Faculty senate meeting minutes

Friday, February 1, 2013
Amethyst room downtown campus
1:00 PM - 3:00 PM

1.0 Introductions and Call to Order
Attendance taken by Faculty Senate President, Joe Labuda (DW)

In Attendance: Matt Meehan (CC); Pat Leverentz (CC); Matej Boguuszak (CC); Duff Galda (CC); David Kryder (CC); Barbara Benjamin (DC); Sterling Vinson (DC); Roman Carrillo (DC); Patrick Lawless (DC); Cynthia Howe (DC); Steven Croft (DC); Kimlisa Duchicele (DC); Tommmy Salazar (DC); Jeff Gabbitas (DC); Dianne Porter (DC); Josie Mililiken (DC); Imad, Mays (DV); Joel Dvorin (DV); Pollyanna Wikrent (DV); Teddi Schnurr (DV) Olga Carranza (DV); Mary Mitchell (EC); Don Roberts (EC); Rob Modica (EC); Patricia Figueroa (EC); Theresa Riel (EC) Proxy for Ana Jimenez; Gifford Wayne (NW); Cheryl Blake (NW); Carin Rubenstein (NW); Greta Buck-Rodriguez (NW); MaryKris Mcilwaine (WC); Steve Mackie (WC); David Katz (WC); Pat Townsend (WC); Joseph Gaw (WC); Carol Christofferson (WC); Karie Meyers (WC); Margarita Youngo (WC); Rosa, Morales (WC); Lazaro Hong (WC); Joseph Dal Pra (WC); Taralynn Petrites (WC); Mic Denfeld (WC); Melinda Franz (DW); Dolores Duran-Cerda (DO); Jeannie Arbogast, Faculty Senate Vice President (DV); Joe Labuda, Faculty Senate President (DW)

Absent: Gene Gotwalt (DC); Susan Prichett (DC); Linda Marks (DC); Susan San Jule (DV); Doug Holland (EC); Randolph Wright (EC); Kathy Fueling (EC); Darryl Graham (EC); Erin Eichelberger (NW); Donald Bock (NW); Sandy Niederriter (NW); Vickey Smith (WC); Debra Kaye (WC); Sarah Marcus (WC); John Kordich (WC); Catherine O’Brien (WC);

Guests: Dr. David Bea (DO); Dr. Jerry Migler (DO); Rita Flattley (EC); Dianne Franklin (DO); Leticia Menchaca (DO); Dr. Brenda Even; Dr. Dan Wright

2.0 Approval of December/January Minutes
Rob Modica (EC) moves to approve December minutes. Motion was seconded by Duff Galda (CC) and passed with unanimous support.
Jeannie Arbogast (DV) clarified that Dianne Porter (DC) was present at the January meeting but was noted as absent.
Sterling Vinson (DC) moves to approve January minutes. Motion was seconded by David Katz (WC) and passed with unanimous support.

3.0 Announcements
Jeannie Arbogast (DV) reminds everyone to sign the sign-in sheet. There is also a separate sign-in sheet for guests to help the notetaker keep track of who’s in attendance. She also reminds everyone to state their names when speaking and to please use the microphones.
4.0 Agenda Modifications and Open Forum Items
Joe Labuda stated Dr. Bea is speaking for Dr. Miles. Item 6.4 will be moved after 5.1.

Dr. Brenda Even thanked everyone for their efforts made in the last year and for the research done regarding registration and placement. She also recognized Mary Mitchell (EC); Kimlisa Salazar (DC) and Scott Collins (WC) and thanks them for their effort and time on the Chancellor Search Committee.
She stated an email, regarding the Chancellor Search, was sent out informing everyone that there would not be interviews or forums in the coming week. One of the candidates interviewed had decided to stay in Central New Mexico. They also received concerning information regarding another candidate, Marie Sheehan, who has also withdrawn. There were several articles and a report indicating Desert College calculated their numbers incorrectly and 5.2 million dollars was possibly owed back to the state. The committee should have had the information from the candidate herself or from the consulting agency. Due to these events the committee stopped the search process. A special meeting with the board will be held February 5th to decide what the next steps are.

**Rob Modica (EC)** stated he’s been a member with the faculty senate for twenty years and Dr. Even is the first BOG member to ever attend a faculty senate meeting. He would like a BOG member to come once in a while for updates. He also stated he read materials written by Maria Sheehan and was appalled by her poor grammar and spelling errors. He questioned how the candidates were whittled down from 39 to 5 candidates. He was told by the previous committee members who chose Dr. Flores and said basically that the consulting firm directs what is going on. He finds it troublesome that material got her to the final selection. He questioned if R.H. Perry was going to be held responsible for not doing their job. Dr. Even stated that is something the board will have to address. Rob also added that on the agency’s website they pride themselves for their due diligence in their search and a complete background check. If they are held responsible he feels we should demand a refund. Dr. Even said it is something that would have to be discussed by the attorney. Rob also questioned if the process for a chancellor is started again would they not have a Chancellor selected until late fall. Dr. Even stated they are still aiming for July 1st. Rob questioned if we could afford to have a part-time Chancellor for that period of time. Dr. Even stated this has all transpired recently and the idea was to go until July 1st. She stated that will be another point she will bring up.

Dr. Even stated everybody went through all 39 candidates and were eliminated down to 8. The candidates were asked if there was anything that might come up that would be embarrassing to them or to the college. The information was not provided to the committee by the candidate or the consulting agency. It was a member of the press that provided them the information. She thanked everyone for having her and appreciates that the faculty senate would like her to come back periodically. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact her.
5.0 Business

6.4 Chancellor’s Report- Dr. Bea for Dr. Miles
Positive feedback was received from the HLC monitoring report that was submitted relating to student learning outcomes. The college has made good progress on that and Dr. Migler will talk more on that later.
They are expecting to hear back from the HLC visit in four to six weeks.
There is an update in the 2013-2015 College Plan. It includes a series of dates and locations for employee feedback forums.
The cabinets had a discussion regarding the changes of the smoking policy. Based on the feedback received from Faculty Senate, students, staff council and other campuses they are leaning more towards allowing smoking in designated areas at each location.
Updated signage is in process and change in policy language. It will also address smokeless tobacco and E cigarettes. He asked for feedback on whether a survey that would go out to employees and students would be of interest to help determine whether we ban smoking completely or have designated smoking areas.
Cheryl Blake (NW) stated there were plenty of people from NW waiting for the opportunity to give feedback.
Theresa Riel (EC) questioned whether the county just recently prohibited smoking on all county property and how that would affect the college. Dr. Bea stated the county did prohibit smoking at their facilities as Maricopa Community College has also done. PCC is an independent entity and it would be our policy to put together.
Joe Labuda questioned Cheryl if a survey was still necessary or if Dr. Bea should specifically poll NW campus. Cheryl replied she feels its great to go ahead with putting us in compliance but also thinks some people from NW would like to weigh in.
David Kryder (CC) stated in the interest of moving forward, would like to see Dr. Bea’s plan put into place rather than having survey after survey.
Barbara Benjamin (DC) questioned if we already had an idea of what the consensus is that would mitigate against doing another survey college wide. Dr. Bea stated there’s people strongly opposed to smoking of any type, the opposite perspective and the majority are somewhere in the middle. Designated smoking areas hit all interests sufficiently well. To have a full smoking ban you have to have a really good campaign to do it effectively.
Barbara Benjamin (DC) questioned Joe Labuda if it was in order to make a motion that the senate allow the administration to go ahead and setup designated smoking areas.
Rosa Morales (WC) reminded everyone there was a discussion in the December minutes where Dr. Miles questioned if it would be important to send a survey and Rosa and everyone agreed that it would be good to include the students. She also stated that she is very grateful that Dr. Miles is following up on what was already stated here.
Joe Labuda questioned everyone if they feel a college wide survey should be done or just specifically for NW.
Rosa Morales (WC) feels strongly about having a survey and including the students. 17 were for having a survey and 15 were against.

Dr. Bea stated that they would get a survey out quickly.
Kimlisa Salazar (DC) questioned if there was a cost difference between enforcing a complete ban and designating smoking areas. Dr. Bea stated the financial issue wouldn’t be the big driver. The big driver would be the impact on students and the community and being perceived as unwelcoming place. He doesn’t feel there is a big cost difference between the two. 

Joe Labuda questioned if what the time frame was for the survey. Dr. Bea stated they would try to have something out within the next two weeks.

5.1 VPI’s Ted Roush et al.- Class Cancellation
Ted Roush presented a power point presentation on the Philosophy and Practice of Class Cancelations.
Key factors influencing cancelations: FTSE Funding model and Budgets determined based on FTSE projected.
Each Campus has a FTSE/FTFE goal based on: Projected FTSE and combination of High Cost and Low Cost classes scheduled and projected enrollments. Nursing is an example of high cost classes. They are very small classes with a lot of faculty and the cost to put on the classes is very high. Pressures that push the FTSE/FTFE ratio up are classes with lower cost, lower loads and high enrollment. Pressures pushing the ratio down are classes with higher costs, higher loads and low enrollment. Decisions to cancel or run a particular class depends on: the program, classroom capacity, districtwide norms, complete-ability, expected student attrition. Other Cancelation Factors: A campus with multiple sections of same course at less than capacity, scheduling at other campuses. Reasons smaller classes are run: Faculty loading, new disciplines, new programs, new modalities, new times of day or days of week.

David Katz (WC) stated he’s seen a problem with class cancelations starting before students come back to the University of Arizona. The students come back looking for classes and they are not there. Ted responded that we want to make sure to cancel classes that won’t be successful and the decision needs to be made with enough time for students to move to another class. It’s not a science but it’s our best guess. However there are classes that they do wait on. David also commented on science courses that are capped at 28. They get around that by putting it in a double lecture so they have separate labs and students are prorated above 42 students which keeps costs down. That is one option to balance out the numbers a bit. David states another factor involved is late enrollment. Students hold off as late as possible to get courses and it doesn’t help us with enrollments. He feels if we get rid of late enrollment and have them enroll on a certain date or require them to take a late start course, it would be a better way of trying to handle course cancellations. Ted replied that he would leave that for the Provost to address separately.

Jeannie Arbogast (DV) stated she is concerned for Math/Science and upper level courses with low enrollments of eight or nine. These classes continue to be canceled because they are in the single digits. They are concerned that they’re losing some students they might attract from the university or they’re not serving members of the
community who are trying to keep their costs low and smaller classes. By losing the upper division courses or specialty courses in writing, art, theater and sciences they are concerned about that type of trend. Ted replied that it’s not always about the bottom line but it’s a publicly funded institution and it is about the bottom line so we have to balance our budget. The debate becomes how small is small. If the break even point is around 18 or 19 in the class then they are getting half of what they need at 8 or 9. They can balance that out with a certain amount of large enroll classes but can only absorb so many of the small classes. They sometimes run the courses with 10 students but they can’t do it often because they can’t afford to.

Rob Modica (EC) questioned about averaging enrollment within a certain discipline. If you have a discipline that fills up classes continually and then wants to run a couple that are low enrollment, averaging that out within that discipline gives you the FTSE you need. Ted responded that is their approach and it can work at some campuses. Campuses like West campus have to absorb high cost programs. If they sectioned things out their books would never balance. Rob also commented on scheduling around campuses. Throughout the years they’ve found that students will not travel that extra four miles to take something. You’ll also find classes that are 10:10 at one place and 11:40 at another place. You can’t get there in that time.

Teddi Schnurr (DV) stated prior to the beginning of the semester there is a payment deadline for students who have already signed up of courses. Sometimes course cancellation decisions are made very close to the time after the payment deadline has passed. There’s a pattern where many students are dropped because they haven’t paid and it takes them awhile to get back into those courses. She questioned if they’ve considered moving the payment deadline a little early to avoid that. Ted responded this is an area the VPI’s have asked relief for several times. The date seems to fall a week before classes start which is exactly when they need to be canceling classes. They have asked multiple times to move back the payment date. One option they’ve discussed is having students pay when they enroll instead of holding seats for 3 or 5 months, students would have to pay something up front.

Olga Carranza (DV) stated focusing on Psychology 200 courses, sometimes canceling them is frustrating especially for students in that major who need the courses. It’s frustrating for them to try and complete those requirements. She also stated that they are being flooded with online Psych 101 courses. She realizes those are probably less expensive but if we could find a way to be more mindful of how to put those online courses out there and allow the full-time faculty to make their load first so we don’t have to send someone out to another campus. It would be helpful if there was a way to coordinate that better. Ted stated there are successful models in the college where colleagues work together in scheduling who’s got lead to add another online class and decide how many classes they will offer. This can be done in other disciplines by getting together with your VPI’s and Deans. Olga also added the online Psych 101 courses are not showing as successful compared with those in class. Many students are not savvy in that area and it’s something to consider. Ted replied he didn’t have an answer for that but would be glad to talk about it.
5.2 VC Janet May- REG 1501/A, SPG 1501/AA, SPG 1501/AC
REG 1501/A Equal Opportunity/ADA/ Non-discrimination and Anti Harassment- Responsibilities were set out and there were changes of titles.
SPG 1501/AA Complaints of Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation- Clarified when there is a complaint of discrimination, harassment or retaliation that involves a student it falls through the Student Code of Conduct.
Directed applicants and/or employees through the EEO, AVA and AA offices for doing their complaints.
It is the duties of all members of the college community to uphold and not have instances of discrimination, harassment and retaliation.
It is the responsibility of administrators, supervisors and instructors to report acts of discrimination, harassment and retaliation timely.
Issues with vendors and contractors should be reported to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Administration of Finance.
Complaints against Chancellor or executive administrators can be made into the EEO office, HR, Board Chair, Boards Attorney or the Ethics and Compliance Hotline.
SPG 1501/AC ADA &Equal Opportunity, Reasonable Accommodation Guideline for Employees/Applicants
Updated the changes made to the ADA laws and set out processes and procedures.

5.3 Senior Assistant to the Provost Dolores Duran-Cerda - RG 2701/A
The RG 2701/A was distributed to everyone via email. It will be posted for comment on the website for 21 days if anyone has additional comments.

5.4 MaryKris Mcilwaine- Late Registration Resolution
The late registration resolution was sent out via email and read aloud by MaryKris. Barbara Benjamin (DC) moved to approve the resolution. Rob Modica (EC) seconded the motion.

“WHEREAS, Pima Community College is committed to student success; and

WHEREAS, student success is intimately tied to student engagement beginning with attendance on the first day of classroom instruction; and

WHEREAS Pima Community College’s current practice of allowing “late registration” is a detriment to the establishment of such student engagement for all students, but particularly the College’s “at risk” students;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the College undertake a process of successively shortening the period of time during which students are permitted to add classes after those classes have already begun, with the end goal being the eventual elimination of late registration. The Faculty Senate requests that this change be made expeditiously since delay only serves to continue to harm our students’ opportunities for success.
Since the Faculty Senate realizes that there may be unique circumstances where “late registration” is appropriate, the Faculty Senate requests that faculty members retain the option to allow “late registration” into their respective classes at their individual discretion. The Faculty Senate requests the formation of a task force consisting of Senators and administrators to develop strategies and time frame goals to accomplish the Senate’s request.”

**Jeannie Arbogast (DV)** requested more clarification on the difference between late registration and late adds to a class. MaryKris stated there is an official deadline printed on college documents stating the add period ends on a specific date. An example of a late add would be if a student adds themselves into a class at lesson four within the college add period deadline. This differs from the current privilege that faculty has and wishes to retain the ability to sign certain students on a case by case basis past the add period deadline. Jeannie stated registration for her means registering to take classes at Pima as a brand new student as opposed to adding a class when you’re already registered for classes and want to do a late add or late change. She feels there is a fine line between the two definitions.

**Teddi Schnurr (DV)** questioned what the advantages were of keeping late registration in place. MaryKris stated in data gathered in national studies there are arguments made by various colleges stating they think allowing students to register late increases enrollment. However it’s not supported by the data.

**David Katz (WC)** stated to Jeannie that he’d rather leave the semantics of late add/late registration for a task force to figure out the best way to address that. He also added that many instructors start class the very first day and give quizzes the second day of class. Students who come in late miss the quizzes and their success rates are not good. He is in favor of the resolution.

**Theresa Riel (EC)** stated last semester she had late adds for an online late start class and it took Banner two days to populate the online D2L system. She feels this is a reason why we need to shorten the late registration period.

**Margarita Youngo (WC)** congratulated MaryKris for bringing this crucial issue to Faculty Senate. She doesn’t feel there is one faculty member that is for a long registration. She commented on the third line of the resolution, “the end goal being, the eventual elimination”. She would rather see the shortening of drop/add. Some faculty members believe that a five day leeway to enter the class room, without an instructors signature, would be more fair to students. The she would not support the eventual elimination of late registration. MaryKris responded she feels it’s unfair to students to give them the ability to add courses after they’ve already begun. There is a difference in rates of success between late add students and timely registering students.
Dianne Porter (DC) stated that at the downtown mathematics departments there’s more of a stronger feeling towards not abolishing late registration. The reasons they felt this way stems from the fact that we have a lot of UofA students and are worried about not being able to serve that population. They are also concerned about having lines out the door of people trying to get the instructors signature to get in.

Wayne Gifford (NW) responded that he endorses eliminating late registration but feels there has to be a minimum amount of time for those who signed up for class and those who canceled and have to move to another class.

Rosa Morales (WC) stated she spoke to her constituents and they approved of the resolution with the exception of the third line “the end goal of eventual elimination”. They feel the time should be shortened by five days or one week and then based on results we can move to abolish. They don’t feel it’s a good idea to immediately abolish late registration.

Joe Labuda reminded everyone this is just a starting off point and shouldn’t worry about special details right at this moment.

Joe Labuda called the vote. 32 voted to approve, 4 opposed, with 4 abstentions.

6.0 Reports
6.1 PCCEA- Rita Flattley
In Meet and Confer they’ve had two meetings. Both Board Management team and the Faculty team have exchanged our original draft proposals. Some proposals have been based on the faculty survey. They have not had any presentations about raises at this time.
She thanks Human Resources for putting into place more administrative appointments to fill in for full-time faculty vacancies.
Ana Jimenez met with the Provost in regards to carrying forward faculty concerns raised to PCCEA about revisiting the Student Code of Conduct and campus safety. There have been concerns on Academic Standards of Progress. There are concerns that there is no appeals process. A student can get disqualified and still be able to register. There have been a couple hundred students who have registered and then are bumped out. It’s not something PCCEA can solve but can be of interest for the senate to take up.

Rob Modica (EC) commented on texting to alert people. It will be interesting for his classes because he has a zero tolerance for texting and having cell phones on during class. Rita responded they can look at their text messages after class. If it was an extreme emergency there would be multiple alarms that would go out.

6.2 BOG Report- Kimlisa Salazar
The BOG meeting was held January 9th 2013
Dr. Sylvia Lee and Marty Cortez were sworn in
New BOG officers: Dr. Brenda Even, Chair Person and David Longoria, Secretary
Public comments consisted of comments from CFAIR about admission standards, tuition increases and concerns about the leadership. Robert Schaeffer from National Center for Fair & Open Testing discussed his concerns and questions on whether PCC is using COMPASS exams fairly. A former PCC student and alumni addressed the board on the new admission standards. Dr. Even indicated there would be a report on the statistics gathered in the past year to see if the admission standards are working. David Longoria reported on the Chancellor Search Advisory Committee. Michael Rossi gave a presentation on the Legislation Session and mentioned education seems to be on the rise. Dennis Holden provided a report on the PCC Foundation and an explanation of it’s mission. Jerry Migler shared current status of how the public universities and community colleges in AZ are responding to the guidelines from the Department of Homeland Security for deferred action for childhood arrivals. Dr. Nancy Sorenson gave an overview of the fall AACC meeting. Dr. Bea stated everything looks as expected.

6.3 Online Education- Kimlisa Salazar
The Online Learning Committee went over accreditation regulations. They will also be looking at compliance and scheduling. Kimlisa invited Dr. Wright to discuss the ongoing situation with D2L. Dr. Wright stated D2L is up and running and continuing to monitor it’s current usage and performance. Initial reports show that it is stable. On January 29th it was noticed that D2L was slow and sending out error messages. The issue affected all of their hosted client systems. D2L was aware of the seriousness of the outage. They don’t have the capacity to fix the issue themselves. It’s a hosted system outside of PCC’s technical support. All they could do was facilitate communication between D2L and the college. This will probably not be the last time for an outage to occur. They will be following up with D2L regarding the current contract with them and their recent performance. In the event of another occurrence the college needs to discuss how to improve on how we communicate such crises to each other as well as creating alternative access to course materials for our online instructors and possible alternative hosting of online content. Dr. Wright will pursue with the support of the Provost’s office, IT Department and the Online Standing Committee.

Theresa Riel (EC) questioned why an email wasn’t sent out to the students involved. She hopes that our system can tell which students have online or hybrid classes and inform them via email or website immediately. Dr. Wright agreed and stated it is a communication process we need to improve.
Don Roberts (EC) questioned if D2L reimburses us for the outage. Dr. Wright stated they would pursue conversations with D2L in-terms of our contract.

6.5 Provost’s Report- Dr. Migler
Good news was received regarding the monitoring report. It was the last major piece needed to be completed from the site visit for accreditation in 2010. He publicly thanked everyone who had a roll in supporting and contributing to that effort. They asked for data that had not been completed but were satisfied with the process and trusting us to continue the effort. The challenge is to maintain the momentum. Reports will be provided to the board regarding developmental education, registration and admissions status. They will also provide the first round of information regarding the Prep Academy. If it’s something you would like to bring to the senate he would be happy to do that.

An action item relating to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals will also be provided. The board will be determining if they want to look at a pathway similar to what Maricopa Community Colleges are doing or the pathways universities and other community colleges have followed. Maricopa showed that out of 3,000 students they had 15 students that have gone through the entire process.

The Internship Task force has received final names from faculty this week and will schedule the first meeting.

There is an appeal process ready to go and will be put on the next Faculty Senate agenda.

6.7 Faculty Senate President- Joe Labuda
Joe stated we still need to fill the secretary position.

Jeannie Arbogast (DV) stated the time commitment for the secretary position would be 3-5 hours every month to review minutes.

A synopsis of the Senate Faculty meeting will be sent out a week after the meeting. The Department Chair Task force has finally been put together. The names of faculty on the task force are: Mark Backes (DC); Denise Meeks (NW); Suzanne Desjardin (NW); Theresa Stanley (DC); Mark Nelson (WC); Patty Figueroa (EC); Virginia Harmelink (DV); Rick Rosen (DC); Pollyanna Wikrent (DV); Cal Stanley (EC); Pat Leverentz (CC)

Joe thanked Mike Rom and his team for a great job.

Adjournment was motioned and seconded.