



## **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 October 5, 2018**

>> TAL SUTTON: So with that, we can go ahead and go for any requests for open forum or executive session? Brooke?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I think it's open forum that I want.

>> TAL SUTTON: There has been a request for open forum by Brooke Anderson.

Any other requests for open forum or executive session? All right. So then we will go and hopefully people had an opportunity to read the minutes. I will sort of scroll through them moderately quickly right now, and then we will take a vote.

All right. Again, I hope people had an opportunity to read it beforehand. Is there a motion to approve? Sean Mendoza. Second?

Hernon makes a second.

Discussion? Any edits or typos that people need to see?

The one thing to comment on because I know there are a few new senators due to some changes is for votes like this where it's a matter of just approving minutes, we typically just do a vote call, like a voice vote.

So I will ask all in favor, and you'll say aye, and then those not in favor would say nay. And then if you abstain I will just ask for a show of hands so we get an idea. If you weren't a senator last month, maybe it will make sense for you to abstain for the minutes meeting.

That's for sort of like small votes, like just approving minutes. And for more formal votes, pushing forward a recommendation or something like that, we might do a show of hands. For the new senators, that's typically how we'll cast our votes, sort of those two ways. One is a quick voice vote and another is sort of a show of hands.

So we will do a quick voice. All in favor?

All opposed?

Show of hands, abstentions?

So the motion passes with two abstentions.

Next we have emeritus nominations. We only had one application this go-around, but we will have another opportunity in the spring.

So we have Rosalia Solarzano, and we have various speakers to speak to that. As you know, we are sort of establishing the protocol here, we typically give five minutes or so for each candidate to speak to the accomplishments and the merits of the nominee. So I'd like to sort of give it to -- I forget. Yes? So I will call James, Francisca James.

>> SPEAKER: I know there are several people here to speak. I'm going to cede the floor to them.

>> TAL SUTTON: We do this as a secret ballot. Josie is handing out pieces of paper that are going to be used for two votings. When you get a big hunk of paper, if you're a senator, please rip it in half so that you can use it for the emeritus vote and then afterwards we are going to do the ACC rep vote. So we are putting the work onto you guys to rip a piece of paper in half. This is an interactive.

>> SPEAKER: So Marcos suggested I read a little bit of this, which I'm not going to do, because it's very long and I submitted it to the senate. Rosalia, for those of you who may not know, was faculty here for 21 years, full-time faculty in sociology, and a pioneer here at the college in establishing gender and women studies

as well as advancing the Mexican-American studies program and co-founder of the ethnic, gender, and transborder studies department. That's just the very, very, very tip of the iceberg of the many, many, many things that she did over those 21 years to support students and to grow the college and to keep it updated with academic social science perspectives.

Now I will cede the floor.

>> SPEAKER: Great. Thanks, everybody. I am Marcos. As one of the newer hires in our ethnic, gender, transborder studies department, I have only amazing things and shining things to say about Rosalia, and one of the things that I think that I attribute my job here to Rosalia and her capacity of not only providing excellent education, providing student support, but the way that I was -- one of the ways I was recruited into even throwing my application into this ring here at Pima is I was working on a grant and doing outreach information here at campus, and Rosalia was, like, This is really cool, overlaps with my class, and we are really interested in this information.

So through this really interesting, reaching out to community resources, engaging with people, taking that initiative to not only provide good content but to provide good experience, not only again

for those students but to really be utilizing our resources within this community college as a community, is the reason why I'm here teaching as part of this institution. I feel so much of a debt of gratitude to that.

And I think that when you take a look at this document it will be very impressive to have, in plain language, listed all of the things that she's contributed to our institution, and I think some of the things that she's also done is created an amazing sense of representation, not only for students within our catalog, but also within our faculty representation.

So one of the reasons why I think I felt encouraged and supported in seeking a job here was to be able to identify people like Rosalia having not only contributed to this system but to have really gotten a good experience from it.

So I feel like I'm a legacy of Rosalia. I hope that everybody appreciates not only what she's done for me as an individual but hopefully seeing how that has the ability to impact every student and every person she's ever interacted with.

I appreciate your time. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Hi, everyone. I'm a Ph.D. graduate student at the

University of Arizona, and I will be a future adjunct faculty here in Pima.

My encounter with Rosalia was similar to Marcos in that I met her at a faculty affiliate GWS luncheon, and she really kind of pulled me to the side and just told me, you know, We really value scholars like you and your research is really important.

My research is on Chicanas in subcultures and Chicanas' and Latinas' experiences in feminist practices. And finding that support and value in my research from someone with the repertoire and activist background that Rosalia has was very empowering. I will just read something that I had written.

Upon hearing about Rosalia's retirement, I quickly got on board to take her last class offered in the spring of 2018. I took her classes as a student, but it became so much more than just kind of like a quick overview and refresher of Chicanas feminist history and activism. It became really a teaching mentorship for me, something that I don't often have access to, even at a research institute, such as University of Arizona.

I think it's really important to have teaching mentorship that is coming from someone who values your work and really believes in you. I want to support her nomination as a former student and future

faculty here at Pima. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you for this opportunity to speak. Very briefly, because I could talk a lot about how amazing Rosalia is as a professor, as a human being, as a woman, I think she's kind of magical. I'm a former student here at Pima. I met Rosalia in 2012. She was a co-advisor for an honors independent project that I did.

In that project, she introduced me to the concept of scholar activism, and she introduced me to the theory of intersectionality which continues to inform my research today. I want to emphasize that I was one of six students that was selected from Pima to attend the Arizona Institute for New Women Leadership, and Pima Community College was the only community college in the state that had students attend that institute. And that was because of Rosalia's influence.

There's a lot that she has done for me personally, for Pima. I think Pima, as an institution, as a community college, it makes me proud to have been a student here, and Rosalia was a huge part of that.

Thank you so much for the opportunity. I think this is a very well-deserved honor and accolade to Rosalia.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks to everybody who came and spoke on her

behalf.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: There is one more. Sorry.

>> SPEAKER: Hello again. I met Rosalia about three years ago.

What I love about Rosalia is that when you speak with her, you can tell that she's really listening, and she listens with a passion and enthusiasm and an eagerness to participate in uplifting the lives of historically marginalized communities. Rosalia is and always will be a fighter.

As you can hear from some of the testimonies earlier, her passion lives on through us. Me, as a new member, adjunct faculty, and ethnic, gender, and transborder studies, Rosalia is a transformative figure in the history of Pima Community College, and I second all the other comments that this is a well-deserved honor and I'm proud to be here largely because of her efforts in laying down the groundwork for us being here. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Just a reminder of what our process for faculty emeritus is, I'm going to have -- a thought occurred to me as people were speaking, and I am looking at Kate and Mike, I'm wondering if

it's possible to sort of like get this four-, five-minute segment of the video to the ELT when this nomination gets to them so they don't just have this paper document but they also have the testimonies that were just spoken to just now? Hopefully we can get a little clip of that?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I can do that.

>> TAL SUTTON: Awesome. What we will do is we will do a ballot of support. So I think we will just keep it simple yes or no on your paper, fold it up, and we will come around and I will sort of look towards maybe Margie since she's proxying for Tanya to collect them.

Don't forget to tear the piece of paper in half because you have to use it for two votes.

All right. I think we are mostly ready to move on to the next piece. Again, thanks again for coming in and speaking on behalf of Rosalia. You obviously are welcomed to stick around and listen to Faculty Senate business, but I would understand it if you have other engagements.

But the next -- we will have someone count it out, and then we will announce it maybe after the next item, but I think Josie -- yeah, it might take a few minutes. In that time, we will just move on to the next item, which is the election for ACC rep. See, I

told you you needed two pieces of paper.

With that, we have, as you recall, Josie Milliken is both the president and president-elect for 2019, which means that that's a lot of work, would be too much work. So the roles and responsibilities of the president-elect will move to somebody who won't become president but will serve for a year as an officer. So they will be serving as the ACC representative. This person is expected to be a member of the ACC which meets approximately twice a month on Mondays, typically 3:00 to 5:00 you're not alone. You have Brooke and Sean on that committee. And you're participating in the strategic planning of Faculty Senate, so you will be attending the executive officers meetings, which are flexible on when we meet but we try to meet at least once a month, depending on what's going on, maybe more, and also taking part in sort of leading some projects that might pop up over the course of the year. Anyway, those are roughly speaking the responsibilities of the ACC rep.

With that, I will put out a call for anyone interested in serving as the ACC rep.

>> SPEAKER: I would like to nominate someone. Joe Brewer.

>> TAL SUTTON: Do you accept the nomination?

>> JOE BREWER: Yes, I do. Yes, I'd like to accept the

nomination.

>> TAL SUTTON: Great. Thank you.

Are there any other people interested in serving as the ACC rep?

All right. So I think -- we don't need to write down names or learn how to spell people's names for these votes. With that, we'll conduct another secret ballot where again we will keep it simple since there is only one candidate, Joe Brewer.

Again, just a reminder, only senators are voting. If you're not a senator, that paper is valuable, yes, and so just write yes for Joe or Joe's name. Yes, some sort of notation, or no is fine.

One thing I forgot to include, if you are proxy, make a note in the corner of your ballot. I forgot to add that.

Are the first results in? Can someone hand that woman a microphone?

>> SPEAKER: So the results for Rosalia going forward as a nomination, we have four nos. And the rest I haven't counted yet are yes. Four nos, and the rest are yes.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think that is greater than 75%, which is the threshold for endorsing a candidate to move on in the process.

With that, Rosalia's nomination will move forward to the ELT with this document for them to review as well as the video of the

testimonies that we just heard today. All right.

Then we will also -- I don't want to overburden poor Rita over there, so we will move on to the next bit, which is an update on the prior learning assessment, PLA for short, application process. It's undergone a revamp in the spring, and we had ask the provost to speak a little bit to it, which is why, in the provost's report, there is also information about PLA, but during this past month Josie has done a lot of legwork in finding out more information, so she's going to provide an update about the PLA process.

>> JOSIE: So back in the spring, deans worked with divisions and departments to identify areas that could count for PLA, prior learning assessment. So we worked to fill out this spreadsheet and it was a very elaborate spreadsheet. One of the items on the spreadsheet column was credit for noncredit courses. Just as a reminder, we were asked to -- Tal is pulling it up so you'll be able to see it to just kind of refresh your memory, but we were asked to check in the box or write notes in the box if we would consider for our areas accepting taking credit for noncredit courses that students have taken.

We have heard from a few faculty that they have been asked, through their deans, whether or not, or have been asked whether or

not to support the creation of mirrored noncredit courses for Pima courses. So that has revealed that Pima has started a process of identifying courses that could be used potentially for PLA by offering them in a noncredit format.

That has sparked a little bit of concern just because of the way that process has been carried out. And so after a bit of research, we have learned that the prior way of creating noncredit courses or adult education courses is changing. According to the plan so far, those in the related areas, including Maggie Romance (phonetic) and Brian Miller, are going to work together, Ian Roark are going to work together throughout the next month and determine a new plan for that.

And so as faculty, we feel that we would value having faculty input. Not only of course in which courses get mirrored and offered as noncredit courses, but also in the creation of that process just to ensure that faculty involvement is a mechanism configured within that process.

So that's basically the update I have, and the only other piece of information that I feel is valuable to know and to pass along to constituents is that if you, knowing this or just knowing anything different or having, if you realize anything and you look back at that spreadsheet and you say, this makes you realize that you wish

you would have, you in consultation with your division or department, you wish you would have placed something different in that column, you should contact your dean and then your dean can work with Brian Miller to make a change.

I guess because this document is brand new, there will be the opportunity for all divisions and departments, this is what I have heard, to revise it in the spring. However, eventually it will become less of a dynamic document and will be more static.

So that is the information I have at this point. We're just going to continue following up on this to ensure that, you know, faculty maintain a voice in the process, and with that, I'll take any questions.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. ESL. Do you know if international is involved at all with the noncredit side? Because ESL classes, international students take our ESL classes as noncredit.

We need to be involved in that whole mirroring, changing of the way that courses are mirrored.

>> JOSIE: I do not have the answer to that, but Maggie Romance would have the answer to that, so I would contact her.

>> ROSA MORALES: Is it possible for us to get a copy of that document? I notice that it was not shared on the agenda.

>> JOSIE: This document was actually included from an e-mail about, sent within the last month from Brian Miller, but I can forward -- that e-mail had a lot of information and a lot of documents attached, but I can forward it to you.

>> ROSA MORALES: So we can share it with our constituents, will be good.

>> JOSIE: All faculty should have been sent that e-mail, but I'll forward it to you so it's fresh in your inbox.

>> ROSA MORALES: Thank you.

>> JOSIE: You're welcome.

Any other questions or comments? Okay.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks for the update. We do have the end results of all votes.

So again, the final vote for the emeritus faculty was 23 yes to 4 nos, and so that is greater than 75%, as my number sense was correct on that one. And then as for Joe, that is 27 yeses, no abstentions, no nays. So we have that vote completed. Congratulations. Yay.

(Applause.)

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. So we have a full set of officers for next year. The next piece is to consider the, reconsider the headsup resolution we talked about last time, last month.

Let's take a moment to reread it to see if we're happy with it.

All right. There was a comment regarding the shared governance piece that we could be more specific and include the specific core components that is in the HLC mission statement if we wanted to include that.

So I think we can, if you remember, the purpose of this is to sort of start slowly building towards and refining a process that has Faculty Senate and faculty in general involved in all major academic initiatives at the college.

And so again, this was sort of in mind using guided pathways as the illustrative example of a large initiative, college-wide initiative, that impacts curriculum.

We want to make sure that faculty start being participating in that process once it's identified as a direction or a priority of the college in that some sort of change is going to happen and we want to make sure that our voice is being heard and that our feedback is being considered.

So the first step of that is to sort of be involved as early as possible at the early stage of consideration.

Typically I think for a resolution, if we can get a motion on the floor and move to discussion, I think that's the best way to conduct

this. So would there be a motion to accept as is or accept with including the specific core components or anything? Rosa?

>> ROSA MORALES: I move to approve with some additions that I would like to propose. And I would like to read them, if possible.

>> TAL SUTTON: Okay.

>> ROSA MORALES: In addition to the concepts that were listed there, which I'm very happy that one was included that I recommended before, I would like to add the role to be as specific as to what role the Faculty Senate is supposed to have as partners, sponsors, as spectators, as participants. And then the other one is the scope of work required from faculty, the scope of work required.

So in addition for this -- I guess for this resolution to have those, to add the role, role of the faculty, role expected that faculty will have in the initiative. And I'm putting as an example as partners, as sponsors, as spectators, as participants. There is a reason why I want to see what role, is that the initiative that is presented, what role the faculty should be expected to have.

And then the other one is the scope of work. How much work is expected for the faculty to do with that initiative.

>> TAL SUTTON: So there is a motion to approve as is with the additional information on the bulleted list, if I'm understanding, to

identify the role of faculty to serve in initiative as well as the scope of work involved in carrying out or implementing the initiative.

Is there a second to the motion? Carol?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Second.

>> TAL SUTTON: Now we will move to a discussion. Hernon?

>> SPEAKER: I'm just a little bit hung up with the word "impact" on the third paragraph. I thought we would discuss this last senate session. I'm not sure that it could be a little more specific whether or not something impact curriculum could be debatable whereas if we say something that initiatives that will modify curriculum and impact academics would probably be a little bit more specific and easy to keep track of.

>> TAL SUTTON: That's a fair point. I know Margie had a large hand in rewriting this. So if you want to speak to that.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: I used the word "impact," because it's more encompassing. Because if we get too specific, then that doesn't give us the flexibility.

Which other word would you like to see added? But I think that I used "impact" because I thought that was a strong enough word to any degree, it would impact curriculum to any degree. Or maybe I need to

say that. Would impact the curriculum to any degree. Perhaps?

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I agree with you. I was thinking something more like you could say affect or modify curriculum and impact, use the word impact academics. But I like your suggestion, as well.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: For Rosa, when you say "the role," well, I tried to do that with "whereas," we, the Faculty Senate, this is the role we want to play. It's in all kinds of words rather than -- but I do like the idea that you're trying to say. We are not just going to be spectators, that we want to be partners. So perhaps in partnership, we could use that phrase, that the Faculty Senate in partnership with the curriculum office or the provost office.

>> ROSA MORALES: I just want to make sure that when the decision is made that the faculty is told what is the role that is expected of them.

So because not all the time we have been asked to be participants or collaborators. In some instances, we have been asked to be spectators, right? This is happening regardless. So I just wanted to make sure that those categories that were listed before included the role that is expected just be as partners, be as spectators, be as supporters, and then also the scope of work, because in many instances we end up doing work that we weren't expected that we

needed to do.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Maybe another bullet at the end?

>> JOSIE: That is what I think is the confusion. Rosa, just to clarify, you're simply suggesting add two more bullets to that list.

If you scroll down, I have just jotted out what I believe those bullets are, based on what you noted.

One of those bullets is that it be specified what the role faculty will have, and then the scope of the work involved. Correct? That's what you're suggesting, correct? Okay. So just the addition of those two bullet items. To be more specific.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: You want two bullets or will one bullet do? Two bullets?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Rosa, since both of those bullets are both in the same category, can we just make it the role faculty will have and the scope of their work? I don't feel strongly about this.

>> ROSA MORALES: I prefer them to be separate because communication has been a problem with Pima for historically and for generations, and I'm expecting that in the future we will continue like that. And there is a reason why even the last Faculty Senate I included timelines, because that gives me also an issue.

So I feel very strongly that I would like those two categories to

be spelled out as clearly as possible, so there is no confusion.

>> JOSIE: Just to clarify, for the scope of the work, are you referring to the scope of the work faculty will be required to complete in relation to the initiative?

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes.

>> JOSIE: So we should add that, the scope of the work -- and the role faculty will be expected to have within the initiative?

>> ROSA MORALES: Yes.

>> JOSIE: So they are two separate things in my view, then.

>> JOE BREWER: I'd be happy to support these additions, but it seems to me that the main purpose of the resolution is to get the provost's office and others thinking about very divergent initiatives that they may not be thinking about in terms of curriculum at all, to consider how down the line they may impact these areas that are so central to us.

And the main thing is to let us know at the earliest point of consideration so that we can find out. And we're probably the best ones to figure out what our role would be. So asking them to specify this right now, although we could certainly do it, it seems like the main thing is if something crosses your mind that may have these kind of impacts, let us know, we'll get back with you and we'll find these

things out together. But I'd be happy to support it either way.

>> SPEAKER: Ken. On that note, where it says whereas initiatives designed to improve, I wanted to propose possibly changing that to initiatives that may potentially modify academic quality rather than just ones that are intended to improve. Because who's to say what the impact is going to be.

>> TAL SUTTON: You're talking about the second "whereas" initiatives to improve academic quality? Okay.

I think that's fair. I think the intent, I can't imagine that they would have any other intent other than to want to improve, so again, I'm just thinking about this not being a policy document, this being sort of a declaration of saying, like, we're here, we're interested in actually participating in these processes.

Once there is some direction that the ELT or the provost or some person who has that type of pull to steer the college in some direction, we should be one of the first blips on your radar, and we want to be involved and bring that to us and we're ready to take that on. That's sort of, with a very broad brush, what I'm seeing that the purpose of this sort of resolution is trying to do. It's not setting up a policy -- we don't need to define what that process is right today. It is to sort of say we want to be part of that

process.

If this can evolve into a well-defined process, that would be amazing. I don't think we need to solve that in a five-minute, ten-minute conversation with a bunch of people talking at a meeting. So if we want to create that process, that's great, but I think the purpose of this, like I said, it's not a policy document. It's just meant to say we want to move forward with you and be involved in any major direction that the college decides that it wants to pursue. And if it's going to impact curriculum and academics, involve us ASAP so that we can really talk things out and sort of help bring our expertise to the conversation.

That's at least my understanding.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. Taking that into consideration and what Joe said that this would be like an initial heads -up to the administration, I'm wondering if we could add another statement therefore once the description, the rationale, and the evidence are presented, administration will work with faculty to determine a timeline role and scope.

Because if we ask for a timeline up front, that may slow down how quickly we hear about an initiative.

>> TAL SUTTON: That's a fair -- that's a great point. I think,

and that might be even what needs to turn into a second resolution.

This first one is just -- we saw what happened with guided pathways.

If we were brought into the conversation before sort of the package of guided pathways was already had ten feet into the door, I think we could have had a very different way of implementing guided pathways.

Not to say that all of it was a chaotic mess, but there was so much of it it felt like chaos always. But nonetheless, again, the purpose is that, is the first part of that. I think maybe there should be a second.

Again, I think we are sort of slowly piecing and introducing a process that we want. And this is just meant to be step one of a process, like get as much information as you can to us, a description of the initiative of rationale for the need, because then that can help us think outside the box and say is this package deal of guided pathways the best deal for us? If what you're trying to do is improve X, Y, or Z, we can think about other ways or ways to tweak the package that is sort of being brought to the college?

And so that's what I see this trying to resolve is that first step of really trying to convey to administration, it's more important to understand what your end goal is trying to be rather than just saying this is the direction we are going. Well, that

direction has a goal. Let's bring that back to all of the stakeholders and have a conversation about how do we achieve that outcome and goal, rather than just saying, hey, there is this very cool thing I found on the street. It's very shiny.

I mean, that was more negative than I wanted to sound. I apologize. But anyway, so I can see what you're saying, but I see that more as a second -- but you're saying maybe like exclude some of this information? Just keep it super simple?

>> ROSA MORALES: I just wanted to, for the group to understand that if somebody approaches us and asks us to participate or to be part of this, we will be able to ask each and every one of these questions. And let's see if the initiative is brought into the Faculty Senate and says we want you to participate or we just want you to be a supporter. Okay, well, the whole Faculty Senate is going to be, you know, agreeing that that's going to be our role. And then if down the line it's decided that instead of just supported that we need your participation, then it has to be brought in also to the Faculty Senate to discuss that the role is changing here.

So I just want the initial understanding that has as much information, as clear information as possible, of what is expected. And if there is later on any additional changes, changes can be made,

but at least we ask the correct questions in the beginning.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think the counter of that is the more the conversation that happens before it comes to us, the more it's already taking a solid shape. We want to be part of that shape making as soon as possible.

So in some sense, in some sense, given how I feel like working with the presidents and the Lee and provost, they are very willing to hear us out. If they say, oh, you just need to sort of participate as a sound board or something like that, we can come back and say, actually, no, this is a really big deal and we want to play a much more significant role, they will hear that.

In some sense, I don't really think that it makes sense for them to try and anticipate what role faculty will expect. They just say, okay, we know faculty will play some role, and I know you guys need to talk amongst yourselves to decide what that role is going to be.

And so in some sense I don't think we need a fine packaged announcement of what that initiative is. It can be messy, ugly, I don't care. I just want that information as soon as possible.

>> JACKIE KERN: I really like the document as written. I think it's broad enough and specific enough. It talks about us being notified at the earliest stage of consideration. And then I think

it's kind of on our plate. I mean, you could add a lot of words. We could edit it forever. That's what we're good at. But I really think I like it as is.

>> TAL SUTTON: Maybe two more after this one.

>> SPEAKER: Jackie, I don't know what you mean by "as is."

Before we started doing these edits, the very first one before that happened?

Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

Tal, you suggested that these suggestions that Nancy made should be in a second resolution. I'm not clear on how effective that would be if we need a second resolution. That's a piece that's not clear in my mind what you're trying to discuss on that.

>> TAL SUTTON: I was just meaning if -- I think the four bullet points that are in the original version should be fairly quick to gather on the side of administration, and then they can bring that to us fairly quickly. Once the strategic direction of the college goes towards that initiative, it should be fairly quick as to why they are turning the ship, so they should be able to provide that rationale, should be able to give the description of the initiative that they are interested in steering towards. Maybe a proposed timeline might be -- maybe we don't necessarily need that. That's something worth

considering.

And then evidence, they should have evidence regarding the projected effectiveness of the proposed initiative because that probably exists based off of what the initiative is, just again using guided pathways as the illustrative example. They have tons of literature out there, so they can share that with us. It's not something that the administration necessarily has to generate.

>> SPEAKER: So can those things be incorporated in this single resolution to make a Part 1, Part 2, instead of two resolutions?

>> TAL SUTTON: Again, I feel that would devolve into a lot of editing on the spot. If we just sort of accept those four bullet points and above as sort of the first step in establishing what process we would like as Faculty Senate for large-scale initiatives, then we can work and maybe even form a subcommittee to talk about -- because that single bullet point underneath add could end up being something bigger than and is worth investigating and having people come up with what do we want this process to look like?

So that's why I don't think we are quite ready to provide step 1 and step 2 today.

>> SPEAKER: Okay. I'm in. I was just wondering if there is some way we could add another statement about how the senate would

form a subcommittee and come back with a discussion about the roles and the timelines and the scope.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think, again, if this were a policy document, I would completely agree. But this is more of a resolution. Rita?

>> SPEAKER: I just wanted to remind everyone that our motion on the floor right now is that to accept as is with amendments, define the role of faculty example, sponsors, spectators, and that was seconded.

So are we tabling that or are we moving forward?

>> TAL SUTTON: So we need to put that to a vote, because it's been seconded.

So after this discussion, again, as Rita reminded us, the motion that's actually on the floor is to take everything and include those bullet points underneath the add. Are there two bullet points? Let me go and scroll.

And so we will do a show of hands. Actually, we can go -- Rosa can also amend her proposal if she wants. Do you want to amend or still move forward, based on this discussion?

>> ROSA MORALES: Move forward.

>> TAL SUTTON: One more comment and we will go to a vote.

>> LISA WERNER: I'm confused. So are we going -- so we are

voting either with the amendments or not?

>> TAL SUTTON: We can do multiple motions after this, but the current motion on the table --

>> LISA WERNER: Just for now this is what we are voting on?

Okay.

>> TAL SUTTON: Currently the motion on the table is to include everything that is being projected right now, including the title, which is not being projected.

So we will do a show of hands to count. So all in favor of approving the amended version of the resolution, for yes, raise your hand. If you're a proxy, I will ask you to keep your hand up for a little while.

For yeses? All right. If you are a proxy, keep your hand up?

That's 17 yeses. All opposed? If you are a proxy, keep your hand up. 18. So that was very close. 17-18? So the motion does not carry. Would somebody like to put forward a new motion?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I would like to motion that we accept the proposal before the additions.

>> TAL SUTTON: It's been seconded.

Discussion? I think we are pretty discussed out.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: I'd be willing to eliminate the top

one, the role, anticipating that we could get that into version 2.

The reason I supported Rosa's suggestion is because when people plan things that other people are going to do, they don't always take into consideration from their point of view the amount of work that it would entail. Therefore, the planning proceeds with respect to what the end result will be rather than the end result in conjunction with the amount of work that it would entail to get there.

Anyway, that's why I was voting yes to keep the scope of the work part in there.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I voted against it because, I'd like to second what Joe had said earlier. I think the sooner we are informed and the more feedback we can provide about the amount of work we believe this sort of initiative would take, the better. I believe that puts it more in our purview, which it should be if -- I would rather be making the decisions and advising the administration on how these sorts of initiatives might move forward than having them do all that thinking for us.

So that's why I would prefer to accept it as it was so that we are informed sooner. I also believe part of that issue of if we ask for too much detail in this initial request for information, they may wait and think through it and not get us involved early enough.

>> JACKIE KERN: I like it without any changes because I think initiatives are so variable. Guided pathways was massive, and then there can be smaller changes, and without, I don't think a document like this needs to specify what the scope is, because it totally depends on what is being discussed.

What I view this document as is just a statement that we will be included, and then I think we really kind of get to decide, do we need a single representative? Do we need to put up an ad hoc committee? I think all of that is open with this document as is.

>> TAL SUTTON: Maybe two more discussions.

>> SPEAKER: Ken S. I voted no just because I don't feel that, one, we should go in late enough that our role has already been defined. We should be defining what our role is. And to, again, I don't feel comfortable limiting our role to only what they feel may be an improvement as opposed to anything that we decide may have an impact on the quality of academia.

>> TAL SUTTON: Time for one more.

So we will move to a vote of hands again. All in favor of supporting the original resolution as it was, raise your hand?

I lost count. I'm sorry. Keep your hands up. I'm sorry. If you are a proxy, keep your hand up. 33 yeases. Opposed? If you are

a proxy. Two nays. That wasn't a no? So that's three then. Three nos. That's still two nos? I think so. Okay.

So I think the motion does carry, and so we will move the resolution forward to the ELT and we will put it on our website to start the conversation on these college-wide initiatives at the earliest stage of consideration.

All right. Back to the agenda. Our policy review, where we have five different policies to consider, and there was a summary that I will project as needed. I think some of these came out of Nic Richmond's office, and she has a very aching back right now so she's not able to answer questions on that regard. I think any questions or discussion we can still direct towards her.

So I don't know if there is anyone here to represent or speak to the initiatives? You're here for which one?

>> SPEAKER: Administration.

>> TAL SUTTON: I can project that one for you if you want to speak at the podium. This one? Okay.

>> SPEAKER: Basically this administration, administrative procedure was really to solidify the existing decision-making structure as well as kind of solidify really the ELT and the deputies group, and then identify the structure of individual lanes within the

college for decision-making, like provost lane, administration policy, finance, the various lanes that are out there.

And then kind of really tell folks, okay, everything academic will be in the provost's lane, and the provost is the decision-making authority. We are trying to power down, as most of you probably already heard from the chancellor, decisions down to the local level to where things are a little bit more flexible, you could be more flexible about it. So really the faculty, decisions now can be made really at the lowest level, which is the dean level. So really more responsive to you and/or and everybody else's lane, the other employees.

So as we go through this kind of deliberate model, things again could be more flexible, more timely. So not everything is taken up to the ELT. Again, decisions are made again at the lowest level and then really the formalization of ELT and the deputies group to then make college-wide decisions. Operationally done at the deputies group, the strategic level at the ELT.

That's the down and dirty. Any questions?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Are you Tom Davis?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, Tom Davis, special assistant to the chancellor.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So this is not replacing any older policy?

This is a brand new policy?

>> SPEAKER: Exactly.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Or administrative procedure?

>> SPEAKER: Correct.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: That list of the different -- it's functional areas that it lists, the administrator and what they are kind of responsible for, is that meant to be kind of a comprehensive list or all the administrators above a certain rank or level?

>> SPEAKER: It's all the administrators, really more the executive administrators because there is three level of administrator. Those are mainly the ones that are in charge of those specific areas, so executive vice presidents, the provosts, vice chancellors in charge of specific areas like facilities, external relations. And then there is one assistant vice chancellor, Nic, in charge of the planning area.

But everybody else falls underneath them. All academic realms obviously is provost level. She then delegates down to her vice presidents and presidents and all that to execute whatever needs to be done in the provost lane.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So you're saying all other areas like what we call like instructions, the vice presidents typically and the student

development --

>> SPEAKER: For your guys' lane, the provost is in charge of all that. She delegates responsibility and authority down to her vice presidents, presidents, everything academic-wise, instruction-wise, basically that's listed in the table

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So it is supposed to be a comprehensive like partition into different areas and everybody will fall into one of these generally?

>> SPEAKER: Well, yeah, everybody is going to be in one of those lanes, silos, for a better word. Then the provost delegates down the responsibility and authority to do whatever to, depending on the specific position, from a campus president to the deans and everything down through the chain of command, for the better word.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Okay.

>> SPEAKER: Because some people just didn't know that. So we are just trying to delineate -- again, for you guys, the provost is in charge of all things, instruction, academics, and all that. So she has the full authority from the chancellor and hence the board to take care of all issues within her lane. Then she delegates down authority to then her subordinate who then delegate down who then delegate down. So then issues are solved at the lowest level,

because it creates more flexibility, better and ideas and thoughts, innovation, creative thinking. All of those things happen at the lowest level. They are not happening at the ELT.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: May I ask a couple more?

>> TAL SUTTON: I'm waiting. I'm waiting.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So it says the deputies group would meet twice a month, and it seems like it's a fairly large group. 24 people.

Do we really need another, like twice monthly meeting with so many different people in one room, like the --

>> SPEAKER: You may not.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I mean, I'm just questioning, I just recently had a conversation with Jeffrey about the amount of meetings at the college, and, you know, so it's just a question. Does that seem like good practice for such a large group to meet for so often and listen to all the different things that are going on? Has that already been happening?

>> SPEAKER: It's been happening and it's been working fine.

Kate's a member of it. Anybody else in the room? No?

Bottom line is there are a lot of things that need to be fixed and/or issues that need to be resolved at the operational level.

Again, this is the day-to-day kind of stuff that's going on, again, taking the ELT out of it and you take that input, because really the people that are really instituting and coming up with the solutions and coming up with the processes and all that are all those vice presidents, vice chancellors, directors, executive directors, they are the ones that really have to do the work, anyway, so they're the ones now making the operational level decisions to then make whatever happen happen, depending on the subject matter.

It's been very effective so far. We're moving things along. But there is a lot of little things. If we don't need, because of not stuff to do down the road, then we can go to once a month or, again, but the whole point is there is a lot of issues out there that have been identified that we need to really take care of, you know, from policies and procedures to, you know, creating an environment for you guys to be able to do your job.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Yeah. I was just commenting since we are putting it down into a procedure.

And then finally, a concern that I had was under 1.4, where it says when appropriate college leadership will work with appropriate groups such as the different employee groups. Then it says even though these groups are not in the decision-making process, they do

have unique perspectives that should be taken into account.

So it just honestly -- it seemed to me like a little bit of, I mean, something that doesn't need to go, need to be stated that way. I would argue that certainly there are academic decisions, curriculum decisions where, you know, groups like the senate and faculty would be at least involved in the process, understood not as final decision makers, but certainly part of the process. There is other things like Meet and Confer, the employee groups would be involved.

It just seems like is there somebody insecure about their management rights which are already spelled out in common policy that we need to put, oh, these people are not in the decision-making process?

>> SPEAKER: Well, the point was that we are trying to be inclusive with you guys to ensure that you are providing input. Again, this is for college-wide issues. It's not a specific -- if it's all academic, it's all academic, and you guys are making decisions or providing input to the provost. This is like for big, large initiatives. In my mind, it's still in line with the governance policy, the intent of you guys providing input, not just you guys but all employee groups, input to that decision-making process.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Yeah, it says significant decision, so it's pretty broad. I do like the general point of that item 1.4, but I do really think that part of the sentence should be taken out, if that's the comment.

>> SPEAKER: We can look at that, the comments that you provide. The intent is just that, to delineate that you guys provide input and then (indiscernible) decisions.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Understood.

>> LISA WERNER: I almost think taking out the last sentence or saying, even though these groups may not -- wait. Regardless whether these groups are involved in the final decision-making process. Because there are sometimes where they indeed really should be and some cases where maybe not. But I wouldn't -- either way, I wouldn't say even though they are not. Regardless whether they are --

>> SPEAKER: We'd be happy to look at that.

>> LISA WERNER: Thank you.

>> ROSA MORALES: I just want to mention a couple of things. In taking a note of the amount of individuals that are part of that ELT, I learned that there is 13 of them and then there is 24 of them that are going to be part of the deputies group.

One of the questions that I have and I was able to talk to

Dr. Phillips, is the issue of diversity. Has anybody really looked into whether those two groups are diverse? He confirmed to me that in fact there is 60% males and 30% females that are serving on those two groups.

>> SPEAKER: That's 90%.

>> ROSA MORALES: Well, 60-plus males, according to Dr. Phillips, and 30-plus females. I was just talking to him about the issue of diversity that I noticed there has been a lot of appointments and everything but I'm not sure it's been taken into consideration.

>> SPEAKER: It's not based on gender. It's just based on position. So then everyone is represented within the college. Each department is represented within the college.

>> ROSA MORALES: I'm just letting you know right now, according to the numbers that 60-plus males in these two groups and 30-plus females, okay?

>> SPEAKER: Okay.

>> ROSA MORALES: So the next thing that I want to mention to you, Mr. Davis, is that I notice on section 6, page 6, there is a list of areas that individuals need to be aware when participating in these meetings.

But I found that in any of these documents states how the

information is going to be made public and how is that going to be distributed to the factor to the staff.

I believe these individuals are going to be making very important decisions, right?

So it says, for example, that the chairs will make sure that there is agendas and there is minutes. But it doesn't state anywhere if the chairs of those two committees will make sure that that information is not only archived but also distributed.

Does that mean that if you want to have access to these documents you only will have access by introducing an open records request?

>> SPEAKER: No, the documents for summary of conclusions, it's not minutes, summary of conclusions, because we are trying to delineate discussion from decision. And so decisions will be documented so people can use that as a foundation to say, okay, if we are creating a work group to study X, Y, Z, then they can take that document to then say, hey, this is my kind of the basis of the charter that we are going to write to then do X, Y, Z, and then either resourcing stuff, point, or hey, we want to bring all these individuals from around the college, then that gives them the authority to do that.

But that's distributed out to literally all the ELT members and

the deputy group members. They then will utilize that to then distribute out information throughout down the chain to the lowest level, again.

So there is a lot of information discussed in the meeting, as well. Again, the expectation is to disperse that information out to the lowest level through their chains.

>> ROSA MORALES: (off microphone.)

What I want to mention to you, and I know you're new on this job, that historically communication within the college has been an issue. One of the things that we have been addressing lately is that the best way to manage any company, regardless of the size, is to establish communication procedures.

So I was interested in, given the fact that there is other information listed here about how the meetings are supposed to be conducted and all of that, there is nothing about how that information is going to be transpired to the other rest of the organization, which is faculty and staff.

That's just something that I don't find it very good, because that's the main issue where we are having problems.

>> SPEAKER: Okay.

>> ROSA MORALES: Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Go ahead and make your comment, as you guys bring up the document to us. We'll take a look at it.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. Thanks for sharing on -- I think 116.02 and 03 are Nic Richmond's, and as I said, she's not able to be here today. You can of course direct questions. If you want to send me the questions, I'm happy to relay them to her.

And then I think we actually kind of discussed -- didn't we discuss 409 at one point? I feel like we saw that one before. Maybe not.

Okay. Yes.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> KATE SCHMIDT: This is a board policy that had its first reading at Wednesday night's meeting, and it was initiated through efforts of the adjunct faculty subcommittee that Sean has been spearheading, and I think actually your notes are misrepresenting it a little bit, because what this is going to do is allow for part-time employees and adjunct faculty to tap into our tuition waiver program. In the past adjunct faculty could take two courses with our tuition waiver program. This will allow adjunct faculty, their dependents, and their spouse basically to take as many courses as they want, just the way we all, as full-time employees, enjoy that as a benefit.

The board had to approve that as per our Arizona state statute, approve that that would be one of our changes. That's the first step is to have the board put that in policy and we will work on the procedures to have that happen. It's one way of acknowledging and offering a benefit that we are legally allowed to offer to our part-time employees, including adjunct faculty. And it was a great example of how we take input and make change at the organization.

>> TAL SUTTON: Though that wasn't my summary. The summary is actually provided by Angie Weston's office.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: Okay. It just was important to know how it came to me.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think we will move on to the next piece.

Sorry?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Even though Nic isn't here, those APs are not being pulled? She's not coming back next month? They are out for the 21-day comment?

>> TAL SUTTON: Again, it's a very ill-defined process. Are they up for -- I haven't checked.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I think so, right?

>> TAL SUTTON: If there's time, we could add them to the November meeting. Would you like me to do that?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I don't know. I was just asking the question and making people aware that if they have any comments they should get those in because they might not be coming back. I didn't see any problems with them.

>> SPEAKER: With regards to .09 I would encourage all adjunct faculty out there to please make those comments, because it's at the board right now and I think it would be important for the Board of Governors to actually hear how it would benefit adjunct faculty and, you know, not just -- well, adjunct faculty, when I think of adjunct faculty, I think of also the dual enrollment faculty, which oftentimes people don't think about that are part time.

Also, there are -- again, anyone who, you know, works for the college in a part-time status could potentially have status to this. So I would like to see part-timers going to the board saying how they would support this and why. I just wanted to put that out.

>> TAL SUTTON: All right. So for the president's report, I don't have too much to speak on. Heads-up resolution went longer than I thought. I will try and be fast.

Two things to report on that haven't been already discussed earlier, one is the faculty evaluation work group is continuing to make progress and trying to help improve and streamline the process.

One way that we are trying to do that is we are breaking up into smaller subgroups for the parts of the evaluation process you are interested in, and so we are welcoming any members that might be interested in joining that. If I'm remembering correctly, the subcommittees we have going there is sort of one on essentially the student evaluation process. I think actually there are two of those right now, one in terms of how to improve the output, improve the results, how many students are actually completing it. And then there is another one looking at the actual measurement tool itself.

And then there is a committee that I'm on that's looking at developing key performance indicators that our group can use to sort of say are we doing a good job with this, is it measuring what we want to measure, so on and so forth.

And then there is another one on sort of -- there is the IT side one that's kind of more on like the website -- not website. The my career center. Yeah, the software. Yeah, the software side. What else is there? And then there is the adjunct faculty. Because right now it's sort of a single paper plus the student evaluations, and so we are looking at, A, moving that into My Career Center in ways to make that a richer evaluation for the adjunct faculty without increasing the amount of workload by 15 billion hours.

We can obviously improve the process if we just say everyone has to do an observation. So we are trying to sort of be strategic on how we optimize it, the process of getting the most bang for our buck in terms of how we can improve that evaluation.

Are there any others?

And then the other one is again the CDAC evolution committee is continuing to work and move along. I feel like we had a pretty decent meeting the last time, but again, I have to apologize today. I went from what feels like -- I feel like I'm trying to be James Bond here, outskiing an avalanche and then going to have tea with the Queen. I just went from watching my kids this morning to here. I'm a little frazzled. I apologize for that.

So I do think the meeting went well, and we were mostly focusing again on establishing the structure that we want and I think we have a pretty good idea what that proposal will look like for what a discipline structure will look like. There is going to be essentially a core of voting members, which would be the disciplined faculty that are teaching, or is it certified? I think it's teaching within that discipline. And then including in that we are looking to include an adjunct faculty rep, essentially, that the adjunct faculty choose to represent them.

That person need not be a adjunct faculty. It could be full-time faculty. But somebody who has the added responsibility of keeping the flow of communication with the adjuncts within that discipline going and making sure that you're collecting their input to these conversations, and so that's sort of one component that's something new that we are actively discussing in that group to just sort of put that on your radar.

And within that core, then that core could opt to include additional people. If you remember the survey that went out in terms of who might be considered reasonable voting members for a discipline that that core can opt to say let's include these other disciplines that are very closely connected to one another. For instance, again, the example in the survey was talking about language faculty. You might have a decently sized core of Spanish faculty but very few to zero Italian faculty, German faculty, Japanese faculty, and so how are the curriculum decisions being made for those satellite -- that's not the right term, but for the less-represented disciplines. Maybe you would just sort of merge as a voting block for curriculum matters involving discipline.

So again, those core faculty would make that decision. Do we sort of make that decision to merge.

And so we are trying to make it as customizable as possible to fit the needs, because there is such a huge variety of disciplines and how they are comprised. Sometimes you have a large enough core of full-time faculty that that's adequate for a voting block and getting plenty of perspectives. Sometimes you have much smaller full-time faculty and large adjunct body. Maybe there the core would decide let's include faculty that have taught the classes in the past year or taught classes in the past two years, whatever make the most sense for that discipline.

And so we are trying to sort of come up with options to allow each discipline to customize, and that will sort of get documented and that will be sort of the voting structure. "Voting" is sort of the wrong term because there is also input structure. You have mother roles than just voting, but that's sort of the structure that I think we have made progress towards. Then we are going to sort of tackle the process, which is going to be -- I'm not looking forward to that, but I'll be sure to give you the blow-by-blows next month.

That's sort of my president's report. I will hand it over to Brooke and Mays for the professional development committee update. Sorry.

>> ROSA MORALES: I took the time to actually print the list of

committees from the website, and we currently there they have 27 committees. Some of them are headed by people that are no longer with the college. And the reason why I did that, it was because on the one of the policies that we were reviewing about the administration, one of my questions was what is the role of the current committees? Which ones are working? Which ones are no longer working? Is that possible, as president of the Faculty Senate, that you can try to get an update of such committees so people can start figure it out which committees they would like to work on? Only because according to this document, it says that the deputies group might organize a group to, I guess, to research an issue and present the recommendation.

So that's confusion as to we still have this up there --

>> TAL SUTTON: Anything you try to find online is outdated. We are actually working on that. I just didn't feel we had enough takeaways to sort of Sharon that.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

On all the committees, we realize the same thing that you guys have realized that some of these groups may be outdated or can be changed into a work group, et cetera. The last deputies group we tasked out to the provost's office because most of the committees are

academic and instructional, but not all, to then get a work group together to then go and get with the stakeholders to then ask those same questions, is this standing committee good? Is this something that's relevant or not? And then come up with a recommendation again with everybody to then either delete or potentially even add a group, depending, if needed, and/or change it to a working group versus a standing committee, et cetera, et cetera.

So if you guys, again, they should be soliciting input from you all, as well, as all the stakeholder groups so then you guys can partner to help that effort out. And Julian Easter is the lead for that.

The bottom line is we can partner easily with you guys to do that.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks. Now Brooke and Mays, that's an and/or statement.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Good afternoon, everyone. Did you want to update them or shall I on our last meeting decisions?

>> MAYS IMAD: So I want to remind you that on Monday, at 5:00, the deadline -- that's the deadline to apply for the teaching and learning center coordinator. So I encourage all of you who are interested who were on the committee or still on the committee to

apply.

We had an All Faculty Day for 2019 meeting with Sean, Brooke, and Kate. We have an exciting proposal to share with you. Do you want to talk about it?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So the theme that we chose this year is Back to School. So for that day, the proposal will be coming out soon, we're going to get a draft to the provost today, and then the call for proposal should officially go out hopefully by next Friday. Basically we will be looking for faculty to present mini versions of their classes, and then we will register for school for All Faculty Day and attend some classes.

So be thinking about that for All Faculty Day. It is just going to be a half day with CDACs after lunch. The first part of the day will be going back to school.

The provost has agreed to start us off in Spanish class.

>> MAYS IMAD: So it will be like showcasing your classes, your favorite class or your favorite topics. So for instance, I'm going to submit a proposal, I hope it gets accepted, and if it gets accepted, I will be teaching a lesson on the ethics of artificial intelligence.

So questions?

>> BARBARA FOX: I'm on the committee, I think, still. Will this demonstration module be available to adjuncts as well as regular faculty? Yes.

>> MAYS IMAD: Adult education and staff instructors and Kate Schmidt --

>> BARBARA FOX: How do we apply?

>> MAYS IMAD: The provost's office will send a proposal, will send the announcement on our behalf.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: And we have a timeline, and that should go out next Friday, so October 12, the proposal should be sent to faculty.

We also encourage you, it will be 50-minute sessions. The idea is that not only are you teaching, say, a lesson that you love, but that you are also sharing your teaching strategies.

Part of the proposal will ask that you not only present a lesson but that you also talk with the people that register for your class about your pedagogical strategies that you use in that lesson and in general.

And we encourage people to also team up. Make a whole day of what it's like to be in your discipline. I believe we haven't had fully decided yet but we will probably do two classes, it would

50-minute classes, two sessions. If you wanted to make it what it's like to be ethnic, gender, transborder studies, this is what it looks like, then think about that, or whatever discipline you might be in.

I think that's all the -- oh, I do want to just say that by all means please reach out to your constituents, let them know that the committee is open, right, not just to senators, but to anyone. So when you send out any information about senate, remind them that they can join the professional development committee. We are rather small right now, because we realize everyone is quite busy. The more people we could have on the committee, the better.

If you, yourself, a senator cannot work on the committee, by all means encourage your constituents to reach out so they can be a part of it.

>> TAL SUTTON: What is the day of All Faculty Day?

>> MAYS IMAD: It will be January 15th.

>> TAL SUTTON: Is that a Tuesday? Is that right?

>> MAYS IMAD: Actually, one more thing. After a coordinator is hired, the other fellow positions will open. So if you're not interested in the coordinator but you want to be, you want to work on one of the other projects, that will be coming soon, as well.

Questions?

>> JOE BREWER: Do you have a mascot or flag or anything yet?

>> MAYS IMAD: We're going to hire you. (Laughter.)

No, I meant we are going to hire you to design one for us, but not that you would be (laughter).

>> TAL SUTTON: I'm looking at the academic calendar, it has All Faculty Day listed as Wednesday.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: There is an error with the online academic calendar? PCCEA and Senate negotiated with the provost over the summer because of the first day of accountability is Monday and first day of classes is Thursday, having All Faculty Day the day before the first day of classes did not seem optimal. So I think you were cc'd. PCCEA pointed that out over the summer. It was agreed to change it to Wednesday. We didn't know it hadn't changed in the calendar until recently but it's slated to be changed on that calendar.

>> TAL SUTTON: Got it. Thank you.

Now Brooke will stay as she will now give the board report.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Thank you, Tal.

Could you open up the report from this week for me.

So I hope that you got a chance to look at my board report that I submitted this month. There is a very important item on there for me to review with you. That is the FACT team information.

So this was reviewed by me. This was also brought up by Dolores at the board meeting. So just to make sure everybody is aware of where we are in the process, the deans are making their recommendations to the leadership for the faculty positions that will be eliminated on Monday, October 8. Right?

And so one thing that the leadership discussed with the Faculty Senate officer leadership at our last meeting was the sort of third phase here, which is faculty having the option to negotiate with leadership for possible positions.

They suggested that things we might be able to negotiate with would be things like professional development funds, sabbatical funds, release time and then possibly if we were willing to give up some of these things that we could save some positions.

So they presented that to us. We had some discussion. And then the officers met. We came to the conclusion that we did not believe that those things -- and we really didn't talk too much about release time, but we talked about professional development and sabbaticals in particular, but I think it is important to bring up release time as well as something that has been mentioned. That those were too vital to us as professionals for that to be a negotiable thing. But of course that's just the officers. So we need to bring that to the

senate for some discussion.

So we probably actually should have had that on the agenda. And so I guess I'm putting it on the agenda now as part of my report.

So I would say that really was the absolute most critical thing discussed since our last senate meeting and at the board recently.

So how do I move forward with this, Tal? Just open it for discussion?

>> TAL SUTTON: Well, I mean, I apologize, this probably should have been something I included in the president's report, but, yes, so this was something that came up with Lee, provost, presidents, and Kate and now Tom.

So it was brought up to us in that meeting with the idea that PCCEA and Faculty Senate could identify a small group of faculty that could talk about, after that group of people have gotten feedback from all faculty regarding these potential negotiables, and again, these are things that are unclear and didn't sound like they were meant to be long-term solutions. For example, it would be to halt professional development funds for X years to save Y positions for Z years, if that's enough variables for you.

We talked with Matej, the president of PCCEA, at our officers meeting, and we sort of felt that if we are working towards being a

premier institution, we need to cultivate the best pedagogical and teaching practices as we can, and you do that by investing in the faculty that you have, and if you start treating those investments options as these negotiables, then we felt that that would be challenging to really allow faculty to focus on improving their pedagogy and giving their students the best possible education that they can get.

So we weren't -- granted, we don't have a finalized list of what these negotiables are, but again, the only thing we could imagine would be professional development funds and some sabbaticals and things like that, and it didn't seem like that would be something that we wanted to be part of a conversation about these layoffs, I guess.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I want to add, too, that the leadership also said they are open to ideas that we have for things that we believe would be negotiable, so it isn't that they are simply presenting the things that could be negotiable. But if we had ideas about ways we believe we could compromise in order to save some positions that we would want to bring that together and have that discussion with the leadership and elect someone to represent us or a few people to represent, a few faculty to represent us in this conversation.

>> SPEAKER: Rita. I just wanted to ask, do we have a timeline for when this will be presented to us, the negotiables, the list of?

>> TAL SUTTON: I'm trying to remember.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.) Those were just examples. Just as she said, you guys come up with your ideas, if there are any, that you guys want to bring to the table, and we'll discuss it.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So I guess that is a question is do we feel there is anything we would be willing to give up in order to save positions.

And then a second answer to a somewhat of an answer to Rita's question, too, is we have some dates. We do have October 8 as the day we will learn how many faculty positions we are talking about. And then they are wanting to make a decision by the end of the month, by the end of October.

So our timeline is tight.

>> TAL SUTTON: In terms of the negotiables, I really left that meeting with the impression Dolores was charged with identifying a list of -- since you guys are the ones that know the budget, so --

>> SPEAKER: Right. That was going to be my point is we don't know how much money is in all these different buckets. And what's available? We don't even know.

>> TAL SUTTON: I remember that -- I thought Lee had charged Dolores in that meeting to sort of come up with a list of, you know, so that we could have a better idea of what, you know, what X and Y and Z would be in these conversations.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: For any of the pieces, if you can identify just, okay, are so what if we were willing to look at reducing sabbaticals further, we can give you budgetary information that says, oh, okay, so a faculty position, if you're looking at that, would be this. Or if you say, okay, what if rather than having a thousand dollars professional development for each person, what if we reduce that to whatever it is that you said, and we can figure out for you, well, that's what this is. What if we change loading temporarily. What would that do? What if we changed reassigned time temporarily. What would that do? We will do all the number calculating for you. That's not an issue for that. It's just we don't want to be responsible for saying, okay, so here's the things that faculty members should be looking at to try and save these positions.

One of the other things, too, is remember, this is not something that is supposed to be a long-term solution, because we are expecting our enrollment to change. Remember? This is one of the things we are working on is improve enrollment, improve enrollment. And so at

the point enrollment changes and starts coming back the other direction, then at that particular point, we are not having discussions about how do we eliminate faculty positions. We are now back in the position of looking at, okay, so we have some room to look at how can we build more programs, how can we continue to expand the institution and continue enrollment growth.

And so what we are considering in this case is are there places where you can say, in a short time, for a year or two, in the interim, we can do these things to kind of level out that turning point so there is not as many faculty members impacted in the short term for that.

So that's really the piece that we're looking at

>> JOSIE: So just a comment. So what that list that you just provided, even knowing that from our perspective, would be helpful. You know, load hours. Enrichment -- those type, that's what we would kind of help us get some footing with these determinations, because we don't know, because we are not involved with budgeting and those pieces, what exactly we would be deciding on sacrificing or modifying.

So, you know, that was, from the meeting that we attended, that was our understanding, that we would be provided with those items,

and that would help us have a foundation from which to, you know, determine involvement, if any, in these conversations.

So that's the impression I was left with. Because there might be items that we're not even aware of that we wouldn't even think to consider that could be presented in that pool. That's why we were, you know, hoping for --

>> KATE SCHMIDT: I know some of that message got through to -- I know Dolores is looking at a list and looking at the average cost of a faculty member plus benefits to sort of figure out what that would look like. But I think the only three things she was looking at were those things mentioned as examples in that meeting. So I think the idea is if there are other areas, I don't know where they would come from, whether they would come from senators or PCCEA or coming from Dave Bea.

So the three things I know were currently on the list were the three things mentioned: The professional development enrichment dollars, sabbatical dollars, and release time. It's not an absolute list, but I know those are things she's started generating some numbers around.

Does that make sense?

>> JOSIE: Yes, we were not clear about that. We were not clear

-- I hate to use the word "sacrifice," but some element of sacrifice of the faculty position. You know, we are under the impression it could be something like, you know, make an adjustment at this building with facilities or, you know, things like that that we weren't even aware of. Now we know it's kind of winnowed down to these areas --

>> KATE SCHMIDT: I don't know that that's true that that's winnowed down. I just know those are the only things I saw Dolores and had a conversation with her. I think we can take that information back and get some clarity on are there other areas, and if there are, who's going to identify those and how.

>> JOSIE: That exactly is the clarity that we are seeking.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: It sounds like we are too. This was a Phase 3 that was thrown in after the process had been developed, which I think is worth having these conversations, but there isn't clarity on how it would go forward.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: A key piece on that is faculty members would need to be giving up that's faculty members something. It would not be appropriate for suggestions that we should save some faculty member positions by doing these pick things in the facilities area or requiring the business office to do these particular things in their

area.

The idea is these are faculty positions that the institution is trying to maintain a reasonable number compared to other places, and faculty members working with the institution can say, okay, well, we have this other something. I would think you probably could look in your FPPS and see, okay, where are the places where faculty members have some benefit, have something in there, and say, hey, here's something I may be able to trade from.

But that's really the point is that these are faculty positions and we are looking for places where faculty are saying, okay, for right now I'm willing to trade this for this. Not really looking for we think we should do this particular thing with facilities at Community Campus.

>> JOSIE: That's the clarity we were seeking.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Just a few things. So a couple of things.

I do know at the bottom I did request that the administration provide an open forum where they provide updates and allow time for faculty to ask questions. Administration did agree to that and the board also really told the administration that they wanted that to happen.

So I'm assuming that Dolores will be letting us know about that, and that should be rather soon. And I would imagine Kate was

probably going to announce that in her provost report.

>> KATE SCHMIDT: It's actually not in the provost report. So, yes, everybody is on board with doing an open forum. Looks like the date would be October 19. Dolores is looking at having it be probably at District Office but having it streamed to other campuses, however we do that technically.

There was one other piece, I don't know that it's in your notes, but there was some confusion about the, I can't remember, the rubric that we are using to gather data, and there was an understanding, I think a request to see the current rubric. I know Dolores presented it to the board.

The deans group was actually going to over the weekend make sure all the written definitions are clear to a layperson that would see this without somebody there to explain it to them and is planning to release that next week to faculty, to anybody.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Thank you. One of the other things I did want to encourage you to do is go to the board meeting notes, because she provided several documents, including the rubric there, as well as her presentation.

So I encourage you very, very strongly to review her presentation and the attached materials that you'll find under the meeting notes

section on the website.

And then just one other thing, I wanted to say about what she did present, was she had spoken about the target being 50 students to 1, that that's the average sort of nationally. So 50 students to 1 professor. Whereas we are at 44 students to 1 professor. So that is how they came up with the number of positions to cut.

So again, I think we are talking about, right, if we do some negotiating, we are keeping it below the 50 in order, by giving up some things, and if that number goes up, right, with increased enrollments -- so these are key things to look at and listen to from the board meeting.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So I will not be very coherent, but I would just like to say that I was personally pretty distraught to hear about this whole process and this quote unquote negotiation. PCCEA, in our meeting with administration, was not asked about this kind of possibility. Perhaps that was just not something that was seriously considered at the time, although we had heard just, you know, general brainstorming about this kind of stuff as far back as last spring.

So again, PCCEA being the group sort of tasked with working conditions, I was distraught that we were not approached about this.

As Morgan said, these kinds of things are outlined in policy,

professional development, reassigned time for senate officers, reassigned time for PCCEA, and I would argue they are really crucial, like, services for the faculty that we have. They provide academic leadership for the college. You know, it provides policy for policy review. PCCEA, I would argue, provides really valuable just mediation services and some institutional memory, right, profession development is invaluable and if we want to be anything resembling some kind of premier institution in the changing environment we are at, it's key we have the best faculty and that we support them in what they are doing.

It's really, if you add up the numbers, it's a very small overhead compared to the total, if you add up all the salaries and benefits for all the faculty that we have, right?

So I think we should really think long and hard and carefully about entering any kind of discussion like that. I would encourage everybody to let people know if there is a forum to go to that and express their views. But again, it's an FPPS, so if this was a serious consideration, then administration should have gone through the proper channels, go to this new AERC group we put in place so there is this more flexible model for changing policy if that needs to happen. None of that stuff has happened. And then there is

processes for appointing a team and getting a team into those kind of negotiations.

But again, if we are supposed to make decisions by end of the month to lay people off, then why is there now this emergency? Why has that not been done much earlier. And what is going to be the benefit of, you know, making these kinds of choices? I mean, Morgan said it wouldn't be a fair choice to choose between some faculty positions and these key, you know, really budgetary lines, we need to support the faculty that we do have, right?

But at the same time be diverted a good amount of the instructional budget of things that are supervision and approving travel and things like that, that should be in the administrative budget if we want to start talking about what's appropriate and making tradeoffs between different kinds of budget.

So I really think it's not -- you know, I don't know. I personally don't think it's appropriate to ask the faculty to be making those kinds of, you know, choices. It's certainly something to look at but not something to just kind of throw out there at the last minute for us to consider and be sort of pressured or intimidated into making concessions like that, right?

Again, are we looking at other people's professional development

or making cutbacks like that in terms of, like, international travel and what people always bring up? I have nothing against personally our international program, as people often bring up, but there is problems with this on many levels, I would say. Again, not that I would be 100% opposed to even considering or having a discussion, this to me, sounds very problematic.

PCCEA is meeting with the provost and the presidents next Wednesday to discuss, you know, perhaps some of these, you know, this issue, but also just the issue of this reduction in force in a little more detail and to really ensure that there is some transparency, help develop these criteria, but the criteria by themselves don't mean anything. We don't know what the data from the different disciplines was, for like how were those final decisions actually made, right?

And finally, it should really all be based on teaching need. We should be able to identify how many faculty do we need to stop this decline in enrollment and not hurt that further by, you know, laying off, you know, faculty in an area where there is really a need to continue offering courses and support enrollment.

I don't know. I'm probably forgetting something, but these are my comments and I'd encourage anybody else to speak up.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think to just add to Matej and then Kiley, I think you're right, there is something to be said like apples and oranges, like, if you have a problem with your teeth, doesn't make sense to wear an arm cast for a month. That's not going to be sort of what fixes the problem. If we have an issue with our teacher to student ratio, then talking about what makes our teachers great and what we do to support them to be great teachers is not the right variable.

Ultimately, I think -- Lisa, you were waiting. So I just want to sort of parrot a lot of what Matej said. I think in terms of the timeline that we have, if we misunderstood the communication of who has the negotiables, then we might have lost a few days, but still, I think, even with a month or month-and-a-half time, it's hard to envision a rational process to come out of this. If this is something that we generally want all of the faculty at the college to have input in, it's hard to see how that's going to sort of play out in a not, almost adversarial way. So that's a real concern that I have with this.

>> LISA WERNER: My concern is along both those lines. I would not want this to roll out the way for example and have the type of moving target decision-making we saw with guided pathways. It's not

enough time. And again, some of these things are real critical, and they are peanuts compared to what a position cost.

So I took \$800 per credit unit for paying for adjunct faculty. I know there are other indirect costs and stuff. I multiplied 800 times 15 credit hours for full time for one semester times 12 for sabbatical positions, and I come up to \$144,000. The cost of one faculty position for a year, I'm guessing, is probably around there even though we get much less because there are other costs at the college, as well. So it's peanuts.

So then my question, though, is again, this 50 -- is this for community colleges?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yes.

>> LISA WERNER: Nationwide? That's the average?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: That's the average.

>> LISA WERNER: What is it for Arizona?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I'm just reporting what Dolores said. I'm not the expert in that area.

>> LISA WERNER: Just curious. Thanks.

>> SPEAKER: Kiley. I'm going to reiterate some things, but what I'm really hearing here, and maybe Kate or Morgan, you can address this, I'm hearing a mixed message. Because I'm hearing on the one

hand it's the 50 to 1 ratio that was so important. The first time that I ever heard that that we needed to cut 23 faculty because of the 50 to 1 ratio was at the board study session in February for the budget.

It was something that David Bea just sort of mentioned as one possible metric for looking at our numbers. It seems like that's really what the college has run with, that it's the 23, it's got to be the 23.

I know I brought up and PCCEA has brought up that we have had significant savings in the faculty line because we have lost, jeez, like 80 faculty in the last 10 years, something like that?

So as our enrollment has declined, we have lost a lot of faculty. A lot of the faculty that we lost have been through retirements who are, you know, at the highest levels of the salary scale and a lot of the faculty we are hiring are at the very lowest levels.

My question is if we are looking at this transactionally what can we give up to save in the budget, why is the 50 to 1 ratio important? Are we looking at ratio or are we looking at money? If we are looking at money, how are those cost savings being applied?

One other example, math 89, which is a tremendously expensive program, is going away. I don't know if you know this, but the

operational cost for faculty and tutors and staff instructors is about half a million dollars a year. That program was a pilot. It was deemed to not be more effective than regular instruction. It's going away. We are saving about half a million dollars a year by not offering math 89 as of next year. We are phasing it out right now.

Again, to reiterate, my question is how is the budget impacting this number of 23? Has that already been cut down quite a bit based on these cost savings? Or are we more committed to the 50 to 1 ratio, at which point the cost savings seem like they wouldn't matter, because it's the target ratio that's the issue.

Thank you.

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: One of the challenges with this is it's primarily a budgetary issue, but in the budgetary issue, the question that finance has that the budget office is working from is, okay, so we need to remove \$15 million from the budget, so where can we work, what kind of things can we do, and then they are trying to inform that decision by looking at data and looking at metrics, because the question becomes, oh, well, we can just get rid of a bunch of faculty and cut \$15 million out. Oh, no, Dave, you can't do that, because we need to be able to have instructional support. Is there some kind of guideline that we could use to figure out what would be an

appropriate amount to look at for instruction compared to student services compared to other places in the college?

And that's why they were looking at other institutions to see kind of what's the average amount of faculty per enrollment other institutions have so we have a way to look at Pima Community College and where we are at enrollment-wise, and the number of faculty members we have, and what seems to be a reasonable amount of the \$15 million in budget cuts to come from the faculty area.

This comes back to the piece of, okay, well, we're talking about the faculty part right now. We're not talking about how much is facilities and how much is instruction, because that was a discussion that's taken place in the past, and the board has, just like you said, they approved a budget that said, okay, here's the different pieces that are coming from places. The board actually is approving instructional cuts.

So the instructional cuts we are covering by these faculty positions that we are talking about, and so that's the one place where the chancellor has said, well, you know, I guess if there are other places we can cut from that same area that the board is allocating and move it around, that's something we would be allowed to do, because the board's not approving down to the particular

positional level. They are approving for the particular functions at the college.

So that's the piece that goes with that. Since we are in October right now, we are not in the point where we are negotiating what budget the board is approving. Then that puts different constraints on us.

That doesn't mean in future times when the board is approving something, there could be other discussions about that and there could be other things we are looking at doing, but right now, that's where we are at and it is kind of time constraint, I agree with Matej, it would be nice to be able to plan these things further out, but that's just not where we are at right now.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: And just to quickly say the rationale behind the timeline was they were trying to take into consideration giving faculty time to apply for other full-time positions at other institutions.

And so that's why.

>> SPEAKER: Kiley. Could I ask you to just speak to the savings that come as a result of the retirements and math 89 and how those have been incorporated? Since those are cuts from instruction?

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Savings from instruction retirement is

basically built into that \$15 million reduction in the budget. The institution is trying to figure out how can we, in the least painful way, be able to reduce our budget. When you're saying, oh, people retire, yes, people retire, and the number is 23 because people have retired and we have some budget savings in those areas. But that's something they looked at before they are starting to figure out what's the number that we need to have as far as reduction in positions. They were already looking at, oh, good, here's some savings that we can apply toward that that we are going to be able to lose. That's other places, so if we have savings, for instance, I don't think we are getting a bunch right now, but say, for instance, the solar things we have been doing, any savings from those kind of projects, that goes into the budget savings that impacts things downstream. You can't really count it when you're creating the budget and then go in the budget and say, okay, I'm going to trade out those same kind of things, too.

But that is part of our reduction is those savings from retirements.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I'm going to flip to the other side of the spreadsheet here. So we talk a lot about savings and cuts. I want to switch to the revenue side.

The term "enrollment" keeps coming up, Morgan, and you and I have had this conversation about enrollment at Pima. I really hate to see us cutting like this when we still haven't solved the issue with students' ability to enroll at this institution.

You have kids here, right? I have one here. Probably other people in this room have kids here. I would be willing to bet that most of us have horror stories of getting our children as Pima employees through the door, through the system, through all of the hurdles of our processes to get them enrolled. I don't even want to think about how many students have run screaming from here because -- and there is a story this morning in our department head meeting of a student at West Campus that was reduced to tears trying to get into Pima.

I really would like to have, in addition to this dialogue, of cutting instruction, a serious conversation about why it is that it's so hard to enroll at Pima Community College.

West Campus, Downtown Campus, any of the campuses, how many students are we losing to our processes? Have we had that conversation? Because I have been bringing this up for how long, guys? A long time. I mean, the nightmare of my daughter -- and I'm a department head, you know. You're a president. Was it easy? You

don't have to answer. Just -- you know.

I really would like to have that serious conversation between the key players and a small group to make it so people can actually enroll here. Because we can't fix our enrollment. We can't bring in students if we can't get them through our processes and get this done.

Because that really is our key issue, is it not, our enrollments? And one of the issues is it is extremely, extremely hard to get past the processes and all of the things to get enrolled at Pima Community College. And I would love to see that fixed and I would love to see that fixed and see the results before we start having people lose their jobs that we may need if we fix those processes. Maybe not all the positions, but certainly some of them.

So I would really love to have that happen in a collegial manner.

(Applause.)

>> MORGAN PHILLIPS: Right now we have an enrollment task force that's beginning to work on a lot of the issues you're talking about. The student affairs area restructuring is an attempt to move forward with some of those things. I know in the registrar's office particularly we have made a lot of progress. We are nowhere close to done yet, but we have made progress in addressing some of these kind

of issues, because these really are issues that we have that we are trying to fix that we are trying to make it easier for students to become Pima Community College students.

If we look at the numbers that the chancellor talked about, one of the places that we are actually pretty successful right now is actually our instructional component, what's happening in the classrooms, and we want to try and maintain that area as best that we can, but we also have to realize that when we are looking at instruction and we are looking at the exact problems that you're talking about, we can't necessarily fix our budget by maintaining instruction and putting all of the weight of the budget cuts on the areas of the college that are the ones that right now we are trying to alleviate the problems and fix.

So that's one of the things where temporarily if we can adjust things, and if you're interested in addressing some of those kinds of things, we can work with that, but we really can't look at the other places in the college which really we have big challenges right now we are trying to address, and have greater impact on them when, like you said, that's the places we need to address to really start having that positive impact on enrollment.

So this is not one of the things where we are saying instruction

is not valuable. It's not a case where we are saying we don't want to fix particular things. It's we are in a budget constrained environment. We don't have any choice. The legislature has prescribed particular amounts that we are limited to expending, and we have to find some ways to work around that.

Right now the Foundation is working with individuals to find out are there ways to get additional funds coming into the institution? Academic programs, one of the things that's possible is if programs are able to secure funding for things, we might be able to attach programmatic funds or positions to outside funding, but it really just becomes how do we try and balance the bad situation that we're in until we can get around this corner and until we can start impacting our enrollment and moving forward? And it really is our processes. That's the place where we have to continue to work things, because every person that I talk to is interested in making things better for our students, interested in making things better for our community.

Everyone wants to work hard and fix these things, but it just takes some time and some effort for us, and we're just going to have, truthfully, a couple of rough years going forward right here to be able to get around this corner and start going the right direction.

I appreciate what you're saying, because you're true.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: And for the record, eight hours, two days, to enroll in two classes.

>> TAL SUTTON: Rita is next.

>> SPEAKER: Rita. I just wanted to -- we don't have our logistics officer today and it's 3:30. I just wanted to be cognizant of time.

>> TAL SUTTON: I wanted to --

>> SPEAKER: Ken. I'm a CPA. I'm an auditor. I have audited many not-for-profits, large multimillion-dollar companies, schools over the years. It is extremely common practice when an entity is failing or underperforming to make the option available to its employees to make sacrifices before layoffs.

This is common practice. I'm actually really glad the college did that. We can't in one breath say we want to be involved and in the next say we don't want to be responsible for making hard choices.

I think it's great that they are asking us, giving us the opportunity to decide if we want to do it. Personally I don't feel we should make those negotiations for all the reasons he said earlier. We need to maintain a level of quality. And also, it's just a short-term fix to kick the can down the road, but it is nice

that they included us. It's great. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: That's exactly what I wanted to refocus us to.

A lot of what was mentioned, which was very valuable, I think can all sort of be said in the open forum that will eventually be set up in the very short-term future. Sort of the one unknown thing that is part of this conversation is the negotiation of making sacrifices and is this something that we want to sort of make as a motion as a senate? Is this something we want to bring to faculty? If so, how do we bring this to faculty in an informed way? Are they going to be doing sort of the napkin math that Lisa was doing to sort of see what this savings actually are?

And so I just want to make sure that we have as informed of a conversation about this as possible, given how sensitive it is, and we don't have a whole lot of time to have that conversation. If we're going to involve 200-plus people in it, it's hard to have a quick conversation with 200-plus people.

So I'm just curious how we can move forward with involving -- as you said, it's nice that faculty have this option, and I think a lot of people in this room based on how this conversation went feel one way, and we are representative of faculty and maybe that's adequate. Maybe that's enough, and we can call for a vote now if we're still at

a quorum, I think we might still be. Or if we say no, this is something we really want to share with faculty, I don't feel comfortable representing my constituents on this particularly sensitive matter, I would like a survey to go forward, that's the part I think we need to decide now so that we can move forward quickly.

I would like to do it in a way that's very reasonable and provides "the" most informed conversation possible.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy. I'm not sure we can have that informed discussion until we have the budgetary numbers to know how much money is involved, is it even worth us giving up, I agree with Matej, frankly, but we need to know what kind of numbers we are looking at in dollars.

>> TAL SUTTON: So again, I think what we are asking is, like, what we were asked is do we want to find a group of people that would get their hands dirty with those numbers to negotiate on behalf of faculty?

And so is that something that we want to entertain? Or is that something we want to sort of ask faculty, like, would you like this process to go forward or would you like to say, no, the budgetary items that seem to be on the cutting table are things that we need

for academic quality.

So I think -- yeah, I think we have had a very deep discussion.

I think we should move to a vote on whether or not we want to have a survey asking faculty if they would like to be, to have a small group of people represent and negotiate these negotiables, for lack of a better term.

>> SPEAKER: Might it be worth it to do the survey and ask them if they would even be willing to do this before we go down the road of doing all that number crunching?

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah, I think that's what the survey would be.

>> SPEAKER: I would motion that. Oh, yeah.

>> ROSA MORALES: (off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Which document?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: It's not shared? It's linked. Let me look at that while... thank you for letting me know that.

>> TAL SUTTON: There was a motion to put forward a survey asking faculty if they were interested in -- maybe you could support more -- since you have done this before maybe you could put your motion into better words than I can.

>> SPEAKER: We could motion to survey the faculty as to whether or not they'd be willing to entertain giving up some of those

negotiables to some extent or another, provided that they are given numbers before the final decision.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I would like to respectfully suggest again that since these are policy matters, that I know it's very unusual, serious, urgent situation, but we should put one of those resolution teams together through that all employee representative counsel bureaucracy that we have now and that would be the group that would start getting the data together, start brainstorming with administration what the options are, start contacting any faculty in case there is a survey, like, do you even want to consider this? If you do, what would you be willing to, you know, look at?

But again, I strongly feel that this should be done in the right sort of process that we have for this and not just sort of some kind of last-minute ad hoc group or survey or something like that.

>> JOSIE: So just to clarify, what we need to decide is, because we are not meeting again until November, and a lot of this is getting decided by the end of October.

So just to refocus, we were asked if we would like to have a representative group engage in a dialogue to determine whether we could make changes to the budget in order to save these positions.

This discussion today has revealed to us where that money would come

from, and it has also revealed that the majority in this room seem, who have spoken, seem not to support letting go of some of those benefits.

But what we need to decide then is do we, as a group, as Faculty Senate, want to have a selection of faculty represent the faculty voice in those budgetary discussions? We have shown that we don't support giving up those benefits, but do we still want to have a group of faculty engaged in those discussions? That's the immediate thing that we need to decide.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think that's what the survey is going -- I don't think a lot of people were comfortable with making that decision as Faculty Senate. They wanted to ask all of the faculty that, and what I'm hearing from Matej, is if we were to go as close to the letter in terms of how policy should be, to be followed, this process of identifying the best way to negotiate this, be it identifying a small group of faculty and identifying what those negotiables are, the proper lane would be through the AERC as it is much more involved with FPPS and those items.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: They don't meet for another month, so it would have to be some sort of quick, emergency type of thing.

>> ROSA MORALES: Can they ask for a special meeting?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I don't think we need a full meeting

>> ROSA MORALES: A special meeting to discuss this?

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I just want to say for the record that

I really feel like we need to reach out to the faculty. As important as this is, this is like majorly important, and I definitely think we should have a voice.

I feel like there needs to be a dialogue with faculty as a whole, because we are here as representatives of them. How do we represent them if we haven't even asked them what they want? Just saying.

>> TAL SUTTON: I broke Robert's Rules, and I apologize. I

didn't wait for a second before going to a discussion.

There was a motion put on to address that. Do we ask faculty?

And then there is the -- so is there a second for holding that survey?

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> TAL SUTTON: Now, continuing the discussion -- second by Sean Mendoza. Matej made the point in terms of the AERC could conduct that survey and they could sort of run the course of that. So is this a responsibility of Faculty Senate or is this more of a responsibility of AERC given what it entails? And so that's part of the question. If so, maybe we put forward a motion that we strongly

urge the AERC to conduct a survey, just to sort of help them focus the direction in which they would pursue this.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Just to be clear, again, it probably wouldn't be the entire AERC, but just that specific team of faculty and administrators, I would imagine, and that would be then this group that would look at the details more, do any surveys, and certainly, like, Faculty Senate can be involved, I would love involvement of, you know, officers, senators, any other people who are interested in this. Not to exclude anybody, certainly.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think the motion is that senate would conduct that survey to start getting that input, and then Matej offered a possible way to amend that, if Ken wants to amend it, or we can vote on Ken's, as is. What would you like to do?

So the motion is on the floor. Is there any further discussion?  
All right. A show of hands for yes, Faculty Senate will conduct the fact-finding survey to engage faculty's interest in whether or not we should pursue developing a group of faculty to negotiate the negotiables, for lack of a better way to say that?

A show of hands in support of this? Raise your hands?

If you are a proxy, keep your hand up. That's 17 yes votes.

Nos? 4 nos. Proxy? Any proxies? One more no.

Were any of you proxies? One more no.

Thank you. Six. Yes, we will go with six.

Were any of the no votes a proxy? I don't think so.

And then abstentions? Seven abstentions. Am I supposed to do proxy count for abstentions? All right.

Seven abstentions. What does that make the tally? I'm punch drunk. You wrote stuff down. 17 yeses out of 29?

>> SPEAKER: Yes, correct.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think we just need a majority on that because it's not a charter change. I think the motion does carry that Faculty Senate will develop this survey and get it out to all faculty.

I think the officers will do that.

I will share it with the senate if you guys are interested in wordsmithing it, but I think it's important to get it out as soon as possible. We will try to get that ready to go out by the end of the weekend.

Sensitive topic. Kiley?

>> SPEAKER: Just one comment. I voted yes because I think expediency is important. But the survey is just gauging faculty interest, so I would suggest that if faculty indicate that they are

interested that we do put it forth through the AERC to do the actual negotiation. Thanks.

>> TAL SUTTON: Well, we are not going to meet again, sort of make a decision based on the surveys. We will do our best to have a reasonable conversation about that during the month of October. We don't have a lot of time, but yeah, that's a great point.

We will develop it. Give you a day to review it, and then it's going out.

That happened all in the middle of Brooke's --

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Well, I won't keep you any longer. There is more I could say. But just make sure I am making sure to vocally acknowledge some of our notable faculty accomplishments, so be sure you send me any sort of accomplishments for the November meeting so that I can add them to the report, okay? Papers, presentations, partnerships, special events, all of those great things that we do to make sure you send me those, okay? So I can add them to November.

And then of course you can always e-mail me if you have questions or comments or feedback.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you, Brooke.

Now we will move on to reports, and then we will have an open forum at the end of that.

Kate?

>> KATE SCHMIDT: (off microphone.)

Open forum is Friday the 19th. Two weeks from today.

>> TAL SUTTON: Friday the 19th, you said?

>> KATE SCHMIDT: 1:30 to 3:00 is the open forum. At the District Office but then somehow streaming to campuses.

>> TAL SUTTON: Has that been captured in our minutes?

All right. And now PCCEA report with Kiley Segers.

>> SPEAKER: So the report is attached to the senate agenda, so you do have that. First item, RIF update, I think we can skip that.

The second item is about continuing education units, which deals with the prior learning assessment, which is what's in the provost's report.

The one thing that I'll mention, I don't have a ton of understanding about this, but with the prior learning assessment, the idea is that the college has been looking at ways to give students credit for things they have done in the past by either taking (indiscernible) exams or getting credit for noncredit courses and things like that, but one problematic thing that we have seen that I don't know if this is directly related as a part of this or tangential to this, but I know that some CDACs have seen that courses

being offered as credit by Pima are also being created and offered in a noncredit version by the Center for Training and Development.

So for example this happened with accounting. There was an accounting class that was offered by the CTD, and the place where this is really problematic is there is no structure at Pima for our full-time regular accounting faculty to have oversight of these CTD courses. So there could be a course in your division where you are the subject matter expert that the college wants to run for noncredit but you have no say in what the curriculum is and you have no say in the standards for the faculty.

So at this time, there is not really a resolution to this. It's just something we are watching out for. I'm not really sure -- I don't think there was any nefarious intent so maybe it was poor organization in terms of the way that the college communicates between adult basic ed, noncredit and our credit areas.

So hopefully this is something we can look at going forward, because obviously it's very important we are maintaining our standards and maintaining faculty oversight of curriculum, as I feel like I say a lot.

Hopefully goes without saying, if this is happening in your area, if you have any concerns, I know we mentioned that if you wanted to

change your PLA survey selections, that's something you can look at now, but if you feel this is being problematic in your division, please let us know so that we can follow up on this. The nice resolution with the accounting division, my understanding is that it's solved, right? So the class is gone? Everyone's happy? But certainly speak up.

PCCEA sponsored a forum for the candidates for the Board of Governors. That was sometime last month, the 20th I think of September, and if you look, you've got a link there to the PCCEA website. We have a video of the whole event, and then we also have additional questions that we put forth to the candidates and that the candidates responded to, so you can read those responses at that link.

The other thing that PCCEA is talking about right now is putting forth endorsements for some or all of the candidates. So that information will be forthcoming and will also go on our website.

Then the one thing I do want to just point out is that the Luis Gonzales who is running for District 5 is not the Luis Gonzales who is incumbent. Just making that totally clear.

Some other things upcoming we are putting together a retirement workshop for the ASRS. Ana Jimenez is working on that. Info will be

forthcoming. We will have an all faculty meeting on Friday, October 19, popular date. That will be in the morning at Downtown Campus. I am working on reserving the room right now so I don't have the exact time. That will be e-mailed out shortly.

As far as mandatory training updates go, we have been told that all of the things we want to be addressed will be addressed in an e-mail coming out shortly. Keep an eye on your inbox from HR.

PCCEA elections for campus reps are upcoming. We need, working on how many reps we need for each campus right now, based on the number of full-time faculty we have. If you're interested, pretty much all our campuses need at least one rep. Put your name forth.

Just keep in mind that we are always advocating for you, so if you see anything fishy, anything you're concerned about, anything that's nonpolicy, please let us know.

I also want to really encourage you to at least download the FPPS and have it somewhere handy so if something comes up, at least look at the table of contents. Is this something addressed in policy and if you need any help interpreting the policy or finer points, please keep us in mind, because it is there to protect you.

Any questions? All right. Thanks a lot.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you. So lastly we have an open-forum item

from Brooke Anderson.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: It's almost 4:00, so I will try to make this fast.

In my role as writing tutor, faculty liaison, I attend the learning center work group meetings. David Dori came to our last work group meeting and asked that the learning centers submit a proposal for how they would like to be restructured or ideas for how they would be restructured.

And so I think this is also a faculty issue and that we should definitely get involved in terms of what we would like to see in our learning centers. So for example, in writing, there is very little subject matter oversight of tutors. Supervisors do not have to have any discipline expertise in the tutoring areas that we have tutors in and tutors can be hired based on very minimal qualifications for passing some of our very, very basic courses.

And so this is a critical issue for writing, especially, but I could also imagine this highly impacts science and math, possibly languages and ESL.

So if you are interested in having a voice, please let me know. Also please reach out to your constituents and let them know that the learning centers are going through a reorganization, and if we want

to get more faculty input for instruction in there and subject matter expertise, then we really need to make our voice clear too.

I'd be happy to share what I'm working on presenting for writing with anyone who is interested in thinking about ways that they could involve discipline experts better into the learning centers, as well.

Briefly, one of the biggest issues that I see is a lack of specialists that are subject matter experts. We have one in writing at the West Campus who is there 40 hours a week who has a Bachelor's degree and a lot of tutoring experience. He's there overseeing the tutors. That is the only campus that has a position like that.

So the rest of our campuses are staffed with tutors who are sitting there by themselves trying to serve our students. And these students may be, in writing, only through 102 and that's it.

So they do get training and things like that, but there is just an incredible lack of discipline expert supervision, mentorship, and, you know, student success rates are really, really directly connected to services like tutoring.

So please contact me if you're interested in participating in this work.

>> JOSIE: Brooke, from what I understand, this is you're required to submit a reorganization plan by the end of October,

correct? So you need a volunteers quickly. What date would you like us to provide for people to contact you to express an interest in being involved?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Today. Today. Because that is -- yes, that is correct. Thank you for saying that. The request for proposal has been asked to be provided by the end of October. So the sooner we can get together and have some discussions and talk about the ways in which we think subject matter expertise should be connected to our learning centers, the better.

>> JOSIE: But today may not be -- people may need till Monday? What would you like us to say? Please contact her by the end of October 8?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: No. Yes, of course. Contact me as soon as possible. If you contact me on Saturday, Sunday, Monday, I'm not going to say sorry, too late. But just in terms of some timing, I am meeting with other writing faculty on Tuesday. I'm meeting with science faculty on Wednesday. Working on getting together a draft by the 12th.

So that's, what, next Friday? I apologize for the rush notice. I wish I could answer Rita's question about the timeline, but --

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I think one of the things, as well, is that because this is another issue within the learning centers, because learning centers have been historically staff-driven at this college, I don't think they even thought that faculty would have something that they might want to say.

So we could always reach out to Dr. Dori. I have already told him that I plan to submit a proposal and that I was bringing it to senate and that he should reach out to faculty, as well.

But we could definitely approach him with, especially if other faculty are as concerned as I am and other disciplines, that they have a voice and maybe some guidelines for timing.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think we can, even it might be kind of late, but even if we bring it up as a major enough issue, we can get an extension, but we can add this to the officers meeting with the chancellor, the provost, and the presidents to talk about. If this is something the faculty feel really needs to, you know, slow its role and take some time on, we can make that argument at that meeting.

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Institutional knowledge is that West Campus had a very vibrant writing center. So did Desert Vista. Then those went away. And that the salary is \$9 an hour. That's all.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: For tutors? It's up to 10 to \$11, but that's still not much.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you, Brooke.

Is there a motion to something, something, something?

Is there such a motion?

>> SPEAKER: I motion we adjourn.

>> TAL SUTTON: Is there a second?

All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: Sounds like that's a motion to adjourn.

(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.