 1st at Community Campus at 1pm.

Meeting Adjourned.