



PimaCommunityCollege

DISCLAIMER: This CART file was produced for communication access as an ADA accommodation and may not be 100% verbatim. This is a draft transcript and has not been proofread. It is scan-edited only, as per CART industry standards and may contain some phonetically represented words, incorrect spellings, transmission errors and stenotype symbols or nonsensical words. This is not a legal document and may contain copyrighted, privileged or confidential information.

This file shall not be disclosed in any form (written or electronic) as a verbatim transcript or posted to any website or public forum or shared without the express written consent of the hiring party and/or the CART provider. This is an unofficial transcript which should NOT be relied upon for purposes of verbatim citation.

Pima Community College Faculty Senate February 2, 2018

>> TAL SUTTON: One update to give is there is going to be an arts and humanities consortium here on March 2 in the Amethyst Room, so we will be holding the Faculty Senate March meeting at West Campus, F-204. I will probably send an e-mail and Google invite with the location.

Just after that announcement, I'd like to give a chance for Hilda Ladner to give a more formal introduction to herself.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to take a moment to introduce to you our new diversity, equity, and inclusion officer, Hilda Ladner. She will talk a little bit about herself and her office here at Downtown Campus and her vision for

diversity.

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everyone. Excuse my voice. I have a cold. It's finally caught me, the cold that's been going around everywhere.

This is meant to be a short introduction of myself, my background, and an invitation to you to come and visit with me and talk about your experiences here with Pima Community College and in this community and in the work that you do.

I'm really excited to join you as your new diversity, equity, and inclusion officer. This is the end of my fourth week on campus, and I have been spending a lot of time reading many documents. This is my third introductory meeting of the day. Some of you have heard this this morning or maybe earlier this afternoon.

I have been spending a lot of time reading the many strategic documents, reports, a number of other pieces around trying to get to know a little bit more about the culture of Pima Community College, the climate, and to think about what are some of the things that we need to be moving forward as far as maybe training for different groups of people, students, faculty, staff, and others around diversity and equity issues.

A little bit about myself. I grew up here in Arizona, came to

Arizona when I was seven years old, grew up in Chandler, which was the far east part of the Valley at the time when I lived there. Went on to higher education in Flagstaff. I have a Bachelor of Arts degree in modern languages from Northern Arizona University and then earned a Master of Education in bilingual and multicultural education also from NAU.

I worked there for close to 14 years in career services and multicultural affairs, and for the last 10 years I have been at the University of Minnesota in Morris, which is a Native American-serving nontribal institution, working on a number of issues and as their assistant vice chancellor for student affairs and chief diversity officer.

That's just a little bit about me, and again, an invitation for you to come and visit with me. My office is here at the Downtown Campus, upstairs by Ken Chavez's office.

Thank you for allowing me to introduce myself, and I hope to get a chance to talk more with each of you as I get to know the campus and think about our vision and values and how we are making this a more accessible and welcoming place for all of our students.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Next we will move on to any agenda -- caller any open forum or executive sessions.

Okay. Looks like we can move on.

Next is Josie Milliken to speak about the upcoming Speaker Series.

>> JOSIE: Our first speaker series of the spring 2018 semester is Tuesday, February 6, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the District Office, community room. This one is titled Lyric Microbursts, and it's for English faculty reading selections of creative works. I am one of them.

We also have Maggie G, Eric Aldrich, and I'm blanking on -- Steve S. Thank you.

So that will be on Tuesday. I hope to see you all there, and please spread the word with your colleagues and your students and others in the community.

Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Next is an approval of the January minutes. If Michael could scroll over to the January minutes, we can take a quick -- it should be in open in one of the tabs.

If you have a laptop or can maybe zoom in, hit control-plus, once or twice.

All right. Is there a motion to approve?

All right. We have a motion by Sean Mendoza. Second? Second by Rosa. We will do a voice vote. All in favor of approving the minutes as is?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: All those who oppose?

Abstain?

One abstention.

The minutes are approved with one abstention.

All right. Next we will move on to work that the charter revision committee has been doing regarding a new mission statement for the Faculty Senate charter.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Hello, everyone. What we have here, previously the charter had something called a purpose in it, if you can take a look at those documents. It's slightly below here.

Faculty Senate is the representative body of all faculty...(reading quickly)...policies and procedures of the college.

Then would you scroll down to so I can say what we had before.

And then the Faculty Senate, through the president or other authorized...(reading quickly)...and other administrators at the college.

So that's what currently exists in our charter. And we replaced it -- we drafted, we haven't replaced it yet, whether we replace it or not will depend upon the vote we will have today -- with this mission statement that we drafted. Whenever we drafted it, we aimed to be as concise as possible and tried to reflect more the active role that we are taking in overseeing academic matters at the college.

So the revised version, which isn't the purpose, but it's the mission, reads, the Faculty Senate is the elected body representing both full and part-time...(reading quickly)...to overseeing, and then you have these four areas which I believe, you know, if it gets passed today, we will spell out in greater detail, college-wide academic matters, governance, strategic planning budget and development, and accreditation.

So that's what we are bringing before you today, and I suppose the next step would be to hear a motion to approve the mission, and then we can begin discussion about it.

>> ROSA MORALES: I just have a question about the least of items here. I don't see anything about professional development unless it fits in one of the other categories.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: That looks like a pretty big omission, given

the role we are taking in TLC, so someone could move we include professional development, that we amend it and to include professional development.

Would you like to move that we adopt this mission statement with the amendment, category, professional development?

Okay.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Yes.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Actually, Tal should be calling for this.

I'm just the explainer.

>> TAL SUTTON: There is a motion on the floor from Carol Christofferson to adopt the new mission statement with the amendment of adding a fifth item of professional development.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Move to second.

>> TAL SUTTON: Second by Brooke. Now we have discussion.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, do we ever refer to part-time faculty in any documentation?

>> TAL SUTTON: As opposed to adjunct faculty?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah. Just wondering for language's sake, it's kind of not with the norms of everything else we produce.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think that that verbiage choice was addressing the fact that in the HLC definition of who is faculty, we need to

include staff instructors, and there are part-time staff instructors.

So that's why we went with that wording.

>> SPEAKER: I just mean -- I just mean for our internal classification. Are we ever really referring to them as part-time faculty versus using our language of staff instructors? It just seems like it's a mismatch from what we currently have.

>> TAL SUTTON: I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, my understanding is we are trying to sort of update our verbiage after the HLC sort of said anyone who teaches at your institution needs to be considered faculty, and so I think part-time faculty is trying to capture both adjunct faculty and part-time staff instructors as part-time faculty.

>> SPEAKER: Okay.

>> SEAN MENDOZA: A question for No. 3. I know we changed development to professional development. Was there any reason why it was just development?

I was guessing that maybe the reason why development was so, that way, the word is a lot more broad. I don't know if there was something behind that.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: That refers to something else. That refers to the development of the budget that we believed that we should participate in, at least advise something, make sure we have a voice

and say okay, in order to ensure we are pursuing academic excellence, does our budget reflect that.

You have the broader term development that could refer to either one of those, but based upon that context, it is the development of the budget, not professional development.

>> SEAN MENDOZA: Then I would recommend or suggest that professional development be added as a whole, you know, as a bullet point or maybe a No. 5.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: I think that's exactly what the amendment suggested.

>> SEAN MENDOZA: Oh, okay. I thought that it was a replacement of development. My apologies.

>> SPEAKER: Addressing Robert's concern, we could avoid the whole issue of what we are called by changing the first sentence to say representing everyone who teaches within the governance structure.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: The one ambiguity, and this has sort of come up and maybe no one would ever interpret it that way but you have people who are part of HR who lead these professional development things, and they are not faculty but they are teaching at the institution.

>> SPEAKER: I'm just wondering if you could move your microphone up.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: No. This is as high as it goes. I could squat, but it won't go up any further.

Is this okay?

>> SPEAKER: That's much better. Thank you.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: All right. That was an easy one to address.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Regarding the fifth item on professional development, we might want to consider specifying it a little further. There is a professional development committee that deals with sabbaticals and faculty exchange. There are professional enrichment funds that individual faculty can request.

I just would -- I just want to be careful about not creating three different groups kind of working on the same thing again, right. I think this refers mainly to that center for teaching and learning innovation and so on.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Do you have a suggested revision, Matej?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I do not. I have to think about it.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Jackie?

>> JACKIE KERN: One really little comment, just grammatically, in particular, the Faculty Senate is responsible for but not limited

to overseeing, and so forth.

And then the other thing, and I could be way off on this, but to say the Faculty Senate is responsible for overseeing the budget, that just -- we're responsible for contributing somehow. I'm just -- the wording that we are, we oversee accreditation, I'm just not sure that's quite what I think Faculty Senate does. I could be off the mark.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: No, you're perfectly right. We could change it such that those begin with, you know, Faculty Senate is responsible for, and then we could say -- we could put a verb in front of each one, overseeing college-wide academic matters, ensuring faculty participation in governance, participating in the development of the college's strategic plan and budget, and providing a faculty perspective on accreditation. I think we could make those sort of revisions.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: One more time. I think if we do that, then along those lines we could also expand on something like provide opportunities for professional development.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Diane, I don't know that I satisfactorily answered your question.

Does it make sense what I said to you? Whenever you asked the

question about distinguishing between everybody who teaches at the college and then saying these faculty?

>> SPEAKER: I understand the concern. I would lean to the side of being more general rather than trying -- so that we're sure we are including everyone that should be included rather than making sure we are excluding a few people.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Okay.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: If we just said all faculty, would that be inclusive enough?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: I think because adjunct faculty have often felt excluded from that, whenever people say faculty without the modifier adjunct, they just automatically think regular faculty.

>> TAL SUTTON: I'm seeing some nods from the adjunct faculty.

>> SPEAKER: I don't think staff instructors feel included under faculty, either. I understand what the HLC is saying, but when we read that, we think, oh, you're not talking about us because we are not classified as faculty.

>> TAL SUTTON: Are you saying you'd like to have the inclusion of staff instructors explicitly?

>> SPEAKER: Actually, I'm not. I think I would prefer it just simply faculty but then maybe someplace we should have, you know, it

should be tagged so that at the bottom of it we can see that we're using the HLC definition of it, and that means part-time, full-time, that means adjunct, that means staff instructor, because I don't want it to be a laundry list. I think we start losing things when we get that.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: This just came to mind, too. We also represent counselors and educational support faculty, too. So I think that the terms full-time and part-time faculty captures everybody. Even though it might seem like a strange way of saying it to many ears because we don't typically hear adjunct faculty, but I think that that says, those two terms are probably as capacious as we could be and cover everybody without, you know, getting into a -- again, a laundry list of saying here's this, this, this and this.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: One possibility might be faculty and instructors.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I was just going to say instructors. Hmm. Just instructors. Then we wouldn't have to say faculty because faculty instruct, right? And staff instructors instruct? I don't know.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Does someone want to offer an amendment?

I'm sorry. Tal?

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah, so is there any further discussion or interest in offering an amendment?

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: ...our educational support faculty instructors, I kind of think maybe the use of the word "instructors" might not be the best idea.

One thing that Rosa pointed out and I will voice her comment, Rosa pointed out that sometimes in documents like this there is a section of definitions, and, you know, there could be, like, a little footnote and in smaller font we could lay out the term faculty here includes blah, blah, blah, but does not include, and you could go on and on in that footnote without the loss of smoothness, streamlineness, and clarity.

So something to think about, defining what we mean by faculty.

>> TAL SUTTON: Instead of focusing on exact wording, we can assume that we will roll this into --

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Definition and footnote.

>> TAL SUTTON: -- a footnote or definition section?

All right. With that --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Jackie has a question or a comment.

>> JACKIE KERN: I have a comment. I'm wondering with all these comments whether a small group of people could rehash this, because

we have so many good ideas and not try and vote on something at this point.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: There is a motion on the floor.

>> TAL SUTTON: There is a current motion on the floor regarding adopting as is with the addition of professional development, and the discussion offered several points with several possible ways of resolving those points.

So we move to a vote right now? Is that --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: You could close discussion. I think we could approve what we currently have here with the proviso we could make what are essentially -- I don't think they would be substantive changes. I mean, they would be substantive changes, but they would be clarifying substantive changes.

Instead of saying that we oversee the strategic plan and the budget, we add a series of verbs in front of each one of those numbers right there to help clarify it.

We could bring it back to you. It's up to you, Tal.

>> TAL SUTTON: I don't know the orders, Robert's Rules of Order, as well. Could we approve this with the understanding that there will be changes that are ranging in their significance and then we could sort of just -- it's been approved and then sort of show it

again after it's been tweaked appropriately for like a quick voice
vote or something like that?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Or we could delay the vote, I could go back
to my computer, include all of those and bring it back up for a vote
again.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Do we need to -- we can just --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: I'll go back. We'll table this until we get
through the rest of this.

>> TAL SUTTON: So this motion is being tabled. We will move on
to the next bit, which is emeritus faculty.

Two things I want to bring up regarding this topic. One is the
general call for putting forward additional emeritus nominations.
The minutes contain a link to this survey form. We can send this
out. If there is anyone interested in nominating or having a faculty
nominated for emeritus status, you can go ahead and fill out the form
or have the person interested fill out the form because they probably
know what they did better than someone else.

I think the date for the ELT to consider it is April.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: The deadline is April 1. This is a general call
to sort of get those nominations in by that deadline.

Then the other portion of talking about this is to potentially revise the current AP regarding faculty emeritus. We found that in the current wording of the AP the process has a couple of points where it's unnecessarily awkward, and I think we can sort of clean that up.

So I was going to ask Kate to talk a little bit about that with the potential of identifying any faculty senators that might be interested in modifying or fixing or improving the current AP could contact me and I could send your name on to Kate and you could sort of form a temporary committee to clean up the AP and revise it so the process is much cleaner and streamlined.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: Yeah, I'm just looking for a couple of people to take a look and see. You put this AP forward, as I understand it, in 2014 so it's really seen as a senate-driven project now, and as we have tried to implement it, there are some things we need to look at like how do we verify that somebody has really met the requirements of the 20 years of working at Pima and 15 as a full-time faculty. If there is somebody who has been working here for a long time or has retired quite a while ago, we have all these new record retention policies, and there are some things logistically we need to clean up and how to communicate back to someone who has been nominated.

I think we need to give better guidance to the ELT who vote on proposals that come from senate. I think you sent a bunch forward last spring and they were looking at them next to each other, comparing them, and some were very scant in information and others were very rich in information so some got kicked back.

We certainly don't want to be saying to a retired faculty member, oh, we nominated you for an honor, but you didn't get it. That's not really the purpose of this.

I think there are some logistical things we could talk about improving it. Secondly, I think we could be doing a lot more to engage the emeritus faculty that have gotten the honor, and we have heard that a little bit from some of them. I think we could use them to help us out. I think there is some brainstorming we could do around that.

I think we could probably take care of it in one two-hour meeting. I think we may even be able to solve a lot of these issues without modifying the AP, going through that whole process, and just sort of put together some procedures that work better for getting this to be what it's intended to be, which is honoring people who have served the community and college and not making anybody feel badly about something or not getting hung up on somebody not having

quite 20 years or being unable to identify exactly whether they were full or adjunct in 1968 or something like that.

Okay? Good?

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. So the next piece to talk about is the other aspect that the charter revision committee is working on, which is seat allocation, and I think everyone who submitted their responses to the Google form I had sent out, what I'd like to do is go over the results from that survey and then talk about what the charter revision committee discussed in terms of taking this as direction for how we should better reallocate our seats at senate.

So I'll try and make it a little bit easier to see. So the responses regarding adjunct faculty was pretty strong in support of increasing their representation. That's 53% in favor of essentially doubling the number of seats allocated to adjunct faculty, 14% were pretty much okay with whichever the option, any of the options that were provided, and then about a quarter were fine with it as is.

The staff instructors boiled down to about 11% that blue pie slice were fine with keeping it as is, and then the yellow and the orange larger pie slices were essentially saying yes, we want to increase the representation of full-time staff instructors, which is about half, and then about a third of that 28.8% were like we're fine

with any of the above options.

So again, just like in the adjunct faculty, it seems like the general consensus is there should be a stronger voice from these particular bodies of faculty.

The full-time faculty, there were a lot of suggestions. Some were sort of like I'm fine with this option with this sort of contingency, and that's how a lot of those minor little options will read if you scroll over them. But to get a broad idea of what's happening, it seems like a lot of people liked the aligning things along discipline. So the yellow, largest pie slice, is by division, specifically, and then the green pie slice is by CDAC. Those are people in favor of aligning it by division with a lot of those very small pie slices being, like, I like the idea of divisions, but I want to ensure there is some representation across all of the campuses. So they sort of liked the by discipline but wanted to make sure they could go physically knock on somebody's door and say, hey, you are a senator, I want to talk to you.

And then there was some uncertainty about -- large blue one was as is. About a quarter were fine as is.

Definitely most people saw, including provisional faculty and the count as considered in whatever formula we develop or system we

develop to consider provisional faculty as faculty and seat determination.

We will get to this another day.

With that, now I want to sort of move on to the conversation that we had at the charter revision committee. So this is focusing on section 3, membership election section. So what's in blue is what our current language is. I will paraphrase it as I scroll down.

Point 1 says there is one seat per department per campus. Then point 2 is -- yeah, this is for the district-wide counselor seat, librarian seat, and adult basic ed seat.

3.3 is adjunct at large at each of the campuses.

The last one is talking about establishing an at-large senator to make sure that everybody has representation.

What this more or less boils down to is that there are 66 seats for full-time faculty and six for adjunct faculty, and with that 66 being somewhat dynamic in that if there is a vacant department, they will be represented by the at-large senator.

Our goal, when we were talking about this, was to make sure that all faculty are represented within Faculty Senate and ensure Faculty Senate is best positioned and structured to fulfill its role in governance and improving academic quality at the college.

The proposal we are working on is to have senators elected by constituency that would have similar vested interests and concerns regarding governance and academic matters, so that's why we are moving in the direction of aligning it along divisions.

So the new potential structure, and again, there is more stuff we have to look into, so that's why we can't sort of put forward a proposal yet, but the idea, new structure would be identify all operational units within the college that contain faculty.

For the most part, this just means academic divisions. But there are other operational units like adult basic education, workforce development, things like that, that do have full-time faculty and part-time faculty.

So this will roughly translate to about 13 academic divisions and two or three other operational units that I still have to look more into that have faculty.

And then within each of these operational units, designate one seat for a part-time faculty seat, so an adjunct faculty when it's adjunct faculty or part-time staff instructor if that's what the part-time faculty looks like in that operational unit. And then furthermore, within each operational unit, designate one Faculty Senate seat per 10 full-time faculty.

So this new structure would give about 42 seats to the divisions, and I still need to sort of look into the other operational units to see how many seats would go there.

From what I know, there are currently 46 full-time staff instructors sprinkled in a couple different areas, so that would translate to about four, maybe five more seats.

In all, about 47 seats. This is approximately what it would look like by the divisions.

Total number of faculty is in this first column. This third column is one seat per 10 people. And then this far right column, I think I showed this last month, the last, one on the furthest right is a very -- informally calculated number where I just went through the attendance and saw who was generally coming to Faculty Senate and figured out which division they belonged to.

In general, currently what we have is we have about two people from allied health showing up to these meetings. Four from applied technology, and so on.

You can see that if you compare the right two-most columns, there is not that much change. We will have to kick a couple of people out but bring more people in in certain divisions.

I don't need to go through these notes, but I wanted to give you

an idea -- I may need to jump over here. I made a graphic, because I was told that a graphic would help convince people of things.

So this top graphic shows how we have our seats allocated right now. It's kind of all over the place. I tried to color code it by division. The gray boxes are departments that essentially draw from multiple divisions. I didn't know how to classify them. Say there is biology and wellness department, but biology goes to science and wellness goes to a different division.

This really is just kind of all over the map with how we currently allocate our seats. It just kind of feels very ad hoc. Even during the introductions, we would hear, say, for example, adjunct faculty at large at West who is also teaching at this other campus, and so it just feels a bit outdated, especially after the reorg, and so the new structure would look approximately like this where there would be three seats for allied, three for applied technology, and so on and sort of one part-time seat for each of those 13 divisions. I have to add in adult basic ed and other departments as I learn about them, but that's basically what the structure would look like.

This was the direction we took -- this is what we heard from the survey, and this is our attempt at sort of honoring that and moving

it in a more logical direction to create a seat allocation system where you are there and representing people with similar ways of thinking about the college, people from your division.

Maybe I will just open the floor for another one or two more comments if people want to sort of offer any suggestions or offer any additional insights before moving on. I just want to give you an update mostly.

>> ROSA MORALES: Was there also a discussion of what to do with senators that don't come to the meetings?

>> TAL SUTTON: We would keep the provision in there that said if you miss three meetings, you're out in the world looking for a replacement. What we need to do in our own processes, which we are, is to do a better job of taking attendance that we can enforce it. We now have taken attendance long enough that we can keep that up to date.

>> ROSA MORALES: Is that three total or three --

>> TAL SUTTON: Three consecutive. I think that's what the language is.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: And, well, this is making me really wish I had made a correction to the minutes since they were incorrect showing me absent with no proxy last time.

When we say absent, do we mean absent without having secured a proxy? Is that the definition of absent?

>> TAL SUTTON: Right. The language is -- allowing a proxy is similar to being there.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Because I did have a proxy. It just was not reflected in the minutes. They were inaccurate.

>> SPEAKER: Senator at large. I have a suggestion. I think this is probably more for the provost's office and administration rather than you, but as a new senator representing at large faculty in my campus, I have had a devil of a time figuring out who my constituents are.

I think as we move to this new model it would be a great idea if the provost's office would put together LISTSERVs for each senate group. Especially for the adjunct faculty, I think it would be really difficult for the adjunct senators to figure out who are they representing and how do they get in touch with that, and I think in the role of supporting the senate, the provost's office should provide those LISTSERVs.

>> TAL SUTTON: One additional comment to say is we want to sort of -- we would like the structure in place in such a way that we are not heavily inconveniencing our vice president in October to conduct

elections, which is a lot of work, for a structure that won't exist for very long. We'd like to get this in place in such a timeline so that by October we sort of know the new structure and we are in the upcoming elections will reflect that. Expect another survey from us that will talk about options about how we transition to the new system and how -- and then I will outline this format and see how many people support it and if there is any slight tweaks so that way we can come ready in March with a complete proposal.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I think we had some discussions about each division kind of ensuring internally that they have these different seats representing different CDACs and sub-CDACs, possibly different campuses if they are on different campuses.

Can you talk about that a little bit?

>> TAL SUTTON: Right. And so this was, in the comments, as well, of the survey. When we define the voting process -- right now this is just the seat allocation. When it comes to defining how the election process is conducted, it will take steps to address sub-CDACs within a division as well as campus representation. Again, we are not entirely sure what that would look like.

We are going to try and come up with language that will ensure that, say, not every single math faculty is coming out of East

Campus. And then Diane?

>> SPEAKER: That was my question.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you, again, for that survey and expect another one, and we will try and get something more finalized to be voted on in March.

And now we have a revised...

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Based upon the feedback you all gave me, I have created a revised mission statement that reads Faculty Senate is the elected body representing both full- and part-time faculty within the governance structure at Pima Community College. The Faculty Senate protects academic freedom and promotes academic excellence. In particular, the Faculty Senate's responsibilities include but are not limited to overseeing college-wide academic matters, ensuring faculty participation in the college's governance, participating in the development of the college's strategic plan and budget, providing faculty perspective on accreditation, promoting the professional development of the college faculty.

Then I have come up with the definition. The term faculty refers to all the college employees to instructed students, including regular and adjunct faculty and staff instructors and to educational support faculty.

>> TAL SUTTON: Is there a motion?

>> SPEAKER: I make a motion to approve what's been rewritten there.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Is there a second?

Okay. Discussion?

>> JACKIE KERN: I'm a little -- the wording is a little fuzzy.

The term faculty refers to all the college -- all the people, is that what it's saying? Basically all the college employees to instruct its students or -- the wording --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: That's what I meant. I didn't mean anything other than people.

>> JACKIE KERN: The term refers to all college employees who instruct? I mean, it could be just me, but I --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Refers to all people the college employs to instruct its students.

>> JACKIE KERN: You don't need the word people in there. I just wasn't quite clear on --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Okay. Lisa?

>> SPEAKER: I would be okay approving, but if I knew someone would clean up the words later, because it does read awkwardly. I either would like it cleaned up before or just to have the clarity

that somebody will go back --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Are you talking from beginning to end or the definition?

>> SPEAKER: I'm talking specifically, I guess right now, that sentence, the one we were just reading, because it's kind of grammatically weird.

But besides that, I'm sure there are some other places. So I don't know if there is an editing team that might go through it later or whatever.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: How about all college employees who instruct?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Fine. I was going for concision, but if you want to multiply the number of words, we can do that.

>> SPEAKER: That struck me immediately, too. You want to say in your head all the college employees, but that's not -- can I make a motion perhaps to just change all to everyone? Because everything else reads perfect.

I move to change all to everyone, and then vote on approval.

>> SPEAKER: Michael, also add librarians for definition.

>> SPEAKER: I'm just hoping we don't line-by-line edit as a whole group. When I said what I said I didn't hope we would do that.

I really think we need to allow a subgroup to do that, either before

this or after, but line by line, we're too big of a group.

>> TAL SUTTON: The assumption, any minor fixes will happen after this vote?

>> SPEAKER: Michelle Matthews. I have a question. When you sent out that survey, didn't you have on the bottom one of the questions was are we going to include, are we going to expand our duties? So we didn't go over that when you were going over the items before, when you were going over the charts. We stopped before we got to that.

And on your paragraph here, you say but not limited to. So you're kind of defining what our duties are, but then you're expanding it by saying but not limited to. Without knowing if the general consensus was to limit what we are doing now or to expand it, I don't know if that language is correct, either.

Does that make sense?

>> TAL SUTTON: It's more to not constrain us. By having verbiage by, but are not limited to, it allows for a broader interpretation. As the various many fires that show up on Pima College's door, we're not going to sort of go, does this technically fit into one of these five categories, it's something that affects faculty, we need to get on it. It's more to be a catchall, not to

sort of say we're going to -- now we're going to sort of have all these additional expectations on all the senators. It's not meant to be that. That's a different conversation on a different part of the charter.

This is talking about the Faculty Senate's role at large and we haven't talked about Faculty Senate, individual faculty senators' responsibilities. That's going to be a different conversation.

>> SPEAKER: Okay.

>> TAL SUTTON: So there is a motion on the floor. I guess we'll do by hands this time, show of hands, all in favor of adopting the language, mission statement... with the changes of the grammar coming that won't be substantial.

All right. 36 yays. 36 yeses. Opposition? Opposed? One opposed. Any abstain? All right. The motion carries. We have adopted a new mission statement.

All right. The next piece is, in some sense, a senate president's report. I want to talk a bit about, as well as give Brooke a time to talk about some of the things we met about this past month. I have already sent you an e-mail summary of the 15 plus 1 versus 16-week semester conversation, and what just -- I want to provide an update to that and make sure that it should be the case

that the deans have been contacted to start a conversation within their divisions about what they would, what structure they would support. I'm seeing a lot of nods. Seems like that conversation is happening in some divisions.

If that conversation isn't happening at your, in your division, look in Karrie Mitchell's general direction and just look sad a little bit.

So that should give a general impression of making sure that this conversation is going on at the divisions.

I think that's the only piece that I needed to say about that.

Additionally, we attended a meeting on block scheduling. I'm going to jump down to assessment real quick. We had a meeting, a committee on assessment met with the office of assessment and quality

--

>> SPEAKER: Academic quality and improvement. No, academic
-- provost, can you help me out here?

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: The office of academic quality improvement, formerly known as the office of assessment, to talk about what is going on with assessment, because that was sort of the topic de jour before pathways, and we wanted to make sure that didn't fall off the

face of the planet.

We met and talked about eLumen, which is the assessment management system that is coming to a theater near us soon. It was demoed, I think, in October of the fall where people were invited to go and sort of take a look at it, but just to let you know what's going on with eLumen, it's going to become the assessment management system rather than the CLO interface we were using in MyPima.

The rollout of that, from my understanding, is currently there are going to be six programs at PCC that will pilot eLumen this spring. They volunteered to do this, to let the office of AQI work out any kinks of the software, and then starting in the fall the hope is to continue more programs into adopting or migrating over to use eLumen on a voluntary basis.

It sounds like a lot of what eLumen can provide is, should serve somewhat as an enticement. That's my understanding of office of AQI wants eLumen, to offer it as a useful software platform for faculty to keep track of all of their CLO data.

It's flexible, it can be customized for each discipline CDAC, but that being said, there was no point when they were saying that it would become a mandatory migration to eLumen, although there is an expectation that at some point it will become 100% of faculty are

using eLumen.

My concern is I don't see how a voluntary migration will ever lead to 100% of anything. And so I do believe that they are fine with having a conversation about having voluntary migration for a time. At some point that is going to shift. We are going to continue to talk to the office of AQI to sort of get a better understanding of what timeline they are envisioning.

We didn't walk away with, on Friday, with an understanding of when that timeline would actually take place. So we will continue to sort of figure that out. But again, just to let you know that eLumen is on the horizon. It's a voluntary horizon at the moment and then will shift to mandatory horizon.

>> SPEAKER: So this is what I heard, but I could be wrong, but I heard fall 2019 the voluntary is over, and the mandatory begins. Now, this was in a private conversation with somebody at AQI, but that's the strong implication I got.

I went to the demo in October, and there was also a strong implication that the demo in October that in fall of 2019 people would be using the system because the interface would be shut down, down, gone, interface would no longer be there.

So that's the rumor that I heard. Could be a rumor. Could be

correct. It would be good obviously to get it clarified if they absolutely think 2019 interface gone, because then if you're not using eLumen, what platform are you going to keep all your data on if the CLO interface is gone? I throw that out there.

>> TAL SUTTON: We will definitely do -- okay.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Thank you. I will follow up on that and find out for sure and we'll let you know, okay?

>> ROSA MORALES: I just want to make sure that the faculty senators that are sitting on the table, listening, being provided that information that emphasize the need for some transition time for the faculty as well as training.

I think lately we have been going through a lot of changes, and while there is some faculty that rapidly can grasp what needs to be done, there is others that it really takes a little bit more time. Usually, there's not, how can I say it, a set of, I guess, mandated list of things that need to be done that will include training.

So I just want to emphasize that, because one of the crisis, one of the things or traumas the changes that have been created is related to the fact that not enough training, not enough training, just go and do it.

Secondly, regardless what you mentioned before about the fact

that divisions should be talking about the changes, having a conversation about the changes of structure, when you said conversations are supposed to be taking, do you mean among the department heads? Do you mean about, you know, discipline chairs? Or do you mean among all the departments? Because one of the things I noticed, last semester the divisions were having a meeting in the beginning of the semester. Then another one in the middle. And sometimes one at the end.

The previous semester, last semester, we just had a meeting in the beginning of the semester, and we didn't have nothing else. But we do know that there has been department head meetings, which is very good. The problem is there is no minutes for those department meetings. And it is very difficult for the department heads to be keeping track of all the things that are coming their way to be informing, you know, other constituents.

As I have stated years before, I made the vice president of instruction at the West Campus to have a staff person there taking the minutes for the department chair meetings. Because before it was not happening, and therefore, the department chairs were going to the meetings, sitting down, listen to all these things that are happening, and then coming back with the faculty but never really

informing the -- the faculty was never really fully informed.

I'm just trying to make sure that that higher level of communication that we have been trying to establish, that we continue moving on that direction.

So if we're not having division meetings in the middle of the semester or at the end, we're only having one in the beginning, then allocate somebody to actually develop minutes of those department heads meetings and pass them out to the faculty, because otherwise we don't know what people are talking about, because we're not participating in those meetings.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right.

Sean, Matej?

>> SEAN MENDOZA: A comment with regard to adjuncts, oftentimes when there are new initiatives, one of them being eLumen, going back to the whole training, they are not compensated for that. So basically we're losing money whenever we go to, whenever we need to, whenever there is a new tool or some sort of new process that's in place.

So really, we need to have -- if we, if the whole college, if all faculty are going to be adopting this, I'd like to see some sort of compensation for the adjuncts that are going to be participating in

the adoption of this.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So this might be a nice segue to what I'm wondering about, was the discussion, is eLumen just a new tool to do the same thing, or has there been a discussion of actually changing what kind of data they are going to be requiring?

>> TAL SUTTON: I will let a member on...

>> SPEAKER: First of all, if you have tomatoes, put them away.

I will try to answer these questions as best I can. Please keep in mind we have not yet met this semester.

As far as the programs who agreed to do the pilot, that was voluntary, we are part of the assessment work group, and this was just something that was asked of us.

As far as the AMS goes, academic management system, it's supposed to be a lot more robust than anything we have ever had, including TracDat, so it will be a place to implement our CLOs, PLOs, and GELOs, and we might be changing GELOs to ILOs, who knows. Right now they're general education learning outcomes, but we might be changing, only because, you know, well, first of all, Pima loves to change things, but also because this is the movement that more aligns with the nation, what the nation is doing.

So that might be something we do.

As far as your question, it will provide us a place to input our data, but it will also give us meaningful data back. That's where -- that's where we have had a problem before in the past, is we implement these changes. We don't know if they are working or not, so this will help us as a course, a program, division, CDAC, a college to make better changes and, you know, evidence. Hey, evidence, and data.

Does that answer your question for now? I will have more information when I actually go through the pilot.

>> TAL SUTTON: It seems like that generated a lot of interest.

>> SPEAKER: My understanding, Matej, was from seeing the demo and talking to Wendy Weeks, was that it will still be up to the faculty to decide how to measure what they are measuring.

So the office of assessment is going to leave it up to the disciplines to decide for all the courses how they are going to measure the course learning outcomes, but the course learning outcomes need to be measured, and then the folks that are responsible for working closely within eLumen to track the data are your own faculty people that will be using it.

There is a possibility I think to create a very close match between what the faculty want to do and how the data can be tracked,

which is, to me, the exciting thing.

>> SPEAKER: So I notice there are a lot of different components to eLumen, and one is tracking student learning outcomes or course learning outcomes by student rather than by course. Is that what we are moving to?

>> TAL SUTTON: Yes. Yes, we will be inputting data for each student rather than a summary of what happened in the entire course.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: 30 times as much data to input.

>> TAL SUTTON: Yes. That is a lot to do with the reporting needs of the institution. But we are going to move on. It sounds like there is a lot of interest here. Perhaps I will talk to AQI about perhaps coming here in March so that they can more directly answer your questions and ask them to present what their timeline is, provide clarification on the expectations of how eLumen is to be used and so on.

With that, I will hand it over to Brooke to speak to block scheduling.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Hello, everyone.

So Tal and I are on the work group for the block scheduling committee. Work group, committee, that's the wrong language. Just the work group.

We wanted to bring a couple of updates from that group. So with block scheduling there are two key goals. One is the common start time or end times. That was really key at the meeting, because I think there has been some confusion. Not all the classes have to meet both. They have to meet one or the other.

So that may mean that some classes start a little earlier than others but then end at a similar time. Some classes start a little later than others, and so on and so forth.

So there is flexibility. But the idea is that all courses align in some way with either a common start or end time.

There are a lot of programs that don't necessarily fit in that, and so there is supposed to be flexibility there. The other key idea discussed is having pivot times, and so what that means is that there would be different classes in these different blocks, but all classes would end at 11:00 or all classes would end at 12:30. And then that would allow another block of classes to all start again at the same time in the afternoon, for instance, and then again, say, in the evening.

So there is lots of discussion going on with the work group to figure out how that works with our different programs and our different needs.

And then of course the other key goal of block scheduling is to allow students to complete their entire program in a schedule that works every semester and complete the degree within the right time, right?

And so some of the tricky components of that would be, say, there would be a line of classes that were three-credit classes that would fit this block and then maybe there is another line of classes that are four-credit classes that are scheduled to fit these blocks, but then they hit the pivot time all together.

And then we have five-credit classes that then are a challenge to fit within these. All of these things are being considered in this work group. But all means, please send Tal or I questions, feedback, we can bring to the work group if you have them so we can make sure we have a full, rich discussion and make sure all of our needs are met for the block scheduling and the students' needs are met.

Two other key points with this. Yeah, so, you know, the goal is if it fits into one of those block schedules, it will be scheduled that way, but when it doesn't fit, we will work with it, is offer the overall approach.

Yeah, and again, if it doesn't fit, the goal is to not have it disrupt students' schedules to the point where they can't register

for the classes that they need, keeping both of those needs in mind.

That's what's going on in that work group.

We will be meeting regularly, so give us feedback if you have it.

>> SPEAKER: Isn't it true that our fall schedules are due today?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yes. And so the committee -- Lamata wanted to make sure that everyone understood it would be sort of a process that will be -- that's being looked at, and then another group is looking at how that schedule worked and possibly making revisions. So the schedule that is submitted now may not be the ultimate schedule in the fall, and they are looking at that to give time for the revisions.

You shouldn't have to worry now about what you're submitting. Right now that's what's submitted. They're going to look at that. If there is revisions needed, they will let us know. Yeah.

All right. So then for the Board of Governors report, I hope you had a chance to look over it. It's quite full this month. Note that there are several action items on this report that are updates from committees, not only what senate is doing, but also what the subcommittees are doing. You'll see -- I always try to make sure there is some sort of update on pathways, always some sort of update on professional development.

We do have an added faculty leadership work group that did get started, and so everyone should be receiving those updates. Tal sent out some information, I believe, from Robert, who is on that work group, or will be sending out some information from Robert who is on that work group for us. So that's a line in the report, as well.

We did get the DACA letter submitted to Louise to get on to our web page, so we are just waiting for her to follow through and get that up there for us.

We have structure of governance updates from last month, as well as the 15-, 16-week institution schedule up there, and the faculty Speaker Series and the assessment committee.

Let me know if any of those things, if you're on those groups, if the summaries don't sound like they are fully expressing what needs to be said, let me know.

The report has been submitted, but they do give us a little bit of a caveat that if I submit a revision after the meeting, we can make some slight changes.

Finally, just note all the amazing things that faculty are doing. I've got probably just as long a list on this one of the notable accomplishments that people have pointed out to me that our faculty are doing at Pima as I do the action items of the senate and the

subcommittees related to the senate.

Awesome job, everybody.

Any need for discussion?

>> SPEAKER: Rita. Are we changing the name of the Board of Governors report since now they are the Governing Board? I like BOG, but...

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Well, I mean, the form is a -- you know, it's just the Board of Governors report.

>> SPEAKER: Didn't they change to Governing Board?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Okay. But the template says the same thing.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Where did you get the template?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: From Andrea.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: I will let her know she needs to update it. Thank you.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: All right. Do we want to take a vote of approval?

>> TAL SUTTON: I don't think we need -- I don't think we need a vote for that.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: All right. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: That concludes the business section. I saw David Bea slip in here stealthfully.

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Good afternoon. I don't think I was that stealthy, but... it turns out I was here for staff council this morning and I left a pencil here, so I recovered my pencil.

Good afternoon. So we, just to give a quick update on some budget information, things are moving fast and furious, I won't go through the presentations I have been giving but more to give you an update where we are at and some of the newest things going on and what to look out for in the near future and then if you have questions for me.

First of all, we just concluded a series of 10 forums. We are estimating that we saw more than 300 people, so a pretty good proportion of our employees showed up to one or more of those sessions. They were really good exchanges where we talked about what the challenges were at the institution, what the opportunities were going to be, what the approach was going to be in the next year and two years going out, because remember, the expenditure limitation, the big challenge is two years out and we are working on our plan for how to address that going forward.

The biggest news I think I will give a couple brief pieces of positive news, enrollment for spring is up, so FTSE, which is what matters for the budget, is up about 2% in spring, so hopefully we

will hold on to that, for everybody to keep in mind that the way the expenditure limitation formula works, it's a pretty certain number that decrease is going to happen in a couple of years unless we start growing.

And the good news about that 2% in spring is that at the end of this year, if we hold on to that and that averages out about right throughout the year that we are up above the 15,000 level, that what that means is growth beyond that will now start making a difference on that \$10 million target in two years. Because instead of using the five-year average, we will start being able to reset to looking at the last year actual, and that will be a higher number than the five-year average.

So the thing I have said to the forums, I think the most common word I said throughout all of those presentations, is enrollment, enrollment, enrollment, enrollment, enrollment.

Everything hinges in the budget on our getting our enrollment stronger and the positive sign is spring is looking good. That's good news.

Study session will be on Monday with the board, so that's going to be our next conversation with the board. That's going to be talking about the outlook, giving them an update on things, talking

about different revenue enhancement ideas and expenditure reduction options, for them to sort of get feedback, get direction, because big decisions are going to happen in March. We will take tuition, we will take salaries, property tax, benefits, capital and talk about different priorities for the board. Hopefully as one whole package so that the board will give final direction for the budget in March. Way earlier than we typically do it. We always give a lot of that information because they want that information for tuition. We will be putting it in one big lump sum package for them.

That will give us the opportunity, after they make those big decisions, we can actually start scheduling more of those forums, go back and say okay, here's what they decided and here's what it means. Because oftentimes when those decisions happen, you all are off contract or finishing up your semesters and we wouldn't want to bother you with that when the students are needing to get your guidance and so forth for finals and then you're off contract. I think it will give us a good opportunity to have an exchange after that and then talk about, okay, here's what it looks like for next year, and what does that mean going forward?

One other piece to add to that is that while we are, continue to be not funded by the state, I have said in those forums that we

continue to lobby to get restored funding from the state, it's not going to be like whatever what it used to be. It's very unlikely they will restore our operations funding. What we have been pitching for is more like funding for specific workforce-type programs, STEM-type programs, to try to get additional funding to do some of that major equipment replacement that we need to modify and modernize those centers of excellence we are going to start building.

The good news on that is that we have been invited to give a presentation and to be at the house appropriations education subcommittee next week, so I will be talking to them and sort of giving them the what has been the impact of them reducing and eliminating funding for Pima for the last number of years. Maricopa will also be asked a similar question.

That's a really positive sign, because I think they are starting to recognize that it's having an impact rather than just going we don't want to hear it, we know everybody is suffering.

It's hopeful. Not really hopeful, but we will see what we can do. We will do everything we can to get some restoration of funding. That will be used for equipment purposes. It has to be expenditures outside of expenditure limitation, so it's not going to help us with the operating budget but it will help us with doing some of the

investment we need to do. Any money at this point is good money.

With that, I will ask if there are questions from anyone here?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Hi. Do you expect to offer up sort of different scenarios again or just recommend one package and then tweak that as the board wants?

>> DR. DAVID BEA: What it's going to look like is different ideas. So it's -- right now for the study session in particular, it's going to be here's different ideas to increase our revenues, here's different ideas to decrease our expenditures. Some of them are kind of no-brainers. Some are not going to be very attractive. It's going to be, understand if we are going to make that \$10 million reduction target in two years we will have to do some things that aren't very attractive or aren't as pleasant but we have to understand that -- and by the way, one of the reasons for that is because the board is resistant to a tuition increase and tuition is outside of expenditure limitation.

No one wants to increase tuition. However, tuition helps us immensely. Property tax revenue does not. I mean, we need the money. Again, the money helps for our capital investment and so forth, but tuition helps our operating.

So if you recall, hopefully you got a chance to see the study

session slide or the forum session slide where I talked about the pressure that institutions have to increase their expenses, natural pressures from inflation and need to give benefits increases for healthcare costs, so forth, salary increases, that what we showed is normal type increases at the college, and then compounding that, if there is a zero tuition increase, it makes that issue worse.

When we talk about those revenues and expenses, one of the reasons to do that is to show, to highlight that issue, because we know they are resistant to doing a tuition increase, but it's to highlight if you do no tuition increase, it actually makes the expense reduction bigger, and that means you go deeper into these really unattractive cuts.

And we will put ideas out there just to see which ones seem attractive. I have said in all the forums, the first thing we talk about from an expense standpoint is the 2.5% increase we all received this year is going to be one of the first topics of conversation, and the reason for that is because, one, again, they didn't want to commit on an ongoing basis to that because they wanted to see what the big picture was this year.

Second one is, and this one, just to be really obvious, is if we have a \$10 million cut two years out, 2.5% is \$2.5 million. So it's

a quick, significant reduction of that \$10 million target if we reset back to last year. Now, no one wants that. It's not attractive.

However, when you're talking about that and then you're talking about some of the other reductions that we will be talking about going forward, you've got to balance these sort of also unattractive options.

So, no, it won't look like scenarios -- it won't look exactly like the scenarios we talked about last year, because really what we are talking about we're starting with last year you decided scenario B, even \$5 million, we are taking that assumption and saying, okay, this year here's what that looks like as the second year of that three-year plan.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Thanks. That's helpful.

>> ROSA MORALES: First of all, I wanted to thank you for having all those forums, but also for sending the slides for those of us that were not able to attend. So I really appreciate it.

The other thing, I think with this presentations that you have been doing annually, I think it has also allowed for the public to be more educated as to some of the issues that are affecting Pima. I wanted to mention that besides just enrollment, enrollment, enrollment, what we need is retention. We have, in the beginning of

the semester, you know, a large number of students, and then we see them moving classes or changing and dropping.

So that's some strong work that needs to be done right in the beginning to ensure that the students are able to survive and continue.

But those initial couple of weeks are essential.

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Actually, I couldn't agree more. When I say the word enrollment, I don't know if I use it the Pima official way, it would factor that in. When you talk about FTSE, you're actually talking about 45th day FTSE, and so if you lose people after the first week or two, you actually lose them from a FTSE standpoint.

If you talk about investments and things like that that we have talked about, where we want to invest in and spend a little more money right now, the best thing that we can do, most efficient use of money right now is getting better at retaining the students we currently have.

If you know anything about business, and a number of you are business-savvy folks, marketing costs, it's very expensive to get someone brand new. Once you have someone who's connected to your brand, the college in our case -- I'm shifting now to the college world, keeping them going is much more effective. So when we lose

people, that's really costly, because replacing them with someone brand new is very difficult to do.

So I agree. Retention is a part of that. It's recruit, get them in the door, get them effectively enrolled, and then retain them throughout the cycle until they're successful.

>> ROSA MORALES: Now the provost is here, one of the things I did this semester that was very unique is actually I sent in an early report of those students that I wasn't able to get ahold of and I got a phone call back from the group of people that are supposed to be doing that and they said, Rosa, you're not supposed to be doing this right now. We are supposed to be doing these alerts after this time.

I said, I don't think so. We need to start early. So the group has started helping me on getting them in. That's something we need to consider on changing the time when the early alerts can be sent, because those first two weeks are very crucial, okay? Thank you.

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: You said a lot of what I was going to ask about marketing. With enrollment being so important. You did say business-savvy people would have to understand this. You have to spend money to make money. There is a lot of us smaller programs that don't get the love, and would there be some money we could put

away or put towards marketing those smaller programs?

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Yeah, I'm not saying yes or no. I'm going to say the notion of that is definitely something we shifted to, and actually the board is really clued into. The way I said it in the forums is the day you could just be the local college and just expect everybody in the local community to many could to you, those days are gone. We have to now compete for our students, which means we have to have the best services, student services, academic services, the best business services possible. These students have other options. 20% of our enrollment is online. That means they can find some other place to go to relatively easily.

On top of that, you have all the for-profits, you have other options that are in town people can go to, so we have to find a way to get out and get the message that our brand, that Pima is where you want to go.

In terms of -- so in a big picture, that's rebranding the institution. It's really creating much more sophisticated mechanisms to get students in effectively. We are talking about there is a CampusLogic, a new tool we will have, helping people navigate the FAFSA forms. They start the FAFSA process and they give up, because something gets hung up and they need to have their information

verified, and so this, what this system does is actually grabs the information we already know about the student and prepopulates it for them. And then it says this is what we need from you.

The company that does this has said that they have got a recapture rate even if we have a fraction of that rate will more than make up for the money and then our enrollments will improve of course.

We have to also realize that not only is a smart idea because it sounds good, and it would be -- it also is something we need to do because that's what students expect. If they don't see those kinds of processes, they go, eh, that's not where I want to go to get my degree.

In terms of the smaller college, I think what you will find is we will start big and then as the board starts wanting to invest more and more money, there will be more money to target towards our smaller programs, and marketing is shifting their focus also, figuring out how to do a better job marketing. I think that will have a better impact on a more localized level if you will. We are starting big and then I think it will trickle down.

Improving the website, having more flexibility that students are used to, that will help programs. Getting the pathways, getting the

where you identify what classes they take when, getting that stuff up on the website will help also, because it will be a lot clearer for students what they take when. Degree plans and, yeah, all of that, the scheduling.

Any other questions?

>> ROSA MORALES: Another comment. I just need to let you know that this semester for the first time I'm working with a financial aid office to bring the financial aid officers to the classroom, because last semester we tried to set up something outside and people were not coming.

We did have our new student orientation this week, and the most questions were asked from the person from financial aid.

So they are coming in the beginning of March, and we are getting a computer lab and they are going to start.

>> DR. DAVID BEA: Great. That sounds good.

Well, have a great rest of Groundhog Day. I guess it's six more weeks of winter, which I'm not sure what that means for us since it seems like it's spring already.

>> TAL SUTTON: The next is the provost's report.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Hello, everyone. Maybe we will have six weeks of rain. That would be nice. Ha ha.

Nice to see everyone again. You all should have received the provost's report electronically and then we made copies here. You will notice it has a slightly different format so you can see kind of a mini table of contents of what's in the provost's report.

I will just go through some highlights, not through everything, of course.

So as Dave said, we are up by 2% in enrollment, so, yay, wonderful news.

Take a look on the first page at the bottom, All Faculty Day, there is a link when you get it electronically to provide feedback for the day, and I believe, Maize, the due date is Friday, February 9? So if you can please respond by then, that would be very helpful for the committee and to start planning for next year.

Highlights on the second page where it says faculty resource center information, it says attached, so when you receive it electronically, you'll have the various campuses and the information.

I believe Community Campus had a slight change, so we are working on that for the library there with Keith Rocky.

Let's go to page 3, HLC annual conference, so you will have Faculty Senate leadership going to the conference, and we are also including staff council representation for the first time, so we are

really happy they will be joining us on the trip, as well.

I understand that there will be a presenter there from senate, Maize? You were accepted to present at the conference? And Brooke. Awesome. Can you tell us what you're going to be presenting on?

>> MAYS IMAD: Brooke and I will be presenting some of the exercises that we have developed to build a community within the classroom.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Fantastic. Congratulations for being accepted and presenting. I'll be there.

Another point to show you, also on page 3 at the very bottom, the Futures Conference, we have this annually, and it's usually been on the mission fulfillment framework, this year will be focusing on pathways, centers of excellence, and diversity. We will be sending out more details. That will be on March 9, held it be DoubleTree Hotel.

Something not in this report, but I will put it through PimaAll on Monday, and we will host our annual high school counselors breakfast, and that will be held on April 19 at Community Campus, and that's when we have our counselors meet with the high school counselors. We invite all of the counselors in the local area.

Tentatively, the agenda is to discuss and share with them

multiple measures, dual enrollment, pathways, the first-year experience and Connect U, and advising and the navigators, also enrollment and admissions and recruitment.

We are really excited about that. It's been successful. Keeps growing every year, and it's our way to communicate with the counselors. We are very happy about that.

Also, you will be receiving more information about this. For a pathways institute, that's basically training for faculty and for student services staff, we will be closing the student services center, so everyone will be at the West Campus gym. As I said, I will be sending more information about that. That will be on April 20. We will have speakers on pathways and on equity. It's important to embed equity in our pathways. I heard a panel in Seattle in pathways this last week, and it was very interesting what one of them said. They said pathways is the institutional mechanism that establishes equity with students.

I thought that was very impactful.

One more thing I wanted to share with you.

On the next page, page 4, Karrie Mitchell is looking for some faculty for the prerequisite task force. If you are interested in participating in this task force, please let Karrie know.

Is anybody interested now or want to contact her after the meeting? Ponder on it.

Thank you.

The last thing was already announced, but it's the Speaker Series. We are excited to co-host, provost's office along with you, Faculty Senate, we have a wonderful lineup of speakers and I'm looking forward to hearing you, Josie, and others, Maggie, Steve, Eric, and I think it's going to be exciting.

The following one will be Tuesday, March 6, I'm not sure how to pronounce it.

Then on April 3, Pride and Prejudice. It's very exciting to see what our faculty members are sharing with their research and work.

Those are the highlights. I think the rest you can read on your own. If you have any questions, please ask me after the meeting or through e-mail or stopping by.

Any general questions right now? No? Okay.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I just had a question of clarification about the pathways institute that's being held on April 20. I received a save the date e-mail, and I was wondering, is this a mandatory training?

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Strongly encouraged to go, yes.

This is the one mechanism to get everybody together, because we really wanted -- for all faculty, adjunct faculty, full-time, staff instructors, advisors, everybody at the service centers, that's why we close them, so everybody can participate.

I really strongly encourage that you go and, because you'll learn a lot, and it's a way to talk about pathways in an open manner and dialogue. We haven't had that opportunity where everybody is together at the same time.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Thank you.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: You're welcome.

Any other questions? Thank you very much. Have a great weekend.

>> TAL SUTTON: Next we have PCCEA report.

>> SPEAKER: Hey everyone. I have a robust report this month. I have sent a copy to Tal to distribute to you guys so you have the summary.

So the first item is that PCCEA has been working with the provost's office now that faculty hiring has been relocated from HR to the provost's office.

Matej and Nan Schmidt are working on streamlining some of the language and making updates, especially trying to move up the timeline for the faculty hiring dates so that, you know, we're not

losing some of our promising candidates just because of our delayed timeline. This is something that we were very glad to be included on. We were not tasked to do but allowed to work with them on.

We also wanted to report that as a part of, you know, reducing our budget, 10 vacant faculty positions have been closed. We have been given the PCNs from David Bea but we are gathering information on what those PCNs actually indicate. Right now we don't have the plain language titles of what divisions those positions were in, but we are getting that and will send that out.

You'll remember that in January I mentioned that in spring 2019, because of the way that the holidays fall and the UofA start date and all that stuff, our start date only allows for two days of accountability prior to the beginning of the spring semester, and so Ana sent out a survey to faculty, asking if we are okay with that or if we would like to move one or two days of accountability from the end of the semester to the beginning of the semester, and so that survey just closed yesterday, and our final results are that 134 faculty responded. 39% requested that two days be moved from the end of the semester to the beginning. 36% requested one day be moved. 18% requested no change with the additional percentages made up of other responses.

We are not directly responsible for doing anything with that rather than, rather, we'll just forward that to the academic calendar committee and let them decide how to interpret that data.

Another item is recently the sabbatical committee was contacted by Dan Berryman that it was the intention, due to budgetary constraints, that only six sabbaticals be awarded this year this year rather than the 12 allowed in policy. You may know that 8 faculty were awarded sabbaticals and contacted in the end of the fall semester. PCCEA was able to contact Dolores and her office and let her know what was going on and asked that she reconsider. They have agreed to fund all 8 sabbaticals this year, based on the poor timeliness, untimeliness of that information.

So I'm sure it was just a miscommunication, but I know that there is the intention to look at how many sabbaticals are awarded going forward next year and beyond for applicants next year and beyond. That's based on the budget. So PCCEA of course will, you know, stay in those conversations, make sure that policy is being upheld and timeliness is being honored.

A couple more things. We are still hearing from some faculty in certain divisions that they are being pressured to adopt curriculum or make changes to curriculum for the guided pathways process that

the faculty are not comfortable with, so we are continuing to advocate for the faculty. And if you are experiencing anything like this, please contact PCCEA so we can work with you, work with the deans and administrators in question, and make sure that faculty are retaining their oversight of curriculum.

So then a couple of meetings that are coming up, so we, PCCEA president, Ana Jimenez, and Matej, you meet with admin. Meeting with admin on the 8th. In my report, I have listed several of the major topics that are going to be discussed, but if you have any things you would like us to bring forward to admin either at this meeting or future meeting, just e-mail PCCEA and let us know.

And then also, I mentioned last senate that morale has been on PCCEA's radar as an important initiative that we are going to work forward on this semester. And so one thing we will be doing is next week at the Board of Governors meeting, we will be using public comment to bring forward the faculty survey results regarding morale so that the board is aware that this really is shaping up to be a very systemic issue for the faculty.

That's all I've got. Any questions?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: I have a question. (off microphone.)

>> SPEAKER: Honestly, this hasn't been something I have been

personally on these e-mail threads. It's more sort of in the PCCEA exec discussing that this has been happening, so I don't know. I wouldn't want to say anything that is incorrect.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So without getting into any specifics, I think it's mostly when there are changes to courses or program requirements, and the recent cases I believe was again that not all the faculty in a division or CDAC were involved in those discussions. It seems that maybe perhaps the dean or maybe just the department head sent something forward without a broader discussion about those curriculum items among the faculty.

So again, we'd just like to encourage you, the faculty are responsible for curriculum, and so if there is any motions or changes that haven't been discussed or you feel the majority of faculty in your area don't support, please speak with your dean or please call on PCCEA if you need any assistance.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Along those same lines, thank you for mentioning that, we have been having some conversations about the importance of getting documentation of faculty input.

So the deans should have received -- I know they received -- a template where they are supposed to document those conversations with the faculty in their divisions, and they are supposed to have

returned them to the curriculum office so we have that.

If you have not received or not been talked to by your dean,
please let me know. Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Anything else?

>> ROSA MORALES: I think one of the problems that are happening
is also the fact that sometimes the department heads have some
conversations and make, you know, I guess, understand issues at a
certain way, and then bring it to the faculty and we discuss those
issues based on the understanding of the department head, and then
later on we send them out and we receive them back and say with
additional changes that we didn't talk about it, and then that's when
a lot of times, in our case, the department head responded by saying,
wait a minute, we didn't discuss that because that was not actually
the original issue that I was asked to do that.

I just wanted to mention that sometimes there is misinformation,
miscommunication on the part of the, I guess, curriculum as well as
department heads, and then, you know, faculty, some of that going on.

>> SPEAKER: That's true. And I think if you are not sure that a
policy is not being followed correctly, confusion, anything like
that, that's where you're best off asking for help from a rep. You
know, we're familiar with policy, familiar with how things should go,

and through many meetings with administration, you know, we have sort of a quicker line to getting in touch with Dolores, for example, curriculum, things like that. That's part of our role to support you if -- even if you just have a question, you know, is this okay, you know, did this go correctly, or was policy followed or was the right process followed, we're here to help with that.

Anything else? All right. Thank you very much.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you, Kiley.

There were no open-forum items or executive session called, so --

>> SPEAKER: Rita. If anyone has not signed in, please come see me before you leave.

>> TAL SUTTON: Is there a motion to adjourn? Or we can just hang out.

Sean moves and seconded by Barbara Fox.

All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Motion passes. We will see you next month at West Campus.

(Adjournment.)

DISCLAIMER: This CART file was produced for communication access as an ADA accommodation and may not be 100% verbatim. This is a draft transcript and has not been proofread. It is scan-edited only, as per CART industry standards and may contain some phonetically represented words, incorrect spellings, transmission errors and stenotype symbols or nonsensical words. This is not a legal document and may contain copyrighted, privileged or confidential information.

This file shall not be disclosed in any form (written or electronic) as a verbatim transcript or posted to any website or public forum or shared without the express written consent of the hiring party and/or the CART provider. This is an unofficial transcript which should NOT be relied upon for purposes of verbatim citation.