



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 August 24, 2018

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. I think that's everybody. Welcome
back to fall semester. We're going to speed through and hopefully
get through this in under two hours.

Request for open forum or executive session?

Then we will move on, and Michael Parker asked for a brief
announcement.

>> MICHAEL PARKER: Good afternoon. I have accepted a position
to be the acting dean of social sciences and that renders me
ineligible to serve on the faculty senator or as an officer. So I
resigned to Tal yesterday and to Josie, but I wanted to take just a
moment to thank all of you for the work that you do and the

opportunity to work with you and for twice honoring me by electing to serve, preside over this body.

The fact that you're willing to spend your Friday afternoons in a, when it's short, two-hour meeting, I think exemplifies the sort of dedication that is rarely seen.

Again, thank you, and I should apologize to Tal and Josie for having to invent a process for finding my replacement. It's been an honor to work with you all and thank you for the work that you do.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: We definitely appreciated your time on the senate, Michael. I thought that making dean, you would just get a blazer for free?

>> MICHAEL PARKER: It's in the mail. It says PCC on it.

Somebody should take a before picture of me, and in three weeks, it will be completely gray hair.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. The last short announcement is to declare some good news. Last spring we had eight applications for faculty emeritus go through the process to be reviewed by Faculty Senate, be reviewed by ELT, and then be reviewed by the board. All eight have been approved for faculty emeritus.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: And I believe they will be honored at this upcoming Governing Board meeting in September. So if you can make it out, they typically deliver those right at the start. If you're interested in seeing any of your, if you were involved in any of the applications, they will be invited to be honored at the September meeting of the Governing Board.

Some good news, with that, we can go on and knock down our business items. First is trying to remember what happened before the summer is we approve our May minutes.

Hopefully you people had a chance to review it when it was sent out yesterday. Is there a motion to approve?

Hernon makes a motion to approve. Is there a second?

Sarah Marcus seconds.

Any discussion or edits that you see needing?

We will do a verbal vote. All in favor, say aye?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Nay? Raise of hands for any abstentions? One abstention?

So the minutes have been approved, and we will be posting those to the website.

All right. The next business item is, as we saw or were reminded

of in the main minutes, we approved a change to how faculty senator seat allocations were determined. We are going from the very small, microdepartment per campus to a division model that allocates based on how many faculty are in the division, and we need to come up with a way to transition to that new model.

So currently everyone sitting in this room was elected by their department within their campus, and we need to transition to senators who are likely going to be very similar to the faces I'm looking at right now, but elected through a different process where we will be going through the divisions, and if you had an opportunity to go through the proposal way back when, I think it was the charter committee developed this years ago, so if you have a chance to read this, it's great. I will try to summarize what the proposal is saying is currently there are some senators whose term would end this fall. Half of the elections would end -- I'm trying to see if I can look at -- okay, Community Campus, Northwest Campus, and West Campus would typically be having an election this coming fall to take over and take new seats starting January 2019 for two years.

And then what we are proposing is instead of doing that, we would expand those seats for one semester so they would continue to serve on in spring. Similarly, the other campuses, East Campus, Downtown

Campus, and Desert Vista Campus would have their terms, their two-year terms cut short by one semester so that we end all current seat allocations by the end of spring 2019. And during spring 2019, we would hold the elections in this new way through the divisions where half of those, or roughly half of the seats would be decided upon to be one-year elections and then the other half would be for two years to get us on to that staggered process.

So that's what this model is trying to illustrate. Yeah, these are the Community Campus, Northwest Campus, and West Campus, serve two-and-a-half years, and these would be the other half of the senators that would be cut short by one semester. We would start on this new process where half of the division seats would be for a year and the other half of the division seats would run for two years.

So that's our proposed way of transitioning to the new process.

I don't know if we need to have that formally said or if we say we will adopt this document as our transition document to the new system? If there is any discussion or if there is a motion, I think now would be the time for that. Or any questions.

>> KARIE MEYERS: I'm sorry. I'm just not remembering, is there a reason that the yellows have to be extended one term? Is there a reason they can't start in the spring and then be a full term?

>> TAL SUTTON: Well, I don't think we could have half of the seats be done by department and the other half by division.

>> KARIE MEYERS: Oh, I see. Sorry. I couldn't quite remember how it worked. Yes, right. I'm sorry. Okay.

>> TEDDY SCHNUR: So on the time frame, spring 2019, where there would be this new process for the seat allocations, when would we be given the information of what the divisions will be so there is some understanding of who would fall under those divisions that could be possibly eligible for a seat?

>> TAL SUTTON: We'll make sure that information for each division is known by All Faculty Day in January so that you can think about and sort of know what to expect for each division.

Throughout that semester, the vice president will be working probably with the deans, would make most sense, to help conduct each election within each division.

>> TEDDY SCHNUR: Okay. Thank you.

>> ROSA MORALES: My question is related to the faculty allocation. When we discussed the last semester how there was going to be working out, it was based on the number of faculty. They were going to be in each of the departments and divisions. And knowing that there has been some changes and more changes are expected, is

that going to change? Or are we going to continue going with the original proposal that we discussed last semester that have different numbers of faculty there?

>> TAL SUTTON: The way the wording in the -- the new language that was adopted in May says that numbers are determined at the point of the election. If there is a fluctuation in faculty numbers as well or fluctuation of what comprises a division, changing a new division would trigger a special election, but the numbers for determining how many seats to put forward for that election is determined at the point of the election and then sort of carries for those two years and then readjusts when there is an (indiscernible) is at least how the language is.

>> ROSA MORALES: Thanks.

>> TAL SUTTON: Any motions out there? We can still have discussion. This is on the need to approve --

>> SPEAKER: Is there a motion?

>> TAL SUTTON: There has only been questions so far.

>> SPEAKER: I move to approve.

>> TAL SUTTON: There has been a motion to approve the plan to transition to the new seat structure. Is that a second?

>> SPEAKER: I have a question.

>> TAL SUTTON: That's what the discussion after the second --

>> SPEAKER: I second it.

>> TAL SUTTON: It's been seconded. Now, Lisa?

>> SPEAKER: So this is probably my stupidity in forgetting things. So what do we have in terms of how many senators and so forth in each division and how that's what the new structure is actually going to look like?

>> TAL SUTTON: That was on a (indiscernible) in May. If I remember right, it's going to reduce the total number of possible seats by around 18 or so, and so it's going to bring us to around -- I can't remember. Upper 40s or lower 50s.

>> SPEAKER: So this is on a document in Google Docs so we could probably bring up and take another look at or I could if I wanted to? Just find it? Okay.

>> TAL SUTTON: Yes. If you look at the May agenda, there will be a link there.

>> SPEAKER: Thanks. Lisa Werner, West Campus at large.

>> TAL SUTTON: Further discussion?

>> KARIE MEYERS: I am risking being stupid twice in a row, and I'm sorry, I haven't really kept up with this over the summer. Last few weeks have been kind of crazy.

Is there a reason we can't just have the elections in the fall and start it in the spring for both red and yellow? I mean, we have one whole year of a senate that doesn't represent the way the college is now.

So I'm sure that we have discussed this before, but I just -- I just am kind of going sideways. Can this start in the spring? You can hold elections by e-mail.

>> TAL SUTTON: If I remember correctly, there is wording in the new charter language that says we are transitioning to the academic year for terms rather than calendar year. And the other thing is this election will be a huge undertaking for the vice president.

>> KARIE MEYERS: Okay.

>> TAL SUTTON: So I think it was more of a logistics concern.

Any other questions, comments, concerns? All right.

Maybe we will do this by hands this time. All in favor of adopting this transition, raise your hand?

If you're a proxy, keep your hand up.

All right. 32 say yes. All opposed? Abstain?

No nos and four abstentions. So 32 yeses.

So the motion carries and we will transition during the spring and get as much information to the divisions as possible for All

Faculty Day to make sure that people know what to expect for the transition.

That brings us to Faculty Senate elections. As we just heard moments ago, we have an immediate vacancy that we are looking to fill as well as we will do this in reverse order, I will mention again that if we hold our officer elections in the September meeting, so if you're interested in running for any of the seats -- yours is two years. Are you up?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I don't think I'm up.

>> TAL SUTTON: We will have president-elect, vice president, and secretary up as well as logistics officer for the September meeting. So if you're thinking about it or if you have any interest, you can e-mail any of the officers who currently hold those positions and would be happy to answer any questions, I just wanted to make people aware that we will hold the elections at the September meeting. We will be holding one election today to fill Michael Parker's shoes as president-elect.

So now we will look for nominations or anyone interested in serving as president-elect for the remainder of this year to become president in 2019.

>> SPEAKER: Silly question again. So the replacement would

then -- we would elect the president-elect today that would become president in the spring?

>> TAL SUTTON: Yes, to finish out the term as president-elect this year, and then the president-elect becomes --

>> SPEAKER: And then the president-elect in September will be the new president-elect in the spring?

>> TAL SUTTON: In January.

>> JOSIE: The new president in January.

>> SPEAKER: So the president-elect that's elected in September will be the president-elect in January?

>> TAL SUTTON: Yes, there are two president-elect elections going on. One today, one in September. (Laughter.)

And then there is the president-elect-elect position and president-elect-elect-elect.

I would let personally like to select Josie Milliken to serve as president-elect, and I will hand over the mic to see if she's interested.

>> JOSIE: I'd be honored.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: She's willing to serve, so is there a second?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yes.

>> TAL SUTTON: Are there other people interested in serving as president-elect? I don't want to rush this.

All right. I feel weird, but we are supposed to do this by secret ballot, so someone willing to hand these out and collect them and count? Maybe we can also stretch our legs as things are handed out, but make sure you get a ballot.

Just to make it clear, yes, no. Josie with a check mark. Josie with not a check mark. A smiley face, sad face.

As we tally up the votes, any further votes, just percolate them on down to Karie.

The next bit is the college enrichment funds, and Aubrey Conover is going to discuss those, so I will have him come on down here.

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everyone. A couple of quick updates as we move through this. Just a little history of why we are looking at this. There has been some changes in the faculty enrichment fund in terms of how much faculty retain year to year.

We had that 3,000 cap and we are progressing towards the \$5,000 cap. That has dramatically impacted the overall reserve fund that we have, because the reserve is populated by funds that accrue after a faculty member has hit their max and does not use it for that year or retires.

Over the past multiple years, it has fairly held steady around 300,000, 330,000, give or take at a given year. The rollovers and retirements have basically supplemented any use that we have pulled from the fund. That has not been the case over these last couple of years. To give you an idea, the business office is still cleaning things up for last year, but as of -- so this is not going to be

exactly accurate, but we went from approximately 330,000 historically to about 230,000. Now, that's to be expected. You know, we have multiple years of not feeding the fund, and so the only money going into it was retirements.

So the committee thought that to be fiscally prudent, at least for the next couple of years as we see what happens as we move forward and to make sure that all faculty have reasonable access to the funds, that we survey faculty with a proposal about how to balance out the use year to year.

So in the spring, and I do apologize because it was close to the end of the year, we put forth a survey to all faculty, all full-time faculty, I should clarify, to two different questions, because really what we saw were two different major areas of demand for these funds.

One was tuition. So one of the questions was, and to be honest, we took a look at people's use over the last couple of years and tried to find a balance that would fit people's requests but be somewhere in the middle, so what we put forward was a yearly use of funds for tuition up to \$5,000 with a lifetime cap at Pima of \$15,000.

Now, this did not mean that you have to use 5,000 a year. Let's

say you're taking one class a year and it's going to take you 10 years but each year you're only paying a thousand dollars. You would still be able to work up to that 15,000. You do not have to use it in that three-year period.

The other question that was put forward -- let me just finish this one before I move on. So we basically just asked for, yes, this is appropriate, no, it should be higher, no, it should be lower, and then comments.

As you all can see, we had about -- my eyes are not what they used to be -- 57% for yes. 28 say no, it should be higher. 15% said it should be lower.

It's not perfect, but kind of gives us the gauge that most people were in favor of at least being at that high. Small percentage lower and little bit larger that should be higher.

I don't know if we're ever going to get to a perfect number. That's what we got in this survey.

Going to the other question was on a yearly basis, beyond which you get in your personal bucket, how much should you be able to ask for and what we basically said, going back up to the question, was that faculty should be able to request up to \$2,000 a year, and if they don't use that \$2,000 in that year, let's say they have a big

event coming up the following year, they could save that and would roll over so they could request up to \$4,000.

So it would be a rolling amount that would give people access to funds on top of their personal funds.

If you can go down, so on this one, we had a little bit higher percentages, so almost 70% saying yes, this is appropriate. About 24 say no, it should be higher. And if anybody does the math off the top of their heads, it says no number up there, a smaller percentage says it should be lower. So that's where we're at.

So what the committee is proposing that we do and these are not set in stone forever, but it is to, based on the feedback from the surveys and the changes in numbers that we have seen in the overall pot, would propose to you all that we institute these amounts as part of our process to kind of balance out the requests. In about a year or so -- so at the end of this year, we'll be able to see where the fund is at without the increase, because we will have hit that max increase. I can come back to you all and say, Okay, we got through another year, we went up from 238,000 to X number or we went down, and based on that we can kind of re-evaluate what we're looking at.

So that is our recommendation to the group, but I'd be happy to answer questions or do we have a discussion? How's that work?

>> TAL SUTTON: So you're looking to get an endorsement from the senate on these numbers as they are since they seem to be moderately approved through the survey?

>> SPEAKER: Exactly.

>> TAL SUTTON: So I think that we can have some questions before we put together a motion of endorsement or not.

>> SPEAKER: Any questions I can answer, folks?

>> SPEAKER: Hernando, West Campus. Those percentages that you presented are based on how many actual respondents? What was your sample size on that?

>> SPEAKER: 147 or...

>> TAL SUTTON: 147.

>> SPEAKER: I thought it was 147. It's kind of hard to read.

>> SPEAKER: So on the professional development support, we can request up to \$2,000 a year, and if we don't request anything, the next year you can request 4,000? But if, in the first year, you requested \$150, then the next year you'd only be able to request 2,000, is that right?

>> SPEAKER: No, 3,850.

>> SPEAKER: So the remainder of what you had, you get swept every two years? Okay.

>> SPEAKER: So it would be up to \$2,000, but -- and this is going to be kind of an interesting bookkeeping endeavor for us that I have asked my support person Sandy to help us with. We will do a running Excel sheet to try and do our best to track all these moving pieces. The Business Office one doesn't do it. It just gives us a pot of money and how much has been pulled from that pot.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Could you tell me what is the name of this committee? Is this college-wide enrichment fund committee?

>> SPEAKER: So we have kind of gone around a little bit with this one, but I think what we landed on was the college-wide faculty reserve fund committee. We wanted to make sure it was college-wide and faculty based reserves. That's what we came up with for now.

>> SPEAKER: This is the last opportunity for anybody back here...(laughter).

>> SPEAKER: Do we have a way of determining how much money we have available to us or left for us other than just contacting the business office directly?

>> SPEAKER: The quick answer is it's probably -- I don't even know if the campuses are going to have access to the individual funds, because it's been -- historically all you do is ask your business office and they'd be able to pull it up. My quick answer is

try that. If they gave you any feedback that it's difficult for them to get it because it's centralized, let me know, and maybe that's something we can take over in our office.

If you're wondering where your balance lies in terms of previous requests as we go into this model, if we go into this model, contact my office, because we will be keeping the totals of that.

I don't want to -- I think that's probably the only way to do it. I don't know if I want to have it open access for anyone to see. I'd like to keep it a little bit more private to respect everyone's choices, but if anyone has a better idea, I'm definitely open to it.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So to clarify, with this money, this is separate from that money that's accruing for us every year, right?

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So let's say you have your personal 2,000, so then this is proposing that you could request another 2,000 for 4,000? Okay.

So max amount a faculty member could possibly request in a year, would be if this year -- you have 4,000 in your account. You could request up to 6,000 this year?

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: And then the following year you would have

your thousand dollars for that new year; is that right?

>> SPEAKER: Right. And an additional 2. Let me give you two extreme circumstances. Let's say you have never -- let's say at the end of this year, let's use 4,000 because we're still going into 5,000. Let's say at the end of last year, you hadn't used anything, so you're starting this year with \$4,000 in your account. You'd be able to request an extra 2,000 up to 6,000 for this year.

The following year, assuming you used all 2,000, you would have the 1,000 for the new year in your personal account and you'd be able to ask for another 2,000.

On the extreme end if you didn't use any at the end of this year and didn't ask anything at the end of next year, end of next year you'd be able to ask for 5 plus the 4 so 9,000. Wherever you're going for 9,000 you have to take me with. (Laughter.)

Other questions I can answer?

>> TAL SUTTON: Just a question on the first one. I suppose because it's relating to tuition, the word that jumped out to me the most was the word "lifetime," and so I'm assuming that it made sense to have a lifetime part for tuition, but I'm just thinking about what has happened in the past recent number of years, where a lot of faculty decided that they needed to get certified because there was

no longer grandfathering in and the HLC required all of this.

So I can see someone exhausting this tuition cap and then years down the road, because again, our college seems to like changing everything drastically, they might see it worthwhile to become certified to teaching another area closely related but they still have to take some additional courses but they have already exceeded the -- so that "lifetime" word is, it sounds so final.

>> SPEAKER: Well, and what I would say is it's only final for right now, because at Pima nothing is ever final.

What we could say is, you know, we could start with this as a possibility and that if we get to a place where, you know, we can revisit this every year, every two years, whatever you all want to do, if we're starting to see some of those things happen or if we're, like, looking and there is all of a sudden another big shift another year, two, three, four years, we can absolutely revisit that.

It was a balance. I mean, we had -- people feel very passionately about this in different ways. There are some faculty who are, like, lifetime learning is critical, and we should just fund it, we should not even have a separate -- we shouldn't have any caps. And others that were, like, you know, we shouldn't be paying people to get another degree, that's really on their own.

So people felt very differently. So we came up with this as a way to hopefully, you know, allow folks going for classes that were submitting things fell within that \$5,000 even if they were pursuing a degree. I know grad school has gotten unbelievably expensive. It's not going to cover everything but that...

>> JOSIE: "Lifetime" also jumped out at me, because I was thinking of the fact that that could mean one year for one faculty member or 40 years for a different faculty member. And so another possibility to consider would be to say maybe every five years of service to the college, X amount, or just something to recognize that lifetime can be drastically different depending on the person.

>> SPEAKER: Sure. We could do -- I mean, it's kind of arbitrary. Whatever number you all think would be appropriate, I mean, we could do something that says cap every 10 years. One of the questions would be, like, if we do -- if we do it for every five years of service, let's say, then do we do the full 15,000, or do they have to be here a certain amount of time before they will qualify for it. Because in some ways we want to make sure our newer faculty are getting, might be more interested in pursuing education so we don't want to hinder them from doing that.

I mean, it's hard because there is a lot of different paths that

we could go down.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yeah, I would argue that it should reward years of service, you know, so maybe there is a lower cap for faculty that haven't been with the college that long, but as you serve more years, you should have the opportunity to use your funds for tuition, you know, more opportunity to do that.

>> SPEAKER: One thing we could do, just to throw this out there, is we could put together some research tools that ask faculty to get a broader sense of things, you know, have this in place for this year, give that people that 5,000 amount for this year, and give us time to put together some different scenarios and get folks' input.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I wanted to second or third this lifetime thing. Sounds like health insurance before the reform. So something maybe like 10, 15 years at least. The other question I had had, how did you get to the 15,000? Seems like some programs this year could be a lot more expensive, right?

>> SPEAKER: It was a little bit of an arbitrary number. Different numbers were passed around. We did look at some of the requests that had come in over the past couple years, and it looked like the 5,000 a year would cover most people's requests. We had a couple who are in very expensive programs. I'm sure they were

bearing some of the burden on their own, but it would not cover all the programs out there, but it did cover most of the ones we had come in in the last two years.

>> TAL SUTTON: If I'm understanding this correctly, it sounds like it would be helpful to at least adopt or recommend something be in place for a year or two, just to be able to get the money flowing?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, and I'd be happy to add the caveat that you would like, because of what I'm hearing is, us to explore this lifetime idea with potentially a couple other scenarios that I could either bring back to this group or we could send out to all faculty, whatever you feel is most appropriate.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think should this come in front of us again, I think it would be very useful to look at those or a summary of those requests for tuition just so we can sort of have a number of, like, well, what number is serving, does actually get the job done?

I think that would be useful. I think for now we need to just come up with a temporary endorsement for, like, okay, these numbers seem reasonable to use for a year or two. I guess I'm putting this out to the senate, do we think these seem like fair numbers, that -- I'm not going to pretend I know the name of your committee, but have the committee come back after discussing this feedback? Does

that sound reasonable?

>> JACKIE KERN: Do we even need to have anything that firm in place as approving this versus just asking you to consider what we're thinking about and coming back with another more specific proposal?

>> SPEAKER: Well, if we don't have anything, and that's absolutely your choice, we would not have any guidance going forward, so it would be just kind of whatever came in. One of the things that the committee struggles with is you are already doing amazing things, and the requests we get, I think we have had one or two that I'm not really sure this fit, but for the most part, if they're getting to our committee, they are positive things.

But what the committee struggled with is if we get multiple requests from one person and they are all doing amazing things, they didn't have any guidance about whether or not, and so they're approving. That's why they wanted to bring this to you all to say, should we have some guidelines?

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> SPEAKER: And the other caveat I want to throw out briefly is the college sometimes has travel that they need faculty to go on for X reason. HLC, you name it.

Those would not be coming from your professional development.

Those would be up to the campus, the provost, whoever is guiding that travel to fill those requirements.

>> TAL SUTTON: Is there a motion to endorse these guidelines for one year, two years, whatever people feel comfortable with? And then ask that the committee revisit, in particular, the lifetime caps, things like that?

>> SPEAKER: I make that motion.

>> TAL SUTTON: There is a motion to endorse these guidelines for the next two years with the caveat that we would like further benchmarking, further information.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: That would be great.

Is there a second? Second by Margie.

All in favor, say aye?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Opposed? Abstention? One abstention. The motion carries with one abstention.

I have to log back in. Just a second. All right.

So that brings us past -- that brings us to, going back to, back in time, we have the results for taking the president-elect position.

Josie is the new president-elect with 29 yeases and two write-ins. So

the motion carries.

We now have a president-elect again.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: And now just to provide some bit of report, I don't think I need 15 minutes, but I just want to talk a little bit about the things that the senate president I was invited to participate in over the summer. There is a fourth thing, but I will leave that fourth thing to Kate, because she's a pro at that. CDAC evolution update, and then e-mail about mandatory trainings, and then the faculty allocation criteria team, which is primarily the division deans with some faculty representation.

I will start off with the CDAC evolution update. Several of those members of the committee are also in this room, so they can feel free to add to that. But right now, our process, as you may have seen, there was a brief survey to get input. So we are hoping to really involve faculty in coming up with what do the CDACs have to look like to align all of the crazy changes that have underwent since the last time the CDAC guidelines have been touched.

And so we are hoping to gather input right now with this brief survey, and then the committee will take that and synthesize that input into some sort of proposal or maybe a subset of proposals and

gather feedback from all faculty about all those guidelines before we make any recommendation to the provost regarding how CDACs should or should not look going forward, align with new faculty leadership structure, the crazy reorganization with divisions, and all of that.

The CDAC guidelines weren't touched, back in Flores' day, which is before my time, so I don't even know what the college was like back then, because I wasn't here. Clearly a large amount of change in the guidelines and to reflect that and incorporate that and integrate with that.

So right now we just have the data input stage, and our next meeting we're going to look at that and analyze the data and input we are getting from all of the faculty. A few things, some big-picture things, I have been pushing for in that group is to not just think that it's just cleaning up that one document of the CDAC guidelines, which is why you saw multiple links in that survey. We need to make sure that the faculty leadership handbook, the PimaOnline department heads handbook, the CDAC guidelines themselves, and the essentially the SOP for the curriculum office are all aligned. Those are four documents that have all language that has to do with curriculum and curriculum oversight. We need to make sure that those things agree and make very clear who is driving the decision-making process at the

college.

That's what we are making sure that that's happening. The survey I think mostly asks for a little bit of general input but also kind of focuses more on the leadership side, asking for how do we need to integrate department heads and both the online as well as the discipline department heads into the CDAC structure, because they didn't exist before, since the guideline has been revised.

And the other thing that I haven't really talked about in the group, but as president, sort of sitting in that meeting, I'm thinking one role that I would like to push forward, and I might be coming back with perhaps your endorsement or not, is the role Faculty Senate would play in the CDAC structure.

I see us as sort of the portion of the governance -- we are the faculty governance body for this college. Since curriculum decisions is governance, we need to make sure that the process for the CDACs is clear, well-defined, and documented.

So I see Faculty Senate's role as ensuring that each division is capable or has documented somewhere their decision-making structure. This goes back to the spring, or actually before, I think, this was when Michael Parker was president, where the senate endorsed that each division should be able to decide upon their own decision-making

structure.

There has been very little progress in making sure that documentation was made and that it was being put forward and implemented.

So I think one thing that the senate can do is essentially enforce that. Instead of having to go through the curriculum office, we would go through the senate and say, okay, this is the structure that we want to use, and then we would just sort of be sort of the -- we wouldn't impact the decisions. We would just be making sure how each CDAC makes their decisions is clearly defined and documented somewhere so that we could go and say if there is an issue with someone circumventing the process, then the senate can come and say, no, this is actually the process, you need to go and fix this, and so that's sort of what I see our role in this process as, and I think that could be encoded in the administrative procedure for faculty governance.

That's probably a bigger-picture view than what we are talking about in CDAC evolution right now, because right now we are just taking all the faculty's input. That's the update there.

The mandatory trainings, it's going to be very easy. I don't know much about this.

Seems like we have to do many hours of mandatory trainings, and it seems very -- it seems like whoever is responsible for documenting that these mandatory trainings are being done, they don't have their act together yet if I'm understanding things correctly. So I think -- I know that PCCEA is following up on this a fair bit, so that might come up in their report.

But anyway, I'm keeping my ear to the ground to try to hear what's going on with that, because it was sort of sprung out of the blue and we want to understand that better.

>> TEDDY SCHNUR: Are you taking any questions on these?

>> TAL SUTTON: Sure.

>> TEDDY SCHNUR: Tal, since you're going to be keeping your eyes and ears open on this, Ana Jimenez said she was having some discussions about the mandatory training and relationship to adjunct faculty and what's required for them.

I have already started doing the mandatory training, so I have seen several of the pieces of it. It involves some time, and some of the topics may not be necessary for adjunct faculty, so I'd really like to advocate on their behalf that that be looked at very closely as to whether they have to complete all the same requirements that full-time faculty have to.

>> TAL SUTTON: Great. Thanks. I'll definitely try to bring that in. Like I said, PCCEA is really on top of this, as well, so we will bring this up when we talk with the 4 minus 1 Ps and Lee.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Just taking kind of an informal surf the expected amount of time for each of those classes, having taken some of them already, I'm looking at a little more than a week and a half of work time. Maybe I'm just slow, but to me, that seems like -- that's maybe a little much, especially to ask an adjunct faculty. That's my take on it.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks. Maybe it would make sense for people who have already done these trainings to get some data to bring back to them. You said it's going to take this many hours, but what we are actually seeing is it's going to take this many hours.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I know how long it took me. (Indiscernible.)

>> TAL SUTTON: It might make sense, but I will talk with PCCEA more about some ideas how to carry this argument forward and maybe a survey to collect that kind of quantitative data.

All right. And then the last thing is the faculty allocation criteria team, the team of doom. They are working really hard in as good of faith as I can see. It's essentially the deans that were charged with coming up with a way to meet that magic 23 number that

Lee said in the spring, and instead of just wanting to develop a way to cut 23 positions, the deans decided that it would even more productive and more positive to come up with a rubric that can be used in generality for what is the right number of faculty per program, per division.

So instead of looking at the immediacy of these 23 positions, they are trying to come up with some sort of rubric that can be applied long term for deciding when hiring is needed, so in the future, when we might need, when the provost's advisory committee convenes to decide where we need hirings, we can go back to this rubric being developed now. So the rubric can sort of determine where we have a deficit of factor where we have an overabundance of faculty in each program. That's the intent of the rubric.

There was a survey that went out about it, and we just met yesterday to talk a bit about the survey results, and the deans definitely heard that. A lot of the stuff that came out was stuff that hadn't already been talked about in the FACT group. I guess team is part of the FACT, so I can just say "FACT." Not going to say PIN number. They have already talked about, in particular, what about the issue of retirements? There is definitely a lot of people interested in retiring. Is that going to adjust that 23 number

appropriately?

The deans absolutely want to talk about that. But at least during the FACT meetings, they're like, well, we were charged with coming up with some sort of process that could name 23 names. So they call it parking -- they are putting all these other issues into the parking lot that they would like to deal with but sort of hands are tied to focus on developing this criteria.

So they definitely are interested in paying attention to how our retirements and various things like that going to impact this 23 number.

Additionally, some of the other feedback from the survey included, when you actually look at the rubric, there is a lot of things, and are all things created equal? How is this going to be weighted? They are not at that point yet. Right now what they are just going to do is actually sort of go to ERPi (phonetic) and collect all the data so they can fill in the numbers so we can see what the numbers begin to look like. They know these are important statistics. It's unclear how to weight them and compare one statistic versus another statistic.

That's definitely a conversation that is going to be -- the deans all agree it's important to have that be transparent with their

faculty, and they understand that there might even have to be a weighting different per division as there are some divisions that have next to no full-time faculty because that's just the way that program operates. They need to weight things a bit differently than, say, the math division.

So right now they're in the phase of just trying to sort of see what the statistics look like once they actually export it from or ERPi exports it for them.

They did address all those little nuance things about, well, how do you deal with dual or cross-listed classes? They're being, as far as I can tell, the deans are being very sensitive to all of these things. The timeline, from my understanding, is they are supposed to submit this rubric by September 1. So that is really soon. I'm kind of interested to see if they're just going to -- I don't think they are going to have time to provide any sort of weighting system to the rubric itself. It might be just a list of criteria rather than actually a well-defined rubric by then. So it might just be more qualitative than quantitative for a while.

That's the feeling that I'm getting. And then I think come October is when they are actually supposed to be start putting forward names, the 23 names. I'm kind of looking at some people that

might know other information that I don't know or...

>> SPEAKER: I think you're right on target. It's a little disheartening you are saying they, because the deans at the very first charge meeting were disappointed not to see faculty representation there and advocated to make sure PCCEA and senate were at the table for, not talking about names, but at least the initial criteria. I'm just hoping you don't feel like this is an us/they thing. You guys have been an active part of the discussions, what the criteria are, how we are going to look at them. I just hope that's not the feeling you're getting, that you're on the side.

>> TAL SUTTON: I missed that first meeting. I actually have only made the last three meetings, which is maybe I feel a little us/they. You're right. They have been incorporating PCCEA in the conversation.

Matej, have you gotten to any of those meetings?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Yeah, I've been to most of them.

>> TAL SUTTON: They definitely hear our input and our comments and incorporate that into the rubric.

>> SPEAKER: I think the reason of the timeline of October was selected is if we identify an individual who may be losing a job at the end of this academic year, they would have opportunities to

engage in a job search, and in the academic world, start in the fall for the following year. But I don't think any decision will be made rashly just to try to meet that target.

If we're unable to figure out a way to really make a good database decision, it may not be October, it may be November, but that's the idea is to give people notice as soon as possible so they can enter into the job search.

Is that what you understood, as well?

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah, that's my understanding, as well.

So there is sort of always two different tensions going on. They want to provide, if somebody's contract isn't going to be renewed, we want to give them plenty of opportunity to go on the job market, but at the same time we don't want to rush these decisions and this rubric will hopefully provide as data-driven as possible of a decision for the college. So there is sort of everything is always rushed at the college for everything, but it's clear that FACT is trying to make as informed a decision or push for as informed as data driven of a decision as possible.

Those are the three big things I want to talk about in my report.

>> SPEAKER: Can I say one more thing?

>> TAL SUTTON: Sure.

>> SPEAKER: We haven't closed that circuit yet. As I e-mailed you earlier, we were slated to close it today at 5:00, but if there is any reason to leave it open for the weekend or through Monday, I don't think anybody -- what we did on Thursday is look at what was there so far with the idea we'd look again to see if trends had changed.

Do you think there would be any interest in leaving it open, or -- we had about, I think, close to 90 responses so far.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think there were pretty clear-cut trends, and I can't imagine 10 or 15 more responses would change that.

>> SPEAKER: All right.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right.

With that, I think I'll hand it over to Brooke for the Governing Board report, as we are starting that up again.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Hello, everyone. Of course we are at the beginning of the year, and so the report is due on Thursday by 3:00 p.m. I'm planning to have it be a pretty short report. I will include some of the actions that we are taking care of today. Then of course notable faculty accomplishments.

So please send me anything you'd like me to include on that report as well as any additional items you think we should add just

not accomplishments but other sorts of things that we want to inform the board about.

That's pretty much it. It's pretty short and sweet today.

>> TAL SUTTON: Any accomplishments or let your colleagues know.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: And just do look for -- I will send out a draft, I plan to have a completed draft on Monday, so that way you can take a look at it and if you want to make any comments or suggestions, let me know, so then I have a little bit of time to revise the report, if needed, by Thursday.

>> TAL SUTTON: When is the meeting?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I want to say it's the 7th. The 5th.

>> TAL SUTTON: It's the first Wednesday of the month? Huh.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yeah.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Thanks.

Next is Mays Imad to update us on the teaching and learning center.

>> MAYS IMAD: So the last time Brooke and I updated you was that we submitted the -- by "we," I mean the faculty professional subcommittee, submitted a proposal to the provost's office for budget for the teaching and learning center. The ELT approved it in principle, and the budget was revised since then. So Brooke and I

met with Kate Schmidt, and she will get us more information during the provost's report, but basically what happened, as you heard, is we will have faculty fellows for the different positions or different activities that deal with the professional development in addition to having a teaching and learning center coordinator that will overlook or oversee all of the professional development related to teaching and learning at the college including the adjunct faculty.

So the budget was reduced significantly, but this is the state of the college right now. On the bright side, we are going to have this center open soon. Kate will tell us more details in the provost's report.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: So we're moving on to the provost's report; is that right?

Dolores couldn't be here and she really wanted to send her regrets for not being here at the first senate of the year, and she texted me a message that I then transcribed. She wants to make sure that you know she's acknowledged how challenging these times are at the college and in so many other areas. She wants everybody to think about being examples of civility, kindness, and acceptance for the students, because I think her point was they aren't getting those role models in other places. And that we really have to model that

for each other. We will get through these times if we support one another and we believe that each of us is working hard to improve the lives of students in our community.

She also wanted to note that she sent out a survey this morning to follow up on her student success commitment that she was talking about on All College Day. I think everybody should have gotten that this morning, just urging you to take that survey and think about your commitment to student success.

Mays is helping hand out the provost's report. It's pretty short, because I think we will get a longer one in two weeks with more detail. We are really excited what we are calling the (indiscernible) teaching and learning center. I think the professional development committee did a great job and has really advocated for two years to move forward with some kind of teaching and learning center, and I think there is some great ideas to move forward. I think the budget reality has really stalled that in a lot of ways. The initial way that we are moving forward is to put all of the existing professional development opportunities that the provost was already funding under the umbrella of the teaching and learning center. That's basically happening immediately. Those included Faculty Learning Academy, which has now been combined with the

mentoring program, and we've got two -- we had an incredible crop of new faculty at the Faculty Learning Academy just two weeks ago. We have two representatives here. So we will continue that, that program combined with mentoring.

There is the -- I will forget all the pieces. Speaker series will go under it. Teaching strategies workshop, my understanding is that is something that's been funded every single year but every single year there is some uncertainty whether the provost is actually going to fund it, so that will become a regular budget item. That is something that happens in August each year. I understand that rotates from math to writing? Any getting that right? I will get more details as we move forward.

Okay. So the other part of this, Dolores has long had this idea of having faculty fellows and funding faculty (indiscernible) for release time or the supplemental assignment rate to help with projects out of the provost's office. She's identified this as a way to sort of -- this soft launch as a way to move forward with the faculty fellows project. So this fall we will be hiring, through a competitive process, a few positions. One of them will be the coordinator for the TLC, which will not technically start until spring because the expectation is that's nine credits of release time

a semester -- the semester has already started. So the plan was to have that start in the spring. (Indiscernible) to start thinking about it and also hiring, be on the committee to hire the other fellows that will help support the efforts.

So the three will be the adjunct faculty fellow and the faculty Speaker Series fellow. Does anybody ever participate in the Speaker Series? Mays? Right. (Indiscernible) you had great audience participation.

That was something that Mays, through the professional development committee, took on last year. I think we were about to kill that program because we didn't have great audience participation, and then took on the schedule and made it more strategic, thinking about how can we use this as a way to increase enrollment? Students start to think more programmatically. They are listed on here who is going to be participating this fall.

>> MAYS IMAD: Dennis is going to be presenting. Yes.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: Put it in your calendar now.

The other area that's going to have, as it relates to the mandatory training, the college has put together an online, updated an existing online training for adjunct faculty as an orientation, and one of the positions, one of the faculty fellow positions will be

to maintain and make sure that that online training stays updated, because it's a lot of stuff about the college that with the rapid change is probably not going to be -- we will be updating on a regular basis.

I want to point out that there are three trainees on the front coming out of the Hilda's area happening over the next few weeks on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

I think we will be back in a couple of weeks with more reports. Are there any questions I can answer? I don't feel like I was particularly articulate.

Okay.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you, Kate.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: Did you want me to talk about faculty evaluation, as well?

Tal and I are co-chairing the faculty evaluation work (indiscernible) is the official title. The goal is to continuously improve that faculty evaluation process, which has been different every single year for the last three or four years. And the big change last year was that it moved into the online system, the same online system that provides training. There were some technical glitches, but there also were, we surveyed at the end of the year

people's experience with it.

One of the big concerns was that there was just a lot of sort of transactional back and forth between the supervisor and a faculty member that was not a good use of time.

We met twice this summer, and in our second meeting worked with the IT person and have really eliminated a lot of those spring steps that just were sort of back and forth so then you will sort of collect the information and then just like the olden days where you had collegial conference in April and May, you will upload all those materials in April and May into the system. There should be less sort of transaction and more focus on improving teaching.

We are, to that end, hoping to continue to improve teaching so we'd like to have more volunteers if you're interested in helping improve the evaluation process. We've identified a lot of areas that could use improvement, but we just don't have the resources of, human resources to move it forward.

I've got the list in this report, but we had a lot of concerns and questions this past year about class climate evaluation, goes out to students online, the feedback thing, you know what I'm talking about? There were questions about the timing of when these are released, opened and closed, and also about the actual questions that

are being asked. So we haven't looked at that in a few years. We'd love for a subcommittee to look at that and make recommendations for improving that process.

We think it is going to be technically possible to move the adjunct faculty evaluation into the my career center system, which I think will ease that process and have a greater return rate, so I'd like to have a subcommittee for adjunct faculty.

The communication one -- and the observation tool, looking at how -- there is a form you're supposed to download and have an observation. Looking at that process and how that can be more (indiscernible) for people.

We are meeting next Friday. E-mail either one or both of us and we will put you on the invite. I think more hands on deck, the more we're going to be able to get done.

>> TAL SUTTON: Just to add to that, the classroom time that the student surveys, I know there was a committee that worked hard on that, so I'm looking at the person that did a lot of work on that. Our group has gotten feedback on that, because right now those student surveys are given near the end of the semester and we are getting feedback asking why -- they are giving an argument for why it should be done earlier in the semester. And I think we have

legitimate arguments both ways, and I think it will be useful to have the subcommittee look more into it or come up with rationales for what is the best time to collect student feedback, because it's clear that there are some faculty out there that feel very strongly on one camp and then very strongly on the other camp, and I think just having, to be able to sort of provide the rationale for what we have chosen to adopt can sort of help people buy into that and understand that process more.

And like you said, I think, especially was just talking about the TLC, I think the faculty evaluation, trying to be not just like, you know, just a thumbs up/thumbs down process but actually also find those moments of inspirational pedagogy, I think there is a way to integrate the work that's happening there into the TLC to help them identify, like, oh, this person is getting these exceptional rankings in the classroom observation tool. I wonder if that could be useful somehow, and those types of conversations that sort of integrate both evaluation with professional development the way it's really intended to.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: So I have a question for (indiscernible) and for Kate. My question to Kate, because we are talking about the teaching and learning centers, and to me it's just an abstract, but

is the college going to have some kind of an idea that they can present to Faculty Senate whether there is going to be an actual physical site for it?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, yes.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: The other question is then my mind, I also see the EGTS, center of excellence, and then I see the diversity and this other person, job, and I see Ricardo, international studies. I wonder is there going to be an umbrella type, either (indiscernible) or Hilda's, those other centers of excellence under there, or are we making the separate centers of excellence where there's a lack of centralization? I think that this center of excellence, the teaching and learning, is the one that I think should take first preference, because I think that's where we need a place, I hub where we can go and do our professional development and help each other.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think that's a great point, trying to get away from siloing.

>> SPEAKER: We were actually going to build a silo for it, but we are not doing that. (Laughter.)

It's in the facilities master plan and the educational master plan, and the -- I thought Dolores said it on All College Day but I don't see it written here, that by spring, an actual physical

location will be identified for the teaching and learning center.

>> TAL SUTTON: Rosa?

>> ROSA MORALES: Two questions. When is the meeting on Friday, specifically a time and location?

>> KATE SCHMIDT: (off microphone.)

>> ROSA MORALES: I would like to involve my faculty in these type of processes. It would be good to have it. Secondly nobody has mentioned that something that was discussed on the social sciences division that I think is very important. A group of individuals I think from the discipline of psychology that stated that were very concerned with the fact that unfortunately decisions were gonna be made to cut some faculty, and they proposed if it would be possible to send a survey to all the faculty as if they would be willing to have less professional development funds they use for the purpose of allocating some of that money to cover for some of those positions that potentially don't need to be cut.

And I'm very sorry that I didn't hear anybody from social sciences mention it before, but I wanted to throw this out, so PCCEA as well as (indiscernible) and what Michael know because he was heading it.

And secondly, since (indiscernible) called for the professional

development from the learning center is it possible that when we have the survey regarding how much funding we would want for professional development, if a case be made as to the opportunity to use some of the funding (indiscernible) that teaching and learning center that potentially can help not only one person but several people, because there is so much needed, okay?

So it seems that based on the discussions that I heard, there were several people that are very concerned that faculty is not being asked on how potentially we can solve some of the problems. The decision framework is coming from the top and saying, okay, it's this or this, but I think there has to be some opportunities for people like this discipline, you know, psychologies that were saying, we (indiscernible) if we might be willing to give up some of our professional development so we can cover some of those funds.

And then the other thing that I'm very interested is that given the responses that we are getting from our students, you can go back and check out how many of those faculty are continuously receiving very good, I guess, high remarks, because those are the individuals that we need to approach and ask them they would like to share their knowledge with others.

I hate to tell you, because a lot of times I seem to think that

those that are very well liked by others are the ones that keep presenting, you know, how to teach, but I'm interested in hearing from the students that you're able to recognize and identify who are those teachers for the best three or four years who keep having such a great success, so I want to hear from them.

I want them to be involved or to be asked to participate on the workshops for teaching and excellence and hear from them, acknowledge their work, acknowledge them that according to the results they are doing very good and they use that to teach all of us.

Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks. All right. I think we will move on to the next report, which is going to be given by the lovely Kiley Segers who grew a beard? (Laughter.)

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Good introduction. Hi, good afternoon everyone. This was kind of a last-minute thing, so please bear with me.

Do we have anything to display? Oh, nice.

It's probably tiny. If you're interested in having this in writing, I'd be happy to share the file with anybody.

I'd like to welcome you back to another year on behalf of PCCEA. I'm currently the president-elect. My term starts on September 1,

relieving Ana Jimenez who has been on and off and so involved in leadership, so I'd really like to thank her. She's not here unfortunately.

So if you have these sort of questions or policy or need support, please start bugging me instead of her. She really needs that break.

And I'll try to do my best to fill her shoes, even though that's pretty impossible.

So we have been -- let's see. I just want to run through some updates PCCEA has been working on. One of the biggest projects we expect for this year for us will be the big rewrite of all the employee policies, made some reports about this before. They are trying to combine the common policy for all employees with the individual faculty exempt, nonexempt policy books. It's a huge sort of rewrite.

Faculty will still have their own policy book at the end of this, their FPPS. Administration has been in touch with HR consultant that's been helping us work through the language.

We have not seen any of the first draft yet. That one should be coming within maybe a month, month or two, we hear.

The employee groups, the first opportunity to kind of comment on it and shape it all before it goes out to full public comment to

everybody.

We do have an experienced Meet and Confer team in place to work on this through this new process that we have now in place with the AERC, all college representative council, but if you're interested in policy and if you would like to help, if you're just interested in talking about what's going on, would like to get involved down the road, please contact me or contact PCCEA and we always love more people to be involved.

This is the potential to be one of the biggest changes to college policy I think in decades, if it becomes a very different document, and we will certainly keep you apprised and we will be watching closely to make sure we preserve all these, you know, sort of details and rules that we have that we have developed over time, to make sure everything works in all the different areas of the college and that we have some processes that make sense in our favor, so on and so forth.

We have gotten some reports about people being asked to, you know, things like select syllabi unreasonably early, dates of accountability, so if there is anything like that going on in your area, please feel free to contact us. This is something, you know, that we have had a bunch of reorganization. Our faculty colleagues

who are department heads are now being asked to review these syllabi, and they're being asked to approve it and submit it all perhaps too early, as well.

And so just if you're having issues, try to resolve them directly. If you hit some wall, don't hesitate to contact us.

What else do we have? So we had Red for Ed a few months ago. There will be a ballot on the initiative this fall called Invest in It. I'm not here to promote anything. I just want to explain, there is different rules about this. So we are not allowed, because this is an official ballot initiative. You're welcome to be involved on your own time but you're not supposed to display any signs in your office or classroom and use college time and resources to promote this in any way.

So just a note on that so that people are careful.

We do have elections for the Board of Governors, Pima Community College Governing Board, two open seats, and both of them are contested this year. Which is I think pretty exciting. It's always good to have some discussion and debate. And so to that end, since there have been really no forums organized, PCCEA is organizing a forum for the candidates, so we will send them some questions, and probably District Office community room will, sort of invite the

candidates and organize forums. There will opportunities for community members and you to come and ask questions.

Again, if you'd like to get involved with this in any way, please don't hesitate to let us know.

The team of doom update? So I have been on this committee, I think I have been in all the meetings except for one. Ana has been at most of them except for one, I think. McKayla Hayes, another faculty member, she substituted for us. Thomas started coming. Michael Parker has also been on there in his capacity as dean, acting, interim, I don't know, dean of social sciences.

And so it can just -- we have been invited right from the start. The discussions have been, I think, very productive and collegial despite this being such a difficult issue.

We have been trying -- we have been active and we voiced our opinions and tried to give some suggestions, but again, I want to emphasize that PCCEA is not involved at this later stage when we would be selecting any individual faculty if it comes to that, unfortunately, right? We are really just trying to make sure the process is transparent, that these criteria we develop and people are looking at are objective and make sense. It's really about identifying our instructional lead in different areas. It's not

about, oh, this person is really terrible, let's get rid of them,
right?

There should have been some brief discussions at least happening within your divisions. That survey is open through today, so if you haven't given any feedback or -- please do so. If you have any questions on the criteria, again, don't hesitate to contact us.

All employee representative council, that's that new group where any college employee can take concerns forward regarding policy or even just other issues they are having that they haven't been able to get resolved. We will be setting up an e-mail, and probably within a month there is a new web page we have, like a comment forum where people can submit issues.

It just hasn't been advertised yet, but it's up and running now, so look out for that.

The one really, or sort of one-and-a-half issues. One issue we did work through as a kind of mini Meet and Confer team is this update to the department leadership handbook for department heads and library directors and counselors and so on. There have been a couple of minor updates, hasn't been posted yet, I have talked with Morgan Phillips today. They are still updating some of those division structure charts, but as soon as that's done, they should have the

new version of the handbook posted.

Again, it was mostly minor changes for this year. That group continues to meet and look at how to further, you know, refine and improve this leadership structure and address some of these issues that we have had.

The training, we have already talked about it here, so we have been in touch with HR and the provost's office. Again, some of the issues are people can't even sign in. They have done some similar trainings, and they are not given credit, being asked to take them again.

So we are really just going to have more conversations. You might have heard that Alison Colter-Mack, our chief human resources officer, will be leaving the college, so I suppose we will meet with Jeff. I think the timeline is a big thing. I think we need to complete certain kinds of training, but let's do it on a reasonable timeline. Especially for adjunct faculty, I agree with the comment that's been made, that it's just unreasonable to expect them to do all this. I'm afraid they will be, I don't need to do this for \$800 a credit. Hopefully we can come to some reasonable agreement.

All right. We will have follow-up elections for PCCEA executive board seats. I believe we still have some vacant, like, campus

representative positions. Again, if you have any interest at all in getting involved in policy work or, you know, with this group, we tend to be sort of math heavy. You might have noticed perhaps now more than ever just because there are a lot of us and it's a big CDAC, so we have, you know, people kind of, each person can kind of do one responsibility, one committee, and we still have people left over to get involved.

But, you know, if you have any interest at all, contact us. We do have some extra seats and there will be an e-mail going out.

Let's see. There is a website. Any questions?

>> SPEAKER: So in the FPPS, will there be no information on the compensation structure for department heads and discipline leaders?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Right. So that was a big discussion that we had not last spring but a year and a half ago. We had advocated for most of this new department leadership head will include compensation, just folded into FPPS as an appendix as it was before. They were very strong about having just a separate handbook that could be updated more often.

What we do have in there though is a reference to the handbook, is a reference to the fact that faculty have to have a strong say in selecting these faculty leaders, and it says that compensation will

be specified in this new handbook.

So right now we have, I forget what the working group is again, the name, but the working group that continues to meet to keep refining this handbook, right. And any future changes to the handbook would again go through this new AERC, through a Meet and Confer process to try and confirm that it all makes sense. All those compensation tables, again, the system, like I personally take some issues with it, as do many people, but it's all there in the handbook.

Does that answer your question? Any others?

Thank you everybody. Happy fall semester.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks, Matej.

That brings us to the end of the agenda. Is anyone interested in putting forward a motion?

>> SPEAKER: I move to adjourn.

>> SPEAKER: Second

>> TAL SUTTON: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Opposed? Abstain?

(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.