



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 September 7, 2018

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. So I think we are done with introductions. Now on to agenda modifications and short announcements. Does anyone have a request for an open forum or executive session?

I'd like to put in for about a 30-second executive session. We are technically supposed to talk about any possible change to the charter with an executive session first, and it's just a quick thing that I noticed in the charter when I was looking at it, so it will take about 30 seconds. Just a very quick executive session. I promise.

All right. Next we have approval of August minutes, and I will sort of scroll quickly through those. Hopefully you have had a chance to look at them or you have a computer open in front of you.

Any necessary edits or any motions on the floor?

There is a motion on the floor to approve the minutes. Is there a second? Seconded.

I know that we have a new faculty member, senate member here

today. Sometimes we will just do a vote by sort of a vocal yay or nay. So I will call for a vocal yay and a vocal nay, and then a show of hands for any abstentions, which of course you can abstain if you weren't here for the previous meeting so these minutes don't make any sense to you.

Sometimes for other votes we will sort of do a vote by hands and sort of will have a show of hands and I will count the hands and count how many exact yeses and exact nos. For minutes we do a vocal call. I know there is a different -- it's probably roll call or something?

So anyway, all in favor of approving the minutes as is, say yay.

(Yays.)

>> TAL SUTTON: All opposed? And show of hands for abstentions? Three abstentions. The motion carries with three abstentions.

All right. The next item is looking for a new representative on the wait list committee. Karie is unable to make those meeting times right now. She had been our representative, so I asked her if she could summarize the expectations, and then when they meet and things like that.

>> KARIE MEYERS: Yeah, hi. Karie Meyers, West Campus. The meetings are Tuesday mostly every two weeks, and they are for one hour from 1:00 to 2:00.

You know, it's kind of tough for anyone who is teaching, but it is nice to have a faculty person there. I only really gave input on what, you know, what faculty want to see and now the wait list -- so the wait list was implemented this fall for science, most sciences, and math and writing. Now it's going to be implemented for everyone. The basic idea is there is a 10-person wait list. If you, you know, if people drop your class during the registration period, then someone from the wait list comes on.

But there are some little idiosyncrasies, and that's what I contributed, you know, what would be best for faculty. You have to have that period free, because it's kind of a -- you know, that's their meeting time.

I think it will be pretty seamless. You might be able to miss some of the meetings. It would be nice if it were a department head but not necessary but just that sort of knowing the background of when to add more sections and how sections fill and everything was somewhat helpful for that contribution.

I don't know. I could answer questions.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. So who would be the chairperson to e-mail if you're interested in doing that?

>> KARIE MEYERS: The chair of the committee is Jamie Calvea, I think her name is. Or Michael, yes. Either of those people.

>> TAL SUTTON: If any of you are interested to represent senate or if you want to identify one of your constituents if they are interested, you can e-mail Jamie or Michael Tulino.

Any questions regarding that?

>> ROSA MORALES: I think one of the questions that I made before was how were this committee informing the department chairs or department heads or acting directors about those waiting lists? Knowing that they will need to decide if they were going to open another section or they were going to start a late start class.

>> KARIE MEYERS: Well, they have been very communicative. You know, you'll get that information. But that is sort of part of the duty of the person who is on the wait list committee to sort of grease the wheels for communication with faculty and also to sort of wrestle with those questions.

But basically, it's done within your division, how you're going to treat the wait list and how sections are added. It doesn't really have to do with the wait list committee. What has to do with the wait list committee is what's the optimum -- yeah, what's the optimum way to configure the wait list so that's of best use to faculty and students and everything.

>> TAL SUTTON: It's not just -- it seems like part of the charge of that committee is to deal with all of that?

>> KARIE MEYERS: Right.

>> TAL SUTTON: Any other questions for clarification regarding that?

Like I said, you can e-mail Michael or Jamie or if you want to e-mail me and forget their names and you only know my name or whatever, I can pass your name along.

All right. Next we have Faculty Senate elections. I have a lot of time set aside, but only simply because we have to walk around and do the whole voting thing. Hopefully it will go seamlessly and smoothly.

We don't need, since the board rep is two years and Brooke has one more year, we don't need to have an election for that position. Same with Sean. Sean is voted through the adjunct faculty committee.

We don't elect a president. We elect a president-elect. That leaves us with two -- wait. Are we supposed to -- we also have, I'm realizing I have left off sergeant of arms and secretary? Is that right? Yes. I apologize for that.

Including the proxies, yeah.

I had only two elections listed here but there is additionally secretary and sergeant of arms. Logistics. Sorry. Logistics.

I suppose I will add those quickly. I apologize for that. I will put out a call if there is anyone interested in serving as president-elect for 2019.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I want to know if Josie might be interested in serving a second year.

>> JOSIE: I have thought about that, and some people have approached me and mentioned there would be a benefit in having some consistency in leadership. So I would be willing to serve as president-elect and president, meaning I would serve a two-year term as president. And from what I understand, what that would result in is I would not be the ACC rep, which is part of the role of

president-elect, so we would just need to elect an ACC rep. That person would get a course release. We could do that not today but I think during our next senate meeting we could elect an ACC rep.

So, yes, my answer would be I would be willing to do that.

>> TAL SUTTON: A bit to what Josie just said, it was something we added in the charter, and this is the quick executive session fix, is as it states in the charter right now, is if an officer that has release time takes on the president-elect position because they are interested in becoming president, then instead of having double the responsibilities for senate, we would have a separate election for the ACC rep where they, for that one-year position, that person would have the responsibilities of president-elect but would not become president the following year. If that makes sense.

So the president-elect has the responsibilities of serving on the ACC, still participating in sort of the strategic planning that the officers do, so meetings with the officers, as well as the meetings with the 4 minus 1 P and Lee -- for a semester there is going to be the 4 minus 1 P until I go to 3 Ps, at least for one semester.

For those additional responsibilities, instead of heaping that on one single person because they happen to hold two positions, we have a separate election for one person to have for one year the responsibilities of the vice president but they -- or sorry, the president-elect, but they don't carry on to be president. We call them the ACC rep because they become an ACC member of the All College Council.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Just a point of clarification, and maybe I'm just no good at keeping up with perpetual senseless name changes, is the All College Council the former name of the All Employee Representative Council? Two different entities at the college?

>> TAL SUTTON: Roughly think about it along these lines: Faculty Senate is to the ACC as PCCEA is to the AERC.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Ah, got it. Great analogy. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: It's going to show up on this year's SATs, I heard. (Laughter.)

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: The GREs? (Laughter.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Is there anyone else interested in serving as president-elect or wants to contribute to the conversation?

>> ROSA MORALES: Can you let everybody know exactly when, what times is it when they meet the dates? So hopefully some people will be more interested?

>> TAL SUTTON: For serving on the ACC?

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes.

>> TAL SUTTON: I was thinking we might not necessarily need to hold the ACC rep -- if Josie is elected as the president-elect, we can hold the ACC rep election next month, but knowing what the expectations are is a good idea.

The ACC meetings twice a month typically, and those are Mondays from 3:00 to 5:00, and then the officers' meetings, well, we are accommodating sort of pool our schedules and come up with a time that works. And then the meetings for 4 minus 1 Ps and Lee typically are scheduled, I think this semester they are mostly Thursdays in the midafternoon, but they try to sort of accommodate our schedules, as well. So the only sort of fixed time would be the ACC meetings on Mondays 3:00 to 5:00, and outside of that there is a little bit of flexibility.

Are there other people interested in serving as president-elect?

All right. To conserve paper and hopefully time, we will get all of the nominees out and then hand out a single ballot where you can write president and then write the name of the person you'd like to serve as president or president-elect. Only person currently nominated for that is Josie.

Now I will do a call for nominations for vice president, and once we go through all four nominations, then we will proceed with the ballots and go through the ballots.

Now there is a call for anyone interested in serving as vice

president for 2019? Again, roles and responsibilities for that would include serving on the strategic planning with the officers, having officer meetings, as well as attending the 4 minus 1 P plus Lee meetings. Then their main responsibility is conducting the elections for senate, which we have just sort of revamped how that's done, so it's going to be a new process on how we are going to conduct the elections for next year and we voted to sort of hold the elections in spring 2019.

I had a hand in developing the changes to those elections, so I'm actually interested in putting my name forward to serve as vice president so I can conduct the elections that I sort of helped restructure. I'm going to put my name forward as one of the nominees, but also have a wait time for anyone else interested in serving as vice president. Practicing wait time.

All right. I will put up and try and project the names of the nominees so that you know who is running.

The next would be, for the secretary, and Rita had served as secretary for 2018, the responsibilities primarily center around conducting the, maintaining the minutes and writing up the minutes, which she did a stellar job of.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: I don't have the charter in front of me. Are there other additional -- pretty much the responsibility?

So writing up the minutes from the notes as well as sort of (indiscernible) the meeting.

Is there anyone else serving as secretary for 2019?

>> SPEAKER: I would like to propose a name to put forward. How about Rita? Just sayin'. You said she did such a good job, by the way, being a former secretary, just putting that in there.

>> TAL SUTTON: Rita, entirely up to you.

>> SPEAKER: Rita. I completely appreciate the nomination. However, my plate is pretty full this semester.

>> TAL SUTTON: I appreciate that. Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: So thank you but no thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Any other names to put forward or nominate thyself?

>> SPEAKER: It's a great gig. (Laughter.) I can't speak higher of it.

>> JOSIE: This isn't a responsibility, but I would just add that the secretary also has the option of attending the meetings and is encouraged to attend those meetings, so it's a great way to participate in those really meaningful discussions. It's just another incentive as serving.

>> SPEAKER: I think if we added release time, that would be a no-brainer, huh?

Sean promised he'd start paying me money to do it, so in the interest of time, I'll go ahead and accept. If I have to miss meetings, then we will figure it out.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you.
(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. I won't wait any more for a second name.

Moving on to logistics officer, which Tanya P served and does a good job of sort of reigning people from going off the rails when they're up here. Also, as Josie said, all officers are invited to attend the strategic planning meetings with the other officers and want to get a feel for what we talk about with the 4 minus 1 Ps plus Lee. Planning and developing our strategic plan for the semester.

You also help with the technology and make sure that all the technology is set up. Mike is unruly. You get the opportunity to work with the lovely Mike Rom.

Anyone interested in serving or continuing to serve as logistics officer?

>> SPEAKER: I'll continue.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: So we have at least one nominee for each position. I will sort of go over there and project the names while someone hands out the ballots.

You can bring your ballots to Matej or Matej can come by and grab them from people. If you just maybe bring the summary to me and I will just sort of move on.

So if you're still writing your ballot, just make sure it gets to Matej and Matej will be counting that for us.

We will move on to the next item, which is the board policy review, which included a total of four policies. There is a rationale document that touches on AP1.17.01, AP2.01.01, and BP1.03 which is recommended for deletion.

And Seth is here to present on that.

>> SPEAKER: I may be taking this a little bit out of order. There is not much to say. (microphone difficulties.)

Now we're in business. So as I was saying, I'm going to take these out of order. Some of them don't require, in my opinion, a lot of discussion. If you feel differently, I'm happy to discuss them.

The first one would be BP1.03. That's gone because it's obsolete. It talks about stuff that happened in 2017. Anybody unclear about what year it is? Okay. Enough said about that one.

1.17.01, that's public expression, and if you're having deja vu about that, yes, I was just here in March talking to you about that. But since March, interesting things have happened in the state legislature that affected this AP, among other things here at the college. Which I'm sure I will be back to talk with you about in short order.

What we had to do there is bring it up to date with some things that went into effect August 3rd. Generally there is not a whole lot

that's different in there. We had to bring our definition of what's a true threat, such that we could tell someone you can't say that here up to the standards with the, with what the state legislature has said we have to have. We needed to have a specific provision in there that allowed for spontaneous expression to occur, which we did before. It just was not -- we didn't use the word "spontaneous." We had to insert that. We also had to bring it up to the standard that the state prescribed for how we decide when something is not in the best interests of the college to be said. That would be the compelling interests standard. If anything knows about con law, that's like a strict scrutiny standard, which is fine. That's 1st Amendment-type stuff. We just had to be clear that unless the college can articulate, like, a very, very good reason why we are telling somebody that they can't engage in the speech they are engaging in, then that would not be compatible with what the state wants us to do.

Again, that's pretty much what we were doing before. We just weren't using that exact word. In case you're wondering, compelling interest would be -- it's disruptive of our ability to engage in ordinary college operations: teaching, engaging with the public, running the ordinary business of the college. Nothing has changed there other than semantics.

The one area where we did have to make a more substantive change on is in the, we had a section for invited speakers. So we are now required to have some specific language that if somebody comes to our college to, at the invitation or not at the invitation maybe of someone here, then we need to make reasonable efforts to ensure the safety of that person. That's not my language. That's the State of Arizona telling us what to put in there. We can also charge a reasonable fee for that security. That's about it.

Anybody have any questions on the changes?

>> SPEAKER: Joe Brewer. It seems I heard you say if someone is invited or maybe not invited. But this has invited speakers. It applies to people that have been invited by members of the community, by (indiscernible) of the community? What does it mean?

>> SPEAKER: I was being a bit facetious, as you might have picked up.

So by invited, it just means attributable in some way to someone who is associated with the college community, asking them to come and speak. It doesn't mean it has to be invited by the institution itself. It could be one of our students. Again, these are not very clear definitions with the new law, so, I mean, we are interpreting "inviting" very broadly. If somebody is a student, a faculty member, if they have an association with the college and this individual is here at their behest, that person is covered by section 6 and we have an obligation to make a reasonable effort to ensure that that individual can safely engage in saying something that may be unpopular.

Other questions about that one? Or anything else?

>> ROSA MORALES: You know, 1.12, fighting words, when you go to the next page, which is 3, it states that hearing the speech to commit an imminent breach of the peace, act of vandalism or act of violence against a speaker or against someone else, I notice that that whole paragraph is only talking about personal, you know, person to person, but I felt that if vandalism or any threat against private property should be included, because as I recall, the video that was found about that individual that shot Gabby Giffords, one of the threats was against the building, right, that he was going to do some damage to the building.

So under those fighting words, the way I understand it is only addressing, you know, encourage others to violence against other people.

But it's not clear if it includes, you know, property.

>> SPEAKER: Good thought on that. I will take it under advisement. Anybody else on the changes to the public expression AP?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So you said we basically had very little creative license with this? This is all just to update it with the most recent Arizona state laws?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, that's a good summary of what our obligations were here. We had to make sure the language tracked what the State of Arizona said we needed to be doing. Except for the stuff about

invited speakers, we basically were already doing it. We're just making sure if anyone were to audit us, make sure we were in compliance, that the language matches up, just so there is no confusion.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Looks good to me. Thanks.

>> ROSA MORALES: I would like to add that the same situation is on page No. 5 on the top on 1.27. It says true threat means speech in any medium that the speaker intends to communicate a serious expression of an intent to commit an act of unlawful violence against a specific person or group of persons, I would like it to be considered to add or private property.

>> SPEAKER: Well, think about that. That's a little more tricky, because true threat is one of the terms that is defined in the new statute.

This wouldn't be my choice of how we would define true threat, but we are bound to follow what the state says, at least with this particular definition. But thank you for the comment.

Anybody else on this one? Okay.

The third not-very-much-to-talk-about one would be AP1.25.01. That's personnel governance policy. I said there's not much to discuss here as far as I know, because this has already come through. This is the same thing you saw when the BP came through a few months ago. This was attached to that. We just have to go through the formalities of having it go through the process as an independent AP rather than an attachment to a BP.

Anybody have any comments about that? The caveat that I don't know that much about them so I might have to get back to you if you have substantive questions.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Again, I would just like to confirm that I was on the AERC for the past, you know, since this year, I think we got started in January or February, and there have not been any changes to this AP, at least any really substantive one. I don't think there were any changes since this last came around. I think it was like spring 2017. Yeah.

But I'd be happy to answer any questions.

>> SPEAKER: Anything else on this one? Moving along.

This is the fun one we get to talk about that hasn't actually been updated in a while. This is our new service animals AP. This is 2.01.01 formerly 3.46.04. 3.46.04 used to be exclusively relating to students, but as you know, we have plenty of individuals who are not students who utilize service animals or bring animals onto college property for other reasons.

We thought this needed to be moved to a more appropriate place that's applicable to everyone at the college, including employees, visitors, that kind of thing, and also that is a little clearer about what differences are between certain kinds of animals that we might have on the campuses and what the various rights and obligations of those individuals who bring them to our campuses and properties might be.

Again, this is another one there has been -- if anybody has been to a grocery store lately, you might have seen the placards standing outside saying Arizona law has changed, not allowed to do this, this, and this anymore, so we had some obligations to track that, as well, with this AP.

We have new definitions. Mainly, as I said, we are distinguishing now between service animals, emotional support animals, program animals, and pets. I can get into depth about this, but I know it's Friday, so does anybody have any questions about the differences between those? I will say that if you see somebody who has something that's not a dog, it's probably not a service animal unless it's about this tall and a horse.

Anybody have any questions about that?

>> ROSA MORALES: I think it's important to notice that on page 14 there is actually listed two questions. The only two questions that we can ask anybody that has, you know, an animal, a pet with them, is this a service animal required because of a disability? And the second question is what work or task is this dog or miniature horse being trained to perform?

So I think it's important for us faculty to understand and then to pass that information to our students, especially social services students, for them to know that these are the only two questions.

>> SPEAKER: Good point. That's for service animals. We did want to include this. We didn't invent this. This isn't the college's policy. This is how the ADA law reads. This is what anyone is permitted to ask.

So we just want to be very clear in specifying that so there is no confusion about it. That doesn't mean if somebody answers no to these questions that the animal is not permitted here on our property. We do have provisions that allow for emotional support animals. We have been doing this. Legally speaking the college is not required under the ADA to allow emotional support animals onto college property. The distinction between the two, an emotional support animal might be doing the same things that, it might look exactly like a service animal, but it has not been specifically trained to do a particular work or task. Its presence is the service that it's providing to the individual who is using it.

We do have individuals who utilize emotional support animals. Previously we didn't have, at least a very easily findable set of rules about how that works. Basically it's the same thing as requesting an accommodation through ADA or through ADR employees to students.

Questions?

>> SPEAKER: Joe Brewer. As opposed to most of our ADR things, this also can apply to community users? For instance, that want to use the emotional support animal in the library setting, they would need to get it checked out with ADR?

>> SPEAKER: Correct. Not ADR, but it would need to go through -- I'm not sure what her title is now. It's still Kate Walker. But she has moved locations. I don't know if her title has changed. Employees and visitors go through ADR. Excuse me, ADA. Students go through ADR.

In that instance, if it is a service animal, employees would

still need to go through requesting an accommodation process but students and visitors don't need to. It's a distinction, there are reasons for it and it's laid out in the AP.

Emotional support animals, though, we can't exclude them if somebody has not gone through either ADA or through ADR to have them approved as an accommodation, just like any accommodation someone with a disability might request and have approved.

Does that help?

>> SPEAKER: Not really, but I will read it more carefully.

>> SPEAKER: I won't go on and on and on about it. If an individual is bringing a service animal, which is a dog or in very rare instances a tiny, tiny horse, specifically trained to do a particular task or job, and they answer in the affirmative to the two questions, then anyone can bring that animal.

If the answer is no to those or it's a different type of animal, a cat or a rabbit or something, it doesn't mean that it isn't permitted here. It just isn't permitted here without going through the process to request an accommodation.

So if an individual comes to the library and they have their emotional support animal with them, the correct process wouldn't be to tell them -- well, they need to leave, but they need to direct them to go to, if it's a student, ADR, and if it's a visitor, to go to ADA.

Clear? All right. Program animals is a third category. That would be basically stress-relieving petting zoos that come around finals time. I think we have had those from time to time.

And then the fourth and final category would be pets. We just want to be very clear about the distinction between that. Doesn't mean people can't bring their pets here and they can walk around the sidewalks but they can't come into the buildings and onto our athletic fields, et cetera, et cetera.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Thank you for coming today. My question is back to the library thing. How would we notify the

public, the visiting public, in an immediate way that their animal might not be allowed before they got up to over to the library? For instance, don't you think we should make the public aware that this is what you need to do before you come here?

>> SPEAKER: Absolutely. So that's going to be a function of the ADA office and the ADR office.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Do they have that kind of a budget?

>> SPEAKER: It would be signage. I'm not sure if we are talking bus wraps or TV commercials, but I don't know the answer to that.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Can we think about some kind of signage at our parking lots, warning notices about any animals that come on campus need to be approved through the appropriate place?

>> SPEAKER: Well, knowing John Howe and Kate Walker as I do, I'd be very surprised if they haven't already thought about that, but I will pass that along.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Hernando. Do you have any classification for students that are usually brought into classrooms for the teaching purposes?

>> SPEAKER: That's a good question. You mean like an animal --

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, we do sometimes show-and-tells and people that volunteer that bring snakes and all kinds of other things to show on our biology classes to show live specimens.

Are there any regulations or definitions or any special things we need to be aware of? Any liability?

>> SPEAKER: Always liability.

That's a good question. It's been a while since I have given this a deep dive, but I will think about that and I'll let you know. If not, then that's something to revisit.

Anybody else with questions? One thing I do want to add, it was a little -- we did get questions, quite a few questions, about what do I do if I've got someone bringing a service animal in my class and someone else is allergic to the service animal in my class. There is a provision in here for what to do in the event you have two conflicting disabilities. The long and short is they both have to be accommodated. Kate and John are top notch at helping you figuring out what to do with that.

>> ROSA MORALES: I did have that issue six years ago. It was a Saturday class, eight hours, and within half an hour, one of the students stood up and came and told me that she was allergic to animals. I did have someone with a service.

So one of the things we did, being Saturday, we moved to a larger classroom. I put them on one side and the other side, and both students were aware that when we were going out to another classroom or whatever, never to be close to each other. It worked well.

But obviously it was six years ago when this was not highly regulated as now. So it is an issue sometimes.

>> SPEAKER: Not much has changed in six years. That probably would be the approach if it was physically possible, given the space limitations.

Something to keep in mind, that brings up a good point, is if you have someone who comes up to you and says I'm allergic to dogs, I can't be near this person, if you want to move people around in your classroom, that's fine, but it really is only something that we need to start asking a question, at least for legal purposes, how we accommodate both, if the allergies rise to the level of a disability.

So that's a judgment we'd need to go through. If it's a student, we need to go through ADR because it has to be supported by medical documentation and that sort of thing. If someone tells you I'm allergic to dogs, it doesn't automatically trigger your responsibility to do something about it. You can if it makes it easier, although I'd caution against making informal accommodations. Probably best to refer them to ADR for the interactive process.

>> ROSA MORALES: ADR is not open on Saturdays, and the class was

eight hours.

>> SPEAKER: And you did the best you could, and I'm proud of you.

Anybody else on animals? Adorable little animals? Okay.

One last thought, and this is not really about the AP, but these are things you might encounter is no matter what, even if somebody is approved with their animal, it has to behave itself, can't mess with other animals, has to be house broken, basically four on the floor. Their paws need to be down.

If you have someone holding the service animal, unless it's a requirement, that's what their work is, to somehow be associated with the person or a therapy animal, it needs to be on the ground at all times. A lot of these rules are to help alleviate some of the feelings of anxiety about I don't want to say the wrong thing here or overreact, so please do review it.

If you have other questions, of course you can make comments or let me know. Hopefully this will give peace of mind to people who don't know what they should be doing in a situation. If I could put everything in a document that was readable, I would, but people can and do devote entire careers to this, so there is a lot there.

Do reach out to ADA, ADR, legal, we'll help you out.

Thanks, everybody. Have a good weekend.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you, Seth.

Again, yeah, that request for review for personnel governance policies was a generic call. I think there are still some kinks being worked out and they wanted it to be open for discussion.

No specific edits as of yet. Just look over it and keep an open mind, or if you identify anything that might be improved, share that information.

The next agenda item is sort of being motivated by a bit, by the work that the officers here were asked from what was formerly known as the Four Ps and Lee, as well as work that Ana Jimenez did with FTs about developing a vision-making process, continuous improvement model, some sort of thing to propose and have the college adopt towards that.

I think what we were considering in our last officers meeting was instead of trying to sort of do a major, huge cultural overhaul and say let's adopt this or that policy, to just sort of build up towards that and so make an endorsement towards, like, this would be a good first step in developing a good process for making curriculum changes and introducing large-scale curriculum initiatives at the college.

So we sort of I think aptly called it the heads-up policy. I can go and show it. We had it written in two different ways. One as sort of a resolution, more formal resolution, and one as sort of a summary. They both convey the same information. It's how we want to format the information.

I will just read it quickly. Faculty Senate requests that information regarding all initiatives impact curriculum and academics be presented to the senate as soon as the initiatives are considered for adoption. This information will include but is not limited to the relevant Pima Community College outcome, a description of the initiative, rationale for the need of the initiative, e.g., what goals it is trying to accomplish, what problems it is trying to solve, as well as evidence on its successfulness.

I think these sort of point to some recent initiatives in our recent past, such as guided pathways where, again, I think if we were sort of more open with that conversation right at the get-go, in particular about what is it we're trying to accomplish with guided pathways, you could start moving away from this habit of adopting packaged deals that might try to solve some issue or tension or problem at the college and actually take, if we have a rationale for the need of it, if we have a description of the initiative, and we understand what the outcome is trying -- what it is, we can talk about how appropriate it is for us, how to best customize it for Pima's needs right at the start of that conversation rather than when we are sort of months into that conversation.

So this is just an attempt to make it known that senate is looking to do is play a more active role in a conversation of if there is an initiative or an outcome that the college is interested in pursuing, that we are open and transparent about it right at the get-go and have that conversation about how best to achieve these outcomes.

So in some sense, this is kind of step 1 of the process that Ana Jimenez and Jeff Thies' model describes as well as the continuous improvement model that we were asked to produce for guided pathways, and so this is working towards building up towards that process.

>> ROSA MORALES: More collaborative?

>> TAL SUTTON: Encourage a more collaborative problem-solving culture at the college. I think it's just a means to sort of start taking a stand and saying, this is the direction we want curriculum and academic initiatives to go. We want to be more thoughtful and transparent about it, and we want to be more collaborative. That's what this is.

Based on how guided pathways or at least aspects of guided pathways was rolled out and some other initiatives, we felt that we would -- we felt it would be useful to have such a motion.

Anything else the officers want to add?

>> ROSA MORALES: I would like to add right where it says a description of the initiative, to include along with proposed timelines. Because I think that has been a major issue.

>> SPEAKER: Joe Brewer. It sounds like a great idea. A couple of questions. One would be who is it directed to in the sense of who would be responsible for determining, ah, there is an initiative, it relates to curriculum, I need to bring it forward?

And then talk a little bit about the evidence of its successfulness. What are we looking for there?

>> TAL SUTTON: Again, I'm 99% of the time, out of the provost's office, but I could see initiatives being sort of someone looking into or interest being piqued elsewhere within the college, but once

something starts being looked into or considered for adoption, the senate is brought into that conversation to work on this collaboratively.

As for evidence, I mean, I think it's more along the lines of looking for if we are going to adopt some initiatives like pathways, include the relevant research-based evidence that they have worked on and they have and let us look at it early enough we can drill down into that data and see its applicability.

>> SPEAKER: Kiley Segers. I remember reading some of Ana's drafts that was a part of this. I appreciate you guys are distilling it down to some key components.

I think, though, one thing that was sort of lost from what she was trying to do is rather than talking about wanting different offices to come to us with the initiatives that they have planned as soon as possible to instead come to us with the problem, because I think that something that we have really seen happen a lot is that administration or provost's office or what have you come to us with something they think would be a really great idea and they want feedback, and I think that as Faculty Senate we actually need to be into the creation of the initiative itself.

So I would like to see the language changed to instead coming to us with the problem so that we can get in there before they've already committed to a plan of action and then we are having to just sort of troubleshoot and put Band-Aids and convince them that what they've come up with actually might not work for these reasons.

I'd like to take away the word initiative and (off microphone).

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah, I think the relevant outcome was what could be translated as what problem were you trying to solve? And you're sort of saying that conversation comes before?

>> SPEAKER: Right.

>> TAL SUTTON: Lisa?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Kimlisa, PimaOnline. Yeah, I'm kind of struggling with the words "initiatives." At what point does it

become an initiative? It's a little ambiguous to me, and I'm always leery of "as soon as possible," because as soon as possible to whom?

And I agree, it would be so much nicer to be in on there is a problem, how do we solve the problem, and then doing the Band-Aid after the effect like has happened with pathways.

That's my thing. Because impacting curriculum is so broad. At what point, I mean, does it become overwhelming for senate and at what point does it really become something that we should be involved with? If that makes sense.

>> TAL SUTTON: And I think that makes sense. I think we have to be broad because it's not meant to be policy. It's just meant to be a resolution, like, say, we are taking the step, putting ourselves out there to say we want to be involved in these. And so certainly could be the case that there is something that is tangentially related to curriculum that they bring forward to us and say, well, thanks for letting us know. Or if it's something more akin to guided pathways, like, all right, let's get our (indiscernible).

I think that's the reasoning for having it more open-ended like that. I can see the ambiguous part about initiatives maybe replacing with problems.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. I'm concerned also about the word "initiatives," because that brings out the idea that it's a done deal, and we have to live with that and make it work.

I would rather maybe not the word "problem," when a problem is identified, because that's way too broad, but to find some word to get us involved in the conversation before it becomes an initiative.

>> JOSIE: Just a couple things is regarding the problem, we did create a problem-solving model which is separate. I think that would be a separate item, because problems would come as a result -- subsequent to initiatives and policies being taken (indiscernible), and the idea here is that we want to just have a heads-up. If something is going to impact curriculum and academics, we need a heads-up.

Regarding the point about initiatives, I agree that -- I

understand what you're saying, Nancy, and that does make sense. So perhaps we could put something to the effect of proposed initiatives or proposed plans, because initiatives does kind of give the sense that it's something that's already been decided. Perhaps adding "proposed changes" or "new," something to clarify would be valuable.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I generally agree with the discussion and was trying to think of something. Like you said, "changes" might be a good word. Doesn't have to be an initiative but changes to curriculum and academics. That's what we are talking about, right?

The other suggestion I have is that it's not as soon as something is considered for adoption. That again to me seems late. But maybe well before adoption or at the early stages of consideration, or something like that?

And then I had a question on the last bullet, successfulness. I'm not sure. Is that standard board, or what does it mean? Do we mean efficacy? Do we mean like evidence for potential success?

>> TAL SUTTON: I think tied to the outcome, how does -- how successful is it in achieving (indiscernible).

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Perhaps some writing faculty can comment on the wording.

>> SPEAKER: Lisa. Writing faculty, what do you think about the idea of saying "idea" instead of initiative? So ideas. So we are in there at the beginning. Team Pima all working together.

>> SPEAKER: Joe Brewer. I'm trying to think of it from the perspective of the provost or whoever is responsible for responding, and there is something nice about "initiative." Even though it seems like a formed idea, it probably has a name and it probably seems like a thing, which will be, oh, boy, we've got something called (indiscernible) pathways, we probably better bring this forward.

At the stage of problem or idea, it's going to be difficult for people in that area, especially because there are so many of them to say, oh, yeah, we've got something here that fits this.

But the idea of proposed initiative or initiative being

considered might be around where we want to have it where they feel like, yeah, we know what they are looking for and we know when we need to bring something forward, but it hasn't gotten so far along that everybody is committed to it.

>> TAL SUTTON: These are all great, great input. If this spirals to the point where we feel like we sort of maybe to retreat back and work on rewording it, we are happy to do that. But just one that is jumping to my mind during this conversation is that if we sort of talk more about, like, the problems that we are trying to solve, a lot of ways, the problems are probably going to be ever-existing problems, like you could sort of say, we are looking to solve student retention rate or student success rates, improve student success rates, that later turned into adopting guided pathways. But that is always going to be an issue, as we are always going to want to improve our numbers. Regardless of whether or not we are doing well, we can always do better. In some sense maybe it's like when -- it's almost like when a problem becomes prioritized, that's when we sort of want to talk about it, once we sort of recognize that there is a problem that you want to prioritize and work on improving. We're not looking -- nothing can solve it. If there was a silver bullet for many of these things, we would have certainly adopted it long ago.

I think that's maybe more what we are looking for, at least that's the tenor that I'm feeling, is that, yes, we want to get it in very early stages of consideration, even in the early stages of exploring potential solutions. But these are -- if we just use the word, term "problems," these are problems that exist indefinitely. So it's more like once there is a strategic plan or once there is an action plan or a decision made at the board level, at the chancellor level, provost level, to act upon one of those, that's sort of when we want to sort of have the conversation open up to us and work on it collaboratively.

Rita?

>> SPEAKER: I agree with what you said. I think we just need to add something like or clarify, for me, is this a college-wide initiative? Do we want to do, like, a division or program? We're talking like at that level. I think that needs to be explained a little bit more.

>> TAL SUTTON: Use college-wide. Good idea.

>> SPEAKER: One of the things, looking at what's being proposed here, I think for me that's missing is that oftentimes there is an initiative that comes to senate or a body like us, and then we say, okay, yes, we want to do this, or -- and then maybe a subcommittee or somebody gets assigned. But thing maybe we should, before an idea comes to us, somebody from an administration or somebody should identify somebody at the senate to actually help, you know, introduce it, help introduce it to the senators, so that way it's not -- I think having somebody that is sort of, somebody who -- only thing I can think of is somebody who embodies -- perfect example. John Howe, when you think of John Howe, you think of ADR, right? Somebody like that.

So if we want to have, if there is a problem that we want to have changed, we want to know that John Howe is going to come speak to us. Well, it's probably going to be about ADR. So we want to identify somebody that from senate that could be, you know, the expert or somebody that we could, we, as senators, can look to to, you know, where is this discussion, those kinds of things.

I was thinking like, you know, because usually that's the admin lead or somebody like that. I'm just trying to think of it, like, in projects. You want to have a project. You have sort of like, you know, the president, the manager, project manager or something like that, that would help nurture this through the process of approval through the different areas.

>> TAL SUTTON: Right. I think you're graduating into like developing a structure, developing a process, whereas this is just like even sort of earlier form of that. I think in the interest of time, we move -- we will bring this up again in whatever the next month is, October, but I would be interested in identifying anyone that might be interested in working on this via just within Google Docs, no physical meetings. Just wordsmith.

>> ROSA MORALES: Can I just -- I would like to read what I wrote as potentially replacing the other item?

I wrote, No. 1, a description of the issue. No. 2, potential

collaborative solutions and proposed timelines. No. 3, relevant PCC expected outcomes. No. 4, rationale for the need to take some action and for evidence of successfulness.

I feel like first, a description of the issue, why is it an issue? Why do we need to look into it.

Second is they have to present potential collaborative solutions, which means that how are you involving everybody? And proposed timelines. And what is the expected outcome?

Again, next, rationale for the need to take some action, because it might be that just the need for discussion, and out of the discussion comes out, well, you know, we don't need to do anything.

If there is a need to do something, then evidence of success on doing something.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think you make excellent points, but again, I think in terms of people's willingness to endorse and put their vote behind something, I think it's important that we sort of take a month and we will take that input into it. Right now, if I could just get maybe two or three volunteers that are just willing to put their eyes on this in this next month? The officers will revisit the document, but we will also give you -- I know you can view it. I'm not sure if you have editing rights, I will make sure if anyone wants to, they can have editing rights. Joe, you're interested? Margie? Rosa and Karie? So Margie, Joe, Karie, and Rosa will help us refine this proposal and revisit it. We will bring it back in October for consideration, all right?

It logged out...

All right. The next is a president's report that I will keep -- actually, in terms of honoring somebody's time who has to get back to Desert Vista quickly, I'm going to go out of order very quickly to Ted who has been waiting patiently to talk about the veteran support faculty. And then we will get back to our regularly scheduled program.

>> TED ROUSH: Good afternoon, everybody. Thanks for taking my out of order. We are in the middle of campus vice president

selections for Desert Vista. They are taking a three-hour break so I could come here and join you and then run back.

At least be comfortable by the fact they will stay here late tonight because of that (laughter.)

Anyway, so one of my hats involves military and veterans services. In 2016 we were named a veteran supportive campus, one of many in the state, but very proud to achieve that status. We want to push this hopefully to the next level with your support.

So what our concept is, very simply, is to create something we call veteran supportive faculty. When we say that, it's basically an initiative we would take at the college. Everyone could be veteran supportive faculty, but we would like to be someone to be veteran supportive faculty. Nobody has to be. It's voluntary program. We are talking about people that are willing to undergo some fairly brief training about what it means to be a veteran, what kind of expectations that sets up, and why a veteran in your classroom might react differently to certain stimuli, certain situations, things of that nature.

The second part of that will be a set of principles to which veteran supportive faculty would ascribe to. What does that mean? It means -- well, of course, practices that will be very pro student. In a word, it's flexibility. It's being aware that certain situations may cause veterans to perform or react differently in a class, and if you ascribe, subscribe to those principles, you would be a veteran supportive faculty in that you are showing the flexibility to help them out.

What will we do with that? We would probably try to publicize it as much as possible to our veterans population. While we are never in the business of recommending factor saying -- or steering veterans to certain faculty. If they ask for, is there someone out there that would work with me, we would say, here are people that have chosen to go to training and have subscribed to these principles. You know, you may want to try Tanya or Brooke or whatever as someone who would be, you know, already thinking in terms of accommodating you. That's a little a, not a big A, accommodating, because that's for DSR.

What I'm looking for, hopefully when we are done with this, is

your support. Second thing is hope for a few faculty members to join us in coming up with what those principles are that we would put down that faculty would subscribe to.

We have some suggestions, but again, the faculty input is key to that. So are there any folks that could join us? We are talking about maximum of two meetings. Hopefully not long ones. I love to see this. I see Tanya, I see Teddy, Rosa. Wow. Kimlisa. Thank you.

And you have a question, I see?

Are you writing all these names down or taking pictures?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I have a lot of veterans in my online classes, so is this going to encompass online, as well?

>> TED ROUSH: Absolutely. As I was looking across the room --

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I'm in.

>> TED ROUSH: -- I was thinking we need to have an online aspect to this. What does this mean to be veteran supportive in the online environment?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Right.

>> TED ROUSH: Absolutely.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Okay.

>> TED ROUSH: I know her name and her number. (Laughter.)
Any other questions?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: What kind of training do you envision? Do we have any training yet? Are we going to create something?

>> TED ROUSH: Yes, we actually -- what we are thinking is we have this, it's called a navigator class, not in the sense of student services, but it is this training -- was it four hours? Four hours of training. Some people come down from Phoenix, and they just kind of indoctrinate is a bad word, that's a military word, but kind of

run you through what the veterans' experience is like.

I took the training about a year ago. The part that was extremely impactful to me was the part of, all right, there is danger in this film coming up. Find it. You're like, okay, I'm ready. I can see this, you know.

And they start running this clip. It's a busy street with hundreds of people and stores and people going this way and that way. You realize that during the five-minute clip you can't find the danger. That's what they go through every single day for hours at a time. So imagine what that does to you as a person. Talk about the hypervigilance. You talk about wanting to sit in the back of the room where no one can be behind you. Some of those things that veterans are noted for.

To me, just the entire four-hour training was worth that five minutes we spent on that video, because it really put me in the situation, like, wow, how would that change your lens at what you look at things?

That's an example. We do have some other, much shorter parts of training. 30 minutes apiece. Suicide prevention, things like that. We probably say this is what it takes to make you veteran supportive faculty and just commit over the next year to do these three or four other things.

That's just kind of conceptually what we are thinking, but as we talk to senators and other people with inputs, we can, just like your class is being held over 5 or 12 or 16 weeks or a whole year, we can morph that into whatever size it needs to be to make it convenient for faculty to participate.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Thank you so much for spearheading and overseeing this. A number of years ago I read an article, and I can't recall the exact title, but it was something like 10 things professors need to understand about their veteran college students. I shared it with my dean at the time. I have implemented a bunch of these in my classes.

One of the things that I would be very, very, very interested in seeing your office do with this is I'm sure there might be copyright

issues or whatever, but if y'all could modularize the Phoenix people's course, for example, maybe uploading an MP4 of that video you were alluding to, and if there were, I don't know, PowerPoint slides or something, what I'm thinking is the general principle of making available to all faculty, you know, those who want to just dip their toe in, those who want to immerse themselves, and everybody in between, I would love to see -- I mean, this is, like, I'm getting verklempt here. I am very passionate about this. I think this is awesome. And I really would like to see the college move in a direction where faculty can have access to this type of sensitizing frameworks. I think it's just so important. Thank you for doing it. But can y'all work hard to just get it on the web so that people who are time strapped, overextended, overscheduled can access it as little or as much as their time allows?

>> TED ROUSH: That's just an outstanding idea. It hadn't gotten that far in my brain. I have to say top 10 things student veterans would want you to know is on my phone. There is no reason that can't be part of the resources we put out to people.

Here's the secret sauce to all this. Anything we do for veterans has applicability to all our other students.

Any time we have flexibility and we think about the lens at which someone approaching their education from, and even the companion, not companion to this, but I consider key is that underresourced

population and how it changes your lens as far as when you're an underresourced person, I thought that was extremely impactful training, that would also be a cool thing to have for a lot of folks.

>> SPEAKER: If I could just add one thing, the training itself would be conducted by experts. The suicide awareness would come from the V.A. Hospital. The PTSD and traumatic brain injuries would also be coming from the Veterans Center downtown. They are all combat vets that are dealing with this kind of stuff. The network, navigator training comes from the family support group from the Arizona department of veterans services at the capital.

One of the additional things we'd be adding to this would be you hopefully would want to come visit one of the vet spaces in all the campuses and the vet center here and just sit for a little while and

talk to a veteran and ask one of our staff to kind of walk you through some of the stuff that we have to kind of help you help them kind of thing.

One example, when a student gets a W, the veteran now has a debt. All benefits given to the veteran are now due back to the VA the moment a veteran takes a W.

You just don't know that. I used to deal, when I was a manager, I would help veterans and I was constantly telling them, don't take the F, take the W. Well, I was just encouraging them to get a debt. And I didn't know that until I took this job. So that's the kind of stuff that we will hopefully will be able to ask you to join us and help them, help us help them so you can do your job better with them.

>> JOSIE: Just to clarify, are you soliciting volunteers from Faculty Senate or would you like us to notify our constituents and invite them to serve as volunteers, as well?

>> TED ROUSH: Anybody that wants to make input is certainly welcome. We probably should keep the crowd down to 100, but of course. We are interested in this being a college thing. We are just trying to, as military and veterans services, just trying to be the leading edge for this and to adopt something we think is very positive for the college.

>> JOSIE: Would you like us to ask them to e-mail you directly?

>> TED ROUSH: Yes, please. We got your names. Rosa?

>> ROSA MORALES: Somebody that is very sensitive to faculty, that our veterans, I need to tell you that last semester we had the opening of the veterans center at the West Campus, which is great. Now we no longer have (indiscernible).

But I mentioned that at that time we are dealing with accessibility issues, because we have a door that individuals that are handicapped are not able to go in.

So guess what? This semester, I went again in the beginning of the semester, because I always like to take people around. And I noticed that door is still there. They haven't fixed it.

It's not a good idea. That needs to be fixed. I went to visit a new person. Unfortunately the new person wasn't there. But then I noticed that it's not been fixed, the door next to the lockers that veterans have to deal with before going into the vet center needs to be accessible to handicapped.

>> TED ROUSH: I see Hector standing up. He wants to respond to that.

>> SPEAKER: We resubmitted that work order to (indiscernible) office, and they are working on it.

>> ROSA MORALES: Last semester.

>> SPEAKER: I understand. When we opened that space, that was immediately identified.

>> ROSA MORALES: We want the head of admin here to know it has to be a priority.

>> TED ROUSH: Absolutely. We are navigating -- facilities, I'm going to go ahead and defend them here for a second. The facilities' plate is kind of full with the facilities master plan rolling out. We are experiencing a lot of delays across the college in executing -- I'm going to call it, and I don't mean less important, but smaller projects that aren't the big, let's buy land and build a giant whatever center, you know. It is challenging to get some reaction. We are trying to get the Northwest veterans space opened up right now, and we are waiting for the fire marshal. It's a little frustrating for us.

>> SPEAKER: Hernando. You mentioned you want faculty to participate in two meetings to get ideas. Do you have -- maybe I just missed it. Do you have any idea as to when, on what dates, and at what times you're planning to conduct these meetings?

>> TED ROUSH: I will do the usual, and I'll get the names

together and we will doodle poll it. I'd like to see it happening the first meeting in a week or two. I'm not talking about six months from now.

Because really we like to soft roll out in spring if we possibly

can. I don't think we need to make this into rocket science. For instance, we come up with an agreed-upon list of what we think the principles are that we think faculty could agree with and what that training would be.

But that doesn't mean it can't be edited over time, that we can't say, let's add something, take something off, whatever that is.

Because we are an academic institution. We get smarting as time goes on. Soon. Real soon.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think I can feel a palpable change in the energy in this room when we actually got to talk about something that impacted students. I appreciated that jolt of energy that you gave us. So yeah, I think there is a lot of people that are in support of this, and if you need more volunteers, I think we are happy to oblige.

>> TED ROUSH: There was a question about compensation for training. I have to go back and look at that as to -- I think if we are doing it during -- what's certainly for sure, if it's full-time faculty and it's during regular work hours, there actually is no option whatsoever, that you can't be paid for that. If we are asking you to come in during nonduty hours, like a Saturday, then payment would probably be something that could happen.

(discussion off microphone.)

>> TED ROUSH: I need to go back and look at that. It certainly would be -- if we wanted to bring adjuncts in also on this, which is no reason why not, I have to see what kind of funds are available and what we could do for that. Excellent question. Let us go back and study.

Lisa?

>> SPEAKER: I was saying what about adjuncts.

>> TED ROUSH: Yeah, we need to look at that. I am just so glad that I have come here, and there wasn't a Bronx cheer but that there is enthusiasm for this. I appreciate it very much. On behalf of our veterans, thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you.

I have to follow that tough act. I will keep the president's report brief. There is just sort of two updates I can think of in terms of senate committees. Just wanted to remind people that we have an assessment committee that meets when we can with the office of AQI to probably the big topic there is the rollout of eLumen. So we are trying to sort of continue and help support the sort of announcement of that. I know that AQI is trying to be very purposeful and strategic with their rollout, but there is -- the assessment committee kind of keeps hearing things like the current SLO interface will be sunset at some point and the at some point is ill defined, so we are trying to follow up with that.

If you might be interested in serving on -- I think there is enough new faces that I can put out a call if you might be interested in working on assessment initiatives through the senate, you can contact Josie or I, the current chair of that committee. There is also strategic planning committee, which Michael Parker was chairing that. He's now a dean.

I know there are other people -- Rosa is on it, Tim Cruz, not a senator, but he's still on it. I'm sitting on it, as well.

It's a little bit slow at the moment because the college itself isn't going through a strategic planning process. But that is also another committee if you're interested in looking at larger scale projects at the college. There is a strategic planning committee. There is the professional development committee, which Brooke will talk about briefly in a moment.

And then lastly, there is the -- well, there is the charter revision committee, which we haven't met in a little bit, but if you're interested in -- well, actually, I'm probably going to be working, having a better idea what direction that committee will go on in a month. I will remind us of that committee's existence in a month once we have a better idea of what they're going to be doing.

And then the other announcement is involving the CDAC evolution committee that's going on. And there is other people who are part of that. Matej and Lisa are also in there. Brooke and Sean are there,

but they weren't able to make the last meeting.

Sort of briefly summarized some of the ideas floating around there. And again, we are supposed to come up with an eventual proposal to bring to the provost -- I forget the exact timeline. I want to say the end of October.

I know October is in there. I forget if it's October 1ish or October 31ish.

Given the pace of the last meeting, I'm hoping it's October 31ish. But some of the ideas that kind of merged in the conversations and looking at the input that we got from the survey we put out there, for instance, one thing that came out in terms of how should we incorporate discipline coordinators and department heads into the CDAC structure as well as sort of taking, potentially taking on the responsibilities that were formerly done by CDAC co-chairs as well as the other responsibilities outlined in the CDAC guidelines, like articulation, ATF and all that, and one concern that came out from the survey was, well, co-chairs were elected and the academic leadership is hired, and so that notion of accountability of being able to sort of reelect a different person isn't really there. So that's something that we need to sort of address. If we are going to assign these responsibilities we want to make sure there is some way to keep things accountable.

Let's see. There is also, just in terms of uniformizing the language with a, kind of sick of bouncing around the terms CDAC division, sub-CDAC discipline, discipline faculty, discipline group. Head exploding. So at least for a -- the committee at least within the sort of safe space of our meeting and whether or not it actually sort of becomes part of the proposal, that might be a different conversation. That might be part of when we send out -- so we did an input survey. We will also do a feedback survey once we start getting drafts of a proposal. If we do -- we might decide to adopt sort of set language. Currently what we are floating around or at least using in those meetings is the terminology division, and with the understanding that that's sort of a college construct. It's sort of an artificial division of faculty that is convenient for the administration purposes.

Like, okay, we need the ability to manage and supervise, so let's

divide up faculty in some way that is useful for the college to do. So we accept that as the division composition.

And then within -- a lot of math terms. If I start talking about isomorphisms, I apologize. That just means I'm getting excited.

And then within divisions we have disciplines. We might call them discipline groups or discipline factor just disciplines. But that's sort of more tied to the three-letter teaching prefixes, like if you are -- if you are part of discipline X or discipline Y, then you are part of, like, if you're certified to teach these classes, then you are part of that discipline. That's a way to sort of do it, do the partitioning of faculty more along the lines of something that makes, is more sort of organically constructed by content area.

We have those two tiers, and so that's the terminology that we are tossing around.

And then sort of the other conversation is going through, that's emerging through this piece about what should the CDACs or what should the divisions look like, and how should they vote, how should that structure look like? It came up that there were sort of two things to talk about. We need to talk about the process of that as well as the structure of that. The current homework of the curriculum office is to help us figure out what the current structure is. Like we currently, no one's sort of gone through and actually looked up, like, okay, I know that math has a large number of faculty and its composition. But we don't know, say, something that is comprised of many, many, subdivisions. Social sciences is one common example that gets thrown out there.

But there are other divisions that break up into disciplines where some of those disciplines have between zero and one full-time faculty. So what type of voting structure does that -- you know, what can we do to support that?

So we are kind of coming out of this conversation, like one size might not fit all. We might need to come up with a way to allow each discipline to say, what is a meaningful way for you to make curriculum changes and curriculum edits and perform curriculum votes?

If it's a vote of one person or if it's a vote of zero people, that's strange. It's the empty set, right (laughter)? I'll be here

all week.

So that's part of the conversation is, like, talking about the structure of divisions, or disciplines. Large disciplines, the structure is already kind of there so there is not too much cleanup that needs to be done. It's really getting down into the weeds of zero or one or two full-time faculties that work with many adjunct faculty in what capacity. Are these long-standing adjunct faculty? Should they be brought more into the conversation more directly when it comes to curriculum decisions? If you're just a single person, it might be nice to have people to bounce ideas off of.

We want to empower that discipline to come up with their own structure that makes sense to them. Then comes the process. Then we need to come up with the process of how do we go through a curriculum process that empowers the discipline faculty to be the ones having the largest voice, carrying the most weight in those conversations.

At the end of the day, yes, we understand that things are proposals, like what we were putting forward our recommendations in the final say-so comes from the provost's office, but we need to make sure that things are documented, there is transparency, and there is accountability to whatever process is developed so that when it does finally get to the provost's desk, there is a very clear understanding of how that decision was discussed and voted upon. So that's the other component of it. So structure and process is sort of how the conversation is breaking up a little bit.

And then again, like I said, the other thing that we are trying to do is not just trying to fix that one single document of the CDAC guidelines. We are also considering the Pima Online department handbook along with the curriculums, procedural manual, along with the academic leadership handbook, making sure that the language is consistent or maybe even condense documents. Why do we need five things saying the same thing? We are trying to be as efficient as possible, given the timelines and the charge of what we are tasked.

I don't know if anyone else on the committee wants to share their thoughts?

>> SPEAKER: Joe Brewer. You mentioned sometime in October you guys will be delivering your proposal. What is the overall timeline

for the provost for doing all this stuff you're talking about?

>> TAL SUTTON: I think it might depend on how large scale the proposal ends up being. I mean, if we want to really synthesize everything into, say, or really do a good job aligning everything, that might take longer than what the current charge is asking for, and there might be an extension.

I think there is some flexibility here. So in some sense maybe there are two deadlines. One deadline is to make sure that we get something up and running for curriculum decisions to be made now, because we have been on that accelerated cycle, whatever they -- whatever term they used. The expedited cycle. We are done with that.

We need something that's more concrete, more thoughtful, in place. So that will be on a faster timeline. I think that will be done for the October proposal.

And then maybe there would be a secondary proposal that's more long term of saying this is the structure that we want to make sure is adopted and everything is aligned with it and that might be what needs to get an extension on.

>> SPEAKER: Lisa. So I'm on the committee. I could not have begun to have summarized what we are trying to do as well as Tal has, because it is pretty daunting, because we want to have the language and have a process that makes sense for all groups.

We have a lot of diversity. But one thing, and I'm still I think figuring out my role in this, but when I am talking to faculty and that I represent for senate and as well as those in my discipline, when I ask them what the biggest concern is is that the CDAC has a very strong voice, or whatever the CDAC is called, the disciplines or whatever, that they have a really strong voice and that the CDACs of faculty -- you know, this does tie-in with Faculty Senate, as well, but the faculty have the strong voice on curriculum and all curriculum issues. One thing in biology, a big deal is course modality, and the decisions, there needs to be a process where decisions are made based on things like national standards, benchmarking, best practices and that sort of thing. And that, you know, it supports our students.

So in all the many things, like, for example in the survey, the whole list of all the things the CDAC does, that the CDAC, whatever comes out on this, that the CDAC has a strong voice and the CDAC should be able to have a strong voice in what they should be supporting and having a strong voice about.

>> TAL SUTTON: And that was reflected in the input survey, as well, to make sure that people don't circumvent the voting body of the discipline. And when there is anecdotes of that happening, I think that is typically coming from maybe a bad actor within the process. You can't come up with a process that's impervious to bad actors, and so that might prompt a second call for maybe the proposal could include like we wish that there is some accountability process wrapped up into this that helps to make sure that we are keeping things as close to what the process is supposed to be as possible.

All right. Now, with that, I'm going to hand things over to Brooke to tackle the Governing Board report, as well as professional development committee as well as All Faculty Day.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Thank you, Tal. All right. So the Governing Board meeting was this week. I asked actually Tal to attach the final board report to the agenda. Did you get a chance to add that? I know it wasn't on the -- let me see. Not quite yet.

So I do want that to be accessible to everybody. Hopefully Tal can just share that with everybody. Can you make that a link on the agenda actually?

>> TAL SUTTON: Sorry, I was running to get the voting results.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Would you make it where it's normally Governing Board report, you actually make it a link to the document? Could you just do that real quick?

I sent it to your e-mail just to move it to the front. Thank you.

So I actually wanted to have maybe a little bit of discussion while still respecting that I just have five minutes. I don't want to take more than five minutes.

But it's been two semesters now that I have been the Board of Governors rep, and I feel like this semester I finally have a pretty good hold of what I'm doing. So I just wanted to share with you a couple of things about the way my perception of the report has changed.

What I had sort of figured out last semester was I really wanted to stress the work that we do, the ways that we collaborate with other groups across the college, and to highlight our achievements that go beyond the classroom.

In my mind, I was thinking that means publications and conference presentations. And then to make sure to list those, right?

And then also to have it be a place where we voice our concerns that we feel the board especially needs to be aware of. Not necessarily concerns that we should be taking directly to the provost or the chancellor, but concerns that are, we feel are not being addressed or not being met satisfactorily.

Then a couple of things happened. Francisca is wonderful about sending me updates about what her area is doing, but this time around I found myself saying I wasn't going to include a few things that she gave me because they didn't seem like they fit that exceptional. It was sort of, like, well, these are our normal job duties. We should be doing these things. And so I didn't include some of those. And instead I just included what I found to be above and beyond which is the scholarships that they created for students.

And then, at the board meeting, the chancellor highlighted some of the great work that faculty are doing, including something I know Tal is involved in, because I remember he mentioned his name, and that is has moved to more problem-solving model in teaching and math. He called for board reps to highlight the things that faculty and the other groups are doing that are exceptional.

So of course you know, I felt like I was highlighting some great things, but then I never did say any of the things that I list as the accomplishments because they are individual and there are so many. So I asked him about that after the meeting, and our conversation led me to think that I actually should be finding a way to highlight some

of these things and that in addition, we should be including things that we are doing that are really helping with student success and retention.

So, for example, a big thing at the meeting was OER resources, and the use of OER and how in the online classes a lot of people are going to the OER resources and it's saving our students so much money and this is really good for us to let people know.

English is doing that. And he called for us to do it, or the discussion was that we need to be doing that in face-to-face classes, and we are. But they don't know that, because we don't say it at the board meeting. Right?

And of course really what's going to sink in, what's going to sink in is what's said in a way that the board and the chancellor can hear.

I would just maybe like to have a little discussion about that and if anybody wants to comment on that, and then to just encourage everybody to also make sure you're sending me the great things that are happening that really are supporting student success and retention in ways that go beyond our job duties in the classroom so that I can put them on the reports.

Anyways, any comments, discussion, feedback? Briefly? Because I'm sure I already spoke for probably several minutes. We have two comments.

>> SPEAKER: You could give us topics that you're looking for. Because I don't know what's exceptional. I mean, I have been using OER for several years in my face-to-face classes. I had no idea that that might be considered exceptional.

So maybe if there are topics that you think people might be interested in, that would be helpful.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Thank you. I'm thinking, so again, what's nice is we are in a cycle where I have quite a bit of time to gather for the next board meeting, but of course the next board meeting will happen right after our next senate meeting and I won't have time to include specifics from the senate meeting necessarily, but I can for,

like, three weeks before that, right?

So, yeah, I will keep sending out about a week in advance, hey, make sure you send me information.

And then I will -- yeah, you know, I think I'm going to list publications, conferences, so maybe I can where it says specify some additional things that would be good to include.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I think Diane kind of identified what I suspect will be the case for a number of faculty. They are more worried about preparing their classes and doing those exceptional or normal whatever things and not touting their own horns and doing marketing to the board, right?

So, I mean, it's just a comment. I'm not sure if people have ideas.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: One thing I was thinking, too, because I know exactly what you mean, we are all so busy, right? And that's the other thing, because of course I'm connected to social sciences because I'm a rep and because I'm connected to English because I'm a member, I get lots of updates from them, and I know I'm not representing everybody.

So it is sort of what is an effective way to reach out and gather this information? And is it to the reps? Is it to the deans? Would they know? Is it to heads? Is it to CDACs? How can we more effectively gather that information so that it is heard?

>> SPEAKER: Joe Brewer. One of the things that may be most useful is listening to the board talk, are there things that you think they are missing or things, gaps, misimpressions they have? And to that extent, maybe faculty will find, jeez, we ought to correct that and there is ways of doing it?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Thank you. That's a great idea. Just like, you know, the OER. I mean, that was a big topic at the meeting this month. So whatever we are doing, because that's saving our students millions of dollars, right?

>> TAL SUTTON: Just in the interest of time, I want to keep it

to the last three I see.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I think Kimlisa was right after.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: Yeah, the OER thing is kind of -- I mean, almost every single class in social science has an OER and has for years. So it's not like it's a super new thing

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Right.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I know it's like the newest brightest thing. But the one thing I'm going to say is it used to be, because I was in your position for, like, seven years, it used to be that sometimes the Board of Governors came to this meeting. And they were invited to this meeting. I have seen Scott Stewart back in the day and some of the others sitting in the back. Some of you have been here for a while remember that. I think an invitation is due. I know that they are kind of insulated from us from the entire college, but, you know, maybe it's time to put out an olive branch and say, hey, come visit us and see what we actually do instead of just hearing about what we do. Just saying.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: That's a great idea.

>> ROSA MORALES: I want to tell you, Brooke, that I'm very, very happy about the fact that you have been reflecting on your role and how you have grown about it. Because one of the concerns that I have always stated since the beginning is the fact that we don't give much time to our leaders to really train themselves. In fact, I have been one of the ones that have been asking for two-year terms, because one year is where they barely are learning the ropes, okay?

I'm so glad, through your reflections, to understand that you are maturing, on the fact that you have come to acknowledge the power that you have. Not only is to inform but to elicit some type of response that you need. It's not just about presenting whatever they bring to you and put it up there, because there is going to be a lot of times the same people over and over doing that.

It's how can you select that information in such a way that is fair but is also is going to create an impact? Those are some of the things that I have been kind of pushing since the beginning. One of

the things that I want to tell, you know, actually openly, is that I have admired you on the sense that you have always been very inclusive. You have always made your best on trying to get input from people, understand the recommendations and figure it out your way there.

And like you said, now, after all these months, you are, you know, ready to actually do even a better job. That's why hopefully in the future we will consider to have a two-year term, because we need trained and experienced individuals, given the extraordinary circumstances we are going through, okay?

So I want to thank you very much for your service and for continually coming and asking us. Good job.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I appreciate that.
(Applause.)

>> SPEAKER: Jennie Arbogast. I have not been in senate for a few years, so I will tell you honestly this is the first I have heard that you're actually collecting that kind of information. So that could be important that the general faculty does not know about those kinds of things.

Also, quickly, I believe that Morgan Phillips is part of -- that's part of one of his new duties is about what is new, what is innovative, and how are we working with that in the community? So there is another source that people might have reported to Morgan about what's going on.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: That's a great idea. Thank you.

Yeah, and please, senators, I hope you are, when you reach out to your constituents every month that you're saying, hey, send me your accomplishments, and then copy/paste or forward my e-mail when I send it so that we do get, yes, faculty who are not senators sharing that.

>> SPEAKER: Lisa. Yeah, I just wanted to say that again, for what criteria do you have for accomplishments? Because oftentimes what I see that are the most, the accomplishments that have the most direct impact on students are things that I would say most of our faculty are doing all the time.

I think we need to have a clear message to the board of how important the job of most of our faculty, the majority of us are doing and things like giving extra review sessions or there is no good OER textbook, okay, so this is the alternative way to develop something and so forth and so on.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yeah, that's a challenging question. I don't know if Tal would take one more.

>> SPEAKER: Rita. Maybe we should reach out to our students instead of our faculty. Maybe we should be asking our students to provide what's the cool thing that happened in your classroom that you want to promote?

>> TAL SUTTON: Next, you're still on.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yes. And this is super quick.

So just the professional development committee, we need to meet again soon, because we are still planning All Faculty Day. That's still part of our duties.

And so I just wanted to shout out to those who helped last year and who were members last year, and I hope you will continue this year. And then anyone who is interested in being part of the professional development committee, please let me know. Anybody new or anybody who wasn't serving that would like to, please let me know.

I'll send an e-mail out to the senate just saying please let me know if you want to be a part of the planning for All Faculty Day and we will pick up with a meeting probably in the next two or three weeks so that we can start to put some of our ideas from last semester into action.

And then of course hopefully we will be hearing about the job announcements soon for the teaching and learning center which will include a faculty fellow who will be planning All Faculty Day. But that won't be in effect until after this next All Faculty Day.

So we've got to keep the ball rolling and doing an amazing job

again this year like we have in the past.

Watch for that e-mail, and let's meet and put together an All Faculty Day.

That's it.

>> TAL SUTTON: The last thing to end the business section, a report on the elections. I went to Matej and got the tally.

So not surprisingly, Josie is our new president-elect with 27 votes.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Tal Sutton is the vice president with 27 votes.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Rita L is the secretary with 27 votes.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Tanya P is the logistics officer with 27 votes.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: For recording purposes, there were 2 abstentions for president-elect. One write-in for president-elect, Karie Meyers.

You're under somebody's gun.

For secretary there were two abstentions and one write-in for Dennis Just. So you are also under someone's gun.

And then there was one abstention for vice president. And one abstention for logistics officer.

Just for completion.

We have an officer group for next year. Yay.

All right. And so now we just have two instead of three reports remaining. The provost's report, which I'm assuming is Kate?

>> SPEAKER: Just met two weeks ago. This will be very quick. I

just want to note on page 5 Dolores wants to make sure everybody saw the e-mail that the next draft of the assurance argument is out. Did everybody see that? So she's really encouraging everybody to take a look, read through sections. There were a lot of places with place holders, so there may be information that you have that needs to be included in that assurance argument. The feedback is due on the 18th. There is a feedback form linked in the e-mail.

Also listed on page 5 of this report that we just gave. And not in the report but I want to make sure that everybody knows that with Brooke and Sean's help, we honored the eight emeriti faculty you voted on last spring at this week's board meeting, and it also reminded me in the AP we have two dates we can submit those and the next date is November 1.

If you guys are interested in sending forward more emeritus nominations, you know, I don't know the statistics on this, but I sure am hearing about a lot more retirements so there may be more of your colleagues who (indiscernible).

Any questions I can answer while I'm up here?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: How close are we getting the job announcements out for the coordinator?

>> SPEAKER: My anticipation is it will be released next week but I hate to -- I would say within the next couple of weeks.

>> TAL SUTTON: I will send out an e-mail for all faculty for a call for emeriti.

>> SPEAKER: The timing is just off on that. You guys vote on them in the spring, but then it has to go to the ELT. And then it goes to the board to vote, and then at the following board meeting they actually honor them. It would make sense you wouldn't want them to show up expecting a plaque and have the board vote no.

I mean, it's a long shot, but you wouldn't want -- it's sort of this three-step process. And then we always end up in the middle of the summer, at least the last two years. It just doesn't make sense to honor a faculty member when the rest of you are off contract.

We have held it the last two years until September. But it just seems the kind of thing that should have a bigger audience. So, you know, I suggested to Brooke that maybe we kind of re-honor maybe all the emeriti at All Faculty Day or something where there is a little bit more of an audience. It's such an incredible honor for somebody's career serving here.

One more thing. We are thinking about putting another feature in the provost's report, which would be smart minds dress alike, because we have noticed there is a trend that sometimes you show up at work and somebody's dressed just like you. I think I can nominate Josie and I for the first photo. (Laughter.)

That will be in the October -- I didn't bring my wrap. That will be in the October issue.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Next is PCCEA report with Kiley.

>> SPEAKER: So just a couple of things. Pretty hefty report in August, two weeks ago. So just a couple little updates. So the one I think most important thing is that PCCEA is organizing candidate forums for the two open Governing Board seats. There are two candidates (microphone difficulties) District 3 and 5.

So the goal of the forums are to put together some -- what we are trying to do is put together questions. About the first half the forum will be those prewritten questions from PCCEA and then the second half of the forums will be open to any community members, so if you have a question, bring it, if you want to send us your questions, it's not set in stone just yet. You could e-mail those to the PCCEA.

Depending on the results of the forums, we may choose to endorse one or both of the candidates or (indiscernible) so that information will be communicated at the website. If you are not able to make the forum, you can (indiscernible) later for responses and any commentary that we have for endorsements.

And then (indiscernible) will be helping us if we do endorse, get that information out to the community. So the date of the forum is Thursday, September 20th. It's at District Office. It will be from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m. Doors will be opening around 6:00 or 6:15.

Update to the AERC. You probably saw that an e-mail went out recently with the website for AERC, and I had that in the report that Tal is attaching to the senate agenda so you have my written report with the link.

So the (indiscernible) and they now have their mechanism for submitting items.

So if you have any issues that you think are policy related, you can submit to that website. They go to the AERC and then AERC routes them appropriately. If it is an issue that needs to provoke a policy change, that would trigger, like, a mini Meet and Confer. If it ends up being an issue that doesn't require any sort of policy change, then that would still be get routed appropriately. The nice thing about the AERC is it's sort of a central repository for issues that come in. In that way, those issues will be cataloged and followed up on and so they don't disappear.

Here's sort of a nonupdate. As far as the mandatory trainings go, we have been trying to express our concerns to HR and administration, but as you know, HR is going through a lot of turnover with leadership, and so we haven't been able to get any clarification as far as anything. So we have heard from faculty that some of the trainings don't work. We know there is no mechanism in place right now.

If you have completed like disability training, there is no record of that, that then makes you exempt from have to do disability training this time. So while we can't officially tell you to do or not do anything, I will tell you that we are trying to get clarification and we are trying to advocate for a length in timeline, priority of the training, and we have even asked that if HR really wants to, you know, double down on, yes, this needs to happen with the timeline, with everything else that's going on, just start working, that they would please send out an e-mail to faculty, because we know there is a lot of confusion. So far they haven't even done that.

So we don't know.

Last thing, so you probably saw the announcement for the new

PCCEA executive board, and so you know that Matej is now our president, I'm secretary, Kyla Hayes is now vice president, chief spokesperson. Look on the linked document. You can see all the campus reps, as well. We have quite a few vacancies for reps at this time.

So we need a rep for DV, for Northwest, one for West to replace Mark Nelson who is in an acting dean role right now. We need two reps for Downtown and two for East. So that's looking pretty thin.

If you have any interest in being a rep or if you can get one of your constituents to step up, it's really a way to learn the ropes of PCCEA, if you have aspirations for stepping up into a bigger leadership role even, or if you just want to be a voice on the campus for your colleagues.

That's it. Any questions for me on anything?

All right. Can I motion that we adjourn?

>> SPEAKER: I second that.

>> TAL SUTTON: Seconded by Kimlisa. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: We do have a very brief 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.