



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 April 6, 2018

>> TAL SUTTON: So the next would be a call for any agenda

modifications or requests for open forum or executive session.

Looks like there is no call for open forum or executive session, which brings us to the approval for the March minutes. Hopefully you have had an opportunity to review them, and we will take a vote on it in a moment as we scroll through briefly.

All right. Is there a motion to approve the minutes or a comment? We will move to comment after.

Barbara motioned to approve the minutes as written.

Is there a second?

Hernon. Discussion? Any typos, your name was misspelled?

Carol?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: If we change something on that document today, like, a spelling, is it good now forever in all perpetuity? Because I changed some spellings on a couple of words on the document.

>> TAL SUTTON: This would be the document that would get put up onto the Faculty Senate website.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: I printed it out at, I don't know, 10:30 or something this morning, around there. Yeah, my changes are there.

>> TAL SUTTON: Okay. All right. We can just do this by voice confirmation.

All in favor of approving the minutes as written, say aye?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: All opposed?

Raise your hand for abstention.

Two abstentions. The motion carries. The minutes have been approved. Next we have John Howe who will speak on the ADR faculty notification process.

>> JOHN HOWE: Hi. Thanks. Good afternoon, and thanks for allowing me a few minutes here to talk about what I'd like to propose

for changing the way accommodation notifications are done.

Currently, as you know, you get a notification letter or e-mail, and one of the issues we have found with that is sometimes those e-mails go to SPAM or don't get viewed or get lost in some fashion, so there is a percentage of them that never make them to you for one reason or another.

So we are looking for a way to improve that. One thing we are looking at doing, we have an online system for listing everyone's accommodations. What we are proposing doing is sending out the notification notice to you, which will give you a link to that space online, and that will give you all your classes and all the students in the classes who have accommodations and all the accommodations that they receive, and those will be updated in real time. So any time you want to get the latest, you can go into that website and get the latest thing and not have to go through your e-mails to find out which was the most recent accommodation letter for a particular student.

We have had both systems in place now for a couple of semesters where that online system is in place and accommodation letter has been going out. We are now up to about 40 to 50% of faculty checking their online space. So that's great.

The real advantage to not putting the accommodations in the accommodation letter but just a link to that is with that we can see who views the accommodations. So we can go through that list maybe a week into the semester and see if anyone hasn't had a chance to view the accommodations in their classes or their e-mail got lost, and we can contact you directly and let you know that I don't know what happened to your accommodation letter, but make sure to take a look at this space.

But I wanted to come to you with any ideas and concerns about that process?

>> BARBARA FOX: Given the premium input on privacy when it comes to accommodations, as well as other student data, how will this new additional format on the website take care of guarding the privacy of the students who seek accommodation?

>> JOHN HOWE: Yes, it's a self-contained database that we operate out of ADR. So it has specific security associated with that database.

>> BARBARA FOX: So nobody who isn't authorized to view that information would be able to access it?

>> JOHN HOWE: Yes. And you can check that by -- you can go to,

there is a link on MyPima on the side and under ADR there is a link for students and there is link for instructors. You can click on that. If you don't have a student with an accommodation in your class, you will get a message that says that or something like that.

>> BARBARA FOX: Thank you. That clarifies it all for me.

>> JOHN HOWE: Okay. Thank you.

>> ROSA MORALES: I just want to mention something that I have mentioned before. I'm very happy with the process right now. The only thing that I think would facilitate the work of the faculty is something that I have asked before, which is to include on the letter for the students to try to meet with the instructor before classes start or even in the first or two weeks.

The reason being is it has been my experience in a couple of occasions when I have, for example, individuals that are visually impaired, that the letter says that, okay, well, the documents should be, you know, the font should be to the size that the student could read it. And I have no clue as to what is that size.

A lot of times I tried to figure it out, and I find out it is, for example, 22 as opposed to 24 to 26 that originally I was doing

it.

So I really think by stating on the letter that the student should be, you know, meeting with the faculty, would really be helpful, because I notice that a lot of the students try to avoid to do anything outside the classroom, and they try to do, oh, exchange questions and information during classroom, and it compromise obviously the confidentiality issue. Besides that, it takes away class time.

So I have stated that as my recommendation before, because I really think that it will help for the student and the faculty to start early on working closely and figuring out what is the best way that the student can learn.

>> JOHN HOWE: Okay. Thank you. So if I understand correctly, you're recommending that we have a statement in the accommodation letter that encourages the student to contact the faculty to discuss the details of implementation?

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes.

>> JOHN HOWE: Okay. I will bring that to our group and our student advisory group and work through that with them.

>> ROSA MORALES: Thank you very much.

>> JOHN HOWE: Yes, thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Another issue is on occasion --

>> TAL SUTTON: Name?

>> SPEAKER: Lisa W, West Campus. It has come to pass on occasion where I believe that each student does work with a particular advisor in ADR.

>> JOHN HOWE: Yes, that's correct.

>> SPEAKER: But it's come to pass on occasion a student then goes to somebody else, usually on another campus, and gets an additional accommodation. Seems like actually the system would be much more likely to make anything that happened transparent, so everybody in the loop would know about this right away and could...

>> JOHN HOWE: So are you saying that if a student goes to different specialists, gets different accommodations, the fact --

>> SPEAKER: And the fact the faculty has not always been made aware or even the first ADR advisor, in some cases. I think this happens a happened a few times. It just happens sometimes.

>> JOHN HOWE: So would having the online portal and being able to go online --

>> SPEAKER: I think it would be better, yeah. I was wondering since this reared its ugly head again recently, just that if this portal should, I would imagine, be specifically a good thing to, you

know, to prevent that from happening, because if somebody else put something in they'd have to put it into the portal and everybody would be in the loop? Sounds good.

>> JOHN HOWE: Yes, that is also one of the driving factors in trying to switch over to this method in that everything is in one place. All information goes to one place. It's updated in a real-time way.

>> SPEAKER: And so then like if somebody mistakenly doesn't realize the student is already working with somebody or whatever and puts something in, they are going to see what's in there already and it's automatically going to notify the faculty and the person the student is really working with?

>> JOHN HOWE: Yes, that is the intention of this process.

>> SPEAKER: Thanks.

>> JOHN HOWE: But that brings up a good point. If there is any change in the accommodation over the semester, which there often is, you will get a notification, an e-mail, that there has been a change. So you'll know if there has been a change in the area that you're going to be looking in your classes.

>> SPEAKER: And then if there isn't, then you can see right on the thing that, you know, somehow it never got put into the system,

so... okay. Cool. Thanks.

>> JOHN HOWE: Sure.

>> TAL SUTTON: We have time for one more question, and then if you have additional questions, you're of course welcome to e-mail John. I'm sure he will be receptive to e-mail.

>> JOHN HOWE: Oh, yes, definitely. We want to make this transition as smooth as possible and hoping to maybe launch it in the summer when there aren't quite so many students or what have you, work out any details that may be a little rough around the edges.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think Herson has one and then Cathy.

>> SPEAKER: Herson. I just have a quick comment. Based on experience, it seems that every single accommodation that the student requires, sometimes there is more than one, more than three, more than sometimes four, puts a burden on the faculty. For example, they come with, I need a note taker. The student doesn't do anything at all to try to find a note taker on their own. It's up to us to find a note taker. If the note taker quit class halfway through the semester, once again, it's up to us to take the student with another note taker and this and that.

I learned this semester through one of my students that had an ADR letter, and she had four different accommodations, according to

ADR, that she needed. So I talked to her after class, and I said, look, so you need this, and she was honest and she said, look, I really don't need a note taker, but ADR offered it to me, and I just took it.

Considering what's involved and considering what we need to do in order to make those accommodations possible, is it possible for ADR to try to narrow down and tailor the recommendations to the real needs of the student as opposed to offer all of these and so the students can choose whichever they feel more comfortable with? Or whatever is easier for them?

>> JOHN HOWE: Yeah. Our intention is to get the accommodations the student needs right before the class starts, but there are occasions where a student will start in a class and realize that the accommodations that they thought they would need aren't needed in that particular situation. That happens quite often. Often they will come back and tell us, I don't need this accommodation.

Certainly if a student says to you that they don't need an accommodation, you can recommend that they come and talk to us and we can talk to them. We also want to keep in mind that students' expression of what they need to us might be different than what they say to the faculty for various reasons.

If a student does come to you and says they don't need an accommodation, you can always send them to us for further discussion.

But students discover they don't need an accommodation in a class, but then they realize I didn't need what I thought I would need, but now it turns out I need another one. It's a constantly changing landscape, and you should feel free to refer the student back to us and we'll be happy to talk to them about that. Or if you have questions, you can contact ADR specialists as well with what the student told you and they will help you with that.

>> SPEAKER: Cathy F. West Campus. Could you explain a little bit more about when students have worked through ADR, they often don't know who the note taker is, and the note taker doesn't necessarily know who the students are, but how do they go about, if they are going to withdraw from the class, how do they notify ADR that there will be a need for a different note taker? Because if the students don't know the other, you know, who each of them is, then they don't necessarily know when their note taker has disappeared, and they are very dependent on that note taker sometimes.

So who takes responsibility for letting ADR know that that service is going to lapse?

>> JOHN HOWE: Very good question, thank you. We have been

improving our process. We now have someone who coordinates the note takers and is monitoring on a daily basis, uploads and downloads of notes, so we are very much aware in real time when notes aren't being uploaded whether the note taker dropped the class or maybe there are no longer notes needed in the class, or any number of reasons, we become aware that the student doesn't have notes that they can download.

Then we investigate that situation to see what the reason is and try to remedy it. We also monitor the student downloading notes, and if they aren't downloading the notes that have been uploading, we ask them why and see if they still need the note taker.

I agree that in the past there has been a lot of mystery in the process and a lot of students for us not to exactly know what's going on where, but I feel as though we have put things in place to improve that, and especially this semester I think it's gone better.

But if you do sense there is something not working out with a note taker, definitely feel free to let us know right away.

And I think that's the bottom-line message. If you detect something isn't right with an accommodation or the way it's being implemented, just get in touch with us right away. We are more than happy, very happy to try to fix it.

>> SPEAKER: Can I ask a follow-up for that? It's quick. So when you give out that information regarding accommodations, and then at the end of the semester have you done a survey -- you do a survey, right, for faculty to sort of figure out what happened, and so what happens with that survey information? You know, we're sending information back. What happens with that? Is that used for your department? Is that used for individual instructors? What happens with those metrics?

>> JOHN HOWE: Well, thanks for the opportunity to address that. Yes, we send the survey out to both faculty and students, and we look at that information very, very closely, and the answers to the questions, the 1 through 5s and all that, we look at trends and see what's developing, but to tell the truth, the most valuable information are the comments you have put in there.

So I'd like to thank everyone who has submitted those to us, because that's incredibly valuable. We take all those comments. I group them. And then as a team we get together usually during the summer and kind of analyze all the results that we have gotten and all the qualitative information we have gotten and try to see where we can improve, what are the things that faculty and staff value, and what things do they feel are missing.

We have definitely taken many specific actions to remediate those, and the note taking I think was one of them, because that is continually an issue that people have brought up and the specifics of that. So we have gotten someone to coordinate that. Just to let you know, extended time is one of the next ones that we have gotten a lot of feedback on, so we are looking forward to analyzing that feedback and seeing what we can do to support you better in implementing that accommodation, as well.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks, John.

>> JOHN HOWE: Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: We're going to move on. You can run over and talk to him...

>> SPEAKER: It's something I just wanted to clarify. Five seconds.

>> TAL SUTTON: Okay.

>> SPEAKER: Lisa W. So if a student says they have an accommodation, and they have, like, blah, blah, blah, five things on it, and there are one or more things that the student doesn't really want, if you then do not do those things, you need to have that updated or squared with ADR to make sure everybody is on the same page.

So if someone says I don't really need a note taker, you still have to get that changed, because otherwise, it can come back and either totally frustrate the student because maybe that's what they didn't mean by saying I don't need a note taker, or you're not accommodating them.

>> JOHN HOWE: Yes, a student is not required to make use of the accommodations for which they have been approved.

>> SPEAKER: Right, but you have to provide them.

>> JOHN HOWE: If they refuse the accommodation, you can make note that they have refused accommodation and send them down to us to talk about that, yes.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks. Next is Karrie Mitchell, I think speaking for Aubrey Conover, academic calendar, mostly an update on some of the survey -- a survey result?

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: Hi, everyone. So Aubrey runs the academic calendar committee, and he has left for HLC. A couple of things he wanted me to let you all know about is -- are these the actual survey results? Okay.

So I think you all might have seen this before. This was asking in regards to the spring 2019 academic calendar about moving the days

of accountability either one day or two days earlier. Since we had to adjust the semester, you might recall, we had to adjust it in order to make sure we had equal number of days throughout the entire semester.

So if you look at the red and the kind of orangish color on this, it's basically split between whether we move it two days or one day. The recommendation from the academic calendar committee that they were going to move forward was moving it one day for 2019, seeing how that went, and if we needed to adjust again in the future, looking at it after that point, but since they were pretty split, that's what they were going to go with.

Any questions, comments on that?

How much time did I have? I could stand up here a little longer if you want me to.

>> TAL SUTTON: I did have a question. This is unrelated to that portion of the academic calendar, but just a note on this particular semester when I was, I was in charge of a second session, eight-week class, and I noticed that the class started right after spring break and then -- but because it starts then, the eight-week session ends two days before the 16-week classes, which, in terms of scheduling stuff for the testing center made a big deal because that went from

it being the final day being I think instead of being --

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah. So it kind of botched almost three days of possible testing days to choose from.

Is there a way to sort of bring to the academic calendar, is it possible that could the second eight-week section, if it had started two days later, started Wednesday after spring break, then that would have shifted the end date to align. So instead of just paying attention to the start date, I guess it makes sense to have the start date be right after spring break but pay attention to the end date to make sure that it all ends well with that?

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: Yes, I think they are getting, the academic calendar committee, a little more savvy in making sure seat time matches meeting times and for the entire semester and all these different parts of term. Which is why we had to make the change for the spring 2019 to moving before, because the problem was with the rodeo break. We were losing Thursday, Friday, which is why we are now starting the week before with that.

I will bring that back to them. I would also say I was talking with Lamata earlier and making sure that if we have a Monday/Wednesday class that meets a certain amount of time at

Downtown that it's the same time frame at West and the same time frame at East, because we still have an issue with that for fall.

>> TAL SUTTON: Any other questions pertaining to academic calendar?

All right. Thanks.

All right. That brings us to the next bit on the 15-week versus 16-week, and I appreciate everyone's conversation over the semester as well as for the many people that participated in the survey.

Just to sort of summarize -- we can illustrate the results of the survey, and I also wanted to sort of -- I got breaking news that the student senate also discussed the 15-, 16-week semester and they decided to endorse the 16-week semester.

I think that was in no small part due to the impact on veterans benefits is why they went with that recommendation. But could you show the survey results?

If it's hard to see, I will sort of go through the numbers. The purple and green blob is the support for the 16-week, either strongly supporting or preferring, and then the dark blue and red blob is either preferring or strongly supporting the 15-week structure. Almost a fifth, over a fifth in that yellowish/orangish region are people who are fine with either structure.

It seems like of the about 225 respondents, there were about -- there was a slight leaning towards the 16-week. So I wanted to sort of open up for any discussion or any clarifying discussions since we have Karrie in the room, and then I would like to end with Faculty Senate putting forward or own recommendation on which structure to adopt here at Pima.

If there is no discussion, we can also just move straightforward to the proposal and have a discussion after it's been seconded.

Does anyone want to put forward a recommendation --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Michael Parker has put forward the motion that Faculty Senate recommends -- and Cathy seconds -- that we adopt the 16-week structure.

Discussion? Seems like we vetted that over e-mail pretty well.

We will do it through a show of hands this time. All in favor of adopting the 16-week structure, raise your hand?

If you are a proxy, keep your hand up.

All right. And then -- all right. Double proxy? All right.

Some people raised two hands.

Okay. So that was 41. And all opposed? Abstain? One abstention.

Looks like the motion carries.

So the Faculty Senate will endorse a 16-week structure.

All right.

I didn't even need that much time. All right.

We're moving along. The next is going to be the Faculty Senate seat allocation, which we visited once already in March. I apologize that this was partly -- I'm partly responsible that the charter revision committee didn't really have an opportunity to meet in the fall. I have kids in school, so that gives me two weeks of spring break in March. Plus we organized that special session for senate. I apologize, but there were other things going on in March. We didn't really have an opportunity to revise the proposal, so what I would like to use this time to do is to, again, just provide some clarification, provide an opportunity for you to clarify what you're looking for in this new seat structure, because I'm getting mixed messages.

It sounds like a lot of people are very much for a division allocation system, but there are some concerns about campus representation going away in particular for those small campuses, and so I just wanted to -- maybe I will start off this conversation with the tables that I made in the senate seat and faculty distribution,

three tables. The first one and the last one are the most relevant.

The first one shows, in case people are wondering, given what our current makeup of the seat is, this is what our current roster looks like by division, by row, and then by campus, by column.

So, for example, you can see in math, if you scroll down, there are no district-wide math seats but there is at least one math in every single campus, and because of at-large seats, there are two campuses that have two math. And then the parentheses, the 5 in parentheses next to math is if we adopt the new system with the numbers that we are proposing, math would have five seats. So clearly we'd have to go from eight current senators down to five. I could be the first to go.

Anyway, just to sort of see how this would impact us, for instance, social sciences, there are currently six active senators, but you would have four under the new structure.

Library, there are currently two. One is an at-large and one is the district-wide representative, and library will get two seats so that sort of fits.

Communications would get eight seats and currently there are only five active senators.

Again, this was -- take an excellent amount of error here, I

might have mislabeled somebody or something like that, but this was my best attempt at categorizing current composition of the senate.

And then if you want to scroll down to the bottom table, the third table at the end, yeah, so this was me going through the entire Pima directory and categorizing where people are at, and so there are -- yeah, Community Campus, there are 11 faculty at Community Campus. There are 78 full-time faculty at Downtown Campus. There are 40 at Desert Vista. It's in alphabetical order.

There are 40 full-time faculty at East Campus. There are 41 at Northwest. Then there are 125 full-time faculty at West Campus.

>> SPEAKER: Katie B, proxy for Lisa G., adult education.

Our full-time staff instructors I saw listed as faculty, which I'm pleased to see, are they included in the 11 in the blue and white chart here, or have you included --

>> TAL SUTTON: I didn't know how to search for that in the directory in a systematic way to get an accurate count. This is just reflecting full-time faculty and it's not including full-time staff instructors.

>> SPEAKER: Sounds like in the verbiage are included as faculty in a lot of the wording? Which I'm very pleased to see. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: There are 46 full-time staff instructors across about five different departments. So that's going to create about, if we adopt the new structure or something close to it, about four or five seats for full time staff instructors.

Again, coming back to that concern regarding people, in particular at small campuses, wanting to make sure there is representation and voice coming from that, it kind of boiled down to there are two camps you can come from is are you concerned about sort of the voting block of the small campuses, in which case -- well, I will get to that. Or are you more concerned about having -- I think this is what Diane Porter was getting at in March, are you more concerned about making sure that you have a pathway of communication through a campus representative that you can sort of get your voice to the Faculty Senate, along that channel, as well as through the division channel. So those are sort of the two different camps.

One is you're sort of concerned you're diminishing the voting power of smaller campuses. And then the other one would be you just want to make sure that you have some reasonable avenue to be able to get your voice, your thoughts, your concerns, to Faculty Senate either through, if you don't feel particularly connected to your division and you're some outlier hanging out at Northwest, it would

be nice to have a Northwest representative you can go to and say, hey, can you bring this forward.

I think those are sort of the two potential issues that sort of came out in that survey I sent out, and I think mostly people fell into the camp of just making sure there is a voice that they can get their voice brought forward to the senate. And then I think I'm not going to -- I don't think the charter revision is going to try and come up with a system that can deal with balancing the numbers in such a way. I think we are moving away from -- I mean, that would just have us stay with a campus allocation of seats. I think we are going to move forward with the divisional location of seats, because there seems to be a broad support for that.

So I think we might, we are going to sort of lose necessarily a perfectly balanced distribution across campuses, but we are looking forward to ensure there is some representation at each campus.

>> ROSA MORALES: I have a question about the allocation of members for the communication discipline. I notice that currently they have five, but then with a new structure they will have eight.

I have a question why is that going to happen?

And I also want to state that I'm very happy that we will have 12 representatives from the adjunct faculty, because their numbers are

large, so we should have a little bit more representation.

So what is the rationale on changing from five to eight for the communication?

>> TAL SUTTON: Size.

>> ROSA MORALES: Size?

>> TAL SUTTON: The communication division which includes English and various languages there. I think it might just be seven, because I don't know why I have the number 66 in my head. I think there are 66 full-time faculty in the communications division, which would make them have 7. The formula we are proposing is to divide the number of full-time faculty within the division by 10 and round up.

>> ROSA MORALES: Because it's listed on the (indiscernible) that is there that it's eight.

>> TAL SUTTON: I don't know why -- I think it's supposed to be seven but it's still different from the five we currently have, but the final numbers will always be -- and they might be shifting based on how the divisions change, but essentially the number that will be elected will be looked up at the time of the election, shall and then we would apply that formula that we will adopt and say, okay, that's how many people will be elected from that seat.

So take these numbers as soft numbers. It's sort of a snapshot

of what things kind of look like right now

>> MICHAEL PARKER: I think what that may well reflect is that we currently have departments being representative, not actual faculty members, so some departments might be small and large. So if you're a department of one, you get a senator, one senator currently. If you're a department of 10, you get one senator.

So it would be more to reflect the fact that you're representing faculty rather than organizational units within the college.

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah, what he said.

And so, again, to let you know where we are moving forward, the charter revision committees is moving forward, we're going to try to address that second camp of concern where we are concerned about -- we want to make sure there is an avenue for any faculty. There is two avenues to bring issues forward. There will be some sort of campus representation, and there will be some sort of division representation where you'll have -- we want to make sure that your voice is being heard.

>> TEDDY SCHNUR: Maybe you can help clarify this for me, because I'm trying to understand how this would bear out in practice.

With the proposal that's on the table, obviously there would be division representation based on the numbers, and then the question

that was patted around last time was whether we need to have an additional campus representative in addition to that.

So let's say I'm at Desert Vista, and I don't feel I can go to the person that's my designated person in my department. There would be other departments at Desert Vista with senators allotted. Why couldn't I just go to one of those other representatives on the campus and just say, hey, can you please, you know, take this information to senate for me?

I guess we would know who those people are. Wouldn't that be made known who on the campus is in senate? I mean, I guess I don't understand why we would need a separate representative when I can just go to a different senator from a different division.

Can you help me understand that?

>> TAL SUTTON: And that amendment didn't pass last time, to sort of just add one at-large, by campus. And so some of the ideas that the charter revision committee has been floating around would be more along the lines of let's go to the senator responsibilities and sort of define who their constituents are. We can say that you are to gather input from both your division and from your campus. That would just be a tweaked responsibility.

And then we have the Faculty Senate website where we would not

just list the senators' division but their home campus so if you are looking to a senator to contact, it's pretty clear that you have these two avenues to pursue.

So that's one possibility of how we would revise the proposal is to change senator responsibilities to include not just division faculty that are their constituents that voted them in but also to sort of gather feedback from their home campus.

This is an opportunity for any other clarifying questions, because hopefully in May we can actually put forward something that will pass. Also, you can see in this last table, you can see, you know, as the only mathematician here today, the a lot of large numbers would suggest that we will very likely end up with representation -- if we just let the cards fall where they may, it's hard to imagine, given how the distribution looks up there, that there would be nobody from any -- that a campus would be completely devoid of a representative.

And if we don't trust to faith, maybe we could, instead of create a standing seat, just sort of say have in the extreme case that there are no representatives from Desert Vista for that election cycle we create one. There could be sort of a conditional clause. These are

some of the things we are considering.

Again, to not just sort of have a one-size-fits-all solution that didn't pass, let's just always have an at-large representative, we are looking for more nuanced solutions to that.

Are there any other clarifying questions before we move on?

Okay.

>> SPEAKER: Shelly D, Downtown. I just wanted to say thank you to the leadership for taking this, you know, revision on and going through this whole process and then delaying and then rechecking and reconsidering. Because I feel like it's been a good process and it's going to get the senate somewhere in the end, but it takes tremendous work to get the input and revise and then to go back.

Kudos to those people who have been working on it.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Well, thank you.

Yeah, there are a lot of us here, though I think one of them is a math person who is at the conference that I'm not at.

We are going to move on to -- where are we? Policy review? Is that where we are at?

So now policy review, though I have -- there is some breaking news in that regard in terms of some things not going to go through

the process and shelved, so I'm going to ask Karrie to sort of identify those that -- because I'm not sure in this list, if it's everything in this list or a subset of this list?

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: We pulled back the ones that are related to curriculum, so the ones related to ADR and I believe there is a copyright one will still remain but all the curriculum ones, there needed to be some greater review before it came to this body and went for 21 days, so they are being pulled for that, for future.

Do you need me to list them specifically?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: (off microphone.)

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: They need greater review from the committees that have the faculty on them and overseeing these.

(Applause.)

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: I will relay the applause (laughter).

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks. So I think that means the only things for discussion today that are still within the 21-day review cycle is bullet points 7 and 8, ADR and copyright.

Oh, Seth is here. Sorry, I didn't mean to leave you out, Seth.

>> SPEAKER: I thought I was going to get out of here (laughter).

>> TAL SUTTON: So 1, 6, 7, 8, seem to be noncurriculum.

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everybody.

As the bullet point says, we have a revised public access and expression on college property AP. The genesis of this is that the Arizona legislature has changed the statute. Previously educational institutions were permitted to designate specific areas if individuals wanted to engage in a protest or demonstration or really any kind of 1st Amendment protected speech.

That law changed, and we had to revise our policy accordingly. The law changed to say that any public area, outdoor area, of a college campus, including ours, all of ours, and District Office, can be used for public expression purposes.

It does not need to be reserved in advance. Previously that was something that we could require. We cannot do that anymore. People can spontaneously engage in protected speech as long as they are still abiding by the rules that they had to abide by before, which is they could not -- they couldn't engage in violent behavior, be overly disruptive to ordinary college operations, that kind of thing.

We still have a process by which groups or individuals can reserve specific spots if they want to, but they don't have to.

The advantage of that is, of course, if you want to have a large gathering, you can be sure that you will have the spot. If we have two groups -- this might surprise you -- if there is something worth

protesting, there is usually two sides to that story. So we do have a process by which if we have two groups that have different opinions about whatever the issue is that's being addressed that we will be able to -- at least in theory -- to handle that, that we have a process by which the college will put reasonable limitations as is our right under the Constitution, 1st Amendment notwithstanding.

Does anybody have any questions? That's pretty much it. The big take away is no more designated free expression areas. It's a college. We're supposed to freely express everywhere.

That does not apply indoors. We can still put whatever restrictions on our indoor spaces that we want to, indoors being loosely defined to include basically any enclosed space that is not generally accessible to the public. So a fenced-in athletic field, for example, one of the courtyards inside one of our buildings that you can only get to by passing through a building, those things are technically inside.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Paralegal student...

>> SPEAKER: Congratulations.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I had a couple of insights as I was reading through this, not the least of which was how much better written this is than in the days before you arrived at our college.

Thank you for your ability to put together a sentence and use verbs
(laughter).

>> SPEAKER: That's a low bar, but thank you.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: It's much appreciated. That said, I did
find a couple of places where the intent of the policy was a little
bit unclear to me or where I thought there was an underspecification
of what the college is obligated to do.

For example, I think it's section 2D, which talks, on page 9,
about appeals. I'm looking at page 9. Portion D, called appeals.

Well, I can't see anything over there. I can only see my copy
here.

So it says in portion D1, it says an appeal of the denial or
cancellation of a reservation submission or of a decision to
terminate public expression activity may be submitted to the provost
or his or her designee within three business days of the date of the
denial, cancellation, or termination.

And I was kind of waiting for that other clause to come up, and
then there was just kind of no there there. It sort of seemed like
what the author was trying to say is that --

>> SPEAKER: You can say me. I wrote it.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: It sort of seemed like you might have

been trying to specify, like, a deadline for the appellant to express displeasure at the fact that their event was canceled or their reservation was denied or whatever, and it sort of gives this time frame of three days, but it doesn't -- it doesn't frame this as a deadline. Nor does it specify what the college will do if this appeal comes in after three days.

So I was a little unclear on what the parameters are that is the college just saying, well, yeah, you can appeal it, but... you know how they are supposed to -- conventionally, like, there is often like another side, you know, kind of like in a contract where, well, if you get your appeal filed within three days, then we have X number of days to respond. But there was nothing about what the college's part is here in terms of this timeline for responding.

>> SPEAKER: Well, first, very good that you picked up on my scoffing sarcastic tone in writing this.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Yeah, it was all over this.

>> SPEAKER: That's sitting behind my desk, First Amendment (smiling).

Yes, your interpretation of that is correct, that the three days is one's deadline to submit an appeal after receiving a denial of a reservation request or a cancellation for whatever reason.

I believe -- and I can, I mean, I can take a look at that and add, you know, an overt statement such as deadline if it clarifies it. If that's unclear, that's fine.

Now, further down there is -- because of the timely nature of these, usually something is very -- often is something so sensitive people really want to talk about it now that we have a process by which we get back to them within two days so as not to squash their opportunity to express themselves contemporaneously with the feelings that have prompted their exercise of their 1st Amendment rights.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: So they are at their most hot-tempered when they come down to District and yell at us?

>> SPEAKER: They want it hot!

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Well, actually, I did have a query, I have, like, three more queries, and I'm really sorry, but I find this a really interesting document.

Further down in that same section on D, which describes appeals, I was wrestling with the use of terminology, because it sort of seemed like, in point D4, that you really meant, in that last word in the sentence, not the appellant but the appellee, because as we know from court procedure teachings, the appellant is the person pressing the grievance, the person filing a petition, and the appellee is the

target of that appeal.

So it kind of didn't make sense when it said, in point 4, a copy of the appeal must be delivered to the provost, okay, that makes sense, or his or her designee, and to the campus president, executive vice chancellor for...

>> SPEAKER: Not to cut you off. You're right. That's probably an editing issue. There probably was another sentence there.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: That was your assistant?

>> SPEAKER: That's money well-spent right there. You have my ringing endorsement.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I owe it all to the paralegal program. And furthermore, there is this same error that your assistant made in point 5, where it says the appellant may submit...

I think you mean the appellee will submit a written response to the appeal, right? Because otherwise we have the appellant submitting their own response --

>> SPEAKER: After nearly two decades of practicing law, I still don't know the difference between an appellant and an appellee.

No, you're right.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: These are terms from the Normans. They are very ancient, and --

>> SPEAKER: It should say appellee.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: -- then there is a third instance in that same section where you meant copies of the appellee's response must be delivered, blah, blah, blah, blah to the appellant.

>> SPEAKER: If I recall right, not that this excuses my oversight, I believe there was more discussion of both what happens with the appellee and the appellant, and I did delete the wrong one.

So here we are.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I totally get it. Law is -- it blows my brain out of the water.

The other -- here is my last critique, and then we will get on to the glowing and effusive praise that I have for this.

In section 12, which specifies violations and our feelings about them, in point A there, I was struck by the use of the word "ability," when I thought that really the concept meant to be invoked here was permission.

It says any individual who violates this administrative procedure may be removed and/or trespassed from college property or college-sponsored activity and/or denied, I think you mean the permission to reserve public areas of the college for future public expression abilities, because an ability is a capacity to execute a

behavior, and we really are talking about rules which imply permission.

>> SPEAKER: Welcome to the practice of law. Lively semantics debate is about 99% of what I do.

Fair enough. That's a word choice for -- I will take another look at it.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I'm learning, in the paralegal program, to be as maximally pedantic and a big prisspot about words, and --

>> SPEAKER: Split the hairs. That's what they pay me for.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Yeah, because of a single word, as you know.

If I can just get to some glowing praise, in addition to being twice as articulate as the writings of your predecessor, one of the things that I noticed about this document is your erudition in laying out the high-flown ideals such that not only is it normal for there to be variation in people's ideas about things but for, you know, conflicting ideals to come into conflict and that it is not the proper role of an institution of higher education to attempt to shield members of the college community from ideas or opinions they may find unwelcome, disrespectful, upsetting or even deeply offensive. I love this. This is awesome.

I am, as a proponent of free speech, what little we do have left in this country, I am strongly against the ethos of, I'm sorry, trigger warnings for special snowflakes and so on, and I just -- I circled point D, as well. I really appreciated what you have wrought here about even abhorrent speech, the best way to counteract it is with more speech, not by shout-downs and the hecklers' veto and so on. So a huge thank you to you.

>> SPEAKER: You're welcome. I wish I could take credit for those quotes. I believe the more speech one is Sophocles or somebody like that, but I'll take it.

Yeah, you zeroed in on some language that's been included not just here at Pima but throughout the higher education world, is to inform our students that this is an environment where we freely exchange ideas. That's why you're here.

And there has been, I don't have to tell you this, but there has been a bit of an expectation set that there will be things like trigger warnings and so forth, which, I mean, the idea behind it is not -- it's well-meaning but it can interfere with what we do here and it sort of puts people, students, in the mindset that we don't want them to be in, that the purpose here is if they don't like it, they should challenge that idea.

Yes, a question?

>> ROSA MORALES: I have a question on page No. 7. There's actually --

>> SPEAKER: Before we get into that question, can I add one last point to the trigger warnings, et cetera, observation. One thing we clarify in here it's not just to tell students, just deal with the language that's thrust upon you. We do specifically address and delineate, you know, what is acceptable in terms of -- not acceptable in the sense that we like it but acceptable in the sense of it's offensive, yeah, that's what we talk about here sometimes, versus something that's dangerous, something that is, that crosses the line that we will not tolerate. So keep this in mind.

I went to undergrad at Purdue, and we had, as I know many colleges do, we had a street preacher who hung around on campus, Brother Max. Brother Max, I'm going to use some salty language, so trigger warning, everyone, he would tell every young lady who passed by that she was a whore. That was his word.

But -- I misspoke there. He would just, as a young woman passed by, he would say, women are whores, right? General statement.

Who thinks that is protected by the 1st Amendment? Show of hands.

Very good, very good. It is. It's a general statement. We might not like it, but you're not calling anybody that.

Now, where Brother Max crossed the line is when somebody challenged him on it, and he said, You're a whore. Very different.

Now we are getting into what we define here as being a breach of the peace. It is a language, not that it's a threat, but it's language that by its very nature is likely to set somebody off and cause a disruption, that such as a fight, for them to retaliate back in a way we don't want them to do, and that messes with everything we do here.

That doesn't mean that everybody can run around hurling insults at each other. It just means when people are speaking in the abstract it's one thing, but if the same language is directed to a specific individual or even a specific, you know, group of individuals to which that person obviously belongs, in some circumstances, then it's a whole different ball game.

Does that make sense to everybody? It's not like anything goes. We still have some say over what people do in communication.

>> TAL SUTTON: I will let Rosa, and we need to move on to the other APs.

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes. So on page No. 7, on the bottom, under section 3, there is actually -- it states there, under No. 3a, at

least two business days before the anticipated date of the public expression activity, they should submit the reservation, right?

So it's very specific about the fact that the permission has to be requested within two days, right?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, right.

>> ROSA MORALES: But then if you go to page No. 10 on the bottom, right on the bottom, letter E, it says, in the event the college deems it necessary to restrict public expression, the college will nevertheless to the maximum extent practicable propose and provide alternate opportunities such public expression.

On this sentence, there is no date or time when, you know, the organization should be responding and stating that. So it's kind of like, you know, not good here.

So if you're asking for people to request permission to have this gathering, and it's two days before the event, what would be the responsibility to deny it if they say within one day or within two days they should receive a response or alternative place.

>> SPEAKER: Good question and good observation. What would happen in that scenario or intended to happen is that the response would be this information, that we cannot grant your request to use this courtyard because it's already been reserved or whatever, but we

can accommodate you over here. So that's how that response goes.

There is not a separate process by which then if we say no to one thing then somebody has to come back every time and try to get something else

>> ROSA MORALES: But it's stated that the request has to be done within two days but it doesn't tell me how long is it going to take them to respond to me.

>> SPEAKER: It's the same period of time to respond to any request.

>> ROSA MORALES: So two days before the event I'm asking permission to have the gathering. So when am I going to get the response?

>> SPEAKER: Are we still looking at the appeals section?

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes. The request, yes.

>> SPEAKER: If an appeal is denied, when would someone be notified of an alternative location?

>> ROSA MORALES: Which becomes very important if you are interested in getting people then, okay, now we can congregate on this other location.

>> SPEAKER: Scroll down a bit. Back up a little bit. Just above section 4.

Right. So No. 6 there says a response will be given within two business days, whatever that is. Now, I mean, that's the minimum. So that's to basically say if you give it to us, like, two days before, you know, we will get back to you like the day of, but we don't want people doing that so ideally they would submit it beforehand. If it comes up that close we will let them know. For example, if somebody submitted a request for something on Wednesday for something to happen on Friday and we couldn't accommodate them, part of the response we would give them on Friday or before, ideally before, would be to say the area that you have requested is not available at that time. Here is an alternative, here are some alternatives.

>> ROSA MORALES: But it should be -- it should state here that within the two days or within the response the college will provide an alternative location. You see what I mean? It doesn't tell me when that's gonna happen. It just said in the event the college deems it necessary to restrict public expression, the college will nevertheless, to the maximum extent possible, will propose an alternative opportunity for such public expression.

It just very free telling me the college might do that but it's not giving me any deadline or timeline that I, as a committee

organizer, can rely on to mobilize the people to another location.

>> SPEAKER: I think I understand. Feedback received. I will go and take another look at that and see if I can make it clearer that the alternatives would be part of the response that one receives.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think there were only three other APs. One thing I would like to comment -- I know the curriculum-related APs were pulled but I want to make a general comment. Karrie, I think this probably would have been better directed towards Julian, but I guess you'll have to relay it.

This is sort of speaking in larger context of curriculum policies in general. I suppose I have three points here if I can remember them all. First is a concern of APs, curriculum-related APs moving to become SOPs within various operational units if Faculty Senate is seen as the body of overseeing the academic quality at the institution, we review administrative procedures and board policies but we don't review SOPs, then it's going to be difficult for us to provide input in that regard if all of these policies move to SOPs, which I think was an idea for some of these.

So that's one. And then the other is a concern that we got from a constituent who was sort of concerned with the fact that we may have accomplished, mission accomplished regarding the college

reorganization, and we have a new faculty leadership structure huzzah in all of this, but we are sort of in this continuous improvement model, and I think there is a feeling of a slight vacuum in terms of responsibilities as the dust is settling and things like that where the handbook on the new faculty leadership is still being fine-tuned here and there.

Additionally, this organization has created sort of uncertainty about the role and future of CDACs and things like that, and I do believe that some faculty in particular from the feedback that I'm hearing, those coming from smaller programs, are feeling like curriculum is sort of running roughshod over them in terms of how the CCC is being managed and run or not run. It's making it very unclear how curricular decisions are being made in this sort of transition period.

And so however -- I am optimistic that we will settle in on a process we are happy with, but I think in this transition period, I'm getting concerns from faculty regarding how curricular decisions are being made or not being made, in particular, that of what's coming out of the CCC. I think the CCC hasn't -- is anyone on the CCC, have they met -- when was the last time that you --

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Last semester or so.

>> SPEAKER: There was a meeting in September but even though I was on the CCC I did not get invited to it -- (off microphone).

Carrie Meyers, physics. West Campus.

I feel like I have been shut out of this process, because even though I volunteered to be on the committee in March, my name is listed on the website as part of the committee, I wrote to Julian Easter, said I'm on the committee, but I haven't gotten anything, what's going on?

And about a month ago I found out, oh, yeah, there was a meeting in September, sorry, you didn't get invited. That's when we told you guys how to vote and, you know, what you should do when you're considering your votes.

And then everything else has been online. It's been very frustrating and unprofessional, I think. I mean, I get this list of things, and I actually don't really know what to do. I mean, I basically just removed myself from any consideration there, because I don't really know how to treat them at all.

But I just kind of feel like the CCC, at least the faculty part of it, is never really consulted about anything. The only votes possible are typos in the descriptions, really.

I feel like there is really no faculty input in that CCC.

Margie, do you agree with me?

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: I think this process of stifling faculty voices started probably more than a year ago, and the way it used to be done, and I asked the provost once, I said, is the intention of the college curriculum staff to silence the voices of faculty? And the provost said, how do you mean? What's going on in there?

And I said, well, it used to be this way. CDACs had power, and CDACs were notified if a course change came to the CCC. The members of -- let's use history. The history CDAC faculty would receive the changes. Then the faculty would vote. Yes, the chair would vote. Yes. Then the college curriculum staff would say, the vote was. There were 12 faculty members, six of them voted, the chair voted, how does the CCC feel about passing this change? And then the committee would vote in person. Nothing online. It was all we could talk about why the other six didn't vote, et cetera, et cetera.

But then the CCC staff decided that most faculty wouldn't vote because they didn't care. So I don't know -- you know, I think that's their thinking, I'm guessing, that they are thinking that faculty don't care about the curriculum and that when the vote goes out to the psychology CDAC, the social services CDAC and whatever CDAC, if all of them don't vote or half of them or less do vote, then

they feel like we're not getting correct representation from the faculty. Therefore the staff has been going to meetings and we will then decide to pass or not agree to have this change or not to have the change.

So the power was, in my little estimation, or in my mind, was going away from faculty to the staff of the CCC, depending on what each member of the staff felt about a particular course.

So I feel maybe that some of the staff or someone in the staff feels that the faculty are not experts, the faculty don't care, they don't vote, and so that they do care, the staff does care, and the staff can move things for the college because faculty are lax and are not voting.

I think this goes way, way, way back. I'm just making assumptions about what I saw in the many years that I have been on the CCC, but lately, something came up and they did it online, but as you say, we didn't have any information on it, and it was, what do you say about this? Someone said blah, blah, blah, and it appears as a little arrow on the right margin. Somebody from the staff answers it. Isn't that right?

And then we make another comment. We don't think this is a good idea, because as faculty experts on this point, blah, blah. And then

someone from the staff will answer. And then they will send us an e-mail and they say, okay, all the questions were answered, all the questions were taken care of, so this is the way it's going to go.

Our feelings are those are the feelings that little by little and then now they're not having meetings and they say canceled. We are having a meeting on such a date. Monday, 3:00. Canceled. Then the next month. Another meeting. Canceled.

That's what I have. These are just reflections.

>> SPEAKER: Carrie Meyers. Yeah, I would say there have been seven to eight meetings canceled recently. I don't know exactly.

Starting -- I think there was a meeting in September. I think Pollyanna said there was a meeting.

I thought you were. I'm sorry.

I have never been to a meeting, even though I think I was supposed to be on it all year. But I also agree that I'm super uncomfortable with the staff making all these decisions, because I'm in science, and I don't believe that anyone on the staff is in science. So I would like to be consulted.

We actually just talked about this in our science division leadership meeting this morning. Like, we don't really know what we are supposed to do with these curriculum items. We feel like we're

getting them for a vote after they have already been to the CCC. We feel like we should be voting on them before they go to the CCC, because there is just no way that the curriculum committee can decide science items and then send them to us. It's just not -- it's a specialized area that we need to be in on, and whether our board thinks the faculty should set the curriculum or not, I believe that we should.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think HLC agrees with you.

>> SPEAKER: And the HLC agrees with me, and I think most faculty believes we should be setting the curriculum, but I believe that that is being taken out of our hands to a certain extent. I mean, it's probably not completely -- it's probably not, some of it is just due to disorganization, but it's sure -- I mean, it's weird to have all those meetings canceled.

>> SPEAKER: Shelly. What I want to briefly say is that this whole engine that's running this is something called guided pathways. Did you hear about it this year? That's what's changed radically the curriculum process.

And I want to put a moment of defense for the four full-time people that slave in curriculum who are often pigeoned as the evil people that are changing curriculum because of guided pathways.

Well, let me tell you, where did the guided pathways come? Did the curriculum folks sit around and say I want guided pathways so I can work 80 hours a week to try to get pathways through in a one-year process that should take three? Was it curriculum's decision to do that, or was it upper administration that told us we were going to get guided pathways through, come hell or high water, in a very short span of time, and then told curriculum people to get on it and make it happen.

And then that got pushed on to faculty as curriculum is desperately trying to get these programs through in a very short period of time, and faculty also don't have time to participate robustly in the guided pathways process to make sure that everything is as it should be.

I don't want to stop at the mid-level problem as curriculum. I want to go to the top with leaders who are out of touch at the top and didn't realize what that process would entail and how not giving adequate time for it would result in bad decisions at curriculum levels, with faculty, inadequate feedback. That's my soap box and I have now vented that. There you go.

(Applause.)

>> SPEAKER: Lisa W. Thank you very much. And I really like that

people come forward. Really I think I'm starting to have a clear picture of the problem. I think it's really critical that this is where faculty, we are the experts in our areas, and we are doing a disservice to our students if our voices are not heard, and we are not doing whatever it takes to make sure the curriculum is designed in a way that benefits students and our disciplines.

And, yeah, also recently in the past year I have been more involved in guided pathways and I have been collaborating or trying to collaborate with people up in Maricopa County, and their process is so different than ours. They were very frustrated at me for going ahead and making decisions and submitting them by November 17. They started before we did.

Butte Glenn College in California, I have been -- I have associates there. It is a different process. We have what we have. People have invested a lot into making it this far. Not perfectly. I think there is a good vision for where it's meant to go, but I think that -- and I'm not sure exactly how, because I'm still learning what Faculty Senate can and can't do, but we are the curriculum experts, and we have to make sure that we are given a voice, and somehow, you know, this is a long line in the sand thing, it needs to be done constructively, but it needs to be done. And

people came up and wanted to make sure that this came forward.

Thanks.

>> TAL SUTTON: What I'm hearing here is in the midst of the change that's resulting from the reorganization, the new leadership structure, the impact on CDACs, sort of the big cog in the decision-making wheel of curriculum is supposed to be interacting with the CCC, if the CCC doesn't have a well-defined co-partner or other cogs to sort of work with, it's going to spin wildly about.

So it sounds like -- and now, especially when you sort of introduce guided pathways, which increases the number of curricular decisions at an exponential rate, it's spinning really, really fast.

So maybe what needs to happen on a temporary basis, maybe the officers can go meet with Dolores, Kate Schmidt and Julian, to talk about how we can at least develop an interim process that settles things down and brings faculty voice back into this process.

Granted, as we work on the handbook, faculty leadership handbook and revision the roles of CDACs and come up with a longer-term solution, at the very least what we can work on is a short-term solution that will sort of help bring back faculty voice into the curriculum decisions while this chaos and dust is still sort of floating in the air.

>> SPEAKER: Shelly. This is just a brief amendment to that. I agree exactly with what you're saying, and I would say besides those three people, that Jenny Conway should always be involved in those conversations, because those conversations happen, but Jenny and her staff of three are the people who have to administer them. If there is not complete transparency and good communication there, something gets lost when it gets down into the curriculum office

>> TAL SUTTON: In addition to wanting to invite not just the officers, but Margie, if I could invite you as a CCC long-standing person, and Carrie.

>> ROSA MORALES: You need to know that our program has been impacted tremendously, and I was actually very happy that when I expressed my concern about guided pathways that actually Tal immediately stated about the fact that the meeting going to be where the Faculty Senate was going to be included, but it was clear when the agenda was sent for us to decide which of the committees we were supposed to be working, that's when I realized the extreme ignorance that I have about guided pathways, because I couldn't even understand the vocabulary that was listed there.

I think Tal and other people were able to see that we were pretty much behind. So I was very happy that we actually had that meeting,

and I took the time to look through the documentation that was sent to me, and I prepared the summary that I sent to everybody that state the issue, the committees have multiple faculty that were absent, so my question was why is it the faculty has not been included, and what can be done to make sure that our voices are heard at that level?

And the things that keep coming and coming to me was the fact that for some reason there was a lot of miscommunication that happened.

Even though there was actually a committee in charge of ensuring communication internally and externally, when I asked, where is the plan of action, what is it that you're supposed to be doing, those of you that attended the meeting, notice that the only thing that I got was rumor controlled, right?

It's not necessarily what I was suspecting. Well, I requested that the letter that was sent to one of my colleagues to be included on the board report, and when it didn't happen, I went myself to the agenda, to the BOG study session, and unfortunately was canceled because there were only two board members, but nevertheless I stated my mind specifically, and it was related to the fact that I felt that information to the faculty, the students and later on I learned the staff have not been good enough and that somebody needed to be done.

Then, in addition to that, I noticed that my advisory council has

never been informed, even asked, about this fundamental changes of the program. When I started talking to some of the board members, I realized that they were not aware that that was happening.

So I know for the fact that several of my emeritus professors for social services sent letters to the board, including a couple of actually employers, and one alumni, you know, also.

So like I said, I went this Monday, and even though supposedly within their parameters faculty were not supposed to attend, I encourage you to watch the session, because this time it was actually recorded, videotaped, and I stated my mind even without permission, and I was very happy about it.

Three of the four board members stated publicly, three of the majority, three of the four that attended stated publicly that they have concerns over the process of inclusiveness. They realize that faculty has not been participating as well as the students, and then Luis Gonzales advocated for the staff.

So out of that, it was requested for my division to send a letter to the citizen advisory council which they got it yesterday to get some input before they move on on the decision to cut some of the programs and to change our associates and all that.

So I want to let you know that I think I was ahead of the ball

here, because our program was directly affected, and we needed to do something.

But my major concern is that I feel that this semester, whenever I'm being asked, it's usually to sign up, sign the information, approve, because we have a deadline for this Wednesday. Sign it, and it's, like, not enough time to really kind of talk about it, discuss it. In the study session, there was an 11-page report on actually communication and meetings that they have, but like I said, one of the board members mentioned that they were not enough for faculty, for staff, and for students, and that those are the three on the bottom of the letter that need to be included.

So I'm happy that now they are moving on that direction, and I think we need to now, you know, insert ourselves in the process, because that's all we wanted. We wanted to be part of the process.

>> TAL SUTTON: I really want to move on, so one last comment from Lisa and then we are going to move on.

>> SPEAKER: Lisa W. Another thing I was asked to bring up kind of does fall into here now, and that was a number of concern from West Campus faculty that there is a communication from Julian Easter regarding programs that were being canceled, right? And then it said there would be a follow-up e-mail and none of those faculty, and then

I looked, I could not find a follow-up e-mail. What is with that?

>> TAL SUTTON: Do we know anything about that? Karrie?

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: You know in job descriptions where it says other duties as assigned? Sometimes I feel like that's all I do, other duties as assigned.

I don't know if I can speak specifically, but maybe this was what this was alluding to. After the notification goes out, the registrar's office runs reports of students that are in those program of studies, sends those to the dean so that letters can be generated to the students to let them know that the program is being inactivated.

Does that sound like it might fit in with what...

>> SPEAKER: Lisa W. This is a general e-mail that went out to faculty.

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: I think it was announcing all of them with a list of them?

>> SPEAKER: A list of programs. Many people look at that and were very surprised at some of the programs. I think one was archeology, for example, there's quite a number of them, various aspects of (indiscernible) technology and this and that. It was a large list.

And then in the e-mail there was, like, an e-mail follow-up of maybe late they're day that said that he would be getting back to explain this, and then there has been no further communication.

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: Got it. Okay.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: (off microphone.)

>> SPEAKER: Thank you very much. I would refer more specifically but my computer ran out of batteries three minutes ago. Thank you.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: (off microphone.)

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: Would it be helpful if I requested a -- I think it needs to be the reasoning, right, on why these programs were inactivated? Is that what was missing from this?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, and the purpose of the e-mail, what -- obviously everybody would like, you know, open communication to know what's going on, and that may have been the purpose of the e-mail, but there was just a lot of confusion and wondering.

I think rationale and some sort of back story and what we're supposed to do with this, and...

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: I will communicate that.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: So now we are going to move to the provost's

report which I think is again other duty as required (laughter).

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: Was it sent to you?

>> TAL SUTTON: I have it linked.

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: It's linked. Are there any questions about the provost's report that I can help answer?

I do try to -- I can talk broadly about things. Just don't ask me specifics, if that's fair?

Are there any questions about anything in here?

>> TAL SUTTON: I think we will let you off the hook. Oh, Rosa?

>> ROSA MORALES: I just want to make sure to state that I'm very thankful for the provost's office to coordinating with the Faculty Senate for that meeting. And also for them to agree to change the format that originally was set up for that guided pathways meeting to become something that was a little bit more useful for the faculty senators, because they were able to benefit from the questions that everybody were stating.

What I want the provost's office to do now is to follow up on asking each of those committees, specifically to provide a plan of action. I stated it actually to Mr. Gregg Busch. I know what is the charge for each of the committees. What I'm not sure is what exactly is the plan on how they were going to be achieving that? And the

reason for that plan is because then you have to set up some timelines, and then we can see how the faculty can participate, actively participate in the process.

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: I think I can answer that for you, Rosa.

>> ROSA MORALES: That monitoring needs to happen, no question about it. If that's possible...

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: So I have taken on the role of trying to communicate guided pathways more. Yay. Other duties as assigned.

So on Monday what will go out with my enrollment report, because that's kind of the venue that I have, is to be able to talk about enrollment and knowing how guided pathways fits into enrollment, and so if I can use that as a venue to get information out to you all and everyone else, then I think that that's helpful.

In Monday's enrollment report you'll get what I showed up on the board, the smart sheet, project plan, and it has each of those committees in there linked to what their project plan is, and the project plan has all the tasks associated with that as well as dates and deadlines.

So with that, though, we know that sometimes dates and deadlines change, but what I am trying to hopefully help do is to make sure that people stay on those deadlines, because there is a lot of

dependencies that are based off of that. You can't have milestone courses done until you have guided pathways, default pathways done, so making sure that makes sense for folks and illustrating what that is.

>> TAL SUTTON: Rita?

>> SPEAKER: This is more logistical. The sign-in sheets from the special session on March 23rd are somewhere not here. Yeah, question No. 1, did anybody pick them up, and question 2a, if they are nowhere to be found, I need to know who was there. I was not there. If you will please e-mail me that you attended, thank you.

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: So I realize that I think as part of my other duties as assigned I was supposed to pass out paper versions of the provost's report that are in this box. I was also supposed to ask -- so sorry -- do you continue, do you want to continue to have a paper version of the provost's report, or do you want it located here? Because sometimes things change, because we have to make a lot of trees here, and --

>> TAL SUTTON: I think you can cut down the number of printed but I think some people appreciate the paper versions. I think you can cut it down to a quarter of the number that you print, and then if that -- if more people like paper versions, we'll just print up

more next time but let's just try for a quarter of what there is.

>> DR. KARRIE MITCHELL: Thank you.

>> ROSA MORALES: Whenever there is extra copies, take for your constituents instead of throwing them out.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think with that report, we are ready to move on to the PCCEA report. That will be presented by MaryKris this time.

Again, as you may have noticed, if there is a math conference, PCCEA participation cuts down.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I don't have enough hands here. Okay.

Thank you.

So I was kind of told at the last mini would be delivering this will PCCEA report. I'll be brief.

Maybe just for efficiency -- this is kind of a bad technique for a presenter, because they say if you give people a handout they will read that instead of listening to what you say.

I do have handouts of a key document that I think will interest you, but before we do that, I want to kind of go over the key elements of the PCCEA report. It should be linked off of the agenda.

He's displaying it. My vision is, like -- yeah, I'm basically kind of going blind.

Probably the most important thing that I want to talk about is

work on the part of PCCEA to carry out a watchdog function, and specifically PCCEA has been advocating for changes in our college processes regarding curriculum updates.

Rather than describing problematic behavior on the part of administration, I'm going to instead go over with you very briefly five requests made by PCCEA of admin, and you can connect the dots as to whether you think the processes that admin has headed up have been conducive to academic integrity.

At a March 9 meeting between Faculty Senate leadership and our provost, as well as Julian Easter, the topic of discussion was curriculum issues, focused primarily on career and technical education courses, the acronym for that is now CTE. I think that was formerly called occupational programs maybe. It's difficult to keep up with the fact that names, for all of our units, all of our positions, and key documents continually change, but I guess administrators need some sort of recreational activity when they are getting tired from buying hotels.

Anyway, at this March 9 meeting, PCCEA officers and senate officers made five requests for changes to how we are dealing with curriculum, and I will tell you what these five requests are. The first request was that admin assess faculty oversight of curriculum

and identify if there are gaps that exist. For example, if faculty were not being given the chance to oversee curriculum.

PCCEA also requested that admin reject, or at a minimum, provide some clear rationale or research or documentation, anything, Post-it note, for any curricular decisions that are not faculty-driven, of which already quite a few.

Thirdly, PCCEA asked that admin review CTE programs to triage. So maybe to adjust some timelines for programs that require an excessive overhaul. I suppose this is in contra distinct to making demands for people to carry out complex processes on unrealistically tight timelines.

Fourthly, PCCEA advocated that admin ensure that curriculum meetings include the relevant division faculty, as well as a curriculum office representative, the pertinent dean, and an officer from Faculty Senate -- sorry, an observer from Faculty Senate and/or PCCEA, if requested.

The fifth and final request at this meeting for how we might do things better was a request that when admin is scheduling these meetings that they do so at least two weeks in advance and ensure that the meeting is associated with a detailed agenda so that ahead of time faculty can discuss, research, and maybe get representatives

to attend on their behalf.

So those were some suggestions that senate officers and PCCEA officers were putting forth for some ways we could improve our processes regarding curriculum.

I'm going to hand around on both sides here a document written by Ana Jimenez of PCCEA, and this so-called input framework document is also some suggestions for how we, as members of the college community, can be smarter about how we deal with initiatives.

One of the concerns that PCCEA has expressed in the past is a concern that oftentimes initiatives at the college get rolled out before they are fully baked, and there can be a lot of chaos, disruption, wasted time, wasted effort when we are not good, when we do not use best practices with planning, and for some number of years, PCCEA had requested that we have kind of a guiding document that specifies what processes we would undertake whenever we're trying to put forth some big initiative, but that never happened.

So Ana finally wrote one herself, and it's in your hands now. This document titled Input Framework challenges administrators to identify exactly what problem are we trying to solve with this, that, or the other initiative, and it challenges admin also to submit evidence of the effectiveness of the initiative for solving whatever

problem it supposedly is going to solve.

And there are a number of other points on this input framework sheet that you can read. But I think this is a great leap forward for us as a college, assuming that it actually would be respected and used even in part.

So that's an item. There is a third item on here. Thanks to the sharp eye of one of the PCCEA campus reps, there has been a correction to an error on the college's website where there was an incorrect reporting of rates for differential tuition, and that would have been driving students away. What? It's going to cost this many hundreds of dollars per credit hour to take this, that, or the other type of occupational program course? But fortunately, thanks to quick thinking and good communication on PCCEA's part, David Bea managed to get that erroneous information corrected.

So enrollment matters, and I think we will have better chance of getting enrollment if we are not scaring students away with false information about programs costing twice what they actually do.

Upcoming, our PCCEA elections, so vote for me, of course. These will be held this month for the positions that begin on September 1st. You'll be receiving a sample ballot here in a couple of days, April 10, and PCCEA is still seeking nominations for campus

representatives for Desert Vista, as well as East Campus.

So please encourage your interested constituents to nominate themselves or a colleague.

Very important, a week from today, at 10:00 a.m., we are going to have an all faculty meeting, so that would be every single faculty member. Please come to that, and it's going to be at the West Campus to make your life easy to just later that day roll right on into the mandatory budget meeting that starts in the West Campus gym at 3:00 p.m.

I don't think we know a room yet, but in Ana Jimenez's weekly e-mail update on Monday, she'll sharing the room that we have secured for that all faculty meeting. So again, Friday, April 13, 10:00 a.m. till noon, an all faculty meeting. Please attend.

Then we have the boilerplate at the bottom. We love you. We support you. You can find more information on the PCCEA website.

I guess I'm supposed to field questions now or accept corrections and angry rebuttals for the way that I mischaracterized things or whatever.

>> SPEAKER: All faculty, 10:00 a.m., is that to include the full-time staff instructors?

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: As far as I know, I would think.

>> SPEAKER: I'm trying to -- people say faculty, and they say staff, and we often are overlooked. So as a person who has been full time at Pima for almost 15 years as a staff instructor...

>> TAL SUTTON: I think it would probably matter whether or not your representative group would be ACES or PCCEA, and I think --

>> SPEAKER: I'm ACES. Okay. Thank you.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Tal knows more than I do.

Other questions or concerns? Lisa?

>> SPEAKER: I want to say thank you very much to PCCEA, both for (indiscernible) scanning down, this framework, I think it's very impressive and could be very useful for solving problems.

If you scroll back up to the five points that you mentioned before regarding the PCCEA's concerns about faculty input to curriculum, I think that pretty much hits the nail on the head from what I can see, and people's concerns that have come to me.

So Faculty Senate, we're, like, the curriculum bosses of faculty, right? So what do we do now? I'm just learning about how to be a senator. What do we do now?

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I'm going to have to let Tal take that, because, yeah, you're asking -- I mean, this is a great question.

Let me let Tal take that.

>> TAL SUTTON: I mean, this is where we need to establish ourselves as the overseeing body of curriculum. I think when there are issues about that being circumvented, they need to be brought up and they need to be held accountable.

This is part of the reason why Faculty Senate meetings are public, why they are videotaped, it gets things on record, and so if there are concerns, issues, we would have these people, when they're not traveling to Chicago, come and ask and answer our questions and get them resolved until the point when, once again, we feel that faculty have oversight of that, of curriculum and academic quality.

>> SPEAKER: So as -- I mean, it seems to me that we should be making, like, a statement as Faculty Senate realizing that, you know, to put it as kindly and tactfully as we can in the efforts to put in across guided pathways and to renovate a lot of things at Pima, we realize that there have been many cases where faculty have not been involved the way they are in curriculum decision-making and initiating curriculum.

So we want that to change. And so do we just say at this point please bring to us any issues of concern? What do we say? How do we go about addressing this? Because the problem, you know, the cow has already left the barn, horse, whatever, but, you know, it's already

been happening. What do we do to get it back on the right path now?

I'm not picking on you. You're just the boss.

>> TAL SUTTON: Well, one -- there are two sort of sides of, at least the way I see it and the way I have been trying to facilitate it this year. There are two aspects of Faculty Senate. Within Faculty Senate, there is the leadership which it elected, that can sort of act more nimbly and go and talk to ELT and have these types of meetings about, you know, we'll organize a meeting with Julian Easter, Jenny Conway, the provost, and Kate Schmidt who is in charge of faculty issues, and sort of say, you know, there is this gap, this vacuum in curricular decisions going on right now. We need a fix for this. As we work on a long-term solution we need something short-term, as well.

That's sort of the more nimble aspect of Faculty Senate, and I think the more purposeful, there is a reason why we follow Robert's Rules of Order. We don't want to be reactionary. We are the body that represents all faculty, and so when we put forward a recommendation, when we put forward a motion, put forward a vote on something, it carries a weight, has to be purposeful. Can't be reactionary.

So I am saying is there anything that you need on agenda, are you

-- get that information from your faculty, like, that's the stuff we need to sort of prepare so we can put it on the agenda and vote on it in a purposeful way.

That is sort of the more deliberate side of Faculty Senate that really, I think, is what carries the weight forward to the ELT for recommendations and enacting change in that regard.

I think Carrie and then...

>> SPEAKER: Carrie Meyers. I have brought this up before and it's not a fully formed idea and is not a solution in any way, but, I mean, one thing I have noticed is that there really just aren't enough faculty. I know we are told over and over we have the right number of faculty and administrators but we are heavy on staff. We have been told that many times. But the fact is that if we want faculty to have input on curriculum matters, there has to be time for us to do that. We all actually have a full-time job, which is teaching classes.

So it's really very difficult to sort of add basically what, you know, the same amount of work that an administrator might do at a certain part of the time, to add that into our -- I mean, not that we would do the same amount of work, but it's very hard to get that amount of work into your full-time job. There aren't enough faculty.

You can just look around here and see that there aren't really enough faculty to do the amount of work in excess of the teaching that needs to be done.

I don't think there is a solution to that, but, I mean, Ana wrote a nicely reasoned letter that we are overstaffed on the upper administration side, and they don't call themselves administrators, they call them staff, but, I mean, there are a lot of people up there and, you know, they say, well, faculty don't respond, faculty don't respond. Well, we really don't respond because we have this other full-time job. It's just really hard to do those two things at once.

I mean, I'm not trying to make excuses for faculty, but I'm also not -- you know, I also think to expect us to do as much as, as is expected, is just very difficult, also.

I don't know what the answer is, but I just sort of noticed that there aren't enough people to do the things that need to be done. That's just a problem, I think. I wish we had more faculty, and so some of those faculty could have release time. And the reason you and Michael can go to meetings, you have release time, right?

But everybody doesn't. So that's just an observation.

>> SPEAKER: Lisa. Okay, well, I don't know how to do this properly yet. But I would like to have this being an ongoing job

that we are tackling as Faculty Senate to get faculty's voice back in curriculum making.

So should I request that this is then on the agenda for the next meeting? And then I should probably also reach out to who I am representing for their concerns in this area. Am I doing my job right this way? And also, I just want to reiterate, I'm not -- I'm not trying to put Faculty Senate or anybody on the defensive. I'm, like, okay, this is where we are now. We have this problem. How are we going to go forward and fix this? How are we going to solve this?

Because, you know, the problem being that I think there is a consensus in this room, if I'm not mistaken, that we are concerned that faculty does not have the voice it should have in curriculum. So we want to sort that out. Thanks.

>> ROSA MORALES: That was precisely the question I had when I have to make a decision to move on and do the things that I needed to do, regardless of teaching classes, organizing community events, and doing everything. I took myself the opportunity, I decided to do that, because it was so important.

And one of the things that we did with that process, we stopped the process. Okay?

Some of my colleagues stated, it's a done deal, it's a done deal.

It's not a done deal. We still can participate in this process and the first thing that we should request -- no, this is regarding in general. Because one of the things is that the way decisions have been made have been made within certain timelines that were decided before, and somehow people, a lot of the faculty, they think, oh, there's nothing that can be done, the deal is already done.

But I took the approach that nothing is done. We can stop this. And, yes, what happened with the board instructed the administration to stop the process and check with the students and check with the, you know, advisory councils and everything.

I think what we need to do as Faculty Senate is precisely request to stop the process and reconvene and include faculty voices.

The way to do that is that whatever plans were done there, there needs to be a meeting with the Faculty Senate officers and the administration to look at those timelines and the possibilities and include faculty voices right now as we're speaking. There is a request that we need to do.

Because nevertheless, the train is moving. Because the train is moving, it seems like some group says there is nothing I can do about this, because anyway, they already have made a decision, it's gonna happen, and then there is this other group that's saying, no, we can

do something.

Originally I was very upset when I learned that there was this, what is it, the curriculum architecture summit or retreat? And the question that I asked, how many faculty were there? I was told three of them. Michael, Tal, and the lady that is the liaison. Only three? I said, that's not enough. We need to do more than that.

And the reason why I asked who were there, because I was expecting those individuals that were there to say, wait a minute, this is going to be very important, we need to set up a meeting with the faculty to let them know that this is happening. That retreat happened in January, and we just, until March, were learning about guided pathways.

So even if it's one or two people attending the meetings, the No. 1 thing is to advocate for the faculty to be included in the process, and somehow it didn't happen. Well, it needs to happen now. That's my thing that the voice of the Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate should be responsible for the curriculum. So that means that we are finding this voice where it didn't happen. Let's have a meeting with them and make sure that from now on faculty should be involved. That's my recommendation.

>> TAL SUTTON: To be clear, like, the officers are meeting with

Lee and the Four Ps, we are talking about developing a sort of continuous improvement model to be applied to guided pathways, to make sure that we are measuring its impact, measuring its workload and how much it impacts the faculty and advisors and the other stakeholders, so we are working with the administration on these issues that are coming up, about these issues and curriculum decisions, and so we are having these conversations. Working towards a solution in a multicampus institution is slow, and so a meeting that we might have in March might not yield something for some time.

But again, in terms of how other people, how other senators would like to participate, you can always e-mail us your thoughts. You know, we can communicate about our meetings with Lee and the Four Ps, and if there is something that you feel that it would be relevant to that conversation, you can e-mail us about the agenda, but again, we are having these conversations, and I do think that progress is being made. It's just we are working within the structures that we are given.

>> ROSA MORALES: Can I respond to that? You know, I'm passing out the summary that I designed before. The No. 1 thing that needs to happen, each of these committees need to have faculty. Each of these committees.

That's committees that they have not even set up a committee, and they are already making decisions. That's totally unacceptable.

According to the timelines, the No. 1 responsibility of these committee co-chairs was to set up a committee. So why is it that -- we need people here, and I don't want to be part of the problem. I want to be part of the solution. That's why I said I would like to help in any way possible to get faculty voices there. I don't want those committees without faculty to be keeping making decisions. That's a major problem.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: The document you're referring to I think was the guided pathways project plan. If you look at the date on that, that was last updated in November. So I don't know if the thing that you see there actually reflects the committee membership. Yes, I understand where you got it from, but what I'm saying, the one that I'm on, milestone courses, we have a full complement. That may not be reflected in that document, and I think before we decide that it is, that there isn't that faculty representation, we have to look at the date of the document, which was November, early November. We're in April right now.

So it may be that those committees are full, and I can speak for the one I'm serving on, it is full, but...

>> ROSA MORALES: Where is the information?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: I don't know where the information is, but it was a project plan that -- I'm just telling you, I'm telling you that that document doesn't reflect reality.

>> ROSA MORALES: Let me tell you just one thing, you see how Ken Bourbon (phonetic) is listed there? I approached my colleague, Ken Bourbon, and I said, why is it our department didn't know that you were part of this? As a faculty representative, it was your responsibility to tell faculty what is that committee doing? He said, Rosa, when I was asked to participate, I said, I don't want my name there. I don't want to be attending meetings, I don't want to complete any of the assignments. Nevertheless, your name is there.

So that's misleading.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think this is evidence to what Lisa was talking about, how we can enact change. The special session we held in March, when we held it, magically, four updated documents appeared on the guided pathways Intranet page. I think sort of leaning on them gets those types of results.

So I think to your point earlier, this is how we can sort of start enacting changes is by bringing these issues up so we can bring them up to us to bring up to the ELT or if you want to bring, if you

want them to be an agenda item on Faculty Senate, that's another issue. I'm going to let Morgan, because he stood up and seems like he wants to say something. And then I think this has veered far away from the PCCEA report.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: He can have the podium. I'm sitting down.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Working with some of these groups and trying to recruit faculty members to be on the groups, I can tell you truthfully, one of the challenges is when I talk to faculty members, they will say, I don't want to participate in this group because whenever we decide something, whenever we're trying to move forward with things, my colleagues are going to attack me, they are going to say negative things about me, and so I'm not going to participate.

I have talked to a lot of faculty members about what we need to do is we need to make sure that we are sharing things as we go along through the process, because what happens is a lot of times these groups are formed, they go off somewhere for three or four months, and they come back and they say, here's the final thing, and there has been no input in the process along the way. That's one of the things that we need to try and change is have more time to be able to go back and get feedback from people as we are working on things in

the process as we are going through.

That's challenging, because you've got two pulling forces. One thing we want to have more input, but the thing that Carrie said is, well, all this stuff takes time and so you're placed in a position of I want to be able to get as much input as I possibly can, but I also have to realize that people have a life, and they don't have the time to be able to do this constantly.

The third piece that's out there is we no longer have the opportunity to say, well, we're just not going to change. We'll just let it take five years. We'll just let it take ten years. Pima Community College cannot continue unless we change our systems so that we can respond to things in a more effective and timely manner.

We need to have faculty in charge of their curriculum, in charge of their area, empowered to take care of the things that they need to take care of so our programs are effective for our students, so if it's a transfer program, they transfer and get credit for their classes. If it's a workforce program that they are able to get a job, and that's the responsibility for the programs.

The curriculum staff should be supporting that. I can tell you curriculum kind of things, it doesn't run through me. So most of the things you're talking about today I don't have firsthand experience

with that, but I will tell you if you're working with something in your area and you're having problems, I do want to say my door is open, please feel free to come and talk to me, and if whatever it is if I can't figure out what it is that should be happening, we'll go have a conversation with Dolores or Julian or whoever, and we'll find out what needs to be done.

Because the presidents, I can tell you, and our provost, are committed to faculty being the leaders of our academic institution and for us moving forward and doing what the students need.

It's just -- this is a big change for us, and it's just going to take us some time to be able to work through the bumps and things that we have to deal with.

>> TAL SUTTON: One final comment.

>> SPEAKER: Lisa. So I guess I would like to summarize and reiterate, then, the concern is regarding curriculum, because of the pace of everything, faculty have not had the voice they should have. Regarding all matters having to do with curriculum, I think as senate we need to be very proactive and to make sure that, you know, we do have faculty on all these, okay?

And if, for some reason, faculty aren't coming forward, we need to talk among, you know, our peers and make sure that people are

coming forward and doing, being on committees.

But these committees need to have faculty. Anything regarding curriculum, it needs to have faculty oversight and expertise.

So going on with this, I just want to be sure, is this on the agenda for the next meeting, then? Am I doing the right thing here?

>> TAL SUTTON: What is "this"?

>> SPEAKER: Having Faculty Senate discussing the ways that we can ensure that faculty have a voice in curriculum

>> TAL SUTTON: Again, I think I need some more information to know what that would look like for the meeting, but we can talk about it afterwards, for sure.

>> SPEAKER: Okay. Thanks.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: (off microphone.)

Probably our strongest thing that we could do is we can pass a resolution, not a motion, anything like that, but we have made them on a couple of occasions, so, you know, if we have reached the point -- and again, I think that we always prioritize, we say to ourselves, okay, how can we deal with this, how can we deal with this, the resolution is the strongest statement that we have, and if we feel that we have reached that point, then it's time to compose a

resolution and pass it as senate. Then we speak as a body. We represent the faculty of Pima Community College. Our accreditor expects that we oversee academic matters. If that has been trampled, and it's not a matter of sort of carelessness or incompetence or whatever it happens to be, but it's a deliberate design to remove faculty from the process, which I have some suspicions moving everything out of the governance process into procedural manuals so it doesn't have to be reviewed by anybody, maybe it is that time, right? We try and negotiate, we do what we can and talk to the administration, but if there is a clear design, a deliberate design to sort of remove these things from faculty, then perhaps it's time to act.

One thing we could do to evaluate that is sort of what does that mean that you have board policies and all of these curriculum things are being removed from administrative procedures and put into procedural manuals? Is that the way the apparatus is supposed to work? I would like to compare to say how many other units in the college are following exactly this process? Is there a bias of those that are headed by curriculum to move things in that direction?

So, I mean, we could take a look at this stuff, we could present the evidence, and then we can, make and pass a resolution.

>> TAL SUTTON: And I think that's, sounded more to me like sort of a defense for when you need to sort of react to something that is getting pushed upon us. And I think the other side of that is we have, for instance, we can review the input framework put forward by Ana, we can review the continuous improvement model that the officers are working on, and we can put forward -- we can endorse the provost's office adopt this as a guideline for how they will sort of roll out and deal with, as Morgan was saying, committee work right now sort of goes off into the void for three months and comes back with a finished product and say, react, okay, that's going to go well. What if we adopt something like an input framework or continuous improvement model? Then there will be this, all these committees know that they have to follow these guidelines where there is constant communication and constant transparency. That's another thing is we can review things we want the provost's office to adopt and say, this is something that's really good, that we are seeing that committees and task forces aren't necessarily adopting a well-defined process, here's a process that we want you to adopt.

We are 20 minutes beyond, so if it's super fast.

>> ROSA MORALES: Super fast. I want you to go back on each of the committee charges. Most of them have one line item that says

inform your constituents, and they are not doing it. Okay?

So the charge is there. But there is nobody overseeing that that's happening. That's the problem. Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Tanya P. One of the things that I think has been positive in the direction today is when Karrie came in, she said all these people aren't going to present because they pulled it because they haven't had faculty. So I think we are being heard. All of these other APs that would have kept us here till 6:00, those ones, they did pull back, they looked back and said, you know what? There is not enough faculty representation, if I understood you correctly, Karrie. So we are being heard and we are slowing down the machine. So I think we are slowly but surely starting to make some waves and make some forward momentum. I think we have caught some people's attention. Hopefully that's a good thing.

>> SPEAKER: Katie for Lisa G. As faculty becomes more involved in this, we have to be aware of whatever necessities for the college there are and work to educate the faculty to realities and find a way for us to join, to positively move the college where it needs to go, rather than just being afraid of change.

>> TAL SUTTON: Well said. With that, is there a motion for something-something-something? There has been a motion to adjourn.

Second? Who say we should adjourn?

All right. Have a nice weekend.

(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.