



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 May 4, 2018

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Now with introductions out of the way, we have agenda modifications, short announcements, with request for open forum or an executive session.

>> KARIE MEYERS: Rosa Morales asked me to request executive session. She will be here shortly.

>> TAL SUTTON: So there will be an executive session at the end.

All right. Any other -- I guess we don't need to ask for another executive session. One is enough. (Laughter.)

Any open-forum items?

Okay. So that will move us to business, where the first thing will be to approve the April minutes, which Michael will slowly

scroll through but hopefully you had a chance to preview.

Okay. Again, I hope people had an opportunity to read it earlier, and is there a motion for approval?

Is there a second?

Second by Sean Mendoza.

Now we will do by voice. All in favor of approving the minutes as is, say aye?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Opposed?

A show of hands, abstentions?

One abstention, but the minutes are approved.

All right. The next item I just wanted to sort of bring up, I'm not sure how many people were able to go to the, I hope I'm pronouncing her last name correctly, the Trane (phonetic) Consultants focus groups, but the Faculty Senate wanted to thank the senators who were able to make it for Faculty Senate where some of the issues that came up I think could be worth mentioning here and perhaps we could have a mini group of senators willing to sort of look into this, but one thing that came out is there is sort of a section in the FPPS about Faculty Senate, and we just need to sort of make sure that, A, it's updated because it is not updated, and B, that it sort of gets

put into the appropriate place in this new upcoming universal handbook or policy book.

I was curious if there would be any senators that would be interested in helping make sure that that happens, be it, you know, one or two quick meetings to sort of look at what's in the policy, how it needs to get updated?

I'd be happy to sort of participate in that, but again, I'm not the best writer of stuff. So I would appreciate any additional eyes.

Matej and Rosa? I think that will be. And Tanya? Tanya, Rosa, Matej, and I will look at what is in policy right now and make sure that it gets updated and put into the universal policy handbook.

Anything else?

Another thing that maybe wasn't directly related to the policy handbook was that faculty -- some of the faculty's responsibilities can be dictated by the grants that get funded, and it's not necessarily clear that faculty are having a hand in the development of those grants to define what those responsibilities should be.

I'm not sure what this would look like but something to mention now and maybe it will develop into a more focused idea, perhaps a committee or perhaps we can sort of come up with a proposal on how faculty can have a hand in the drafting of these grants when it comes

to developing or writing out what faculty responsibilities would be in regards to those grants to make sure that faculty have a say in what those responsibilities should be to make sure that they are reasonable.

But that's more just putting it on your radar as we move forward.

The next item is the provost's advisory council. That's going to happen on May 14. Brooke and I will be the Faculty Senate representatives and two PCCEA representatives, if I were to guess I can probably guess who might probably, two of them might be in this room who will go, but that is the committee that decides which faculty positions will be -- well, words are failing me today, I apologize.

In determining job hirings for the next coming year. I know we just had the April 13 meeting about dwindling, reducing our numbers, but we need to increase our numbers in the appropriate places, as well, so there will be some amount of hiring.

That's what this committee is doing. We're going to -- I just wanted to say that right now your deans are preparing for this committee meeting to identify if there is a need for either full-time factor at least a provisional faculty, so if you would like to offer your views or you want to make sure that your constituents know that

your deans are preparing for this meeting, make sure that you can contact your deans to let them know, if you want to sort of be part of the conversation of how, what they are drafting in terms of what they are going to bring forward to the committee in terms of the needs of hiring in your particular division, now -- I would recommend you go talk to your deans.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: So I guess just be aware that there is that conversation going on about how do we address the needs of our each individual division while we are undergoing this reduction in faculty.

>> ROSA MORALES: My question is that is the regular division meetings are going to be reinstate in the fall? Because this semester, like I stated before, we only have one division meeting in the beginning of the semester, and we never had any other meetings. Which in the previous semester we have at least three throughout the semester when these type of changes are occurring to make sure that everybody is being informed.

So given that these changes are going to happen and we want everybody to be included, my question is: Are we going to, I guess, recommend for the division meetings to be reinstated throughout the

semester at least a couple of times to ensure that all the faculty, not only department heads, are part of that process?

>> TAL SUTTON: I guess I don't know. I'm assuming division meetings are determined by the deans, and so I think it's a conversation to have with each dean to make sure that your meeting -- each division feels like they're part of the conversation, and if the division likes e-mail conversations, then maybe that's how they have their conversations. If the division wants division meetings, then hopefully that conversation is happening and the dean is setting up those meetings.

>> ROSA MORALES: That's not the way it was before. Before, we used to have at least a couple of meetings throughout the semester. Then the last couple of semesters we have had not only two meetings. We have had three meetings, because there were multiple issues that needed to be discussed, and for the group to be informed about the changes.

But this past semester, only one meeting in the beginning of the semester, and the department heads have been meeting with the division dean but we still haven't gotten the minutes from those meetings.

So I'm concerned with transparency and communication which has

been an issue lately, and I think the major decisions that are going to be happening require to at least recommend for the divisions, division deans, to contemplate having more than just one meeting in the beginning of the semester.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think this is tied to the very large conversation about what the CDAC structure should look like, because CDAC is very closely related to division, so we will talk about that a bit when we get to the CDAC.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: I'd like to ask a question, too. You said something about this date being distributed to deans and leadership. When you said leadership, did you mean department heads?

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

My understanding is that it was to be distributed to all faculty on Monday of this week, the Monday that's passed. Initially I think it went to deans and department heads and leadership roles, and then should have floated down to any, any full-time faculty in the division.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Thank you. Maybe Carol can correct me here, but in the division of arts and humanities, none of those steps have happened.

Carol, are you in here? Have you received any of this data?

Okay. Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: I'll follow up.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Hello. I would just like to also say that in English, in the communications divisions, I don't believe we have received that information, either. I do not recall receiving that.

>> TAL SUTTON: Okay. Hopefully that will be rectified.

Now, has anyone received this information, this data? Math has received it? Science?

>> SPEAKER: It's very benign. You're not missing much.

(Laughter.)

>> TAL SUTTON: But still, if it was supposed to be sent out, maybe we can make sure that all of the deans sent it out. Perfect.

Next is revisiting the Faculty Senate seat allocation proposal.

Okay.

So in March we brought forward this seat allocation where it would change the seat structure from being every single department at every single campus to be by division, so seat allocation would be determined by division, and with the assumption that, and with the caveat that we would encourage a diverse representation from each division. So if a division has five seats they would try and not pick all of them from one campus or from one discipline if you are

comprised of multiple CDACs in that single division.

The concern that came up in March was that there would be a diminished representation from the smaller campuses, and what I tried to get at from understanding that, that could mean one of two things, concern about voting power or voting representation for the smaller campuses, or that it was a concern about having enough avenues of communication for any faculty to be able to get their input or suggestion brought forward to senate, that there wouldn't be enough communication lines, whereas if you have it by campus you just sort of knock on the person's door and you can communicate and that he will bring it to the senate, like that was the old structure that people felt they could make sure that their voice was heard.

From April, from what I was understanding, it wasn't the former. It wasn't trying to sort of have proper voting representation, because that is unrealistic, to sort of do that, unless we just do it by campus, which I think, again, based on earlier surveys, people are more in favor of a division seat structure than a campus seat structure.

More what we would try to -- the concerns we would try to address is to make sure that all faculty have a pathway that they would feel comfortable getting their voice to the senate in case they didn't

feel comfortable with whoever happened to be their division representative, can we make sure that there is a campus representative that they could approach.

So our attempted fix at this, if I remember correctly, it was a full walkout ago, so I don't really remember things, as well --

>> MICHAEL PARKER: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: That's part of it. That was one of the components.

So one way to sort of address this is to expand the communication responsibility as senators, to include that senators are expected to gather input and feedback not just from those who voted for them in their division but to be able to get the feedback and input from anyone at their home campus, as well.

And then the other change that we did is we created a conditional senate seat. The amendment in March that failed was to establish at-large senators at each campus, and so we tweaked it a little bit and said, what if, instead of establishing permanent at-large campus representation, we have it conditional in the sense that after the vice president conducts an election and looks at the election results and notices that there are no senators from Desert Vista, then an at-large senator for Desert Vista will be open for a two-year period,

and then that election will be held to make sure that all Desert Vista faculty not just have a division tie to the senate but also a campus tie, as well.

So that was, I think, our two tweaks to the, to March's proposal, that almost passed, but there was that concern about campus representation and campus, providing a campus line of communication.

Was there a third thing we tried?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: I can't find the revised portion that you're...

>> TAL SUTTON: I might have linked to an older version, I'm sorry. Uh-oh. Sorry.

Technical difficulties. Please have ice cream bar.

I'm working on finding it.

>> SPEAKER: While you're looking for that, I just wanted to mention that we passed over the -- I'm in the wrong section. My apologies.

>> TAL SUTTON: Oh, yes, I did.

How about we go back to the actual order of the agenda. Sorry. The proactive advising committee input from Irene. Sorry about that.

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you so much for your time.

In looking at the many initiatives that we have going on right now with the college and trying to enhance the collaboration between student affairs and instruction in providing student support, the reactive advising committee under guided pathways has been looking at how we can further enhance that collaboration.

So hopefully you all received a copy of a survey that we will be sending out to all faculty, and we would actually like your feedback prior to us sending it out to the faculty group. Jackie Allen will be providing a bit more information.

>> SPEAKER: Hello. Did y'all receive the survey? It was sent out a couple of days ago. We were hoping you could see it ahead of time so we could receive any feedback you had before sending it out to the rest of the group.

Really what we are wanting to do is ask faculty about a specific intervention that proactive advising usually has at different colleges across the nation.

I give a little bit of detail in the beginning of the survey to help faculty understand what proactive advising is, the definition, and what the interventions are that we are looking at from the committee.

A few of the interventions are tied to the program pathway

-specific across the student's life span here.

But there are a couple of early alert interventions that we really want to focus on within the semester, and so with that, we are hoping to gain access to grades within the semester and have grade accessibility so that when an advisor or counselor talks to a student and the student comes in and says, you know, I'm not doing well in my classes, I don't know what to do, I think I'm just going to leave, we have more tools and ways to help the student understand maybe where they're at, try to identify what interventions or what resources we could give the student, have you talked to your faculty, is it really study skills, and can we get you connected with that? Are you in the correct program? Asking the students more in-depth questions so we can help them before they leave or stop going to school for that semester.

So the survey just has a few questions. We were trying to keep it quick and short for all of you. But I don't want to talk too much. I want to make sure, you know, if anyone has any feedback I could answer questions.

>> ROSA MORALES: When did you send the survey, the information, because I'm trying to locate it here.

>> SPEAKER: I sent it -- I think I sent it to Tal on Wednesday

-- or Tuesday evening. Did you receive it?

>> ROSA MORALES: Well, you see, I do not think it was distributed.

>> TAL SUTTON: Found it.

>> SPEAKER: I have one paper copy I could pass around, but also, you know, if you have a chance to review it and want to provide feedback, you could definitely e-mail me or Irene, as well, so that we can hear any changes or edits you may want to make before we send it out. We are hoping to send it out soon so that we can try to get as much feedback as possible.

Also, it helps faculty understand what we're doing, and proactive advising committee, and what our strategic direction is moving forward.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Thank you for coming today. I have just a question about, you mentioned something about contact, to get grades for students. Well, I don't teach my classes online, and I don't do online grading, and so how would that happen? What kind of measures do you have for liaising with the faculty to get those grades?

And just a program-specific question: How would you determine their program choice if you aren't an expert in that field?

>> SPEAKER: Oh, okay. I will answer the first question. Really that's what the survey we were wanting to get information back about is how faculty input grades and where at a point within the semester are you thinking that an intervention would really help from an advising perspective? Where could we be of service to the student to help them understand how they're doing in the semester and what support and what resources before it's really, well, the semester, there is really not much we could do for you and you have to take the class again possibly.

We want to back that up and connect with them earlier. So with Pima Connection. It's Starfish. I believe you have all heard of that. That's a system where you could utilize that. We have early alerts already in that system where a faculty member -- I'm adjunct, and I go in and what I do is click on a student if they're poor attendance or poor grades, and then that actually sends an e-mail to the primary advisor, and then that primary advisor can follow up with the student and try to outreach to the student.

So that would be our goal is to say if we could have that availability of knowing what grades they currently have in their courses, we could see, is it habitual for the student? Is it across all the classes they are taking? And that really helps us define how

we can assist the student in resources and interventions.

The second question I think was about program, and we would definitely make sure we are talking to the student about reaching out to faculty and the experts in the program to make sure that they are understanding all of their options. We have counselors that really connect with students about career counseling and career exploration, so we can help the student -- because it's the student's choice. We want to give them the tools so that they have the knowledge about who they are as a person and also about the program selection with career options with what they want to do after leaving here at Pima.

>> TEDDY SCHNUR: I serve on the committee with this group. One of the things I'd like to emphasize from the faculty perspective is we really need your input on timing of when information can be shared from faculty to the student service side of the house. We have been talking about that in the group, and if we wait too long to communicate how a student is doing, then the efforts on this side aren't going to do a whole lot of good.

The timing would be something we'd really like your input and thoughts about.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Do you envision this being something like when we do 45th day or it could be like the 32nd day we would enter

where they stand right now so that, you know, the program advisors and everybody else would have access to that information and initiate these early alerts? Is that something like that?

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Would that be one point in the semester? Are we talking about maybe every couple weeks eventually or...

>> SPEAKER: That's what we are asking, when are those important intervention points so that the student is successful, because again, we know sometimes if it's too far into the semester, and depending upon, you know, what assignments there have been, what expectations, sometimes finding out even midterm it's already too late for the student to be able to pass the class successfully.

That's part of the input we want from all of you, at what point do you think it would make sense to have that information so that we can provide referral to resources to the learning center to their advisor, you know, back to the faculty so that we can work as a team?

>> SPEAKER: And we really -- some of the questions speak to is it a percentage within the semester? 20% into the term? 50%? Is it three weeks into the term? We also know there is many terms.

So we are asking specifically for your 16-week term. If you teach that for your eight-week term, what does that look like?

Because that could be very different for a shortened period term in how we outreach and how the early alert is built.

>> SPEAKER: This sounds great. Thank you for doing this.

Are you planning to send it out this semester, or could you send it out in the fall when we have -- it's more likely you'll get good feedback perhaps if it's in the fall, and I don't know what you were planning.

>> SPEAKER: We are hoping to send it out within the next week, but we could also follow up and send it out again in the fall, because the more feedback we have, the better decisions, you know, that can -- yeah, we can put forth.

>> ROSA MORALES: I really would like to know more about it, because I think it's a great idea. I just don't want the information that is available to you to be all the way for each and every single grade for all the multiple assignments that we give to the students. I don't think that that would be feasible and the faculty will not buy into it, because not everybody post their grades regularly and everything.

But I think the process that would work better is similar to the forms that we receive from those programs that really then sponsor some students, and then we get it a month after and says, okay, you

have a student that is part of this program, can you please let me know how is he doing or how is she doing regarding attendance, completing assignments, and is the student passing?

I think that type of approach, more general, will be much easier, because I'm doing that with all the students regarding attendance, but it would be great to have something regarding performance, assignment completion, and tests, but not to go all the way to have to post each of the grades, you know, on a regular basis, because in some of my classes we have, like, 20 assignments, right? So thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Two more comments. Lisa?

>> SPEAKER: I think faculty not regularly posting assignments is actually a huge problem. The student won't be able to figure out where they are. So I actually hope that something like this would address that.

I know it's hard, but if students aren't getting quality feedback about where they are, they can't do self-corrective action.

>> TAL SUTTON: One more comment?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So I agree about that, but I think the important thing is students have access to that information and you do that differently in different classes through various systems, and

I would be very reluctant to require everybody to use the same kind of system.

>> SPEAKER: Tanya. Desert Vista.

As a counselor who sees the students who come in, I can promise you when they come in to my office most of them have no idea. The ones who are coming in to see us, the ones where these interventions would actually be touching.

So when you guys are looking at this, for this to be effective on our end, and to be a tool that would benefit the instructors, there is going to have to be a little bit of give and take. Otherwise we can save a lot of time on our side, because I have a person -- I have had many people come in this week, that part of the conversation was you have to come back to me after you have spoken to your instructor. There's nothing I can do, because you don't have enough information for me.

So just to kind of keep that, for the students who need the interventions, the students that we will lose, those ones, you know, being able to for us to push on a button, access something, can help save them, but it can also, in the long run, save you, you know, time.

So just kind of keep that in mind. That's just my little two

cents as a person who does Starfish and answers those things and reaches out to the students.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you. All right. I think I have the correct document linked on the proposal now. If you relick it, it should include the amendment we added, 3.8. Please be there. Yes.

Yeah, so in the event that after an election a campus has no senate representation, the vice president will hold a special election for faculty at-large seat for that campus. This at-large seat will serve for two years.

That was to make sure we had that line of communication. Again, just to remind some of the goals of what we are trying to achieve with this new structure is, one, to reduce the number of potential seats down from roughly 70 down to about 50. It's still a fair bit. If we feel that's still too bulky, we can revisit this seat structure again and then also to align it with the divisions aligns our entire academic governance structure much more cleanly to be with the divisions to the Faculty Senate and have a much cleaner connection, rather than almost an accidental correlation and have a purposeful construction there. So that's our motivation or at least our underlining goal for this new restructure.

With that, is there any motion regarding the proposal?

Hernan makes a motion to approve. Second to move to discussion?

Second.

And now we can move to a discussion. Brooke?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So I just had a question about -- I

apologize. I wasn't here at the last meeting. Why just one senator?

If a campus has no senate representation, how would just one senator help to balance that out?

>> TAL SUTTON: It's not to balance out the voting weight. It's to provide a path of communication to ensure that there is somebody in your geographic location that you can go and provide your voice, provide your input, and not just have to rely on if your division representatives are at other campuses, if you feel more comfortable knocking on someone's door than sending an e-mail. That's the rationale.

Jackie?

>> SPEAKER: My understanding was from HLC that they, one of the critiques of Pima Community College is that we didn't see ourselves as one faculty across all campuses, and I think the idea of having, needing to have representatives from a campus are inconsistent with that idea that we need to see ourselves as disciplines across all campus. We aren't eastside campus faculty. We're not West Campus

faculty. We are faculty within our specialty areas within our disciplines. And even saying someone we need someone from this campus seems inconsistent with the idea that we are one faculty with many disciplines.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Well, I'm proxying today for a faculty member who does not agree with what was just said. The faculty in the PAR program I think would actually -- they want me to vote no against this new seat allocation, and here is their reasoning: They do not like the idea of losing their direct representation that they now have as a department. They feel that three and only three senators for the entire business division is too low a number, and as I hear Tal review with us the kind of -- I don't know what to call this, extra senator, but this kind of campus backup or campus at-large senator, I think that's actually an excellent idea.

I hear what the senator a moment ago said. I understand that you were saying that we, as a college, have struggled for some time to try to feel like we're one college rather than five separate colleges in five different areas of town, but the fact remains, and I'm now speaking as a sociologist, the fact remains that evolutionarily, humans were evolved to interact with one another face-to-face. 80% of human communication is in the nonverbal, such as posture, tone of

voice, facial expression, et cetera, et cetera. And I would hate to see us run roughshod over concerns that I believe are very valid concerns on the part of faculty who feel like if there is nobody in their division at their campus that we are withholding from them, somebody they can go talk to face-to-face.

So I still haven't decided how I'm going to vote in terms of my own constituents, but I know I'm voting against this seat allocation unless we put in the campus-based senators. I have been instructed by the PAR program as their proxy to vote no for it because of this exact issue. We need campus-based, we need somebody to go to at the campus.

>> JOSIE: I believe it was Joe Brewer last time, if I'm remembering, just to build off that point, another reason having campus-based senators being valuable is because of the campus restructuring that's happening and just how the needs of all the different campuses are going to be shifting and so this representative could also handle issues that are specific to that specific issues and concerns related to that restructuring.

>> TAL SUTTON: Any further discussion?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: We already have two cases where it is not campus-based but division or discipline in the form of counselors and

librarians. Perhaps it would be instructive or informative to ask them if they feel they are not well represented by that district model. I don't think -- Joe is the district-wide librarian. Does he feel he can adequately represent all librarians regardless of campus, or Tanya, do you feel you can represent all counselors regardless of campus?

>> SPEAKER: Tanya.

I represent I think it's 23 counselors between all of us. I mean, part of when we've gotten voted in to represent the counselors, I mean, they have selected me with the understanding that I would be providing them information back and forth.

So that's one of the things, by having just one person, but it is, from our perspective, one person that's a counselor. You know, I don't know if saying just one person to represent all of us is the same as saying that one person or three people from business can represent paralegal, logistics, and all these, you know, the transfer program.

I don't know if I could speak to that. I think when you vote somebody in to represent you specifically was how I was voted in, if that makes sense. I don't know.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Another thing, too. This is just an "if

then" provision because we assume, because of the large numbers, that it is very unlikely, given the number, the distribution of senators across the different campuses, that you wouldn't have campus representation. This is just an emergency provision to say in the very unlikely event that a campus has no representatives, then we'll hold a special election to do that.

So I was just listening to some conversation, don't think that it means we are saying we will always have an at-large senator. This is just sort of an under the unique circumstance when there is a campus that goes totally unrepresented, which, as Tal has described it, he believes in big numbers --

>> TAL SUTTON: The law of large numbers.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: -- that that is a very unlikely thing to happen. But we have included this provision in there and it is complemented by the senator responsibilities that say that you are also, as a senator, you are available, even if you're not within the division, any senator that's on a campus can bring forward concerns from any division, department, whatever it happens to be.

So between those two things, if we're trying to ensure that the perspectives of different campuses continue to be represented, those are the two measures that we have included in there.

So one, in the unlikely event that there are no campus representatives, that a campus goes wholly unrepresented, hold a special election, in addition to that you expand the responsibilities of a senator that you be available to people on your campus, as well. Even if you're not within the division.

So if I, in arts and humanities, there was no science person that was elected from the West Campus, which seems especially unlikely, I could listen to that person's concern and then bring it forward.

>> SPEAKER: Could I see the section where it says that senators are responsible for hearing issues from all their -- that says their constituents, right? How does it say anybody that wants to go to them?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: This may be a case again that was linked to an earlier document. That was certainly something we talked about in our meeting. And we can add that language if we've lost the version.

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah. I think this might have been an edit. Yeah, it's here that it's supposed to identify that you are to collect -- in some sense, to collect input from both division and campus members, but I think that might have been lost.

Yeah, we might sort of just add that. We just need the constituents to say your division and your home campus?

>> SPEAKER: I would think the word "constituents" includes everyone you're representing from your campus or your division. It doesn't seem like it's a limiting word.

>> TAL SUTTON: It's not meant to be.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah.

>> TAL SUTTON: Okay. David?

>> DAVID KREIDER: I apologize for coming in late. Perhaps you covered this earlier. But with the pending closing of Community Campus, what happens to the online classes? Do they go back to division? How is that going to be represented?

>> TAL SUTTON: I believe that is going to end up being -- they are going to be slightly double dipping into our formulas for how they are counted, because I believe PimaOnline is an operational unit, so PimaOnline will have a senate seat. Even though it will say Robert F, who is math faculty, and he's part of the math division, we will count that in the calculus of determining how many math seats there, but he's also PimaOnline, so his head count will also count in that count, as well.

There is a little bit of double dipping but it will just result in having one person from PimaOnline because there is only like six faculty at PimaOnline, anyway.

>> DAVID KREIDER: So you brought up the case with Robert. What about the faculty that I represent? How is that?

>> TAL SUTTON: It's the same. Essentially all faculty that are housed under PimaOnline, since PimaOnline is an operational unit, will have seats, because they are an operational unit with full-time instruction, instructors.

>> DAVID KREIDER: Okay. So... I'll have to figure it out.

>> TAL SUTTON: Okay.

Any additional discussion? Brooke? We will move to a vote after.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So just a clarifying note on the distribution of seats. When it says one senator per ten full-time faculty, just to clarify what that means.

So if there are eight faculty, full-time faculty, they get one senator? If there are 18 faculty, they get two?

>> TAL SUTTON: Yes.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: As soon as you go from 10 to 11, so 10 gets 1, 11 gets 2?

>> TAL SUTTON: Yes

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: 20 gets 2? 21 gets 3? Just to clarify.

>> TAL SUTTON: Yes.

All right. So we will move to a vote.

We will do it by a show of hands.

All in favor of passing, raise your hands.

If you are a proxy, keep your hand up. Okay.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: We are tentatively at 32, and I will ask them when they get back from the loo. There are 32 total right now.

Now, all opposed?

If you are -- so that's two votes no. Michael, how do you vote?

Yay or nay?

That's 33 yeses. Two nos? One no? And 34 yeses. If math works.

I believe that is two-thirds.

The motion carries. We have a new seat allocation system.

Now we are ready to move on to Daniel Sosa taking the show, as he is in charge of all of the documents, I guess. I will turn it over to him.

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm Daniel Sosa, acting AVC for finance. I thank you for your time. I will try to be brief and respect your time so you can finish the rest of your agenda.

Hopefully the APs did make their way to you so you had an

opportunity to look them over.

What I would like to take the time to do is share with you the background context related to the APs and how they are interlinked.

Currently the college has 47 active grants. Predominance of those grants are federal grants, using federal funds.

The college also has funds that come to it under federal contracts, and also indirectly through federal contracts. Those also are federal funds.

Come July 1, 2018, expending federal funds to acquire goods, services, or construction, they must adhere to the federal procurement requirements under the uniform guidance. That deadline has been moved once or twice. It's not moving again. This is the steadfast deadline where the use of federal dollars must comply with these guidelines. Purchasing AP, which is new, is put forward to acknowledge that, as well as establish the means by which it would be the method under which purchasing would be conducted under the highest level of purchasing guidance, which is the federal level.

There was conversation as to the need to move to the highest level as far as policy and guideline. Could we not have a policy that only applies to federal dollars, examine then a policy that applies to nonfederal dollars? That would definitely introduce a

great deal of confusion, complexity, especially when sometimes the pass-through dollars, those who are expending it at program levels may not necessarily be aware that it's a pass-through dollar and then we would be out of compliance. Also, sometimes they are split between using a combination of federal dollars and nonfederal dollars.

So for the sake of trying to become efficient and minimize confusion, it was adopting, well, let's abide by the highest level of purchasing. Federal dollars must do that.

It would also clearly demonstrate to our auditors and the HLC the level at which we operate our purchasing administration under.

What comes with that is you probably saw references to the simplified acquisition threshold. That threshold has a range presently set between \$3500 and \$150,000. Within that range, the guidelines do provide a more simplified way to do purchasing. The intent behind that is to expedite and provide more timely acquisition of goods and services. It actually will add additional flexibility to for the purchasing department to acquire goods, services, and proceed in the construction arena.

It is that basis of the simplified acquisition threshold under which the signature authority makes reference, meaning the key

positions that are identified in that AP for the agreements that are identified within their particular area, would have signature authority for contracts and agreements up to that simplified acquisition threshold.

What that serves, or the benefit from that would help alleviate some of the bottlenecks when everything has to go to specific individuals. That AP also provides a means that those key individuals can also further delegate some of those signature authorities for particular sets of agreements under their purview, again, further streamlining or further facilitating people in the right places to be able to sign (indiscernible) agreements rather again funneling everything to a particular individual.

Tied to that is the revision to the contracts AP, which serves, revisions serve there again to align itself to the uniform guidance of procurement, align itself to the signature authority, so all those are connected in that fashion, and again, clearly state or lay out from an administrative procedure standpoint clarity around those different areas.

That will be beneficial to again in demonstrating that to our auditors and to the intern. Again, as general context, I'm open to any questions you might have.

>> ROSA MORALES: My question is who will have access to the list of individuals that will have that ability to sign?

According to the document that we are approving here, it says that there is a list will be provided of the individuals that will be designated, right, and then you list some positions here, right, whoever holds those positions will have that.

But my question is you are also stating those individuals are able to grant signature approval to other individuals. My question is where the list of those individuals will be allocated for individuals within the college that can know who will have those, I guess, responsibilities or ability to do that?

>> SPEAKER: Yes. Starting with each of those key individuals will be the conversation identification as to who would be subdelegated the signature authority and for what, and are there specified time frames for that delegation.

When that information is collected, it will be part of a master list that would be public not only for all of us to know who are the delegates or subdelegates, but also from the outside entities looking in, so when they receive a signed agreement, they know that was the appropriate person who has authority to sign that agreement. So, yes, there will be a list that will be public, because that will be

the point of reference for who has that delegation.

It will help better firm up -- right now some delegation is done by e-mails, and there is concerns about delegation being done by e-mails, where this really will be the more formalized means to identify who has subdelegation for what purpose, for what period of time.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Thanks for coming today.

Could you give us a kind of a fictitious example of who would be included in that hierarchy of signatories? Just make up a pretend example so we would get an idea of the flow?

>> SPEAKER: Sure. Let's say under the chief academic officer, it may be an opportunity for certain types of educational service agreements to help expedite the execution of those agreements, that that individual would identify, let's say, a VP to say, I subdelegate signing these types of educational service agreements. You will have signature authority for those type of agreements up to \$150,000. Example might be in the workforce development area, those type of things.

Does that answer the question?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: How far down could this list go? I'm just thinking of, you know, departmental needs and various

departments for various and sundry small things over \$3500? And less than \$150,000. Could this go down to the departments themselves?

>> SPEAKER: That would be -- yeah, I would say that would probably be up to the primary individual, because even though they may exercise subdelegation, they are still responsible for what gets signed and who is signing them. It doesn't relieve that responsibility through subdelegation. I would think they would give careful thought as to who gets a subdelegation and for what purpose.

Sometimes it's out of necessity for absences or what have you. I think that will evolve as the AP gets put into motion.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Okay. Well, thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. If there is no other feedback, I think we can move on to the next item, and thank you, Daniel, for presenting.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

>> TAL SUTTON: I thought to include a report, more of an officers report, because they have done a lot of work, as well. I will just be the one I think dominating the mic. I called it the president's report. Just to give you an update on what the officers have been doing, I will start off with what's on -- what Michael is displaying right now, in our March meeting with Lee and the Four Ps,

great band name, we talked about guided pathways implementation and some of the bumps in the road in those processes.

And then we were asked by them to go in and offer a proposed implementation cycle, and so it in some sense draws a bit of, a lot of parallels with the work that Ana has been bringing up with input framework, which was presented at April's meeting and I think that people saw in other avenues, as well.

This is draft of a draft. I already have some feedback from some officers to fix this a little bit. I don't know if you can zoom in any more. But the rough idea would be to ensure that Faculty Senate have an opportunity to review this process and to endorse on to the provost's office or to sort of not endorse with some rationale I think some -- this isn't the guided pathways example, but I think something that sort of followed this process was the 15 versus 16-week discussion we had this fall where there was an outcome of, you know, do we become a 15-week or 16-week institution, proposed at the start of the semester. A group of us was mostly the officers and Karrie Mitchell sort of gathered the data about what it would mean to be a 15-week or 16-week institution and prepare that information, survey the faculty on what they thought about 15-week versus 16-week, and then we brought that information back to the senate in April to

provide a final endorsement of what ended up being the 16-week structure.

I think that's sort of one example of what this would look like.

That wasn't a guided pathways example, but I think there are still other guided pathways components that are in process or some are even just beginning, so I think getting this in place so that we have that faculty oversight in terms of how what are the true outcomes we are going for with this particular initiative or this particular component of guided pathways, make sure that we sort of, that that outcome is aligned with the strategic plan so it can be attached to KPIs and actually measure its effectiveness, and then make sure the rationale, research-based evidence is provided so that faculty understand this is the outcome we are going for is actually beneficial to our students, and then it would go through that development process and then eventually make its way to Faculty Senate to review with understanding how it aligns with the strategic plan or operational effectiveness, what that research-based evidence is, and we could then move on to endorse or ask that they tweak it or revisit it in some reasonable way with a rationale.

Anyway, that's something we are working on. That's a draft .001.

It has plenty of work, but that's what we are going to sort of bring

to the Lee and the Four Ps at our next meeting.

We are also going to include another component, this is just how you initiate, and how you begin an initiative. We also want to sort of provide a framework for what happens when something is already in progress and problems start arising, what mechanisms can we put into place that when problems start arising in some rollout or some implementation process, how can we sort of adjust it and sort of address those problems and not kind of bulldoze them and ignore them the way that sometimes it can happen.

So that's one thing we are working on. Another thing that we have been working on, which I will sort of tie it into the next, upcoming topic, is we are doing a lot of work regarding the CDAC structure and what that is supposed to look like. As you know, we sent out a survey that Brooke developed. We looked a little bit at the results. We have some preliminary results. We will provide a more in-depth analysis of that and share results with you when we probably meet next will be when that probably has to happen. One theme that sort of jumped out at me, and Brooke, you can comment on other things you may have seen, two themes seemed to jump out at me from the survey.

One is there seems to be a lot of uncertainty, a lot of faculty

don't know what the structure is right now. There is a lot of "I don't know" in terms of how decisions are made and who is supposed to initiate what and who is supposed to conduct what type of business.

The other thing is that to some degree, and it was small, some was certainly noticeable, was a diminishing of participation from the old structure to the new structure. In part, that's probably due to the unknown and the uncertainty that was created and where we are at right now. That's probably where some of that is coming from.

That's the early information I'm getting from that survey. I'm hoping that that survey can move forward, can be used in revamping and updating the CDAC structure that needs to happen and is long overdue.

I think there was some mention by the Executive Leadership Team that there is interest in revising and updating whatever the CDAC structure is supposed to look like. So one thing that I would want to do for the fall, at least recommend, is put forward a Faculty Senate committee on the CDAC structure. It could be a joint committee with Faculty Senate and the provost's office to make sure that we have both parties in the room talking about what needs to happen, so we can ask the provost to identify people within her

office that would be useful, that would be -- it would be beneficial to have them in those conversations as we review the CDAC guidelines and update them and have them map on where we are today with our new leadership structure and our new division structure and all of that.

So that's one recommendation that I would like to do is put forward and create a Faculty Senate -- so membership doesn't need to be restricted to just senators, but it would sort of be sponsored by the -- and oversight would be held with the Faculty Senate so they could report to us on a regular meeting as they work throughout the fall to revamp both the CDAC structures and then this other thing to, the curriculum decision-making process, which is another thing that's floating around that I just got -- I just caught up on my e-mail. I apologize. I know that document was sent out earlier this week, but I just saw it this morning.

So going hand in hand with both the CDAC structure itself is the process of making decisions on curriculum matters and how we need to make sure and we enshrine the oversight of that is done by faculty, is done by the CDACs, or whatever name you want to apply to that.

Those are the two big things we are working on is CDAC structure/decision-making, and guided pathways implementation.

That's my update.

Rosa?

>> ROSA MORALES: Is there any way that you could include in that process between Faculty Senate and PCCEA the issue of percentages of membership in those committees? Because it seems to me that there has been attempts to include faculty in many of the committees, but the numbers that are participating are so limited that with the meetings coming out in the middle of the week, in the middle of the day, and faculty being so busy, a lot of those committees are making decisions with limited faculty representation or no faculty representation at all.

So I really think it's important for PCCEA and the Faculty Senate to consider carefully what should be the percentage of individuals in each of the committees, especially the ones of the curriculum that will be fair to have.

I don't want those committees that are full of administrators and staff and other people making decisions, and then when I complain because I wasn't informed of any, they say, yeah, one person was there, and there were 20 others there.

So please consider the issue of percentage.

>> TAL SUTTON: That will probably come up naturally in the -- so we do have a meeting with Lee and the Four Ps next week, and one of

the agenda items is to talk about how there has been a pause on the standing committee membership. There was no call for new volunteers and so on, and so that's going to be part of that conversation is how are faculty going to get on to these, into these standing committees if there is no call for new members? So that's going to sort of come up naturally in our meeting with them next week.

Lisa? And if the officers want to add anything that I forgot.

>> SPEAKER: I was wondering, particularly for the CDAC guidelines, I have had opportunity recently to try to look for them for some help in solving some problems, and they are very out of date and vague, and I know the effort is to tighten them up and make them more specific and stronger, but I was wondering if there was more that you could say on that. And also, exactly in this process about what is the timeline and -- forgive me if I missed that, and what should we kind of be looking for seeing as far as places we can put input, that kind of thing?

>> TAL SUTTON: I think there have been a few false starts in trying to update the CDAC guidelines. I think Faculty Senate needs to take the initiative and say we are going to formulate a committee that looks at revamping the guidelines.

Maybe what I should do right now is are there people interested

in participating in it? And can you contact your constituents to see if they are also interested in it? I think if we could have a committee of four or five people to work on the CDAC guidelines, we can make this move forward.

>> JOSIE: I'd also say that, Lisa, the questions you have are questions everyone has. There may not be answers to those questions. Part of what we as officers are doing and what we hope to do on Tuesday when we meet with Lee and the Four Ps is what is exactly happening. Once we have that framework and have a better understanding of what the future plans are regarding CDACs, then we can proceed forward with a more informed stance. That's what we are hoping, anyway. We don't have the answers to those questions at this point. Based on the survey results, I don't think anyone does.

>> TAL SUTTON: So I think the best we can offer right now is we can take the initiative and make things happen, and so hopefully, you know, next week we will have some additional direction that we can bring to the fall for the group that we can put together now, and then we can work on it. Lisa is willing to work on it. Other people? Brooke? Pollyanna. Margarita. There is a lot of people interested in this. We will start from there, and I think we can probably have -- yes, we will develop a charge, and then we can maybe

even start presenting to the Faculty Senate early in the fall and give them regular updates.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Can we repeat who was interested? And I will make sure to follow up and get us started for fall.

>> TAL SUTTON: Margie, Polyanna, Sean, Matej, Lisa. Toss me in there.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Brooke, have you already included this in your board report? We are forming this committee right now, and I think -- the college was placed on probation in 2013 for violating one of the assumed practices, which is faculty exercise substantial oversight over curriculum. So the complacency I have seen from administration in the face of this saying, eh, we're doing just fine is kind of hard -- I'm incredulous at it that we haven't learned the lessons from our past, and again, the only way I can describe it is complacency.

And we need to have a sense of urgency. If the administration won't take the lead on this, in order to make sure we don't go on probation again, I think it needs to be up to the faculty to do it, because again, the only way I can describe their attitude towards this has been complacency.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. And this also segues into the next

agenda item, which is the actual decision-making process of curriculum at the college, and so this brings up what's happening at the CCC on Monday. I might defer to members of the CCC that have received that document. To give you an update on what's happening with that, and again, members of the CCC can correct me if I'm misspeaking a little bit, but the curriculum office sent the document on how to make -- how curriculum decisions will be made at the college moving forward, and a few concerns was nowhere was the word CDAC used. Michael is showing it.

A few people have already looked at it, Kent Burbank added the two yellow lines that have the word CDAC. Those are the only place you see CDAC mentioned.

A brief summary or brief summary of what I saw from that document is it looks like it's trying to make a bulleted list of what was in the CDAC guidelines and how the CDAC guidelines laid out the process for making curriculum decisions at the college, but then it just happened to sort of remove the CDAC component of that process that's in the CDAC guidelines document, and now it just provided this streamlined process where there is a faculty initiator, and then the division curriculum representative, who is the campus curriculum person, and essentially those two people do most of the communication

with the dean and the curriculum office, if I understand that process mostly.

That's most of how these things, most of what this process looks like, this proposed process.

I don't know if the CCC members here want to comment -- are you guys expected to vote on accepting or not accepting this on Monday?

>> SPEAKER: Rita Lennon. I just saw an e-mail from Jenny Conway. Mays had raised the question that because of so many concerns and such a short period of time for us to look at this, make comments, she recommended that the CCC halt on the vote for Monday. And Jenny Conway said even if we don't vote on it, the discussion, we should have the discussion. So that's pretty much the gist of her response is that I don't think they are going to vote on it. I think they are going to just plan on discussing it.

>> TAL SUTTON: In that regard, I think in terms of discussing it, if we want to provide a discussion that the CCC members here can bring forward, we can do that briefly. But it sounds like that has been tabled and we can address that with the work of restructuring the CDAC.

But if there is any comments that we want the CCC members to bring to that meeting, we can maybe offer one or two comments real

quick? Okay. All right.

Then I think we can move on to the Governing Board report with Brooke.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Good afternoon, everyone. I have been afflicted with the horrible disease that's been going around, and this is week 2. I apologize for hacking. I shouldn't be contagious. But you might want to keep your distance just to be safe. It's not fun. It's not pretty.

So I also apologize that the board report was not linked to the agenda when Tal sent it out. But I did make sure to send it right at the beginning of the meeting, so everyone should have access to the board report now.

I'm working on adding some language at this very moment about what we just talked about for the CDAC committee to be formed and start working in the fall.

What I wanted to just point out, of course, is that Mays and I did present our budget options to the Four Ps, but we have yet to hear yet any sort of decision that was made about the budget. So we are looking forward to hearing that decision sometime soon.

Of course, there is the CDAC survey structure in there and the input framework that Tal updated you on, as well as some information

the committee, communications committee for pathways, so I am on that committee, as well.

We did meet this week, and so now there is a charge that the subcommittees are going to send reports requesting the information I shared with you in the report, so that we can get that comprehensive communication plan. The goal is to have that by the 18th of this month, so some progress in that area was made this month.

Those are all the major updates other than all the amazing things that faculty are doing. Any comments or discussion for the board report this month?

Okay. Great. Well, I can send an update by about 4:00 today, so I will definitely add the CDAC comment, and if anybody else has any other feedback, just please make sure to get it to me in that timely few-minute-left fashion if there is anything else to make sure to communicate to the board this month.

Thanks.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks, Brooke. So now we will move into reports where we have invited the office of AQI to provide some updates on assessment.

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon. Thanks for the offer to be here.

It's nice to meet with all of you. Third member of our team, could

you please come on up.

I bring her up, because I want you to see we are a very, very small office. There are three of us. So I'm Wendy Weeks.

>> SPEAKER: I'm Jen D.

>> SPEAKER: And I'm Vanessa Romero.

>> SPEAKER: With that, there is three of us, and here within a very short few weeks there will be two of us. So we are a very small office, and we work very slowly.

We were asked to present to you some of the new things that are coming down the pike for assessment. We have some specific questions here. The first one is the timeline and process for transitioning to eLumen. eLumen is our new assessment management system.

Up until we have received this system, you have been using the faculty interface to enter your assessment data.

eLumen is in the implementation stages right now, and with that we are in a pilot with six programs and how many faculty, Jen? 26 faculty? 26 faculty right now that are troubleshooting it, working on the bugs. There is a lot of people involved. It's being managed by the enterprise system in IT. It's in a pilot phase right now.

The next part of the question is the implementation timeline. We don't have a final implementation timeline. We are doing what we can

when we can. Like I said, we are very small, and we are going to be even smaller for the entire summer. Maybe longer.

So we do have some additional faculty and programs that have offered and would like to go into the assessment system this summer and in fall.

We have had many volunteers at this point, and we really can't accommodate all of them. So as we are working on implementing the system, we also, the faculty interface, will still remain in operation to the best of our knowledge.

The next question is what is the method for getting on the volunteer list to transition to eLumen for future semesters? So if you'll contact our office and let us know that you're interested, we will be coming out to meet with you to see what it is you have ready to go in. Do you have your course leaning outcomes? Program learning outcomes? Are they mapped? If not, how can we help you get that done? In addition to that, we need to know how your department functions. What are the needs you have around assessment that the faculty interface has been so confining that you haven't been able to do? So this is a very malleable system where we can accommodate many ways to assess, many individual department or program needs.

And lastly, we had another question on here, but I think, Tal, I

got back to you that's not us.

Okay. So with that, we have -- we can respond to any questions you may have on a generalized level. On a program or individual department level, we'd probably need to sit down with you and talk individually, but we are open and depends on what your question is who will answer.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Do you expect there to be, again, any changes in the types of data that faculty are being asked to submit as part of this new interface, or would it be pretty much what we have been doing at the end of the semester we submit the kind of CLO and PLO data that you have been asking for? Or would this be something that is different from division to division, based on what they are doing? Do you have any more information?

>> SPEAKER: So it will really kind of depend on division to division. We try to talk to divisions about what your needs are. The current interface system, as you all know, is very restrictive. It really only has about four different variables to it, and it's all completely summative. Some divisions, particularly larger divisions, want more information.

So we will -- if they want that, and we want to build that into their architecture, then we will do that. It's really kind of a back

and forth between our office and particularly you guys and the disciplines what you guys need and what information and data you want to receive back.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Other questions about eLumen? All right. Also, from the AQI, Bruce was going to mention an idea that he had regarding program review, so I will invite Bruce out of the corner. You're no longer punished. Your idea about peer review, peer program review.

>> DR. BRUCE MOSES: Good afternoon. It was a week or two ago we met with senate leadership, one of the things in our previous standard SPG Reg, there was mentioned within the program review and service review section about administrative team that used to review program review documentation from the program faculty. They would review it and give their feedback. One of the things that I pitched to these folks is that at a previous institution I worked at, we used a peer review process by which the program would do a self-assessment of their program, they would provide that documentation to peer faculty, so faculty -- not in that necessarily in that program but program faculty outside that program, and in conjunction with the dean that oversees that program, and they would give them a peer

review and would provide feedback to that program on their self-assessment documentation that they presented.

And I pitched that idea as a way for Faculty Senate to be a part of that process with the dean, identify peer teams that would keep people, in our case, it was like two to three people from outside of that program who would formulate the team, review the documentation, give feedback to that program, versus us having an administrative team do that for program review.

>> SPEAKER: Rita Lennon. If I understand correctly, the peer review would be a completely different subject matter or still be within their division just not necessarily teach the same types of courses or program?

>> DR. BRUCE MOSES: It would be a different subject matter, because you want a different set of eyes looking at the type of information that, that the faculty from that program who put the self-assessment together, but also the dean that oversees that program would be part of that group who would kind of facilitate that process, so you do have a subject matter expert or someone within that who oversees that program to provide feedback and input.

But it's another way for you to get feedback from folks who I think, again, your peers versus administrators who may not even have

any, you know, familiarity with your program, giving you feedback, and then it's not really as constructive, it's not very, would be more peer-ed. I think your peers have a better idea about how programs would function, the faculty challenges, and those types of things.

Again, this is an idea we are pitching. There is no time frame for this. I talked to a couple of deans, hoping to go to the deans meeting and have a larger conversation there with the deans. I foresee this may be something that would start possibly in fall of '19.

I don't see the administration review process has been an effective process. Actually, it hasn't even taken place in the three-and-a-half years that I have been here. So, you know, right now there is no feedback really that's been given in regards to programs on their program review that's coming from the administrative side.

So again, I will welcome this new process as being a way, a better and more effective and efficient way to do this.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: It sounds like a good concept. So I'm trying to envision, could you give us maybe an example of what the type of feedback is that we would be seeking from other faculty? How would

they be able to evaluate what is appropriate for a certain kinds of program in terms of goals or performance?

>> DR. BRUCE MOSES: So, for instance, let me just tell you kind of what I've seen. So a lot of times in a program review, some of the documentation and information that we have feedback, programs talk about they are going to improve on their persistence, retention, and completion for their students. Okay.

So when you look at that and you start to couple that, one of the other things we want to build into this, built into program review, one of the requests, one of the things that was noted in HLC feedback is they don't really see how program review and assessment is tied to resource allocations.

So one of the things you would look at, if you're requesting a \$50,000 piece of equipment, and you're saying we're going to improve persistence and retention based on buying a piece of equipment, I think your peers might be better served to say, hmmm, maybe that's not necessarily going to improve persistence, retention, and completion. Maybe these ideas and these strategies would be best served, because we have done it in our area. Even though they don't have to be content experts in your area to know what strategies may be helpful to support your program, because they're doing some of the

same things in their program.

So that's one example. I can give you -- this happens, and I don't know if Jim is in the room or not, I seen him somewhere, this happens with the specialized programs that have specialized accreditation. They do this all the time. They will go recruit people from universities, nursing programs, radiology programs will go outside of their institution and recruit people to serve on their program review teams to give them feedback.

So I'm just, again, I'm pitching this idea. You know, it's up to you folks to have a conversation about that, work through it, and welcome the deans to be a part of that conversation.

I just don't think effective and efficient practice of having four, five administrators get together and talk about programs is a way to get really good qualitative and quantitative feedback to programs. That's just -- that's my, just my opinion.

>> SPEAKER: Pollyanna. One thing to think about, this is my third program review cycle that I'm at, and at the end of the program review cycle, it was really nice to be able to go in front of an administrative team and say, look, this is what we have done over the last five years and say, look at how good we are in these areas but we need help so we can improve these areas and we need your support.

I know they aren't the final decision makers on that, but it was nice to be able to talk to an administrative team at that point. I agree with you with the peer review is always good. But I think it would be nice at some level to be able to give our report to somebody that we know they have actually seen it and heard it, and maybe in person is the best way for us to get that acknowledgement.

>> DR. BRUCE MOSES: Pollyanna, that wouldn't go away. That would be part of one of the final steps, especially if you're, as a program that you're requesting resources, that you go now and you even, are even more armed with support because you have support from your peers that they say we value what you put in yourself assessment and we also agree with you that, yeah, you do need those additional resources to either continue to grow your program to a (indiscernible) program. So that step would not go away.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: The e-mail from Jenny and the curriculum office asked, towards the end, it's asking that we're going to move from five-year program review to four-year. Another question, another piece of -- another item of work was that we are going to audit every one of our courses and so Jenny put in her question, would the CCC committee like to attach the course audits to the program review every four years?

And I think that's a better idea. We must audit every course. I think it would save us a step rather than have those two separated.

What do you think?

>> DR. BRUCE MOSES: I haven't seen that e-mail. Again, I think that course auditing, coupled -- curriculum, those curriculum processes like that should be coupled with program review.

One of the things we have done is embedded assessment into program review, and one of the reasons we are moving from a five-year to a four-year, is because it better aligns with our accreditation process that we are in now, which is the standard pathway, which will allow programs to have gone through two program review cycles in our ten-year cycle of accreditation.

I think five years -- and this is my opinion, and I will argue this with anybody -- I think five years is much too long for community colleges to wait to take a look at their programs.

Four-year institutions are going down to three-year cycles because they are trying to be more nimble. We are supposed to be the nimble institutions of higher ed, the community colleges.

I think if we wait four years, you know, to -- or five years to look at our programs, I think that's way too long to wait for us to be reactive to our community needs and our student needs

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: One last question. So the program review would not be optional? In other words, are we going to have this thing staggered or is everyone going to do four-year program reviews in one year?

>> DR. BRUCE MOSES: No, no. It's staggered now, the process where we have 17 programs right now that are going through program review. Next year there will be another group of programs that go...

Now, sometimes a dean or a VP, I or a president may say, hey, we want this program to be included in program review, and might go into what we call an off-cycle, but that may be because they are getting feedback from their advisory boards or there may be changes coming from specialized creditor that says you need to do X, Y, Z. One of the programs is switching over from being like clock hour that has to go to credit hour. That was driven by, you know, specialized accreditation. So they needed to go through and do a cycle that way.

Yes, so there is different factors and variables that play into this. No, we're not going to have a hundred programs go through program review all at once.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think one more.

>> SPEAKER: You answered my question.

>> TAL SUTTON: This is something for us to chew on. We can

bring this discussion back in the fall if this is something we want to consider further, but thank you for bringing this up.

>> DR. BRUCE MOSES: Thank you, guys.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Next, if I can go in order, I evidently have a hard time with that, is the provost's report, right?

Kate Schmidt?

>> KATE SCHMIDT: Did this get distributed digitally? It's linked on the agenda? I will just say a couple of things. The conversation about CDAC and the guidelines, I was sitting in on the administration PCCEA meeting yesterday and Dolores mentioned that many of the same things you were talking about, forming a committee in the fall, looking at revising the CDAC guidelines, and talking about how the CDACs dovetail with this leadership structure that we have put into place this year. I think she will probably discuss that more with you on Monday, but it sounds like there is recognition that there is that need to have that conversation and do that work.

I'm only going to point out a couple of things on this. The first is I think probably people need to know is we cannot issue your contracts until after the board does its final budget adoption, which won't happen until June. So we have put a schedule in the provost's report about when to expect your contracts. If you're a 12-month

employee, we really have to have those back and signed before you start on July 1.

They would be in your inbox, all digital, it should be pretty fast by the 22nd of June. If you are nine-month, not expected back until August, it will be in your inbox by the 29th of June, and we will need it back by July 15.

My understanding is it's just a click for a signature, unlike the old paper copies that I think were sent in snailmail.

And then did I say I said two things? The very final page of this document has the final project from the faculty leadership academy this year, which was taking a selfie with the mentor. And I wouldn't mind if we looked at those photos.

Just two? There should be some more. This was the first year that the faculty learning academy and mentor program merged as a single program, since it was serving the same population of first-year faculty. And in lieu of a final meeting that got canceled because of all the conflicting meetings, Simone G. put out a final assignment to have the mentor/mentee take a selfie.

Any questions for me? Anything I can take back to Dolores?

Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks. Ana Jimenez will next report on the

input framework.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: (Off microphone.)

>> KATE SCHMIDT: (Off microphone.)

Evaluation was actually due in April, but if it hasn't been done, the supervisor needs to finish it by the end of the year. Those are the links to those forms.

>> ANA JIMENEZ: Hi, everyone. I don't have new copies. I was told you were given copies of the input framework last time, correct?

>> TAL SUTTON: I didn't link it here. I will try to.

>> ANA JIMENEZ: That's totally okay. Is that true, though, you all did get hard copies or copies last time? Okay. Fantastic.

At this point I wanted to just maybe give you a little bit of background and answer any questions you might have.

So after several months of voicing concerns regarding a lack of genuine stakeholder input, we were told in February that administration would come up with an input framework, and that was February of 2017.

So in February of 2018 I decided to get together with the dean of developmental education who has rolled out several initiatives in a way that I felt was thoughtful, and asked him what he does so that we could capture that.

So we met and we captured some of what he does in deciding how to move forward with an initiative and put that in an input framework.

So I presented that to district administration when PCCEA met with them last month, and asked for it to be presented here. I have presented it to the All College Council and then this morning to Staff Council, mostly because I think we've also been exposed to situations where work gets done and then it evaporates somehow.

So my hope was that the more people who are aware of this the more likely it will move to something solid.

So I have spoken with Tal briefly about next steps. I think what probably makes sense would be for Faculty Senate to consider the possibility of voting possibly to adopt this. I think my original hope and intent a couple of years ago was to have something like this instituted district-wide. I feel like that would definitely require some initiative on the part of district administration, which I don't really know has happened, so I felt like we should just move forward with what we could do, and so I guess my hope was that Faculty Senate would consider possibly voting on this as something to adopt again possibly just in terms of maybe something that the provost's office would adopt as a standard operating procedure for initiatives, since those are the kinds of initiatives that impact us directly.

But because I presented this out to staff council, I mean, I think I'm hoping that the college will recognize that a process like this would be useful. When I presented this to the All College Council, one of the members said, "Owe isn't this like program management?" I said, "I don't know. I can solve a quadratic. But I don't actually initiate programs or initiatives. I just know that we have felt like our voice hasn't really been included in a lot of decisions and that things have been pushed through kind of quickly and we'd like for things to maybe be more thoughtfully rolled out."

You can call this an input framework, you could call it a program management framework, apparently, and it is in rough form. This is something that really was created with a couple of us involved, and I would love for it to be a living document that gets improved upon and added to as the college evolves, but my biggest component of this is to ensure that there is significant input from stakeholders so that initiatives are well vetted and that the process goes smoothly and that our students don't suffer from processes that are not thought out well or possibly, you know, we have student services people who don't really know how to advise students because things are changing too rapidly, and I just would like to avoid that as much as possible.

Any questions or comments?

>> SPEAKER: Sean Mendoza. Yes, I was there at the All College Council, and I think that the input framework that you did present, really, it is a great framework that most institutions, interestingly our size, we don't have -- like, most institutions our size, we have a project management arm of the institution that really follows and manages really huge projects, projects that oftentimes make their way to staff council, Faculty Senate, and this input framework has the guts of what is really project management processes.

I know that All College Council is something we are looking at incorporating many of the things that are found in there, so that way when there are future initiatives that come up, it will be adopted. There will be a framework, will be steps put in place.

Actually in some cases, it's, I think, it's hopefully -- it's putting us on a path to consistent processes at the institution that we sometimes lack. So thank you for that.

>> ANA JIMENEZ: Thank you.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAIN: I want to speak bluntly for the input framework. I find it incredibly valuable. I was practically in terms when I saw the input framework for the first time. One of "the" most important questions on that input framework is a question about any given proposed initiative that our administrators are, you

know, dreaming of implementing, and that question is what problem will this initiative solve?

This is a question that has been asked many times over the years and it's an important question to ensure that we, as a college, do not just willy-nilly lurch from crisis to crisis and continually engage in senseless dysfunctional change such as, oh, I don't know, changing the name of every single unit in the college? Board of Governors becomes Governing Board. Office of assessment becomes AQI. DSR becomes ADR, et cetera, et cetera, thus preventing any of us from being able to speak to each other, understand each other. That's just one of hundreds of examples.

And I am looking forward to a new era at our college as helped along by this input framework, and I want to thank you for taking the initiative to do something that should have been done years ago. We need this input framework, and I, for one, in my role as a faculty senator, want to encourage senate to say a huge yes to adopting this input framework. I think it's incredibly valuable. Thank you for your work with it.

>> ANA JIMENEZ: Thanks, MaryKris.

>> TAL SUTTON: One thing that it made me think of when I had gone to the HLC conference in April, and I tried to go to as many of

the governance talks as possible, and one of the ones I found more useful was a round table discussion from many, many different institutions talking about their shared governance models, and the ones that really sort of resonated, that were clear that they had functional and positive relationships with their governance structure is you could see a lot of that reflected in this input framework or any sort of structure where the idea of governance isn't we bring you a product and you endorse or don't endorse, you vote for, don't vote for, like, if you are not including the governance groups, governance bodies long before that, you will not have a functional governance process.

Governance means collaboration. It means involving the stakeholders every step in the way, and what that involvement can look like can vary depending on the initiative, can be sort of seats at the table, co-chairs and things like that, could be more advisory, but just having that constant communication, that constant tug-and-pull of here's what we think about this or here's our take, our perspective on that.

Those are the institutions that it was clear when they were talking about the governance at their institutions, like, wow, that sounds incredibly nice to work for.

Some emergency thing is happening right now, because my phone just started vibrating, too.

All right. Maybe one final -- Rosa and...

>> ROSA MORALES: I'm very happy that this input framework is being brought in again, because one of the things that I noticed with the Faculty Senate, we have become entities, an entity that is always in a response mode. Never on the initial, you know, as an initiator.

So in the past, I have been told that we can agree on resolutions and push them, you know, with the administration. I think we need to go back to that. Because I know everybody is very busy and we are trying to navigate these multiple initiatives that are coming down and figure it out, you know, how to alleviate some of the things that we think are going to be going wrong if we embrace them.

But somehow the new set of administrators are coming in with an enormous amount of energy and ideas, which I'm very happy that we have the ability to hear them and everything, but they are coming to a system that doesn't have an embedded model for decision-making.

So the one that is being used currently, and I stated at the Board of Governors, actually, that I attended is top down, military style. Small group, make a decision. This seems to be good. Okay. Push it down, push it down.

And a lot of times in the part of the Faculty Senate and the part of, you know, several committees, they don't know what to do with that besides, like you said, you have two options: Approve it or not approve it. There is no other option. We need to move our, you know, move away from that, because it's not -- it's a toxic muddle that doesn't really allow an academic institution to be creative and innovated and provide input from the different stakeholders. No question about it.

So I think once again, what it requires is going to require a lot more time from the leadership to think on those terms. A couple of years ago when I pressure and I push for the officers to have set-aside time, was with the idea that they would be able to really have more control over that direction of what we were going.

But what I'm finding is that extra set-aside time has been used only to attend meetings that are actually initiated by the administration to hear things about what the administration wants to do and then come back and tell us what is happening.

I want to go back to that section, because that should be part of the role but only a part of the role. The other part will be for the Faculty Senate to provide input as to what are some of the things that we need to create, to initiate, to make things happen.

It has to come both ways. It's not only one way. And that's what it is right now. Only one way.

I notice that as someone that decided not to be a department chair anymore and not participate as department head, I'm on the bottom of the bottom, and that's where I want to be, and I notice that I'm very distraught and disappointed, because I don't really get the information. I'm not getting it from the department heads, I'm not getting it from the division chair and division team.

I think part of it is because they are having the meetings and somehow nobody is taking the time of pushing for that information to go down, okay?

Every time that I ask, if you're not able to have division meetings with everybody, well, we have a meeting with the department heads. Well, where are the minutes? Send it out, send it out. Well, we didn't have the time to do that. There is no staff.

So communication has been now like is not important for the people on the bottom to really to know anything. You have to be like in a military law enforcement agency where you are there just to follow orders.

I always tell me students that's the McDonald's, you know, type of management style. You're coming and you're going to do

hamburgers. You're coming another day it's going to be French fries.
But you don't have any input. You're here just to follow orders, and that's not very good for an academic institution.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Thank you, Ana.

>> ANA JIMENEZ: Okay. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Next is Kiley. For the PCCEA report.

>> SPEAKER: Hi, everyone.

So the PCCEA report this time is quite extensive, so I'm just going to summarize a few things.

So the first item that I want to talk about is our role with policy consolidation, and this also goes into the AERC. Their work was put on hold this month so they could meet with Terri Trane in those focus groups and to provide some context and some history to the policy that we have at the institution, and also to present her with the document where we went through the FPPS and gave some annotations as to what policy we thought was most important to be preserved versus what needs to be updated just to kind of give some guidance there.

Ana has also met with HR as offering her services as a liaison over the summer if questions arise during the policy rewrite so that we have faculty on hand to answer any questions.

Another issue that we are dealing with lately is communication at the college. We have heard quite a bit about that at this meeting, and so just know that PCCEA continues to communicate with our administrators if there are what we feel poor practices of communication.

So some recent examples were the e-mails that went out about the campus-based meetings as the follow-ups to those Friday meetings that happened, like, the announcement went out the day of in some cases for some campuses. So we are continuing to communicate with the administration that, hey, this happened. Maybe it wasn't the best to be open and transparent.

We also communicated about the Red for Ed campaign, our walkout. So we communicated with the administration asking them that they send some e-mails, letting faculty know and staff know that, you know, if we needed to be flexible with our students, keep that in mind.

And also asking if policy could be, if exceptions to policy could be put into place for those parents who needed to stay home with their kids and maybe use sick leave for that time if personal time was used up and things like that. Fortunately administration was amenable so that went forward.

Just be aware we are always advocating for faculty, of course.

In the document you can read a couple recent situations that have gone forward with questions about faculty choosing their own schedules and also the counseling faculty being asked to do a plan for the revamp of student services and what their role will be at the college.

They felt like they, you know, kind of again, echoing all these sentiments, it's not a surprise, really, that they were asked to put in a lot of work in a document and come up with a workable plan that later was scrapped because we're doing things differently now, and so the organization is going to come from the top and then they'll need a plan to fit with that.

So every time we are hearing about those things at the college, we are communicating with the administration and letting them know that's not great. Could you please not do that next time?

Let's see. So we are continuing to have our monthly meetings with district administration, so Ana just met with the provost and Lee yesterday? Yes? And so the summary of that meeting will be coming out shortly. You may have seen in your e-mail inboxes the report for the April meeting that was held with Matej and the administrators and so that has much more but in my report I put a couple items that you might want to check out. RIF was discussed as

well as policy training for administrators and faculty in these new supervisory roles, as well as CAT training and a few other things.

I wanted to mention I was able to attend the meeting with the policy consultant for senate that was last Friday, I believe, and so a couple of things came up where some senators were, you know, advocating for certain things to be in policy. Some of them actually were in policy.

What I wanted to bring up with that is that, you know, PCCEA, our role is to know policy, to help you interpret policy, and make sure policy is not violated. A lot of times, if you get a sense something is not fair, not being done well, and you think, well, there should be a policy about that, a lot of times there is a policy about that and it's just not being followed.

That's where I'm saying reach out to PCCEA. If you have questions about is this kosher, is this okay, why is this happening, this seems wrong, and especially I think we are seeing through really no fault of their own a lot of our new faculty supervisors are not being trained on policy or not being trained in a timely enough manner. So maybe they have had training now, but the issue you may have had with them occurred before they had that training.

So the more you can bring those things forward to us, the better.

You know, we want to advocate for you, but if we don't know about things, about those violations of policy, we can't just bring it forward.

Finally, the PCCEA elections were just held this week, and the results will be announced shortly. But if you did have a chance to vote, some of those positions were uncontested so you can take a guess on what happened there.

And then check out the PCCEA website for any information for anything related to PCCEA.

Any questions?

All right. Thanks.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Lastly we have the results or the update from the faculty leadership work group. Thank you for being so patient.

>> SPEAKER: Robert F designed this document for you to look at, and thank you, Josie, and Michael, for putting it up there.

You can see that we started meeting as the work group in December, and then we started meeting regularly in January. We have a Google Drive, so if you want to see, you know, the documents we are working on. Let's see, our goal is to improve the faculty leadership and be documented in the handbook so you have a link there to the

handbook, as well. You can see all the members who are on the committee.

As I said, Robert F is our faculty co-chair and Ken Chavez our other chair. We have teams and then we have the proposals, so a lot of you have probably received from your deans or from your representatives on the committee these proposals.

As an observer, I just wanted to sort of let you know some of the things that we have learned on this committee in terms of putting out information to the entire college and all the divisions and getting feedback from everyone and incorporating it all, which is what we are here to do.

We were very glad that we started with a very simple proposal. The first one was just changing language for clarification, because we got to see some of the difficulties on putting out information and getting feedback back, so I just wanted to share some of the things that we learned.

It doesn't always work for the representatives of the committee sending things out, because they are not necessarily on the right lists. So we decided deans had to send things out so we actually cover everyone in every division.

We also had different ways originally of getting feedback back

and notice that some of the ways we didn't -- for example, I used a doodle poll in my division, and I thought that would let everyone speak and give feedback. I didn't realize it really privileges yes or no and not really comments. So that wasn't such a great idea.

We also didn't -- some groups representatives had sort of an e-mail avalanche and that's really hard to see everything well. We figured out the Google form works best. It turns out that some of the members of the committee don't really know how to do that, so we had one person develop the Google form.

So as you have seen, as the different proposals have come out, we sort of asked you for things, for your feedback. We have given it out and asked for feedback in different ways, because we are refining our process.

We have also discovered that people aren't in the room with us when we are developing these proposals and they need more context than we have been giving. So we are aware of that. So the final proposal that we sent out, you saw, had more context of why we created this proposal, so we are getting there.

We have also heard that faculty would like a deadline for submitting their feedback so that they make sure that they are included when we are reviewing feedback. So we will be incorporating

that, as well.

A couple of things about receiving the feedback. I just wanted you all to know that when we get feedback from people, sometimes the feedback doesn't actually address the proposal. It brings up something not on topic. But sometimes those things are very important. So we put those things into a parking lot so we don't lose it, you know, so I just want you to know what you're giving us is being read and considered.

The other thing is when we receive the feedback, now it's all coming through a Google form so the whole committee sits down, we go through each piece of feedback and read it together and we discuss it and decide what's the next step.

So that's my update. Do you have any questions for me?

>> SPEAKER: Pollyanna.

Thank you for doing this work. I know you have worked really hard on this, and I have appreciated the stuff that's come out from your group.

I just wanted -- I think you got this feedback already, but I just wanted to make sure that you were talking specifically, this is science-related, but we have these campus coordinators in science and they weren't included in the discussion, and I just want to make sure

they get included in the next discussion on their role.

I think the science division is kind of working on that, but I'm not a part of that, and I just wanted to bring that forward to you.

>> SPEAKER: I'm not sure if I get what you're saying. Because when we are putting out things we are putting it out to all the deans to put out to their divisions. So Emily should be sending out things.

>> SPEAKER: Correct, but we have a science campus coordinator at each of our campuses just to work with the lab and the sciences on those different -- because it's a little bit difficult. That wasn't included in the proposal that I saw.

>> SPEAKER: Okay. Hmm.

>> SPEAKER: I think it was just missing -- I think the science people know. I just want to make sure that your group knows. There is one for each campus. Yeah.

>> SPEAKER: So I'm on the administrative writing team, and we have gone around and talked to almost all the deans to talk about, okay, what's really the structure going on in your division? And so we have heard about how science is unique, but I think the idea behind the handbook is each division can make these changes as appropriate, right?

So are you saying that -- which proposal are you referencing?

>> SPEAKER: One I got a couple weeks ago?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, there was a shower of them for a little bit.

Okay.

>> SPEAKER: Maybe I'm behind, totally possible at this point.

Just wanted to make sure that you knew that.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, we do know science is weird (laughter).

>> SPEAKER: No, we're wonderful.

>> SPEAKER: You have done it in a way that works for your division. It's a little different, which is fine.

>> SPEAKER: If I may answer, I have been working part of this committee and I have been working on the structure of the science division. One of the things I realized our division is almost unique in terms of the structure is that we have department heads and we have discipline coordinators.

Those two were sent initially as a proposal, and after review from comments received were basically adopted as the new policy, so the new language, which is going to be in the handbook.

Now, when I started reviewing specifically towards the end, each division has the actual structure, the organizational structure, and then there is a series of descriptions of each one of those little

boxes, you know, what's the role of department head, what's the role of discipline coordinator, what's the role of campus coordinators.

And the campus coordinators is unique to what I have seen of the science division. I spent quite a lot of time revising and rewriting those positions and clarifying the language on those positions, and I sent that to Emily for comment, and I also sent it to my department head at West Campus.

And the feedback that I got, not from Emily, because I didn't have a chance to talk to her, because she was out, but the one I got from Alex Armstrong, which is my department head, was that the science division is going to be -- is in the process of redoing the entire structure. Right? Because it's too complicated and it's too many people, and there is too weird.

So chances are that soon we are going to have a new division structure for science.

Now, you may be addressing the fact that when we sent proposals we sent proposal for department head and discipline coordinator and not one for campus coordinator, and the reason being that that campus coordinator seems to be unique for the science division.

Does that answer your question? Kind of? (Laughter).

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Is it about science or is it about

the work group? Lisa?

>> SPEAKER: My thing is do we even know that?

>> TAL SUTTON: If this is a -- maybe you guys have to have a little CDAC meeting.

>> SPEAKER: I guess this is the first I have heard of that. Am I just out of it, or -- so for the work group --

>> SPEAKER: We are just dealing with big handbook issues. And then each division is going to, in the back of the workbook, they have, back of the handbook they have what each division, structure of each division, so each division is going to take care of that.

So I don't know if Emily is revising or they are going to clarify or claw arrows or whatever. That's not something that we are dealing within the work group.

>> TAL SUTTON: Any final questions? Maybe one more quick question? For time? Regarding the faculty leadership work group?

Thank you for being patient, and thank you for the report.

Thanks.

That was the last of the business. We do have an executive session, so is there a motion to conclude the regular -- Rita makes a motion to end the regular session. Seconded by Tanya. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. We will -- opposed?

All right. So the regular session has concluded. May the 4th be
with you, and we will have an executive session.

(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.