



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 November 2, 2018

>> TAL SUTTON: And so now we will move on to the second bullet point, agenda modifications and short announcements. Is there any request for an open forum or executive session?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Request for open forum.

Do you need the topic? Okay.

>> TAL SUTTON: So there is one call for open forum. Any additional open-forum items?

>> ROSA MORALES: I have an announcement.

I'm going to be passing out this small flier, addicts of fear. One of our instructors at the West Campus, every year, he and his wife who are part of a local charter school, they have an outdoor German Winter Market. It is done only once a year, so I will be passing out this. Hopefully you'll be able to join them. It's on Saturday, December the 1st, and the address is there. Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Next we have business and approval of the October minutes. Hopefully you had an opportunity to read through them. I

will scroll through them fairly quickly. And we will move for a motion after that.

Is there a motion on the floor for approving the minutes? Sean Mendoza makes a motion to approve. Second? Hernon seconds.

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

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: All opposed?

Show of hands for abstain?

One abstention. The motion carries with one abstention.

Did you notice the (hand motioning). (Laughter.)

I just want to thank Josie and Mike for leading the charge and making this happen. Yay. Wireless keyboard. And a mouse. I'm not running over there right now, as I normally would be.

All right. Next will be Brooke Anderson to speak about learning center restructuring.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So I just wanted to provide the senate with an update. Sort of last month I let everyone know that the learning centers are going through a reorganization and I let, asked for faculty involvement. I think it's critical faculty are involved in this process.

Some of you reached out, but there wasn't -- didn't have time to meet, but Mays and I met and talked about the issues within science related to learning centers, and then Ana Jimenez and Kirk and I met. What's Kirk's last name? Math people? Kirk and I met and talked about it. Faculty want to be involved. We see it connected to instruction as a critical student success and retention area.

So the work group, which consists of the staff that run our learning centers, and myself, the only faculty representative on the group, put together a proposal and submitted it.

And then I put together a proposal, as well, and submitted it.

Lamata and I met today to talk. The whole group is meeting again on Monday to discuss it, as well.

Yeah, I just wanted to let the faculty know where we are in that process. I do not believe that leadership has had an opportunity to talk directly with any other faculty. That's sort of where we are. Hopefully that feedback from faculty will be gathered, because I know while the staff, you know, run the show, they run the ship, they are critical to our learning centers. The faculty really are the discipline experts, and we need the two groups working together as a team, not as divided groups fighting over territory.

So we really need to come together on this. The critical faculty voice is important here.

I know we could take probably the two hours to talk about it, so I know we are very limited on time, but did we want to open it up for a little bit of discussion? Mays?

>> MAYS IMAD: So I agree, the faculty, their voice is important, they're the experts. Have you reached out to either current or former student tutors? Because they really get to see, they are the forefront and they get to see the students who are utilizing the learning center.

I would think that it would be very informative if they have a seat at that discussion.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yeah, I completely agree. I did bring that to the attention of the work group. You know, it's such a difficult -- it's difficult to go through these things. It feels like there is never enough time to have all the conversations we need to have.

I am writing. I don't know anything about science. I don't know anything about math. And I can't be the voice for science and math. I need science and math faculty in particular to be the voice on your end.

So I have talked to our tutors at the Downtown Campus and have used their input to make recommendations.

But to my knowledge, no one else has spoken with tutors. But I may not be aware. And I do think you're right. We need to make sure that we are talking to the tutors. They have had some critical insights that have influenced my proposal.

You know, I see it as critical that we reorganize from the bottom up, which means start with the tutors. What do they need? How do we support them? How do we organize from there?

>> SPEAKER: Diane. When you're talking about the learning centers, I might not be up on terminology. Is that just the tutoring stuff?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yes.

>> SPEAKER: In-person tutoring?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Well, and this is another issue, I think Geselle can speak to this too because she is a coordinator. The learning centers house many things. From my perspective, the No. 1 thing they house is tutoring.

Geselle, do you want to speak to that?

>> SPEAKER: I'm Geselle. I manage the learning center here at the Downtown Campus, and although a lot of what we do is tutoring, but we offer workshops, training, and several different things to help students succeed.

I'd like to thank Brooke for taking this initiative in terms of motivating the faculty in this way.

We do need content experts to work with us and all that we do at the learning centers. They can provide vital training to our tutors, and also support in sending students to the learning center so that they can really see all that we have to offer.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: And I wanted to say too our learning center coordinators do so much important work, and they run the ship, right? They work with our tutors. They are currently basically the ones that are responsible and responsible alone other than my position which I created in the leadership restructure for faculty that allows

me to work with the tutors, too, and support Geselle. We have worked so well as a team.

One of the issues is we are reorganizing as a college, and our learning centers are structured differently at every single campus. Faculty are involved differently at every single campus. Many campuses are not involved at all.

And that really needs to be addressed in the reorganization. You know, yeah, not only do they do that, but they have to manage the space. They have to manage the staff. They have to manage the operations. They have to manage, for Geselle, the learning commons. They do so many different things.

It's interesting to see how reorganizing the learning center, then what do we do with that space and this space and this space, sort of all been grouped into the learning center staff's responsibilities.

And I do think that the reorganization will be addressing that, but they're going to have to do things like address faculty resource centers, because at Northwest Campus, the learning center coordinator is not a learning center coordinator. He's a program manager, and he oversees the faculty resource center. But Geselle has nothing to do with the faculty resource center on this college campus.

Mariah oversees their entire learning commons area at the Desert Vista Campus, and she isn't a learning center coordinator, so we don't even have a learning center coordinator at every campus in title. They have different kinds of titles.

So this is really like -- student success and retention is not going to improve if we do not improve our learning center structures and provide support that students need, that tutors need, that our learning center coordinators need in that space, and faculty, this is an instruction area, need to be involved.

And we cannot be asked to volunteer our time to do that. It's too important to ask us to volunteer. So that means we need to be a part of the structure.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, I want to say two more things. No. 1,

learning centers are very interested in becoming a part of the teaching and learning center. Many institutions of higher education, the two are combined and it is called a teaching and learning center. I'm so excited about that project.

The second thing that I wanted to mention is that all faculty have the opportunity to volunteer to be on the learning centers' advisory committee, and that will include students and tutors. It will involve student affairs staff. So we just want to get a sense of how we're doing and what we can do to improve from different perspectives.

So I will be sending out an agenda soon, before the end of the semester, to set up times that we can meet. So I kind of want to know when the most amount of people can meet. I just wanted to remind everybody about that if you didn't know.

Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Herson. You mentioned you're going to meet again on Monday? I apologize. I'm one of those people that said I could attend --

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: I understand. We all have so many things to do.

>> SPEAKER: -- but my previous appointment went a little too long.

Could you tell us where and what time?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Well, this is a private meeting. So I'm just informing the Faculty Senate that it's happening so you know where we are in the process.

So the meeting is -- we ended up, we were charged with presenting a proposal as a working group, and we did, together, present one. However, I didn't feel the instruction side was presented in that proposal, so I wrote my own, as well.

I see the other one they presented as looking at the top and going down, and mine looked at the bottom and went up. So we will be

meeting on -- the group will be meeting on Monday to talk about those two proposals with Lamata Mitchell, and then we are -- Kirk and Ana are joining the conversation, but, you know, we really do need a science person. Mays. To be involved in the conversation (smiling).

That, because, really writing and math are the two major areas for tutoring. And then science is really important, too. I would say that's the next one. We also have languages and reading and ESL, but that's a smaller group. You know, it's a smaller need than those three, writing and math foundations. Science next most critical. From my perspective. As writing faculty, like writing is the most important thing to everything in the whole entire world, but I know some of my colleagues might disagree or have slightly different opinions about that. So Mays or other science faculty, yes, we really need you. Really, really need you to join this conversation.

>> TAL SUTTON: Maybe just -- it sounds like as this conversation is going forward, as this proposal is taking more definite shape, there might be a point or an interest in Faculty Senate in sort of weighing in and saying like we sort of endorse either a proposal or component of a proposal, like, make sure whatever revamp this looks like, make sure you include X, Y, Z, so if there are some things that Faculty Senate can look at over this coming month so that if it warrants it, we can sort of make it an agenda item in December, so if there is maybe bench marking to see what our best practices for learning centers and things like that that we can sort of -- I could put up into a Google Doc and share and link to the senators as well as other thoughts or documents that the working group can share with us to sort of help inform us if we do decide that we want to have a further conversation about this in December.

Does that make sense?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Yeah.

>> KARIE MEYERS: I did read your proposal for the writing, and it was very intense. I mean, I don't think I can come up with something like that for sciences. I mean, I'm happy to contribute, but I guess I'm unclear about just what kind of input is being asked for.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Well, I think one thing we might think about

is my suggestion is based on my writing lens, right? So I don't have the math or science lens. And I know writing tutoring, that's a whole field of study people get Ph.D.s in. There is a lot there, and it is really a pedagogical field.

One thing we might think about is when the group meets on Monday and we talk about really, you know -- I can present a strong case for what we need in writing. When it comes to math and science, I sort of -- you know, you wouldn't have a writing center director. Doesn't make any sense. But I can at least tell you I think I know that about math and science.

But what does make sense for the way faculty are involved, and I do think that East Campus math faculty are real leaders in that because they have had a culture of involvement at that one campus. That would be good to think about for the learning center.

So I'm really glad that Ana and Kirk are joining the conversation. And then so in sciences, how have you done it and what do you need? We have a STEM specialist at the West Campus, and that's it. So how do we -- and of course we are also dealing with these reorganizations. Really, we can't afford, for this to cost us any money.

You know, yeah, in my, like, faculty, let's create new theories and ways of viewing the world, yeah, we need a specialist in math, science, and writing in every campus. But guess what? That's 20 new jobs. That's not gonna happen. So then how do we take our structure, our expertise and build something that's going to work and that can be for the most part budget neutral?

And so thinking about faculty leadership, how to involve faculty in these ways that can create a more budget-friendly structure that does meaningfully incorporate faculty.

>> GESELLE: I'd like to address your concern. As Brooke said, she's very passionate about writing and Brooke and I have worked together for years. That's why the proposal is written in the way that it is.

However, I would be happy for any type of faculty input. So we can start with baby steps. Just holding one day of office hours in

the learning centers or learning commons, mentoring our tutors for a couple of hours, okay? Brooke has done an awesome job of mentoring our writing tutors. So science, math. I had a math mentor for about a couple of months, and then she got too busy to interact. But, you know, I'm hopeful. Baby steps. You don't have to jump into it. Especially if you're new to this concept.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So I think even looking at the maybe once the group can come together and really -- you know, what I'm expecting to hopefully be able to do on Monday is take the two proposals and bring them together in a meaningful way that can address everything. I think we can -- I'm hopeful that we'll be able to do that. Before we implement, I'm hoping that the leadership will show it to faculty, especially math and science faculty, for their input on whether that does look like that's going to address whatever sorts of needs you have in your disciplines.

So, you know, being aware of the tutors in your discipline and how they work and how successfully they work with students is really important, and it's something that we as faculty really need to think about, because they are, right, we are in the classroom giving the information, and then our students are going to the tutors and saying, okay, help me do this. If we are not connected in science and math, too, right, then that's not going to be as successful as we want it to be and we are going to lose students.

So I think it's, yeah, it's sort of let's revisit it in December. Keep your ears open. Think about colleagues you know who are really involved with tutors already and encourage them to participate and do know there is a real need for at least one science faculty member who does -- I mean, I think it's critical, if you're going to give your input, you need to be somebody who understands tutoring, who understands our learning centers, and who can give some well-informed input. So science faculty, if you know any of your colleagues that do really do a lot of work with tutors or have used tutoring in your own course formats, please come forward to work with the group.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks, Brooke. Yeah, whatever documentation, benchmarking, I will put into a Google folder and share with all senate so you can look at it and be better prepared and informed for December's meeting.

All right. The next item up for bids is the policy review. We have multiple presenters. I know Ian and Amanda are here for maybe most of the APs up there. Hopefully you have had an opportunity to read them. I don't have to go in any particular order, but if you guys would like -- I don't know if you want to speak or just answer questions? You can maybe give an overview of the changes and field some questions.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Sure. I didn't know the format, so I don't have a formal presentation. Although with Google I could log out and whip out one pretty quick on any of these topics should you desire.

In general, if you are aware of the strategic plan for the one we are currently under that goes until 2021, the business and industry advisory committee AP, as well as BP curriculum 3.25 pertain to the implementation of the new business administrative advisory committee regimen.

Those are updates with respect to eliminating a specific board policy with respect to advisory committees. That came at the behest of Jeff Sylvan and the ELT for a consolidation of the number of board policies. You're probably aware of that through this body, that we have actually been shrinking the number of board policies, moving things from SPGs into the APs and then having standard operating procedures.

So the language that we proposed for a specific new advisory committee board policy was just moved into the curriculum BP, which is 3.25. That really aligns well to the strategic plan. If you look at the strategic plan items 2.5B is with respect to the relevancy and alignment of career technical workforce education programs at the college to meet the needs of business and industry at the local, regional, and state levels. 2.A on the strategic plan aligns to the implementation of the new advisory committee regimen. Those two things are symbiotic. Without the input of business and industry, we cannot ascertain whether or not our programs are relevant.

So that is why you have both the BP or the addition of the advisory committee piece to the BP for curriculum, because that is whether or not our curriculums and our programs are relevant, and secondly, the AP for the new regimen. That's the context for that one.

If we go back to the list, there are two other ones, one regarding the noncredit courses and programs and the other one regarding contract training and services.

Those are primarily brought forward with this larger initiative on moving things from SPGs to APs, and at that time we were informed that we were the keepers of those two policies and needed to update those. So the predominant number of changes on those actually do not impact any current curriculum decision-making process in either of those areas. Those pertain to the organizational structure of the college and the funding structure of the noncredit and workforce units that are currently housed at Community Campus.

Most of the strikeouts with respect are like crossing out campus and moving it to divisions since we now have a division-based structure. And also certain things such as -- this is my wording, but there will never be any touch points between the general fund and noncredit, that was, A, never accurate, and B, that is not how most community colleges really handle that sort of work.

Any questions?

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. I'm wondering where international students fall in the noncredit? I don't know if you're aware, but due to a number of issues including the lack or the unwillingness to tag international students within Banner, international students are enrolled, we have two CRNs for ESL classes. One which is credit and one which is noncredit for the international students. Where do those noncredit CRNs and noncredit ESL courses fall out in this?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: The practice regarding your ESL program has not changed with respect to this program.

There is a point I'd like to add on that, if that's okay. Strategic plan goal, I believe it's 1.2, speaks to the equity of treatment of our systems to all students. In particular, Amanda and I have an interest in how noncredit students are handled with respect to Banner and access they have to our credit programs after they have demonstrated a certain level of competency.

So the whole idea is to build multiple points of entry for

working adults in our community into our program so that we can increase our enrollment. I'm curious about your statement on the treatment of international students in Banner, and just after this would love to learn more about that under the auspices of strategic plan 1.2, which speaks to the equity of treatment of all students in our college and our systems.

>> SPEAKER: HERNON. Could you explain to me the rationale and the reason for changing the language of that particular -- can you go a little -- 1.2, it seems a radical departure from what we had before. In the struck-out part of that clearly describes college-level courses that are below 100 level are completely out, and in the language above, it's not even mentioned.

So what's the ultimate purpose of dealing with noncredit courses the way you're proposing in this modification of the AP?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: So to be clear, with respect to courses that may -- the wording is "may" for a very specific reason. College credit may be awarded for noncredit courses including clock hour courses which have the same competencies, et cetera, et cetera. This is an alignment, updating these APs to be in alignment with current college policies and practices.

Last year commenced the implementation of all of the systems for prior learning assessment. This year we have prior learning assessment being implemented through a number of programs across the college. So this language change was aligned to those APs and those processes with respect to the awarding of credit through prior learning assessment.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I'm just confused. So with that college credit and those semester credit hours, is that the same thing? Because it seems like sentence 1 conflicts with sentence 2. Noncredit courses do not earn credit but credit may be awarded.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: So that's just to clarify, and if we need to clean the language up, we can look at that, but under Arizona Revised Statutes, there are really two categories of coursework at our colleges across the state. It's either noncredit or it's credit.

The state itself found itself in a predicament whenever it

mandated that we offer prior learning assessment for our separating military professionals and veterans. That came in the session last year. So again, as sort of some context for prior learning assessment, there are multiple reasons why the institution move forward on that, one of which was to be compliant with state law regarding veterans. If we are going to be opening those opportunities to veterans, then we also ought to consider those opportunities for others.

And so what it is allowing in the language is to clarify there is a bridge now between the two whereas even in Arizona Revised Statutes previously those two things were separated.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: So if students can document, according to that AP3.20, that they had equivalent assessments in those noncredit courses and they passed them, they would be given credit for the equivalent credit level college course?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Think of it as a different version of an AP test or a CLEP test, which are actually, in states that have implemented statewide and other colleges that have implemented campus-based prior learning assessment, AP, CLEP and IB are forms of prior learning assessment, as are challenge exams.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Right. So then under section 3, I believe, there is -- who are the instructors teaching the courses and what are the certification requirements? I think there was a sentence added, I'm not finding it now, under 3.2, demonstrable expertise, technical, so we could basically waive those requirements if there is some demonstrable expertise?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: I think this lies in a broader conversation about when we say noncredit, we oftentimes speak of that as if it is one monolithic type of offering. So there are currently now 1,500 to 2,000 students annually at this institution that receive training through instructors that are not going to ever receive credit for that, and that is usually industry-specific training for which we work with our industry partners to find folks who are appropriately credentialed in that to teach it.

Those will not always be the same as an academic area, because first of all, that may never count towards credit in a program, and

secondly, I think that the college has a, in our mission, in our mission fulfillment framework, the responsibility to serve business and industry partners, and we can't always say, well, they have to have the same exact credentials on the noncredit for this particular course or this particular boot camp as a whole semester's worth of work.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Certainly that's understood. In those cases where students would be earning college credit, would instructors have the same certifications as our credit instructors?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Not necessarily. That could also be the same, for instance, with AP. So can the college answer the question that every student has come to the institution with CLEP or AP, learned that from an instructor who was credentialed the same as our current faculty, the answer is you could never even track that.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: What is the cost for those noncredit courses? I'm not familiar with the area, but I heard that many of those, you know, for an equivalent course, students would be charged multiple, like, high multiples of what they would pay for a credit course. Is that --

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: So again, it depends on all of the different categories. If we are working with a business partner to implement a noncredit training regimen, that may never tie back to the institution for credit, we have an obligation to ensure we're covering our costs and also have a revenue-generating function for the college.

So those vary based on working with business and industry, and appropriately so. That's pretty common across workforce units across the nation. With respect to courses or students that are noncredit in a credit class, those are priced I believe at 85% of full tuition. It's actually less for those mirror courses.

>> JOSIE: How long will this be available for public comment?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: We have until the 12th, I believe.

>> JOSIE: 1.2, first question asked. Section 1, definitions.
1.2. Now, faculty understanding, I'm referring to the Excel document

sent around by Brian Miller back in the spring, we worked with our divisions and departments to specify in that PLA column how those assessments should be handled within our divisions and departments, so my understanding is that it depends, whether or not a student gets credit depends. So with that in mind, if I'm correct in that understanding, I would suggest adding a qualifier to the sentence students must have documented assessments reflecting the learning outcomes of the class in order to earn credit.

That sentence makes it seem like it's a simple step, whereas there are more factors involved related to whether or not faculty -- you know, whether or not on that PLA document there are other measures that need to take place in order to get credit.

I understand maybe that's implied, but that should be, just so we have the language to reflect the reality, I would suggest adding some qualifying elements to that sentence so that it doesn't result in misconceptions

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Certainly. If we can have that officially through the public comment, that would be welcome, but if you don't mind e-mailing me, Amanda, and Brian your recommended language as a starting point for that, we'll certainly -- that's a good point.

>> JOSIE: Faculty Senate officers have been having a dialogue with Amanda and the workforce team and curriculum regarding some of these elements, specifically in regards to PLA.

I presented a little bit on it during our last senate meeting, but at this moment, is the process for creating nondegree courses, the development process is being changed, and so we want to make sure faculty have input in that process. So we are gathering together a team of volunteers to work with Amanda and Ian and other members of curriculum and workforce in order to make sure that just to offer input to ensure the process considers faculty perspectives and also when that process is complete that the process of -- so faculty input on the development of the process and then faculty to ensure that the actual process has faculty input integrated into it in a logical way.

So with that in mind, this would probably be a good time to ask for volunteers. Does anyone know at this moment that... Rita? Rosa? Anyone else? If anyone else is interested, please e-mail Tal or me

and we will add you to the list. Maybe we will send a follow-up e-mail just to, in case others who are not here want to be involved.

>> ROSA MORALES: I already mentioned to Tal and also to Ian that I have a few suggestions regarding the business and industry advisory committee. One of those suggestions includes something that I believe was a surprise for Ian, when I talked to him, is regarding the advisory, the business advisory committee should be able to also recommend program enrollment requirements.

As I explained to him that in the past, especially in the social services program, we used to have four certificates and four Associate's, and we have different requirements for each of them, and all of a sudden, when the decision was made that everybody have to have certain requirements, our certificate programs enrollment went down.

So there is a few other recommendations that I would like to include, so I will be e-mailing them to you to ensure that they are included.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: And I appreciated that, because one of the things that we want to make sure is that, back to my opening remarks about relevancy and alignment, is what do our external stakeholders have to say about equity and access with respect to enrollment in our programs. And that's an important point.

>> ROSA MORALES: Can I say something else?

There is another section also where what are the responsibilities of the advisory, and one of those that is not included and I would like to include is for them to overlook also the efficacy of scheduling, modality, and testing venues.

Because as somebody that is on the trenches, I notice that there is, in some instances, a difference on success on students who are being pushed to have everything through D2L when they are not actually have Internet at home, for example. And I have examples where instructors are having 17 quizzes while, you know, other instructors are only having three tests.

So I'm interested in including that, too. So I will be writing

it down and sending it to you. Thank you.

>> MS. KIMLISA DUCHICELA: I just want to give a counter to that. I want to make it fully clear that online, while we do have slightly lower success rates, those success rates are going up, because we have such strong quality review in our online classes and that online is not that students are being forced online, it is that they are choosing online, which is why online is up 22%.

And I will also say that, yes, there are students that do not have Internet, but the vast majority of our students, according to our institutional research, do have Internet.

>> TAL SUTTON: Ken? Maybe one more comment after that.

>> SPEAKER: Ken. You had indicated that when it comes to PLAs that we can't verify the credentials of whoever taught the prior class. But in this case, we are talking about people working for Pima, so we should certainly verify their credentials, especially if it's a transfer course.

We can get in trouble if we assign credit for, like, say, accounting 211 or 212, which requires an individual to meet a certain standard that is not necessarily required for a workforce course. What are we doing to ensure those faculty actually meet the necessary requirements?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Let's clarify a couple of things. It's a good question. Prior learning assessment and noncredit to credit are not synonymous. Noncredit to credit is a small piece of prior learning assessment. So prior learning assessment also includes individuals who come to us with military training transcript. Prior learning assessment also includes students with AP, IB, CLEP, our own challenge exams. It also includes industry-recognized credentials.

So, for instance, in building construction technology, we have a whole entire program that is aligned to the NCCER standards. Oftentimes people come to us, and they have earned those certificates through participating in their labor union, and that may have even been in another state.

So again, to your question, we cannot make the assumption that

they are instructors because most of the people who will be utilizing prior learning assessment are coming to us from outside of our institution.

With respect to noncredit to credit that is delivered at our institution, there is a parallel initiative that supports it, and that is -- it actually precedes prior learning assessment, and that is when a noncredit student is in a credit course, that is being done on purpose to answer that question. Is it the same faculty member and are we gearing toward the same learning standards?

So when we say we have a mirror course at Pima Community College that is offered in a noncredit setting, it is our faculty and it is our syllabus. That's the process that we will be working with Josie to hone even further.

>> SPEAKER: So if we are going to mirror the course, one, there's no guarantee the course will be delivered in the exact same format if the department head or curriculum people can't verify or talk to or communicate with those people. So what's being done -- I would like to make sure that accounting class is offered through workforce, because I used to work in workforce, as well. The classes that we taught in workforce were significantly subpar to the ones we would do in a traditional classroom.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: So I've been here for three-and-a-half years, and there used to be a distinction called workforce credit, because there were two parallel systems that did not have a bridge. Workforce credit has been eliminated save a couple of programs where there are still students and we are doing a teachout.

So all of the noncredit courses that are the mirror courses, meaning it's the noncredit version of the credit course, we are purposely building those so they are part of your program, not a separate college-within-a-college model, which is not an effective model. So I agree with you, and we have made those changes.

>> SPEAKER: As far as which classes we're going to give credit for -- this says they may get credit. Who is going to determine whether or not they get credit?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: So this gives me an opportunity to piggyback

off the remarks that Josie made. When we have those conversations, because I'm telling you all, is that we should not be looking at only certain elements. So whatever decision-making process we make about noncredit to credit, that should really be about all of the variations of prior learning assessment that we as an institution are looking at.

The reason I'm really enjoying the implementation of prior learning assessment is because it really comes back to the heart and soul of our institution, which is what are our values and philosophies and practices around teaching and learning to begin with. And I will give you a point. Under prior learning assessment and funds that were awarded to us were able to purchase a tool for a portfolio-based assessment, because one of the mechanisms for prior learning is bringing all this together under portfolio and it being assess by faculty. And there is a course that teaches you how to do that and then you actually do your portfolio.

That tool actually has a lot of uses in credit classes, and so we are going to be meeting with Jan and with Michael and some of his team, to see, okay, we bought this tool, we have a license for the college. How can we use portfolio-based assessment to (indiscernible) our credit courses.

Those are lots of examples on how it's really a broader conversation about what do we mean by teaching and learning? What do we mean by student demonstration of competencies, skills, and et cetera, and how are we recognizing that in our students? So we welcome it.

>> SPEAKER: So in our area we have looked at the classes that we want to allow PLAs for. And then of course we have also selected ones we don't want to allow those for.

I guess still my question is why don't these classes just fall into the normal department head? How come they didn't, save for the department head for science or business or accounting or whomever, how come they can't pick those instructors and staff those like we do our traditional classrooms?

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Because some forms of -- going back to the other question, some prior learning assessment is not -- prior

learning assessment is a tool. Sometimes somebody is coming to you not from the college. So you wouldn't have had the opportunity to select who their trainer was in the military or where they got that industry-recognized credential, if I'm understanding the question correctly.

>> SPEAKER: I'm not worried so much about the other outside places. I'm worried about what we are offering here through Pima through workforce, ensuring that this other branch of our college is meeting the same standards and not just trying to circumvent the curriculum committee.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: So there is no attempt to circumvent, to be overt about that. With respect to noncredit mirror courses, I will go back to my prior statement, which is that it is our goal to build those through the existing departments, both full time and adjunct faculty.

With respect to noncredit offerings, like a boot camp or two-week training or over-the-weekend thing for a business partner, there is robust communication between the team and the dean, and most of the time full-time or adjunct faculty are not available; nor do they have the qualifications for that specific industry skill set. So we will have to oftentimes go to the business partners themselves or sometimes their competitor, ironically, to find an instructor for those particular things.

We would overtly have a lot of concern about running the hiring of the hundreds of individuals that we do for business and industry, and again, in an area that is not connected to the credit program of having to sometimes with a business partner expecting a one-week or two-week turnaround running that whole process through the academic leadership. And I don't know that that's something they would invite upon themselves, either.

>> TAL SUTTON: Ken, given your experience both in workforce and credit courses, hopefully you'll consider maybe joining Rita and Rosa in that team that's looking at the process? I just voluntold you, I guess.

>> SPEAKER: I'll do it.

>> TAL SUTTON: One more. Then we do have to -- we have to just move to public comment.

>> SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) adult basic education.

I'm wondering what's going to be put in place with the prior learning assessment to sort of like continuous improvement, because I understand with an AP or a CLEP test, though it's not perfect, that's already been kind of been tried and hopefully true, but with, say, portfolios that we're going back and seeing in a year or two that the person that came in with that portfolio was actually able to go to the next class and be successful, that's kind of more what I'm concerned with, the student's ability to be successful in the class if they passed out of the others.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: I would say that's not a question for prior learning assessment alone but our entire institution with respect to teaching and learning. So again, it's one of those things if we categorize it because it's seemingly different but can we answer that question for all of the sequences of our courses now.

What I'm saying is that the team, which is more than workforce development, there are members in this room who have been a part of the implementation team that have been building out those processes. What we are building for faculty and for departments are the processes and tools by which you can use prior learning as a vehicle to increase enrollment in your program.

So therefore, all of the things that you're implementing in your area with prior learning assessment, much to the gentleman's point, I don't remember your name, sorry, but it's faculty who are determining, in conjunction with their academic and leadership deans, which courses are going to be used for prior learning assessment and in which mode, so whether it's challenge, exam, et cetera, et cetera, it also is those faculty responsibility to make sure those quality assurances are in place as they implement it for their division.

>> TAL SUTTON: I'm cutting the mic off on this, because we are already 10 minutes over on this particular item.

Are all of these relevant APs, the public comment is open --

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Till the 12th.

>> TAL SUTTON: Open till the 12th.

>> MR. IAN ROURKE: Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: That brings us to the next item, which will be hopefully a fairly quick president's report.

Just to share a little bit about some of the work that we have been doing, one thing that came up in the officers meeting was reflecting upon the Friday's meeting about RIF where it very quickly and understandably took a turn to a conversation about enrollment, and again, that is certainly not the first time that enrollment has come up as an issue that faculty recognize as being mission critical to the continued success of Pima.

And so the officers just thought instead of maybe throwing up some random agenda item yet at the very least to just sort of make it known to all of the other senators that given our roles and our responsibilities as officers, we sort of have in the sense increased access to the appropriate administrators that have a say in these various decisions.

We meet with the ELT. We have ACC memberships that go to the ACC where there is administrators, staff. Lisa Brodsky who sort of runs the meeting also has a hand in communications and the communication plan of Pima and things like that.

So we have this increased access we'd like to use to advocate for making the issue of enrollment much more central of an issue than it perhaps seems to be treated, or if it is being treated as critically important as we all understand it needs to be, then maybe we can start increasing the communication flow so that we know what's going on.

And as what became important in that meeting, I think there is this tendency to sort of mentally slating that, you know, these people are in charge of enrollment, these people are in charge of retention and that's typically where faculty fall. We are seeing that our primary role in that process is to help with retention. But what came out in that meeting is there are many faculty that have

great ideas about the enrollment and admissions part of that.

So if you have ideas that you want to share, feel free to e-mail the senate officers. We even have a Google group. If you'd like to start typing Faculty Senate officers, you'll get an auto fill, that's our Google group. And just send us your ideas and we are happy to bring them forward and start increasing -- the pressure to really focus our conversation on enrollment is important, what are the steps, here are some ideas we can do to improve upon that.

For now at least what the officers see as what we are capable of doing in terms of that is to start bringing that conversation up more, bringing in the great ideas that came up on Friday, plus all the other great ideas that haven't come out yet that faculty have.

Please e-mail us, please let us know anything of your constituents that might have ideas. We are happy to sort of relay those and find the appropriate administrator or appropriate group to sort of tell that idea to. It's clearly an important idea that comes up again and again and again. I think to start moving towards a better dialogue, that's what I think we will start doing.

The next thing, to just mention quickly, I know that eLumen is sort of in our little -- what's the bottom line of those, of 24-hour news? The ticker? We know that eLumen is showing up in ticker a lot right now, eLumen, eLumen. So the Faculty Senate assessment committee is in communication with AQI, and we are going to be meeting with them on Monday to further discuss eLumen's rollout.

We have had communications in the past, and it's hard to get any hard deadline about when the current CLO interface is going to get sunset, but we are sure it will be sunset and everybody will eventually migrate to eLumen and we're hoping to have a very open conversation with AQI about hashing out what that rollout needs to look like so it's well thought-out and has as minimum of an impact on faculty as possible. That was a very quick update on that.

Last thing to give you, one more update on the CDAC evolution group, CDAC evolution group sort of concluded their work. They've sent a summary document to Dolores where sort of a quick highlight of some of the ideas that came up in that summary document, in that proposal, was we are not going to use the term CDAC anymore, or at

least that's our proposal. I know. I just saw eight heads...

So in our document, revision, we are using the term division faculty committee, the DFC. And then in terms of identifying who are voting members, we recognize that any full-time that are currently teaching will be necessarily voting members. The dean will necessarily be a voting member. There will be an adjunct faculty representative who will be a voting member. In the description of the, definition of the adjunct faculty representative is somebody who is selected by the adjunct faculty but that person need not be an adjunct faculty. If they say no adjunct faculty has the time to do that, then they may say, hey, you full-timer, you talk to us a lot, be our representative.

So I think that's more or less the core of voting members of the DFC. Formerly known as the CDAC.

And then also it's going to be a description of how you can extend the voting membership as pertains to your particular discipline. For example, the example I always gave in the past, languages might choose to decide that their curriculum decisions are very similar. So maybe they kind of all group together or at least a subset of them and say we will be a voting cluster.

That's meant to more address those issues where, if you have four disciplines that only have one full-time faculty in each, then maybe to get further input and perspective and not just be an echo chamber of yourself you can group together and become a group of four people to discuss and hash out curriculum issues. Or an alternative way to extend your voting membership if you feel you need more perspective is you can go, that core membership could choose to extend it to include current adjunct faculty members or things like that. But there are steps and guidelines that tell you how, for your specific discipline, you can extend and modify who your voting membership is.

So that's one of the big parts of the proposal. The actual roles and responsibilities is currently getting worked through, and so I will have an update, better update on that more next time.

Then maybe the big idea of how all of this information is going to get housed and stored is you all have become, I'm sure, very familiar with the leadership handbook, how it sort of defines the

roles and then it has an appendix for every single division. We are going that route. So the CDAC guidelines will have sort of the CDAC, discipline faculty committee guidelines charge and responsibilities. Then underneath that, as each individual discipline comes up with who they want to be voting members, that will get stored in the appendix. How they want to sort of provide feedback and take votes on various issues like textbook selection, things like that, that will go into the appendix.

That's going to take some time to develop, but that's where essentially that -- it's more for documentation purposes so that each discipline sort of, if you want to know how your decisions are being made, you know where to go. You will go to the DFC guidelines and look up your appendix and there it will say who your voting members are, it will say -- again, these are things that your discipline has decided upon, once you have decided upon it, it will then be archived in that as an appendix.

I think that's probably the big change.

Real quick, two other issues that are still being discussed in that group, textbook selection, that section that's in the CDAC guidelines, there is still a lot up in the air in that conversation. Modality is something being further discussed. I have no final input to give you on those two particular issues, but we know those get sensitive very fast for some disciplines and we are still trying to hash out what that should look like.

Rita?

>> SPEAKER: Rita. Who will be in charge of updating those appendices? This committee or each division?

>> TAL SUTTON: It's probably going to be maintained in a similar vein as the leadership handbook, which is there is a continuing leadership handbook committee that does that, and so there would probably be a similar -- it might end up being a merger of those two responsibilities into one group that, since they are very related in terms of maintaining what the leadership structure looks like as well as what the voting structure looks like. Those are kind of similar in vein. Maybe one group would be in charge of maintaining those appendices, but that has not been decided yet.

>> ROSA MORALES: Given the fact that we are downsizing the amount of individuals that are full-time faculty, is it possible to include the fact that if we are engaging the part-time faculty into being part of those committees that some type of compensation will be allocated for those? Otherwise it will be very difficult for some of those departments that have only one full-time person to be able to get a part-time faculty willing to attend some of those EFC new meetings.

>> TAL SUTTON: I glossed a little bit over the core membership, people who are definitely going to be voting members. Some of those are people who have certain responsibilities within the discipline will be voting members. For instance, if an adjunct faculty member happens to be the discipline coordinator, then even though they are adjunct faculty, the person that fills that role is a voting member.

So if you have all these responsibilities that need to get done, and those responsibilities are shared across three people, even though only one of them happens to be full-time faculty, then all three of those people will be part of the core voting structure. That's one way that will get implemented. Also the dean can sort of help advise and say, you know, you should consider -- well, sorry. Speaking to your point about compensation, the people that are fulfilling those roles are getting compensated for those roles, and I think that would just be part of one their responsibilities of serving as a role, as a SMEE (phonetic) or discipline coordinator. If the discipline decides they want to include all adjunct faculty members, I'd be very surprised if money fell from the sky for that to happen but I think that's something worth considering.

That's not part of our charge, but I think that's certainly a worthy conversation to have, and I think Sean can take up that charge because he's part of that committee and he does advocate for adjunct faculty.

>> ROSA MORALES: So if that's the case, then on the contract for the adjuncts needs to be included the need for them to participate, you know, in any of these committees, if necessary.

>> TAL SUTTON: Again, if that is how the division or the discipline decides to include them, then yes. That's something to

consider. But again, I'm not sure how all that will work out. I have two minutes left. Diane and maybe one other.

>> SPEAKER: Diane. What's the relationship between the deans and the whatever this is called, the DFC-something

>> TAL SUTTON: Similar to the CDAC guidelines has a lot of roles and responsibilities that just sort of need to get done, and one thing that our committee is doing is sort of going through these various roles and responsibilities and sort of recognizing in that is this something that needs to be considered by all faculty, or is this just something that needs to get done for the sake of getting done? It's more of just a checklist thing that can sort of be identified as a dean responsibility.

So we are trying to parse out what are the deans' responsibilities, and then also, just sort of being consistent with document up until the past is division dean is part of the voting structure. They have always been listed as being a voting member, or at least the administrative co-chair has been. We are just updating the language.

>> SPEAKER: Administrative co-chair?

>> TAL SUTTON: In the CDAC guidelines, it lists them as a voting member.

We have time for one more comment. Or maybe we will save some time. All right. That will now take us to a very quick, not sure why I put five minutes there.

I was asked that the AERC, if you remember, this is the thing that didn't come back -- this hasn't been mentioned since Michael Parker was president. The Faculty Senate is responsible for identifying two faculty members who are not members of PCCEA to serve on the all employee representative council.

We selected those two members, but they have since -- I think one either stepped down or has left and is no longer -- anyway, we need to find a new member. I put out that survey, but I just wanted to remind you all, if anyone here is interested in serving on the AERC, you can put your name forward or please remind your constituents to

e-mail me or fill out that survey if they didn't auto delete that e-mail and they still have it, they can go in and fill it, but we just need to get a member quickly.

I'm hoping that I will send out one more reminder on Monday and this will get filled. If not, I will be pestering you via e-mail shortly after that.

Next we will move on to something more happy, such as All Faculty Day. It goes back to Brooke.

>> MAYS IMAD: Good afternoon. As you know, we have the date for All Faculty Day, which is January 15. We sent out the announcement for proposals. We have one proposal so far, and two faculty have contacted me and asked questions. So they are interested in also proposing, yeah, presenting.

We will send a reminder, because we put a deadline for November 16. So any questions?

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So send in your proposals. Make sure you send in your proposals. November 16 means we have two weekends to submit. We are looking forward to the, the committee is looking forward to having submissions for All Faculty Day. I know it's a little bit tough because of course this week we have had to be dealing with our fellow colleagues, some of them losing their jobs, and that's been difficult.

But we are moving past that now, and so this is a great time to sort of reenergize ourselves with future All Faculty Day coming up.

So remember, submit your proposals. You've got two weekends to put it together. Again, remember that the whole idea is what do you love doing? What do you love teaching in your classes, sharing with your students? Present that to your fellow faculty. That's what All Faculty Day is going to be all about.

So we will get to share our work, our pedagogy with our fellow colleagues. And then also, as attendees, we will get to experience being a student again in somebody else's class. Maybe that discipline you always wanted to major in and never got a chance.

Yes, remember, submit.

>> MAYS IMAD: You also have a chance if you want to co-present with a colleague, you may also do so.

So if you want to, if you teach physics and you want to present with an art instructor, that would be great. Yes.

>> JOSIE: So regarding the schedule, two questions. First, can you remind us of the time in which it takes place? And second, is there a Faculty Senate meeting scheduled for that day?

>> MAYS IMAD: So we have not decided as a committee whether we will have a Faculty Senate meeting that day. We haven't worked out the schedule yet. But it will be shorter. The All Faculty Day will be shorter this year compared to... it's morning and part of the afternoon.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: We did work out what we imagined to be a schedule. We will see the number of proposals that are submitted. We will start in the morning, not ridiculously early, but earlyish, and we have been talking to Dolores, which I think we have on board, to start the day with a Spanish lesson. I think that should be really, really fun.

And then we are thinking we are probably going to do two back-to-back sessions of classes with our colleagues. And then lunch and then CDAC meetings and then division meetings. So that's a really good question, because you know what? I do not think we thought about senate when we put together our sort of tentative schedule.

So that may be a conversation we want to have, whether we want to do senate on the same day again or whether we want to do it like we did for All College Day and actually schedule senate a little bit later.

>> TAL SUTTON: I'm going to send out a survey to you all about potential dates for a January senate meeting.

>> MAYS IMAD: So last time we voted on this, the Faculty Senate decided not to have the senate meeting on the same day because it's

just overwhelming, and usually the senate meeting is at the end of the day and we are exhausted, all of us.

The other thing is the feedback that we got, the committee got from last year's All Faculty Day, the overwhelming feedback with respect to what worked was the faculty felt so happy that they had a chance to spend time with their colleagues that they don't normally get to speak with. And so we want to have time allocated, enough time allocated, for that, All Faculty Day.

>> JOSIE: The only concern I would just add to that is that this particular semester is different because of the compressed and lack of planning time. So we might need to look at consolidating some various things to ensure there is enough time left for faculty to plan for classes.

>> MAYS IMAD: Right. Other questions? Okay.

>> TAL SUTTON: Brooke can stay right up there for the...

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: And the professional development committee has one addition the update and then I will move on to the board report. That is that the teaching and learning center coordinator position, they are currently in the interviewing phase, which is very exciting. The committee believes they will have a decision on the coordinator by the end of next week. So very exciting news that we are moving forward with that and we should have someone in that role very soon. That's very, very exciting news.

As for the board report, can you pull that up for me. I filled in my little fill-in-the-blank. Now that Tal has given us an update on the CDAC committee, he told me and I didn't write down the details. So now I can add that.

So you'll see that we've got some information there about the CDAC committees and the reductions and the professional development updates, although I don't think I have the TLC. I should add that update in there.

As well as the prior learning assessment that we have been talking about. And that we had a discussion about earlier today. As well as our heads up resolution which I tried to phrase using the

language of the actual resolution that we wrote at the end there.

And then we have some notable faculty accomplishments. There were only a few sent to me, so we will see. Sandra is featured quite a bit. Then we have some EGTS updates as well as we hit the \$1 million mark in savings in OER, which is pretty exciting. We can celebrate with lots of other people in the college.

Yeah, you know, the ACC meeting, Tal already sort of touched on this, so I don't think I need to spend much time on it, but it is interesting to think about the best ways to use it. Mays had mentioned to the group or to me at the last board meeting the need for maybe some mentorship for student senators. So we had a nice discussion at the last meeting about that, and we are thinking about sort of how -- and Kate has been involved in some of these conversations about how really the benefit of that committee is that we are, all the different groups are actually coming together and talking. So it's a really powerful place for the Board of Governors representatives to actually speak together and work on some initiatives together, think about ways in which we want to best use that time at the Board of Governors meeting, what really is most effective to say to the Board of Governors as opposed to writing in the report.

So I have turned to that sort of focus on really making sure to say some of other accomplishments that are particularly notable to the board so that they hear that.

But also thinking too about, you know, public speaking and being heard and being able to use your voice in a way that will allow the board and the chancellor and the other people at the board meeting to hear you.

So that seems to be a nice evolution of the ACC a little bit is we are having a little bit more conversation about the different groups and the ways in which we can use our time to collaborate in that ACC meeting.

One of the things we noticed too was that Sean is the only adjunct on the committee, whereas every other group has at least two representatives. Maybe the presidents because there is only two of them? (Laughter.)

So thinking about, you know, how maybe Sean needs a counterpart there for ACC. Yeah. Sean says yes, let's do it.

Yeah, nice place for some dialogue. I sent this out last night. Hopefully, unlike last month, everybody was able to open it and read it. Yes? Yay. Success.

Okay. So feedback questions, comments, things you might like me to add. The beautiful thing about this month is I have a whole luxurious week before I have to submit this, so I can definitely take suggestions and incorporate some things or change some of the things I already have there. Rita? Thank you. My timekeeper.

>> TAL SUTTON: Maybe just one thing to add, this is, again, not only just an opportunity for us to sort of make announcements but it is sort of an opportunity for us to advocate for faculty when we feel it's appropriate.

Or there are issues that faculty want to really move forward and want to stress, I'm thinking that one potential thing in the future might be if we really start getting involved in these conversations about enrollment, and after several conversations and several meetings, that it becomes clear that faculty have, you know, maybe one or two really big ideas that they want the college to act upon, that that would be one of those -- this would be a very good avenue to launch that idea out and say to the Governing Board, this is what faculty feel would really have a high impact on enrollment. So that's one role that this Governing Board report serves as. It serves sort of as our megaphone to the Governing Board and to sort of be thoughtful about that when we are taking on big ideas like enrollment and things like that. So just keep that in mind.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: One other thing I wanted to share actually with all of senate, that was a nice sort of example of the process working was the officers met and discussed Matej's comments on one of the APs last senate meeting in which that senate said that the groups were not part of the decision-making process and commenting on needing that to be removed. So we were talking about that and said, yes, we need to make sure that gets moved forward.

So then when Josie and I went to the ACC meeting, I said, hey, we

are -- I am planning to say something at the board meeting about this, but I wanted to talk about it with the group first, because of course we have staff council representatives there, we have faculty representatives there, and so we were able to sort of talk about that, bring that to the forefront. Of course we have the presidents there, right? So Morgan was able to say, yeah, you know, that doesn't look right. So we looked it up. Morgan did some research for us, found out that that sentence has been removed from the AP. We were afraid, oh, no, it's gone through its public comments time, and now we are really wanting to push this and make sure this is known by the board we don't want this sentence in the AP, but Morgan was able to look into that because of the ACC and the place to have that discussion and follow through.

So now that sentence about us not being a part of the decision-making process has been removed. Now I don't even have to say it at the board meeting because we resolved it before we got to the board meeting, which I think is a really good example of the system working.

>> SPEAKER: Diane. College math competition, annual math competition should be in the report. I have seen a number of nice writeups of it, so...

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Okay. If you notice one, would you please just forward it to me so I can very easily and quickly grab it? Yes, absolutely that needs to be in there.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thanks, Brooke. So now that moves us to -- next is United Way report with Heidi A. I was asked to put this on the report like a month and a half ago. We didn't make the cut? Okay.

Well, we will just go out of order, if need be. So Nic Richmond is next up for the CCSSE results as well as the strategic plan summary.

>> DR. RICHMOND: Hello, everybody. I'm a little croaky. I have water if I start coughing. This will be super short. I have very exciting news. Are you in the mood for exciting news?

Let me see. Are you working your way to the report for me? We have recently released the final report on the 2014-2017 strategic

plan. If this seems a little delayed, it is. But the reason for that is we wanted to carry out a comprehensive assessment last year to understand the progress or lack of progress we may have made. The CCSSE, college employee satisfaction survey. We intentionally delayed the report so we can gather those results and understand the performance of the institution.

The report is posted to the public website. You can access it under integrated planning strategic plan. Within the executive summary, we pull together and highlight a number of the positive areas where we see progress between the period of 2014 and '17.

Now, as you can see on here, we have made a lot of progress. A number of our VFA outcomes are up. (Indiscernible) retention has increased slightly. That's actually an area of additional focus in the current plan is not as high as we may want it to be but it's progressively going in the right direction.

A higher proportion of our new students are being successful in their classes in their first semester now compared to three years ago. A lower proportion of them are experiencing no success in the first semester, which is great. Obviously we don't want any of our students to not pass their classes their first semester here.

When we look at the findings from the community college survey of engagement we find that there are notable increases in four of the five benchmarks. This is important because it pulls together results from related questions. These are defined by CCSSE, and we can compare ourselves to other institutions and see how we are doing. For the most recent administration, we see more positive results for those four areas than we saw before. For the fifth one, we were doing pretty well in that last time, as well, and we're still doing pretty well.

We find the employee perceptions in certain areas are increasing as a summary for the ones that relate to the strategic plan. Employee satisfaction with the reputation of the college is going up. With planning is going up. With mission is going up.

So I wanted you to let you know this report is posted and say thank you to you, your colleagues, everyone at the college. We see broad-scale improvements across the institution over the course of

the past three to four years. That wouldn't happen without the hard work of everybody at this college.

So thank you. I would encourage you to take a look at the results. If there are particular sections relevant to you, we have plenty of charts and tables. You can see the detailed data from year to year to year.

Now, it's not of course all perfect. There are areas in which we still need to improve. Those are noted and discussed through the report. But for the areas where we still see weaknesses, they are all embedded in the 2017-2021 strategic plan. So they are all areas the college is active working on. When we do our next comprehensive review, which will be 2020/2021 we will see whether we see progress in those areas, as well.

With that, I'd be happy to take any questions.

>> SPEAKER: Rita. Do we have a definition of student success? It occurred to me that when I talk about student success and other people, I don't necessarily know that we mean the same thing. So I was wondering if we had a formal definition.

>> DR. RICHMOND: The closest we have I have seen to a formal definition is we adopted the voluntary framework of accountability as our system for monitoring student outcomes, and we picked a number of KPIs, different kind of transition points for the student during their experience with the institution. Some of them focus on retention, because that's so important for student outcomes. They need to be staying with the institution.

It also includes outcomes in developmental education, because students can't be successful in their college-level classes if they can't get through that entry point to the institution. We also look at outcomes. The outcomes for the VFA are fairly broad, which is why we picked that system. It enables us to look at formally two years and six years, but we can look at any point in between we want to see. We can look at what proportion of the starting students in a given semester have received an Associate's degree or certificate. Did they receive one of those and transfer? Did they transfer only? Are they still enrolled? Did they leave the institution with more than a certain number of credits or less than a certain number of

credits?

That kind of gives us a way to keep an eye on the student body and get us a sense of are we moving the right way in terms of positive outcomes for students?

The limitation we have, and this is in the process of being addressed, when a student comes to Pima, there is a world of reasons they might be here. They might want to take one class. They might want an Associate's degree. We don't know oftentimes.

We are getting information through the new application process, but when we look at the VFA categories, we're looking at all new students and then looking at their outcomes. So there will be students who we see picked up as leaving the institution with less than a certain threshold number of credit hours, and within that system, it can be, ah, they were unsuccessful. Not necessarily. They could be the people who were here for personal interest classes.

There are nuances we have to keep into account, but it gives us a robust way to slice and dice different students. There is different demographic indicators built into that system, so we can look for positive trends over time.

>> SPEAKER: So if someone asked me to define student success, none of that would be in it. I wonder if that's a conversation that we need to have. For me, student success is about learning. So I have just been worried about that.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Maybe I can add to that. We do have a student success policy as a college, but it's a little flimsy, so the student affairs leadership is looking at reworking it and making it more robust. But I have been participating in the Aspen Institute Presidential Fellowship Program, and they define student success, there is access, success in the first phase many, many years ago. Then it became access, retention, success, completion. And then the most recent phase is all of what I just said but adding postcompletion. So helping and tracking students after they graduate. Where do they go? What do they do? So that helps us.

And in fact, I was at a meeting with the United Way Cradle to Career yesterday, and some superintendents were there and I had a

conversation with the Flowing Wells superintendent. We give all the superintendents data, but they want a deeper dive and they want to know where is it that their students go? What do the students study at Pima College? And if they go to the U of A, what college do they go to? Do they go to the college of education? Premed? Something like that? All of those are components of student success.

But I have asked students, what is student success to you? And they say graduation. So I guess it depends on who we are talking to and what their perceptions are about student success. But all of that is student success.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Are we now sufficiently capturing the intent and the students' goals as they enter the college? I know now when you register there is a dropdown menu, what is your goal. Is that captured in those success rates at all, or does VFA not really care about that?

>> DR. RICHMOND: The VFA doesn't track that. The VFA does give us three cohorts we can look at. We look at new students to the institution, those who are new to higher education, which could be different, and then also those who are credential seeking.

For their definition, they don't consider credential seeking that the student arrived and said they were credential seeking. It's based on course-taking behavior in the first two years. So we use those definitions.

But the advantage that we have through the VFA, we know who all the new students are in a given semester obviously within the system. And as we gather and centralize the information through the application form, we can start building that into the VFA reports. We would never really say externally, because the VFA doesn't ask for it, but there is nothing to stop us looking at that to better understand our students according to what they said they wanted to do.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. I asked this question a number of years back concerning demographics. Is there any differentiation between African-American students and African-Immigrant students? Because they are completely different student bodies.

>> DR. RICHMOND: The short answer is no. And the reason for that is the federal government. The way that we are required to collect race/ethnicity information is defined for us by them. We are told we have to use a two-question format and specifically what the wording has to be. So when we collect information through the application process, et cetera, those are the groupings that we use.

That being said, I know our chief diversity officer and others are looking at other demographic slices that we probably institutionally should look at. As long as we meet the federal requirement, I don't think there is anything that stops us collecting additional information to kind of supplement our understanding of the student body. So that's a conversation that she is having and leading at the institution.

>> TAL SUTTON: Maybe one more comment.

>> SPEAKER: Herson. More of a clarification. I was looking at bullet point 5. Proportion of students who need developmental education is up. What does that mean exactly?

>> DR. RICHMOND: Oh, there is a number of --

>> SPEAKER: We need to bring students up to speed to college level?

>> DR. RICHMOND: For this particular one, the metric in this specific report, we look at all students who based on our methods need some level of developmental education. They might need one class, two class, three classes. They're all in that together.

What we track for the purpose of this report and included in the mission fulfillment framework, is a proportion of those students who become college level in at least one of the subject levels within which they needed developmental education. So that proportion is going up. So what that's saying is a higher proportion of students are making it through developmental education and becoming college ready. So it's great. It's a good thing to see that shift going in the right direction.

>> SPEAKER: Diane. I'm trying to pinpoint why I'm worried about

this. The developmental education thing, for one, and I'm speaking from a math perspective, so is it skewing our data if we are making our classes easier and easier?

Like if we are taking out whole objectives from math 92 and -- I feel like over the last few years my classes have just become easier and easier, and so the success rates are going up if we are talking about success in terms of completing. But if we are talking about success in terms of learning, I feel like maybe I'm not doing well. And I don't know how to balance that. I don't know how to -- I don't know how to reconcile that. I don't know what I'm supposed to do usually. Anyway...

>> DR. RICHMOND: That's a good point. From my point of view, as a person within institutional research, I see the grade distributions, I can see whether there are changes over time for particular classes, or things like that.

If there are things changing within the class, the nature of what's become delivered to the student, the outcomes that are being sought, I still just see that as a passing grade in the database. That's one of the reasons we used to this business intelligence system we have, so we can post the information, we have the enrollment information, the VFA data, accessible in a folder that all employees with a Pima reports account can get into.

Now, the grade data is a little bit protected, because obviously that's more sensitive information. That's a conversation I want to bring to senate sometime to talk about how we open that up to faculty.

I want to hear from you about what we do with that. But by sharing the VFA data, for example, as widely as we can, the goal is for the subject matter experts across the college, which all of you are in your disciplines, to look at the information, share any context, because numbers are just numbers. I can tell you percent passing of a particular class, but you know the kind of story that goes around those classes and the experiences of the student.

So I can provide the numbers, but then it's for the college community to use them, understand them, and figure out what we can do moving forward.

>> SPEAKER: Ken. I was going to say that eLumen can help you in doing that, and if you like, I'd be happy to talk to you with how to achieve that goal. Evaluating, evaluating the performance of your students based on your learning outcomes.

>> SPEAKER: Oh, I can do that.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think it was more of a question of what's getting captured in the data.

All right. But I think we are out of time, so thank you, Nic.

I think the next bit is the provost's report. I have Kate, but since Dolores is actually here?

>> KATE SCHMIDT: I'm yielding my time.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Good afternoon, everyone. I know it's been a while since I have been here, so I thank Kate for her representing me. The reason I haven't been able to come is either for a conference or I'm representing the chancellor at a meeting. I'm glad to be back and to be here with all of you.

As always we made copies for you the provost's report. Before I go into that, just a couple of things. Do you know what today is? Dia de los Muertos. Hence my little pin here. Yesterday was Dia de los Angelitos. And that's the day to commemorate the children who have passed, and today is for the adults.

But it's supposed to be a happy occasion, because the tradition is to reflect on those you have lost and that the spirits are here with you and celebrating.

So anyway. This has been a really hard semester for all of you, for me, for other administrators, but particularly, I feel it because it's because I come from faculty. We have been dealing with the faculty reductions.

It's probably the hardest thing I have ever done. And I know it is for you, too, and those whose departments' colleagues will no longer be at the institution. I understand and I'm very sorry and

it's with a heavy heart that we do this.

I just wanted to let you know that I think you received the e-mail yesterday saying that the conversations have been completed, and the lateral transfer possibilities are posted. So that's the next step. We have some FAQs that we are still developing. Questions are coming in, so we are trying to address those in the FAQs.

We will continue to update you on things. We have tried to be conscientious in letting you know through every step of the process, the deans have been working very hard, the whole FACT group has. The most recent thing is we will be meeting with PCCEA and Faculty Senate leadership on Monday after the board study session to discuss communication and the discipline data so that people have access to that. So we will be discussing that on Monday.

Are there any questions about that before I go into the other provost's report?

>> ROSA MORALES: I just want to thank you. I unfortunately was able to experience some type of situation in my workplace, and within a couple of days I decided to send an e-mail and I got very good response from all of you. I'm very happy that now we have a number that we can refer people to on a 24-hour basis for people to get some support. Thank you.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: You're welcome. We try to put that at the top of every communication that there is a 24-hour number.

Any other questions about this? Okay.

So the other aspect I wanted to highlight is about accreditation. So on December 3 and 4 we have the HLC peer reviewers coming as part of our comprehensive evaluation visit. There will be a team of eight peer reviewers who will be coming.

The agendas are determined by the chair of the peer reviewers, and they work with our liaison who is Bruce Moses, and he said that they probably, the peer reviewers won't finalize until mid to late November what the agenda is, but as soon as we know what it is, the agenda, for those two days, we will let you know. We will post it so

everybody knows what the agenda is.

But basically -- I left my notebook so I have to get that. So as I said, on December 3, that's when the peer reviewers come. They will start off at District Office and speak with the chancellor and the board, and then -- and maybe myself and a couple of other administrators from ELT. Then they will all go to West Campus, because West Campus is the main campus for the institution, that's where their headquarters is going to be. The rest of the time they are here, at the college, they will be at West Campus.

I wanted to let you know there will be open forums, 50 minutes each. I think there will be -- two of them will be on the criterion. One forum, and everyone at the college is invited to it, students, as well, is about Criterion 1 and Criterion 2. And then another forum will be dedicated to Criterion 3 and Criterion 4. Then there will be another one on the next day, on December 4, on Criterion 5. There will also be focused forums from what I understand, one with student services. Also, there will be forums with faculty.

Then on December 5 and 6 we have the multicampus visit. One of those eight reviewers will stay, one of them. That person will do multicampus visits at Downtown Campus, Northwest Campus, and Community Campus.

So on those two days, they will meet with administrators, basically the cabinet of each campus, all of the deans in another meeting, academic and student affairs deans, another meeting with staff, a separate meeting with faculty, and then I think they are having lunch with students.

All of that, cabinet, deans, staff, faculty, students, for I believe all three campuses.

That's separate. That's the 5th and the 6th.

Something that I'd like to share with you, too, is that we will be doing road shows, so the criterion co-shares will be going to each campus, including some of the members of ELT, and doing forums and giving an overview of things at each campus, and if you have questions we will be happy to answer those.

Speaking of questions, we have asked this of staff council and now we'd like to ask of Faculty Senate, as well, think of the top five questions that you have, questions about or -- you need clarification on regarding HLC, regarding the criteria, regarding anything having to do with accreditation. And if you can submit those to Tal, if that's okay, Tal, and then you can forward them to Bruce. Okay?

So think of five questions, burning questions that you have that have to do with accreditation or with the institution or concerns that you have, okay?

Those were the highlights regarding accreditation. Diane mentioned the math competition. I heard that was a huge success, over 100 students from all over the state. I believe it was a large committee that helped with that, and I think Julie T, was she the lead for that and Diane L? So I want to thank everybody who helped with that.

Also, the SandScript received a prestigious award. First place national award for Best Magazine By Community Colleges Humanities Association. This is the fourth year in a row that they have received that award. This is a student publication. All the faculty and staff that were involved in helping these students I really am grateful for everything you have done. That's outstanding.

Just one other thing I think I'd like to share with you. So usually I do conversations with the provost where I come, for example, I reserve the Amethyst Room, but at each campus and let everybody know I'm here, you can come and talk to me if you wish. But I think what's better is if I go to the specific units, walk the hallways where faculty are, talk with faculty, go to the faculty resource center.

Wednesday, I went to West Campus so I went to the faculty resource center and talked to the staff and their concerns about consistency needed at all the FRCs at the various campuses. Talked to some adjunct faculty. I went to the athletic staff meeting, congratulated the new athletic director and asked if they have questions for me. I also went to the student affairs, student services area center, and talked to some of the staff there.

I think that turned out to be better as far as feedback and for them to have a direct conversation. I know it's hard for people to get coverage for their area to ask permission to go see me, so this way I go and see everybody. That worked out very well.

Unfortunately I had to cancel the one at Downtown Campus and Community Campus, one, because I was sick with the flu, and the other was because I was at the HACU conference presenting. But we will reschedule those. Next I have Northwest on November 8. I will be there, those of you that are at the Northwest Campus.

I think the last thing is I won't tell you how to vote, but please vote. Any questions in general?

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you, Dolores. I will tell you how to vote. She won't tell you how to vote. I will. (Laughter).

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Thank you.

>> TAL SUTTON: Next is Matej, I believe, you're pinchhitting?

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Good afternoon, everybody. It's been a long week and a difficult month. We're losing some really, really good people, outstanding faculty. You know, our students will miss them. We'll be a worse college because of it.

You know, I'm really appreciative for the effort that's gone in, for everybody who has worked on this. I don't have doubt that there were good intentions. You know, sadly, many of the faculty I have spoken with are not satisfied with how the process went, so we will be meeting Monday to explore some ways that we can build more confidence in how it went and make more of the discipline-specific data available so that, again, as I have emphasized in various settings, everybody understands why the disciplines were chosen, for which reasons, and to the extent possible, that we can share with the individuals a little more information for why they were chosen. Some of them are meeting with human resources to get that information, but, you know, I think we will need to do a little more work on that.

PCCEA has been trying to provide support along the way. Please don't, anybody, don't hesitate to reach out to us with concerns. We're getting some legal interpretation from AEA on -- individuals

can certainly come to counsel to go over their separation agreement and make sure everything is in order, so on and so forth. We will try and get some read on what the college's obligations are in terms of providing information and being transparent and everything. You know, hopefully we are getting to the end of this process, and we will take a hard look back and see what did we do well and what we could have done better so that if this ever has to happen again, we do an even better job.

As you saw, the survey went out. I don't know. This seems like a blur now, like a long time ago. But as we discussed in senate last time, we were able to free some faculty enrichment funds to temporarily preserve two positions for the coming year. It was a difficult, you know, discussion among the faculty team who was going through the data, making those recommendations.

We did get some passionate strong comments to give more money, offer up more money. People said I want to donate all my professional development fund if only I could save my colleagues.

So in the end we just tried to make the best call based on the votes we got. I hope we were able to represent you adequately.

I think that's it on the RIF. Please contact me or PCCEA if you have any further concerns or questions.

Would you mind scrolling down?

I think Ian addressed this continuing education issue, and I'm sure that's something that both PCCEA and senate will keep an eye on. Yeah, so elections, please vote. I don't think I need to tell you. There are also board elections, in case you haven't heard, for the Pima board. PCCEA has some information on its website, responses from candidates to questions. Please vote at the entire ballot, not just the front side. All those local races, that's where our vote really counts a lot more.

Finally, PCCEA is doing a retirement workshop. I think info went out for those people who are close to retirement to get some information.

We are still waiting for human resources to send an update on

that mandatory training e-mail went out over summer and give more flexibility to our adjunct faculty so that they have some more time to complete the training and they're not scared off, because in some disciplines, we can barely keep our adjunct faculty with how much we pay them and they might just scoff at having to do 15, 20 hours of training. So we are working on some solutions I have been told several times that more information is coming so we are looking forward to it.

I think that's pretty much it. Again, please feel free to contact us any time.

Any questions?

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H. As a representative of the discipline that took a third of the RIF cuts and has now been halved, I would like to thank you specifically and Kiley for your strong support of the faculty.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Thank you, Nancy.

All right. Thank you everybody. I hope we have a happier meeting next month.

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you. We have an open-forum item that was requested.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I will not take up a lot of time. This has been alluded to two or three times in this senate meeting already. For the first time last week, I learned about eLumen, and as the description of what happened and how this process was going, I just sat in my chair and personally cringed. So I wanted to bring this back to the forefront of the senate's mind and please, please tell me I'm wrong.

I'm all for changing a software package, rock 'n roll.

But as I understand the process, in our current situation, I report things as a class. So I can quickly go through, we do ours in math at our final exam, and I can make little tickmarks, did a student, was a student successful on a question or not.

Collecting that data does not take that long of time, and the current pulldown menus, I can probably put the whole process in 20 minutes, 30 tops for all my classes.

What made me cringe as I heard about this is that we are going to enter the data, student by student. That's where I want to come back and bring this to the forefront of your mind again. We can't change. It's in the pipeline. It's coming down. For me, doing the simple math, by the end of the semester, I have 120 to 150 students. Each of my classes has three, four, and five CLOs that I have to enter the data in per student. I am predicting two hours' worth of time. And because our CDAC does it at the final, it's coming at a very tight crunch time when we have to have small windows to complete our course grades.

Most people in math give their finals on the last day of class. We are pushing and pushing to get all our stuff done. Sometimes there is a one and two-day window tops to get your course grades in on top of attending graduation. The idea of, I understand that they extend CLOs, you're reporting after those dates, I also want to point out that you're working on those off-contract.

So I just want to bring this back to the forefront of the people in the senate to go, this is a massive quantity of time. Depending upon things I learn, I approached Tal, I approached Teddy about this, of their meeting, and what's going on, how much is being shared. Tal also suggested maybe we need to bring this into a business matter in December. I don't know what we can do in the business portion. That's beyond me. So bringing those into that, depending upon what I learn in the next week or so, I may personally go to my CDAC or whatever the silly name is now and propose the timing of when we collect our data, not necessarily for finals but do it throughout the semester. So just bringing things to the forefront of all of you and your disciplines and what you're trying to do in there. At this point, I'm going to let Tal run the discussion, call on people, and inform what's going on, because I'm beside myself.

>> TAL SUTTON: I can offer some info on this, but I will let Rita and Carol.

>> SPEAKER: I would just like to know what division you're a part of.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I am in mathematics.

>> SPEAKER: We have math representatives on the AQI team, not only just on the Faculty Senate assessment team but we also have representation. So they should have been voicing this whole process and the pilot to you. So I apologize if that was not completed.

We started this process, the pilot process, in spring it will be three years. Not to say that we didn't have faculty input the entire time, but we also were supposed to be bringing information out to our teams to let everyone know what our process and train of thought was, all of that stuff, in an effort to never make it a train wreck or be a surprise like this.

So again, I'm sorry your representation, I can find out who it was, who was on both teams, and let you know, but --

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: It doesn't matter. The point is we need to come to the forefront of all of us are aware this is in the pipeline.

>> SPEAKER: I agree. That was our intention was to keep everyone, to voice out to our divisions. I'm sorry.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: The individual student part is what concerns me, because in the performing arts, we are dealing with a mass class, in many cases, that is anesthetic issue that is observation-based, and just the simple fact that the piece that you're observing may last 30 seconds, you don't have 30 seconds to write down individual names. I go yes, no, yes, no, how many -- and I make a rough tally. Can the student conduct and sing at the same time?

So some of the assessments that we have, we have pared them down, because the credits have been cut for most of my classes. So we have already pared the assessments down, and as Diane was saying, I'm wondering, are we going to have to be dumbing down the classes to fit this assessment, the eLumen thing? Because I don't see in the fine arts that it really fits the way we work. There you go.

>> TAL SUTTON: So I'll offer the best of my recollection the

conversation that the assessment committee had with AQI back in February, I think it was, or maybe January, as well as some other information that I have based on sitting on some study sessions with the board.

My understanding, in an ideal world, the eLumen is supposed to be able to interface with D2L Gradebook. Michael Amick, I believe, is kind of running a, trying to help people migrate to putting, for all classes, have their grades in the D2L Gradebook to sort of address this best practice of letting students know about what their grade is sort of in real time.

And so if those two things converge at the same time, then most/all classes will have their grades in D2L, into the D2L Gradebook, and D2L can speak with eLumen so you don't need to enter line by line by line by line by line. It just gets imported into eLumen. It's a very front-heavy process, from my understanding, like you have to sort of upload the rubric and all of that beforehand. I think that's going to be a nightmare for, I'm guessing, the discipline coordinators.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I'm still entering the CLO data, because that's not part of my Gradebook. My Gradebook is about tests and quizzes and homework and whatnot. So this CLO data is entirely separate from all of that.

>> TAL SUTTON: Presumably you can make sort of an ungraded item in your Gradebook that is just CLO 1, CLO 2, CLO3.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: I'm still spending two hours entering data throughout the semester. If it's finals time, then we are still back in crunch time. So those are just comments to take to your committee.

>> TAL SUTTON: Right. Absolutely. I think they are worth bringing forward.

Then in terms of migrating, in terms of -- I think how it got introduced into the math division was sort of unique, but I think the intent is to have -- AQI wants to, at least when we last met, was comfortable with a very slow rollout where they would go in and sort of train each discipline when they are sort of ready to migrate, like

if you're interested in migrating, we're going to come in and help you front load all those rubrics, and sort of -- presumably they could come in and make sense of what would a rubric that would make sense for your specific needs, so you don't have to sort of do something ridiculous or contrived. You actually get something meaningful in this rubric, and they help you set it up and then you sort of, once you are all set up, that's when you would essentially move away from the current CLO interface and go into the eLumen system.

They have had enough volunteers to date that they haven't had to go out and sort of grab people off the streets and say, hey, you, you're going to switch now. So they currently have only been migrating the people that have volunteered to migrate to date. This is based off of my understanding off of a meeting we had back in spring was that there was no rush to move entire disciplines. You can even just move class by class. So math would be, hey, we're ready to try out this eLumen thing. Let's try it with 151. That was the intent, and I think it got botched a bit with how the ICS classes happened. But that's the intent of how it's supposed to be rolled out over time. I'm definitely going to be following up to understand that better.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: That's helpful, because I'm envisioning a typical Pima rollout where everyone does it all at once.

>> TAL SUTTON: I don't want another Attendance Tracker. And this is like Attendance Tracker on steroids.

>> SPEAKER: All of the faculty on that, travel team and the AQI team -- we are nicely known as LAWG. Don't ask. We are a work group. WG got thrown on the end of it. Anyway, that was all of our voice, all of us said the same thing, do not do that to us. We are going to do small pilots and roll them out very slowly and intentionally.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Perfect. That's helpful to know.

>> SPEAKER: But then the situation that occurred with math, 89? 92? Yeah, kind of screwed you guys up.

>> TAL SUTTON: So because ICS didn't exist before then, ICS

wasn't loaded into the CLO interface, and the deans, not knowing the full picture of things, said, oh, if we're going to migrate to this anyway, let's go ahead and do it. It got sprung on those ICS instructors. That's from my understanding.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah.

>> SPEAKER: Ken. I just want to say I have been using eLumen in the accounting department now for over a year. Works very well. Doesn't take that much time. It is front heavy to set up the assessments. It's just a matter of going down student by student, what do they get. Depending how you set it up, pass, fail, 80, 90, 70%, whatever you want, but it is relatively quick. But in all honesty, I think two hours for entire term isn't that bad. It might just be me.

>> TAL SUTTON: There are plenty of conversations about work creep that have gone on at this college since I got here, and I haven't even been here for that long. So it's worth making fights when we need to.

Is there anything else?

>> KARIE MEYERS: I'm kind of surprised to hear that there was a work group because I didn't really hear anything about it until it was adopted.

So I think we should have been told. And then second, you know, somebody from AQI said, oh, do you want to be trained in eLumen. I said okay. She came and trained me and she said now you are required to use it.

So that was kind of shocking (laughter). I think that is -- and I have asked about this several times. Are we required to use eLumen this semester, and the answer was if you have been trained, which would have been nice to know because I would have intentionally not been trained. And the training took five minutes. So I really don't have any clue about what I'm supposed to be doing.

Of course I do. I'm very conscientious about SLOs and we all are in the physics department, but I do think it has been sprung in a way that isn't ideal, I'll just say, and I'm not -- I'm just sort of

letting my, rest of my department, stay in the dark so that they can report in the old-fashioned way until I don't know when we are going to be required to do it.

And also, this front-heavy loading that I guess the discipline leaders or coordinators are going to be doing, I mean, it's kind of a big deal for us. We have complex CLOs and, I mean, we hope they are going to be talking to each other. I did ask the AQI person, does D2L talk to eLumen? She said, well, it will.

So I'm not super confident about that, either. I'm just going to say I don't feel like we were very much -- I mean, I'm glad to hear Rita was on the team. I didn't hear anything about it from anyone before it was adopted.

>> SPEAKER: Again, that's because your representative didn't reach out to you. I don't know what else to say about that. We were all giving our marching orders. Everyone who represents was supposed to be kept updated. I'm a little frustrated about that, but I will find out who the science representative was and give them a talking to. I don't know what to do at this point, but...

(discussion off microphone.)

>> TAL SUTTON: I think there is a lot of issues going on with this. We are definitely -- we will e-mail you our meeting notes from Monday. It's also clear we need to make sure that we sort of try and push for checks and balances. If the rollout starts to get unwieldy the way it says, oh, here is a five-minute training, now you have to use it, we will try and talk about how can we establish checks and sort of say wait a minute, let's establish a real training and things like that.

We will have those conversations. If there is anything you can think of that you want to make sure we bring up in that Monday meeting, feel free to e-mail myself. Josie will be there, as well. And so we will -- and Teddy and Jackie I hope can make it, as well.

This is open forum.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Could we put a rush order on what's the priority of those courses we need to take? Because it's almost near

the end of the semester, and I'd like to get a sense of what the priority is for all those required courses.

>> TAL SUTTON: Mandatory trainings?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Yes, that we need to take, because we still haven't heard anything on it, and it's November now. That was back in what, August?

>> TAL SUTTON: I think PCCEA is more on the pulse on that.

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: Yeah, I had a meeting with the head of HR. I think it was in August. Maybe September. It was supposed to go out that week. I have followed up since then. I was told they are working on resolving that whole issue where people who had taken the training previously in a different system they didn't get credit for it. So I encouraged them to send out all the other updates except for that one and said that they are still working on that one. I'm not sure where that e-mail is.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: The first one I got was on June 28 with the mandatory training thing. But it would be nice -- I have done a couple but it would be great to get a priority...

>> MATEJ BOGUSZAK: I would encourage everybody to contact HR.

>> SPEAKER: I have taken several of them, and one of them disappeared from my transcript. So I had to send in a picture of the certificate that I had taken and they found it, but I would encourage people to actually take pictures of your certificates.

>> TAL SUTTON: Okay. On that note, if we are done with the meeting?

Motion and second. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> TAL SUTTON: See you guys next month.

(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.