



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 March 1, 2019

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I don't see Rita Lennon here, our secretary.

>> SPEAKER: I just sent her a text to see if she's on her way.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: In the meantime, can I have a volunteer to jot down minutes? Thank you, Lisa. They can be concise -- I know Rita looks at the videos, too. Thank you so much.

Okay. We begin with requests for open forum or executive session. Any requests? Okay. Interpreting the silence as a no. I will move forward to business and approval of the February minutes.

So if we could --

>> ROSA MORALES: Can we make an announcement?

Margie, you want to make an announcement about your event?

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: The Native American Student Association club, I'm not one of the sponsors, but I have been meeting with them, and they have organized a powwow, which will be six hours of drumming and local teams and adults participating.

It's going to be in the back side of the West Campus. In the morning they're going to have the cancer climb, and then they will be done about noon. So you could park in the back of the West Campus. Then the staff is going to move chairs and tables, we will have one large tent, and there's going to be vendors along the walkway where the solar panels are located.

It's a great event. It's free. And it's a good way to spend a nice afternoon. So everyone is welcome. Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: The date is when?

>> MARGARITA YOUNGO: Tomorrow.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Since we are making announcements briefly, we have a speaking-out event, yay, coming on March 7 here, as well, for everybody. So I have some posters and I can send our fliers for anybody who is interested.

It's in celebration of African-American History Month and Women's History Month. It's featuring Audre Lorde's work. We have a guest

speaker from the U of A, as well, inquiry and exploration into this theme of speaking out, focus on this author and features a lot of student work. Join us 10:00 to 4:30.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you.

I have the minutes pulled up. Hopefully you had time to review them independently, but I will just scroll through them quickly.

All right. Any motions? Nancy?

Just a reminder if we can all say our names and our representative areas before we speak, that would be wonderful.

>> SPEAKER: Nancy H, ESL. I move to accept the minutes.

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed? All abstaining?

The motion passes and the minutes are approved.

Looks like we have two abstentions.

The next item is mandatory training. So we are all familiar with that issue and have been following along.

Is Eric Aldridge here? Hopefully you had a chance to read this letter. This letter is signed by the communications division. It's a lengthy letter, very detailed, so we don't have time to, you know,

read it during the meeting, as you can see, but basically, it outlines a very logical argument for reducing the requirements for mandatory training for part-time faculty and to only what is absolutely essential.

That means, for example, not requiring the bias trainings. Just with the idea that our part-time faculty have a lot of responsibilities, a lot of requirements to handle. You know, the easier we can make their work flow, the better.

This letter outlines that. It's signed by all in the communications division. As officers, we discussed this and we discussed how best to go about this. Is this a Faculty Senate issue? We know PCCEA is working on this, but we determined that, yes, it can be seen as a senate issue, and it was determined we can either endorse it and support it or not.

It has not been sent to the executive leadership yet. The communications division is waiting to see whether we approve it or not.

We cannot, at this point -- this isn't about changing the language. The language is as is. It is as written unless anyone saw factual issues. But otherwise, the letter stands as is. So it's a matter of do we endorse it or not. Then we can move forward.

Any questions, comments?

>> TEDDY SCHNUR: I did have a chance to look over the letter. I support the idea of what the intent is to reduce the number of training hours for the adjunct faculty.

My question is if this letter is endorsed, where does it go from here? Who sees it? What's the decision-making process from here?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's a good question. The idea is that it will get provided to the Executive Leadership Team, and in some way, as Faculty Senate officers, we will also present it in our next leadership meeting with the provost, the chancellor, and the presidents, and Kate. We will, you know, make a case for it.

We can't guarantee this letter is actually going to do anything, but the fact that it's such a logically, outlined, well-written letter, that presents this argument, and it has the support of the Faculty Senate, you know, I think would be why not take this step for change in a way that I think, you know, seems logical.

>> SPEAKER: Diane Porter. Northwest Campus.

If there is not much discussion, I wrote a quick statement that we could vote on.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Please go ahead and read your statement.

>> SPEAKER: Faculty Senate supports the proposal in the letter

from the department heads of communication regarding a reduction in mandatory training for part-time faculty.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Perfect. So does anyone vote for the statement Diane has written? Diane?

>> SPEAKER: I do.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I saw several hands. Carol?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: I would like to support this statement and also Diane's letter. I think we should support our adjunct faculty as much as we possibly can to make their lives as easy as possible, given the challenges that they have teaching as much as they do and all the extra attendance tracking and things that they have to do.

So that's my opinion.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We have a motion, we have a second. Do we have discussion?

>> HERNAN AUBERT: A comment, a question, and a reflection.

Thank you for your full-time support of adjuncts. I really appreciate that. This letter reflects that. I didn't have the opportunity to read the letter in full, but I definitely agree with you that there are certain training that we don't really need, because we are never going to be on a hiring committee or anything

like that.

One of my issues here is not necessarily an issue, but I would like to know whether or not any form of compensation for the training that -- my constituents at least on West Campus or one of the things that we are trying to discuss at the adjunct faculty meetings that we have prior to senate has been the issue of compensation.

I have been getting not necessarily angry but frustrated e-mails from my constituents saying, hey, these are 14 hours' worth of training, and we don't get compensated. Full-time faculty will do these during, you know, their work hours.

Okay. So it is there, and then I stop.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: There's a section for the more we do support compensation for part-time faculty to complete the training, and then there is some logic behind that argument.

>> HERNAN AUBERT: I'm sorry, I didn't read the letter. I should have known.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Next time do your homework. (Laughter.)
Because it's a tight ship.

>> HERNAN AUBERT: I will. Or shut up. (Laughter.) Do your homework or shut up.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: One more comment. We really have to move on.

We have a packed agenda, so I think it was Patty, right? No other

-- any other comments, notes?

All right. I think we are ready for a vote. All in favor of supporting this statement that Diane has written?

Who is counting? Keep your hands up. Tal is counting. We will have the proxies to keep their hands up.

So everyone who is not a proxy, lower your hand.

32 in favor. All opposed? All abstain? One abstention.

Did you get that, Lisa? 32 support, 0 oppose, 1 abstention.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I will communicate that to the communications division, and we will keep informed about that. Thank you.

The next item we have is policy system and process review. This is Jeff Silvyn and Seth Shippee have agreed to be guests today. As they come up here to present, a little bit of background here is that as you can see we have an extensive amount of APs to review, and as officers, not this last meeting but the one before, we were discussing how we didn't understand the logic behind the whole numbering process, AP process, BP process, and the logistics behind basically the whole schematics.

We thought it would be valuable to have a quick little lesson on that, and then an opportunity to ask questions before we actually

review the policies we have before us today.

I know that there is a file I'm supposed to be opening, right?

It's in the thumb drive? There is a file on the thumb drive?

I can't see, unfortunately, which of these -- is it the first one? Is this the right -- the green? Okay. And it's this. Okay.

I'm guessing this should be smaller. I'm trying to make it smaller. That's not working.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: The slider at the bottom, right?

All right. Good afternoon. I thought what I would do is kind of explain how the system is set up, and then Seth created a flow chart so we can kind of kind of walk through what the steps look like in chronological order, and hopefully that will give everyone an idea kind of how it works. We can see if you have any questions.

So about the numbering system. So the college used to have a different system. Board policies, regulations, and Standard Practice Guides. Some of us who were kind of new when we came to the college, we couldn't figure out what the numbering system was. It didn't seem to have much of an order.

So we came up with what we hoped was a more coherent numbering system. So this is how it works.

If you think about board policies, they are all a number, point,

another number. The first board policy is 1.1. The way they are organized is the first number is kind of the general topic. So if you think about the website and the page of policies, No. 1 has board policies, those are board policies that really relate mostly to the board or some really overarching college-wide issue.

2 are all connected to the chancellor. 3 is academic and student affairs. So everything with a 3 at the beginning has something to do with academic affairs of the college. And I don't remember what all the others are. 4, finance. 5 is everything related to HR, et cetera, et cetera.

And then they are just in sequential order. There is no particular order. So 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, et cetera. 2.2, 2.3, et cetera. Board policies, those are the big goals of the college or some kind of standard the board expects the college to meet.

Then under that we have administrative procedures. That's the framework for how are we going to implement that board policy or achieve that goal set by the board. Those follow the same numbering with an extra extension on the back. So, for example, 1.2 is the board policy on how you do a board policy in an AP, and the APs that explain how you do that are 1.2.01, 1.2.02. They are in sequential order.

So the theory is they are all grouped topically, and everything connected to a particular board policy has got the same numbering and then the extension after that.

Does that -- I realize I'm trying to explain something that, to me, is more visually with words. Does that paint enough of a picture so you get the idea?

>> SPEAKER: (off microphone.)

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: So at some point if you have the chance and you look at the page that has board policies and APs on it, hopefully what I'm saying will make sense. They are trying to be more clustered together both by topic, generally by topic, and then within each sort of subtopic, everything has a sequential number so that they're linked together.

Also, that way, if you're looking at an AP, you can know exactly, well, what board policy is that supposed to be implementing? You can go up to that next higher level and see, or conversely, if you have a board policy, and you're wondering, well, what's our strategy for implementing it, you can go to the corresponding numbering of the APs and see how that works.

That's the general overview of how it's supposed to work. So just a couple of things to keep in mind. One is that's the idea. In

the ideal world, it works really well and things are grouped thematically by topic that way. What we have kind of discovered as we've been going along and changing things is we didn't always do the best job of grouping things.

You're going to see, there has been a little bit of renumbering in a more comprehensive project, probably when it's a little quieter, like in the summer, will have to be done with what do we think is a better numbering system. And I don't mean scrapping the system I talked about. What I mean is thinking about the groupings. Like, does that AP really belong with that cluster of APs? Or is it more affiliated with a different cluster?

Probably there is in the future going to be an effort to try and do some renumbering and move some things around just so they seem a little bit more logical but within that basic framework that I just described.

That's the idea. So if you're okay with that overview, then I would -- Seth was going to walk through, okay, if someone wants to create a board policy or administrative procedure or we have an existing one and we want to make changes to it, what does that process look like?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Quickly, regarding the numbering system, what

would explain, like, large gaps between them or is that just because over the years something has gotten deleted and there is nothing to fit in the place, yet we still maintain the sequential numbering?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: Right. So part of what's happening is over time our perfectly neat ordering system has become disorderly, so that's why it probably makes sense to do a little bit of reordering to fill some of those gaps and not have that, because you're right. Looks like there is a hole. That's because -- so part of what happened when we started this new system, the list of board policies, regs, and SPGs was enormous. Part of what we tried to do is consolidate things so we didn't have page after page.

You'll see, when Julian comes up and talks, there is more of that process going in, and that does cause some gaps in the numbering sequence that probably we are at a point where it makes sense to do a little bit of house cleaning.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So there will be house cleaning at some point?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: Yes, and then we will have to make sure everybody knows what we are doing so it's not too confusing and people don't think stuff randomly disappeared.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Or got passed through the system.

I think we have a question.

>> JOE BREWER: Will you be describing the layer of procedures below the APs and so we have board policy, administrative procedure, and then we have some things below that. Will that be part of your talk?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: It wasn't really the main focus, but I suppose we can address that somewhat. Maybe what makes sense is, do you want to go ahead and explain the process for board policy and APs and then we will not forget that you asked that and mention kind of how that slides in, if that's okay?

>> SPEAKER: Good afternoon, everybody. I'm Seth Shippee, deputy general counsel. Nice to be here speaking with you again. I heard somebody say schematic. I hope you wanted one, because I brought one today.

So the good news is that the process for BPs and APs, whether they are being proposed as brand new or the proposed revision is brought up, it's essentially the same.

If you look at the very top, green for go, left to right, under the AP that governs this procedure, it says that any office, unit, or department of the college can propose a new BP or AP, or propose a revision to an existing one.

Over at the right, then the Governing Board can also request that that be done. So either way, some unit of the college is going to be the official backer of whatever it is that's being proposed.

So that's kind of how it comes down through this whole process is there is a sponsoring unit. Let's say -- I recently worked with ADR on a couple, so ADR would be the sponsoring unit for something that has to deal with something like service animals, and then John Howe, as head of ADR, then there is an administrative head who has some responsibilities.

First, everybody kind of gets an idea what they want to do. Then the sponsoring unit will initiate the creation revision process. If that's brand new, or if you'd like assistance with that, if we see our little option arrow, little dash lines are things that could happen but don't necessarily have to happen. You can always call us, call the chancellor's office. Under the AP, the chancellor has designated the legal department as the primary for BPs and APs. You can always get in touch with us if you want guidance on how to get started.

If it's brand new, we assign a number to it as it flows through the process. After that's done, you have your BP or AP, where you want it to be, or when you have it gelled in your mind about what you

want to do, then you need to reach out to input from relevant stakeholders.

It wasn't all that long ago that I was here -- I think I talked to you about the service animal AP, so let's take that, go with that as a continuing example here.

When we, John Howe as head of that, I was participating in it, and the relevant stakeholders we reached out to were at that time Kate Walker was still doing EEO, so it would be individuals who maybe had something, represented a constituency within the college community that would be primarily affected by whether or not service animals were brought -- so facilities, for example, was involved in that as a stakeholder, because they have the buildings these animals will be going into, so forth.

So once we do that, and the relevant stakeholders have been brought together and are coming up with something, we will draft a proposed version of this.

Once that draft has been proposed to the stakeholders, it would be passed along to the administer head or if the head is part of this sponsoring unit body, then the administrative head will give it the A-OK. If it looks great, it gets passed on down to the chancellor's office for review, or we can go over here and the sponsoring unit

will -- the administrative head will go back to the sponsoring unit and say I'd like to see you make some changes to this.

Same process comes down as it flows to the chancellor's office and then through legal. Anybody can say, hey, I think maybe we should revisit this and make some tweaks to it. It circles back and flows through until basically, well, us, legal says it's good to go.

And then, if it has not already been assigned a new number up here, it will be, that will happen down here. We, legal, will send it back to the sponsoring unit with our stamp of approval, not that we like it or dislike it, it's just that it's in format that it needs to be in.

The sponsoring unit will pass it back to the chancellor's office. The sponsoring unit then will be responsible for facilitating the process by which it gets posted on the college's website, and to the extent it goes out to the sponsoring unit or to the college groups, sponsoring unit does that, well.

Once it's posted, it's optional, we don't have to come around or the sponsoring units don't need to come around to all the groups, but senate, staff council, student senate, any college group can reach out and ask for some guidance about it, ask some questions and whatnot, or you can skip all that and talk amongst yourselves about

this policy and then come up with your own group comments and then submit them, if you have come into a collective consensus about what you want to say. Similar to what just happened today with the letter, you can all come to, you support a comment in particular, and then that gets passed along back to the chancellor's office. Angie Weston in our office would be the contact person for these comments.

So this all takes place during the 21-day period. I understand, and correct me if I'm wrong, that there is some question about whether or not there was maybe two arrows, one that would go down here, gets posted on the college's website, and then come down over here to go to the college groups separately. That's not really how it works.

It gets posted on the college's website, but in practice, Angie will e-mail out to the groups at the same time. It's really a simultaneous thing. There is not another arrow that goes over here for a separate process to be followed. This all takes place during the 21-day notice and comment period.

And then we will scroll down here. So after the chancellor's office has collected all the comments, it will submit them back to the sponsoring unit. If there aren't any comments, there is nothing to respond to. Then we will just pass on down here, and sponsoring

unit can proceed to prepare a final draft, which is down here. But if there are comments, then we can always go through this revision process where based on those comments some tweaks can be made further to the draft.

This only happens one time. So once comments are made, they are accepted, incorporated, they're not. That just happens once. It doesn't go back again absent exceptional circumstances. It's happens sometimes, but that's a deviation from the policy. It's not part of the policy. And we don't like to deviate from policy.

Once the responses are posted, the responses to the comments are posted. The sponsoring unit will prepare the final draft. They will send the final draft to the chancellor's office, and that's the point when it comes down to go before the board.

Here is kind of where it starts to make a difference, whether it's a BP or AP. We will start with APs because they're easier. If it's a draft AP, whether it's new or whether it's revised, same thing happens. It's always an information item and the board doesn't vote on it at all. They are just informed of it. That's always at the next regular board meeting when we can get on there. It comes down here and the final version is finally published.

If we have a BP, it's a little bit different. Here it does

matter if it is a new BP or one that is substantially revised or if it's an existing one that maybe has had some not that meaningful or not that consequential revisions to it.

So if it is something that's not really all that material, changes that have been made, it's just put on the board's consent agenda and approved that way, come right down here and it goes up on the college's website. There is no voting except to approve the consent agenda.

If it's a brand new one or one that has substantive revisions, it will go on that board's meeting agenda as an information item for a first reading, which basically means the board is aware of it and if they have any questions or if they want any revisions to it, they will request that that be done. That's very rare. But if so, it will be revised, and then it will go on -- either way, it will be an information item on the first board meeting and then the next month's board meeting it will be on that agenda as an action item, which the board will vote on.

If they approve it, then we are down here to our final version being published. If they don't, then that's the end of it. All right.

>> TAL SUTTON: I think there is a couple different issues here.

I will try and sort of parse out how I'm thinking about this.

So one concern that I have, I guess, goes a bit back to the numbering system and the outdatedness of the numbering and things like that. I guess I feel like there might be some more utility than like closing the gap in the numbering system. At least with what I have witnessed over time through reviewing these policies.

For instance, I will give you two examples. One is as part of the general education committee, we are reviewing the general education AP, which is currently housed under section 3, which is academic and student affairs, but what is being considered as the new AP for that describes essentially the general education information that the community would probably be interested in knowing, but it also includes the information about what comprises the general education committee, which is much more of interest to the internal staff and faculty.

So I'm struggling to sort of see that as existing as a single document when it sort of is addressing two different ideas. I mean, my personal understanding of how the numbering system works is, especially in my interpretation that standing committees, like general education, like college curriculum council, like academic standards, are part of the governance process. Though APs that

specifically address those, in my mind, belong in section 1, because that's related to governance.

And then going back to section 3, which I feel is kind of all over the place when you look through what is in there, if you look through some of them, it really seems like part of it is giving information to the community about if you want to sort of know what your rights are as a student and what the student complaint process is, look here. If you're interested in what grading procedures look like, look here.

So it's sort of information of how the college makes decisions about things that impact students or the community. But then there is also internal documents that sort of read like this is what the college curriculum council is, and this is what our processes are, and really the only people that would ever care about reading that are faculty.

So it really kind of, it gives me a headache every time I sort of kind of look through these documents and say, like, I can see why this AP is important, but it really impacts my life very little.

And then I read another one that's like right next to it, and then, oh, this affects me very much, I'm very interested in it as a faculty member. The fact that these are all lumped in section 3 is

kind of makes it difficult to parse and difficult to understand the structure of what these are trying to accomplish, which I guess brings me to the next point of wanting to participate in the governance structure.

I appreciate sort of having -- it would be great if we could sort of have this flow chart to just review ourselves as well to show new senators to say this is what we're doing when we are reviewing APs. Think about it this way. This is where we are in the cog, we are this cog in this complicated process.

And so I appreciate having that. I guess I do have some concerns about how that process works when something is proposed as -- well, I guess I have two issues. I know I'm going on and I have a lot of different things.

One is when something gets removed from an AP and maybe tucked into an SOP, it no longer goes through that loop that you referred to anymore. So the ability to review it sort of goes away, which at least through the Faculty Senate and staff council, because we don't review SOPs.

If there is some recommendation to have the information in an AP become an SOP, I still feel like maybe keeping some general statement as an AP that just references that SOP keeps it on the governance,

the shared governance process' radar.

And then the other component is how these are constructed and who is constructing them. We are looking at dozens of APs constructed by a dozen different people. So they read very differently.

So if there could be, you know, as a complement to the process, maybe also include a template of what type of information you want to include or how APs should read, what information you want to include in them, just something like that. Because when I do read an AP from, you know, one AP to the next, from a different author, it can kind of be head scratching as to, like, what's going on with that.

>> SPEAKER: Well, I think we can all agree the ones I write are by far the best. (Laughter.)

Okay. So I will see what I can address there.

To one of the final points Tal was making, sometimes when -- well, I think as Jeff will probably step up and address in a bit, as we are rethinking the difference between what needs to be in a BP and an AP, oftentimes we have way too much in our APs, and that can come out as an SOP, because it really doesn't affect, as Tal was saying, the college community generally or even administration or faculty in general, but maybe one very specific area.

And that very specific area can come up with an SOP about how

that works. That would be such as to set up some bylaws or something like that.

That's why you would have something that would be carved out. Because it isn't amenable to being a generally applicable AP that's for everybody, because it's not an issue of, say, general interest to everybody at the college. It addresses one very specific part of the college.

I can't say everybody is doing, but I do this, Tal, is when I'm rewriting them, I do put in there that there is at least a directive that in making this AP, let's say it's an AP that the provost is ultimately in charge of administering, there will be a directive from the provost that SOP or an SOP or SOPs to implement the AP will be developed by whoever it would be.

So that would be where your notation is in there, that there is an SOP. Wouldn't necessarily mean that anything was carved out of it, but it would just be something to tell you then to follow the trail down in finding SOPs to tell you whatever it is that group is doing to implement.

You're right. Those SOPs aren't things that go through notice and comment, because again, it isn't something that -- Jeff is squinting at me.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: (off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I have to say we are way over time, so if we could be succinct.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: Remember board policy is sort of a higher-arching goal or expectation, the AP sets the framework for how we're going to do something. What I try to explain to units to help them with this process, and it's definitely a little more art than science, AP, one way to think of an AP, if it's a process or a function that requires people from different areas to work together, the AP tells you what the roles and responsibilities of each are. It doesn't necessarily tell you every step you take. That's what goes in the SOP.

So that's the way to think about -- the SOP is the step-by-step instructions for how to do something. The AP is the more general framework that basically gives you roles, responsibilities, and maybe a general time frame or quality standards or something like that you're supposed to meet.

If that helps a little bit? So there is not quite as robust an input process on SOPs but what should be happening is those units talking to customers, their customers or clients, if you will, and making sure they are coming up with a process that works. So, for

example, in purchasing, you have a board policy about financial controls, you have an AP that says, finance, you're responsible for that. Here's standards you have to meet. And then there is a purchasing manual which gives you the step-by-step instructions how to buy something, which most of us never need to know. So it's in an SOP. Those people work with the business managers of all the different units to figure out what's a process that works for them and addresses the issues they have encountered.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Two quick questions. Can you send us a copy of this flow chart?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: What I was thinking about is if we tweak it a bit we probably should just post it on the web page, too.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think that would be a wonderful idea.

Secondly, the P in AP stands for procedures, right? If you interpret that literally, the majority of the Ps posted to the APs are not describing procedures. They are defining things like the curriculum manual, which I know is proposed for deletion, but, and so it just seems that how you described the meaning of the APs, procedures, really, truly, which is an action, isn't a defining term of what the policies listed in that area really convey or intended to convey.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: If you have a better suggestion for titles, send it to us.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Finally, one of our concerns is there has been a move to delete quite a few, and this is up next, if -- is Julian here? Julian's here. Quite a few APs related to curriculum, and as Faculty Senate, curriculum is one of our chief concerns in terms of providing oversight.

And so, you know, there is an argument that a lot of these aren't relevant to the AP under which they are listed, which is why they are deleted. However, as Faculty Senate, we are concerned that leaves us with no Ps that describe curriculum. Then we are left with kind of not any or much authority or input.

And so when -- can sponsoring unit be anyone? Like, as a division or a Faculty Senate in terms of creating a P, an AP?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: Yes and no. A sponsoring unit is kind of the business or operational unit that is primarily responsible for implementing whatever the subject of the AP is. But anyone could certainly make a recommendation, hey, we ought to have an AP or a process on this.

But it sort of has to get housed somewhere with people who have a primary function to carry it out. That's where the idea of

sponsoring unit comes from. It would be kind of hard for Faculty Senate to be a sponsoring unit per se, but Faculty Senate could certainly make recommendations to the provost's office.

And the other thing is for some of the procedural, in-the-weeds things, there are other mechanisms to make sure there is faculty input and oversight and crafting of things. For example, you have the curriculum council that has faculty on it. Part of it, you're right, the issue is what's the role, where does it belong, and how does it fit into the bigger -- it's not a question of if. It's how we do that. Right, and there may be better ways and we are certainly open to suggestions about that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. I see two hands so we will take two questions and we have to move on.

>> HERNAN AUBERT: Just to get an idea, once a BP is approved and it says, yes, okay, we'll go, how long, on average, does it take to translate that will of the board into an actual policy that is operational that the college can work on?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: There is no -- there is not really a rule of thumb for that. Most of the time, if it's a sponsoring unit initiated board policy, they have already drafted the AP, and we post them together so people can see what the bigger framework would look

like, but if not, you're talking a few months probably before you have an AP actually final and posted to implement the board policy if it's a new board policy. That, by itself, is a good two or three months.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: So I'm curious, the relationship with the structure of the SOP to then, say, handbooks, how do those two work together, speak to each other?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: I'm not sure there is, like, a real definition for that. I would think of a handbook -- depends what handbook you're talking about.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: The one we are working on for the new CDAC structures, for example.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: Probably more like an SOP-type level document, I would think.

You might have an AP that says you have to have a curriculum council, here are some basic parameters for it, and that's going to be detailed in this other document. The handbook you're talking about would be that other place that sets out all of the details about who's a member, how did they become a member, what are their responsibilities, how are they supposed to operate, et cetera? It's kind of an SOP level.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Maybe this is a question for Julian. Why aren't we calling those SOPs?

>> SPEAKER: That's an excellent question. As it becomes clearer when we are doing an AP or even at the BP level, one of those is going to be needed. For example, we recently had a revised AP -- because I don't know if you knew this, the student code of conduct was kind of floating out there, not connected to anything. Nobody was in charge of it. So we wrote up an AP that says the provost is in charge of it and the provost directs the vice-president of student affairs and the dean of students to create a code of conduct.

That is, and we talked about this at the time, the code of conduct, and now we have a separate code of conduct in an academic integrity code, those are the SOPs.

It's kind of still in the early stages -- I mean, we always think of it that way now, but we haven't gotten to the stage where it says SOP stamped right at the top of whatever it is. But the student code of conduct and the academic integrity code are exactly what you're talking about.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: So it sounds like moving forward the process will be revised and streamlined and polished.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: So just another thing is we have a meeting

coming up with the leadership of Faculty Senate, staff council, et cetera, and we can flesh some of this out.

I think it's at some point this month to talk about some of this stuff and see if we can figure out some better approaches.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's a first step, because Tal was just suggesting as faculty we'd like to have input in some way in the process and perhaps solicit names. So that would be a good start to that, sounds like. Okay.

So moving forward, our next item -- thank you, Jeff and Seth, for taking your time to be here and outlining that process. It's appreciated.

Julian, if you'd like to come up and we'll chip away at these various Ps.

>> SPEAKER: Julian Easter. I'm here to -- I'm glad you heard the explanation, because we are in the 21-day comment process, and part of that is the discussion we have today.

I would say as you have comments, get them documented when you review, okay? And that way, we can make sure we look at all comments coming in.

I'm mainly here today if there are any general questions and to explain the reason. I think the summary of the board policy that

came out in your attachment gives you an idea, and I don't think we have to go through reading through every policy, but let's start with the -- we have the board policy, 3.40, the grading policy. That's been revised, proposed, because the language in this BP where it has a listing of the grades and the reasons under there is also in the associated AP that we are going to get to.

We thought the board policy, just read, here are your grades and then when we get to the appropriate AP, it will have the explanation -- it already exists in the AP. We didn't think it had to exist in a board policy and an AP related to the same topic.

That was the revised. The next one is -- okay, 3.25.03 which is related to college curriculum council. Again, and I want to stress the following APs, now we have it with the curriculum team but also with the CCC, which include staff and faculty who gave input on this.

As it was being reviewed, we realized that with the current reorganization, the membership of the council was not really reflective of the divisions that we have in a sense there were some areas where faculty were not represented by the divisions on here.

And so the language that you'll see is to kind of put language in here that's going to ensure that faculty membership on this committee will be representative of all divisions at the college.

I have heard from faculty that sometimes they felt they didn't have a voice at the table, because sometimes the membership did not reflect it. So as you read this, it's to reflect the current division with the emphasis on making sure all representation, and also, as you will see, it's proposed that that faculty are selected by the division. That's a little different, because traditionally the senate would give us six names, I think it is, and then they would be on the committee and we try to get other representation.

But I have to say sometimes you have three from one division, and so it wasn't -- I think we need to work better in assuring that there is representation. We felt it's the best if the divisions had the responsibility of selecting their membership.

The next one should be 3.25.07. Again, for comment. This is where we have an AP dedicated to a manual, and the CCC, the rationale for having a dedicated AP to a manual. Nobody can answer that. I have said in my work experience I have never seen an AP devoted to a manual. I was looking at the fact that probably the most important manual we have here is the catalog. We don't have an AP for that. I entertain any feedback as to why there should be a specific AP to the manual. It doesn't do away with the manual. It's just the fact that there is an AP for a manual. Anxious to hear input on that.

The next one, 3.25.09, refers to the curriculum, college curriculum office. Again, it's out there for comment why there is a specific AP for the curriculum office. We just want to know. I was asking and nobody knew why.

Those who may be veterans here, if you can give some input as to why this was created, basically we saw no sense to have it. I was looking for an AP for the chancellor's office, and I don't see one for that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Are you asking for feedback how?

>> SPEAKER: No, just throwing out questions to consider.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Would you like to throw out all your Ps and we can go back and ask questions? We can hold off questions because I do think we have some answers, but we will hold off on comments and questions until you're finished with your list.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you. The next one, we have 3.40.01, the grading. Again, this is reflecting back to the BP. You will see on this grading AP that some clarifying language was put in there as far as the terms, how we use them. For example, and we still have to look at this, grades, for example, the term W, I's, really are not grades. They are status, enrollment status in a course.

When I was faculty, I had it in my syllabus, the grades I put on

there were A, B, C, D. I never put W or I on there. We wanted to clarify the terminology. And also, the language revised as to how Ws are assigned. This is based on the fact that the tendency for a high number of Ws to be given out after the official date to withdraw, and you'll see the language. It said under faculty discretion, being proposed, and this is that after the date, the last date to withdraw, then it is strictly would be an administrative decision whether withdrawal was given or not.

I have invited David Dondowitz (phonetic) here if you'd like to hear what the financial aid concerns are when this occurs, or we could move on.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Let's move on.

>> SPEAKER: Okay. Leaving 3.04.01, I think we are then to --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think we are done with yours, Julian. Then we have a couple from Kurt Myers. Those are completely different things. Those address technology.

Before Kurt comes up, let's have questions for the specific items that you have gone through.

I know that we saw that Joe had a comment. One question I want to ask, one response I want to offer to you, from a literal level, it makes complete sense why we would want to delete documents that

really aren't relevant to the term "procedures."

And as I noted when Jeff and Seth were up here, our concern is that when those are stripped away, there is little left that addresses curriculum at all, and so if we are interpreting the term "procedures" and all it entails correctly, it would seem what would be most relevant and what the public would appreciate seeing or what would be value to be publicly displayed is a document that outlines our curriculum procedures, like how are these committees composed, the procedures and practices involved, and then also the manual.

So that would be one answer to one of your questions, and so what that kind of points to is a gap, when these are deleted, that would be nice to be filled with some kind of an AP that does actually outline curriculum procedures.

>> SPEAKER: And the intent is to have procedures in our curriculum manual.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And of course as Faculty Senate, we know that doesn't get reviewed through our Faculty Senate, and so that's the main difference that we are getting to here is that when we have things as BPs and APs, they go through our process of review and comment and the whole schematic that Seth and Jeff presented on.

>> SPEAKER: Understood.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think Tal has a follow-up.

>> SPEAKER: I want to say, it would continue going through the CCC, so I guess whatever discussion is, that's a discussion we can have later.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's not the senate, though.

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah, I just want to remind us what Jeff had said about the intent of the AP being an AP essentially should exist if there is a procedure that involves multiple operational units at the college, and these curriculum processes, we are not disputing that the curriculum manual should essentially live as an SOP, because those are all the steps that the curriculum office do, but there are steps, initiation processes, votes, things like that that happen with faculty, interacting with the curriculum office, so that is an example of multiple operational units of the college interacting with one another, and based on the philosophy that Jeff just laid out, indicates to me there needs to be at least some type of administrative procedure that goes through the shared governance process to provide transparency for that type of process.

>> SPEAKER: Sure. And this is why these are suggestions, and I look forward to these comments in the 21-day review.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And this could be something, too, we are not

going to answer this in this meeting, but we can, on March 6, move forward when we work on revising the whole process, but I think what we are pointing to is that it's not a perfect system but that we are hopefully working for something that is more...

I thought Joe had a comment. Do you no longer have a comment?

Maybe we can take a couple more and then we have to move on in terms of time. I think was it Rosa? Go ahead.

>> ROSA MORALES: I took the time to really read carefully about this AP, and one of the things that I noticed on the first page for AP 3.25.03, that it states right in the beginning that there is two, three, four, five categories that is supposedly the curriculum submissions should cover.

But I notice that none of those categories include the transfer alignment to four-year institutions. I remember in my past 11 years, working here, that on a couple of occasions, we have had to do that with ASU. So I would be interested in recommending to add that category which I consider very important. Okay. So that's one thing.

And then the next thing, there is also the issue that I notice that this is giving us the opportunity to make this committee a little bit better, and I notice that when I look at the individuals

that are supposed to be members, it actually only allows for 55.5% of faculty to participate.

So it seems to me that percentages of, you know, the membership were not probably thought out very well, because if we leave it at 55.5% being faculty, that means we have 45, you know, that are administrators. My experience has been in the past with multiple faculty that have been part of the curriculum committee that due to teaching, many of the faculty regularly don't attend those meetings. So therefore, even if you have, you know, in writing that there's going to be 55.5% faculty, the fact of the matter is that their ability to attend those meetings is compromised, because they are teaching as opposed to the administrators or the staff who have a little bit more control over their, you know, schedule.

So I don't know what HLC foresee the faculty to be, but I don't think having 55.5% faculty members in the curriculum committee is good enough percentage for faculty to actually be able to provide strong input on the curriculum of the college.

I hope that it's clear here.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Yes, no, good points.

>> SPEAKER: Tanya P. I know that in regards to the withdrawal, I don't know if David necessarily needs to come up here. However,

being a person who is faculty who can, looks at a student, I know a lot of times we look at the Ws as a kinder, gentler way to look at students on their transcript.

However, on the other side, being a person who works in student services who has to tell them now what they owe the federal government back, because we gave them a kinder, gentler grade, I want to make sure since we do have David here today that if anybody has a question how that works, that we utilize it. Because sometimes we think we are doing something in the best interest of the student that turns out very much not to be in the best interest, especially when an F later, if they retake an F, it now will completely come out and fix their GPA where their completion rate is still affected regardless.

So I know that. I just want to make sure that since David is here --

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We do include that mandatory statement in our syllabi that says this could have implications on your financial aid and academic standing at the college. That's always good to review our policies that we put in our syllabi and make sure that our students are aware of them and not just assign Ws without consulting with the students and requiring, perhaps, then student contact their

advisor and discuss it with them, as well.

>> SPEAKER: Yeah, definitely, and if any of you, any students or individuals are going to give a W, perhaps before they give the W thinking it's going to be in their best interest, also contact financial aid because we often -- just yesterday I had a person going through an academic drop and having to decide -- you know, they had a death in the family. So should these grades show up on their thing. Well, if we completely remove them, then there are ways they never happened, therefore, 100% of the money that the federal government gave. So there are just lots of implications. It can get very, very expensive.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you for that reminder.

We have one more -- we have to move along. We're running really late on time, so we did say two more comments, and Tal had a comment, so we'll go to Tal.

>> TAL SUTTON: You said they were going to be up for 21 days. They're not. I know these have been pulled and put forward. I'm worried the 21-day comment happened a while ago, so I just want to make sure that these will go up for the 21-day comment. They're not there right now. You seemed to suggest they were. They're not.

>> SPEAKER: I checked with Angie Weston this morning. She said

they were, but I will double-check. The clock won't start running until...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I see you're standing.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Well, I am, but I know there was someone else with a comment before I stood up.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Please, very quickly.

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: Very quickly, I would like more of an explanation, so this is all I'm adding of is there a chance to find out why this decision was made to make that strict cutoff from withdraws and have the information about the financial aid impacts. That would be beneficial, especially to the senators so that we can go back and give a better explanation to the other faculty working around us.

I know you're on a time crunch right now, but if there is a way that we could get that opportunity, I think we would all benefit from that.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Opportunity for what, exactly?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: To hear why the decision was made that we're going to do a strict cutoff on the withdraw date, and what are the reasons for that decision?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think that's a valid question. You're

asking that of Julian to answer that, correct?

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: We are on a time crunch, we don't have time, but I'd like to have that conversation with a large group like this.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. So on hold for now or would you like a quick explanation --

>> MS. JEANNIE ARBOGAST: If there is a quick explanation we can do in two minutes or less, rock 'n roll.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I see we have a standup person. Let's get the two-minute explanation and then we will follow up, we will plan to follow up on this.

>> SPEAKER: Dave D. One of the main reasons is that an institution has to have an official withdrawal policy when we have instructors giving Ws. We actually don't have an official withdrawal policy because they are going to different areas of the college. You need to have one designated office to do that. That's one reason.

The second reason would be when it comes to enrollment reporting, disbursement of federal financial aid, when we give an instructor W, we are giving that as a grade and we are saying that the student earned that. So in essence we were leaving the registration status there of registered in the class. However, that student has

technically withdrawn from the class, so they are not eligible to receive further federal funds with that. In addition to that, they are reported as a drop in enrollment status.

So if I'm in six credits, and my writing faculty gives me a W, I'm now less than halftime. So now my loans are actually in deferment or they are going to into repayment.

So we need to have some systematic approach at the institution where we are withdrawing those students in a proper fashion. One of the things I will add to Julian's comments is that we are not actually getting rid of the withdrawal after the official withdrawal deadline. What is going to occur is that student is going to go through an administrative process where they would get withdrawn from the class.

That would then also shore up some of the loose ends we have is that every instructor is doing it differently, and there is not a consensus on how we are doing it. Now we have one official process. Goes to the administrators. They make that decision. And that's looking at the extenuating circumstances the student has provided.

When we talk about this, it's really to get the burden of a decision that probably shouldn't be made in the faculty's office when it comes to a withdrawal from the class after the official withdrawal

deadline, that they go to an administrator and there is an administrative process for that to occur.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: And I apologize. Your name, did you say --

>> SPEAKER: David Dondowitz (phonetic). Make sure you contact Julian if you have questions. Just kidding. (Laughter.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I'm sensing that this W item is something that we'd like to follow up on in April? Because it is a really big discussion, and it's -- I see lots of nodding. We will add that to our April agenda.

Now, were there any other comments that are essential at this moment regarding the BPs and APs that Julian presented on before we move it over to Kurt?

This is one final -- I'm serious this time. (Laughter.) One more.

>> SPEAKER: Diane Porter. If we are going to discuss the W, maybe people would also like to discuss the change in policy in the I grade.

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> SPEAKER: Yes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Good suggestion. Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Should we do the motion?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: We will just add it to our April agenda and carry this discussion forward at that time.

>> HERNAN AUBERT: I think it would be important...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I said no. Go ahead. Go ahead. Go ahead.

>> HERNAN AUBERT: The reason being is 45th day roster, and I have been instructed to give Ws to students that didn't show up for the last three or four classes, and that may impact them.

My policy has always been I will only give you a W as an instructor if you request that in writing in order to prevent and avoid being sued when their financial aid is taken away. We are on the 45th day roster starting today, and how do we deal with that?

>> SPEAKER: The 45th day is a state requirement. When you're giving -- you're actually giving an enrollment or registration status at that point, so you are saying they're progressing in their class or they've withdrawn, not attended. This is in regard to the final grade. The 45th day is a midterm status check.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you. And if I think if there are further questions about very specific issues, you can direct those to your deans or Julian. And Julian will be back. We have him for another agenda item. So we don't have to say good-bye. There will be more. Thank you, Julian.

Can we have Kurt come up for two items related to technology?

>> SPEAKER: Kurt Meyers. I'm the director of information assurance and records here at the college. Try to keep this short and sweet. We just have two APs and the first one is really just an update of an existing AP, which is investigative guidelines for technology resources, meaning if there is a violation of acceptable use or any issue that uses our systems to violate a policy, it goes through this process.

It's not to say it circumvents HR in any way. If there is an issue with a faculty member or staff member, it goes through the HR process and then feeds into this process.

And really, the material changes for this particular AP is the fact that who the approval, who gives that approval. Current version, it's the chancellor, and that just seems a little bit too high. So it got kicked back down to general counsel, members of the information security group, and I believe it was internal audit, as well.

So that's kind of the scheme of that in HR. I'm sorry, and the chief of police. That's really the gist. It's more language changes and streamlining the process a bit for us internally in IT, that particular one.

Any questions on that one at all?

The newer one, it's called our information management standard, and this one is really all about securing our data here at the college. So it's ensuring that all of our data that has to be confidential is actually maintained in a confidential manner, the integrity of the data, we ensure that it has integrity, and that it's available to the right people at the right time.

All this kind of ties into what, in this particular AP, is the data classification standard here at the college, which is something we really desperately need as essential framework for securing our information assets. One of the big things I want to point your attention to is data records information assets, they are all the same word for the same thing. This ties into our retention practices. This is going to tie into our identity management, meaning you log into a Pima system, you're going to have the right authorization to access the right kind of data that's just related to the work that you do for the college.

So it's part of the larger framework for our internal controls here at the college, and this is the first step. And information assurance is going to be reaching out to not only administrative offices but also instructional offices to kind of do a very

comprehensive data inventory of what you're responsible for, what you might be the data steward for here at the college, and that whole process. This is the AP that informs that process a bit. And there is a manual, as we discussed manuals, there is a manual that's going to inform us for data handling, records and information management in terms of retention. So this is again the framework for that.

Any questions?

>> ROSA MORALES: A couple of questions. One is regarding the training. According to this AP, one of the categories that this AP is setting up is training. Is there going to be any training?

And the second one is it's also a mention about the manual, but what does that manual, is that being created as we're speaking, or where is it?

>> SPEAKER: Great questions. There is going to be training. There are two trainings that kind of dovetail into this AP. The first one is the records and information management training.

So what do you do with college records from creation to disposition? So it discusses all that, as well as all the legal requirements of managing records. So that training is part of what we call directed training at the college, and that's something that's online, so you can do it at your leisure, but it's a component of

this.

The other is security awareness training. So it's more in the sense of if you get an e-mail and it's fraudulent in nature, we're going to help folks be more aware of how to detect that kind of information so we don't click and don't introduce any threats to the environment here. So that would be the secondary training.

Then I think you had -- the third or the other question?

>> ROSA MORALES: The manual.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you. The data handling manual, it is complete. We just haven't posted it because we are just waiting to see what comments have to do with this particular AP, but the data handling matrix is complete. It touches on the data classification. Again, there are four classifications of data.

There is public use, internal use, confidential, and there is regulated. There is a soft kind of what kind of data is that. The data handling is going to say, what do you do if you have a confidential? How do you handle that? Are you allowed to transmit that over e-mail, for example? Do you have to store it in a more secure environment? Is Google Drive acceptable or do you put it behind another system like file share or something like that.

That's what the manual will get down into the nitty-gritty. We

are going to provide training. We want to partner with any group in the college that has more questions or wants to get ahead of the curve, we are going to be there to do the data inventory, go over to data handling manuals, and help folks establish SOPs regarding information management, because every unit has a component of data handling, and there should be an SOP that speaks to that. How do you manage that. What do you do, for example, for faculty? It would be grades. What do you do with academic records that go part of the grade? We are required by state law to keep those for a year. How do we do it, who handles it, where does it go? Does it go to faculty resource center? All those questions we haven't really addressed at the college yet. That's what we are here to do and that's what this kind of sets up.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you.

>> SPEAKER: Absolutely. Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Julian, if we could have you come back up.

>> SPEAKER: Julian. AVC, academic affairs. Long time, no see.

I'm up here to entertain any questions regarding the letter I sent out regarding the curriculum partial hiatus that's going to go into effect. Briefly, the reasons being, as you probably read, that we are going to be incorporating two new pieces of software, one

referred to as -- I can't say what it is. But one piece of software is going to help us be able to work and produce a catalog in a less manual fashion. A second piece of software is related to curriculum and establish a more efficient work flow of processing curriculum work handed in.

It's been my experience that sometimes -- these are two really huge projects we have to implement, and we have to do it right. And so we need it to kind of slow down what we are currently doing while we can work on the transition.

So that's where you have seen the dates when final submissions should be into the curriculum office in time for the May CCC for anything we are looking at potentially for fall of '19, fall of '20. As you also read, it's a partial in a sense if there are any critical things that need to be processed, if we want to keep it to that level. I said the example is like if there is an accreditation issue, if there is industry, work-related stuff, that we have to respond to quickly, we want to narrow our efforts on those.

While the nice-to-do stuff can kind of wait until we get this process in place. And what we are doing now is that we are taking time to review our current processes. Also look at the processes that we need to incorporate that we are lacking that we have to build

in so when we meet with the vendors, we are going to be ready to hopefully speed up the implementation process.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Any questions for Julian about the hiatus or the transition to the new system?

>> SPEAKER: Okay. None? Josie might get mad at me but I need to put in a little public announcement.

This is from a nice person. I was at the DMV. You may not realize, but our Arizona license as they currently are will no longer be valid to use to fly, to get on to domestic airlines. She said that date is October 2020.

She told me it's going to be over 700,000 drivers licenses that they have to work on, and only about 2,000 people have come in. She said, whatever I can do, spread the word, that if you don't like carrying your passport around all the time, beat the rush and get your current license updated so you can use it for domestic flights.

Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Julian.

So I think we have had a request from the provost to bump up the provost's report, so I think we will do that, and then we will move on with the election update.

>> DR. DOLORES DURAN-CERDA: Thank you, Josie. I have to be at a

meeting at 3:00.

I wanted to be sure to be here with all of you. Thank you again for all your contributions as being senators for the institution. I know it's a lot of work. Going back and talking to your constituents. I thank you among all the different responsibilities you have as faculty members.

The reason why I was late today is because a few of us went to the mayor's state of the city address and luncheon at the Tucson Convention Center. It was very well attended. It was his last state of the city address. Many of us are very grateful for what he's done with the community and helping and strengthening. He did a nice shoutout to Pima Community College for quite a period of time saying our role was very important and our contributions to the health and wealth of the community and how the economic development has improved with our students and the whole community.

So that was really nice to hear, that he publicly mentioned Pima Community College. I don't think he mentioned University of Arizona, but he mentioned us. That was really nice.

Also, and I'm sure you know about this, I just wanted to give reflections and my condolences to three employees that worked at the college. One is faculty member Juliana Wilson who passed away

recently, faculty member for many years in history at the Downtown Campus.

Also Nancy Whitlock, who was an adjunct faculty member, taught Pilates at West Campus. And Deborah Castalon, she was a recruiter here at the Downtown Campus and then went on to work at Edge Charter School. I just wanted us to reflect and remember and honor everything they did for our students and for the college.

Also, I wanted to congratulate the financial aid office and the scholarships office for working on the All Arizona Academic Team recognition ceremony that took place Wednesday in Mesa. We had 12 students recognized from Pima College, so from all the different campuses, we are very, very proud of them.

I don't know if you know, but the deal is that they receive a fee waiver so they can attend the University of Arizona, ASU, or NAU. It's a big deal for them. We are very, very happy about that and thanking the Phi Theta Kappa advisors, too. They are recognized for their academic achievement, leadership, and service to the community. One of them, I don't know her last name, but her first name is Elizabeth, I think Woods. She was named All-USA.

There was another student from Mesa Community College. Pima has a really strong, healthy trajectory with all these recognitions with

this particular All Arizona Academic Team. Thank you to all of you, faculty and advisors, who have helped these students.

One thing I'm excited to share with you, and it's the first item on the provost report is the joint U of A and Pima deans meeting. This is the first time, seems like it would be a no-brainer, right, but it's the first time ever that deans from both institutions got together, and there were other administrators there from U of A and Pima, but to really focus on the transfer issue. We want more students to transfer seamlessly, without any issues, from here to the University.

That will help with our goals with Achieve 60 AZ. So they got to meet each other, we were at different round tables and made sure not all Pima people were at one table. It was mixed up. Suzanne was there, among others. I think it was a fruitful discussion. The provost was there from the U of A. I was there. This is the beginning, the first of many conversations that we are going to be having.

Now they know their counterpart and can ask each other questions. We talked about, like I said, transfer but also reverse transfer, dual enrollment, pathways, we did reportouts in small group discussions.

The provost from the U of A and I are going to select two projects to focus on. It seemed like the common thread of the conversations was dual enrollment, to focus on that, and also co-branding U of A and Pima College. So students know we are a set group. We work together, we are partners, and we are going to help each other to have our students to move into the U of A. That was very exciting. I'm very happy about that.

We also have presence at the HLC conference, not all participants going, but also people from the college who are going to be presenting. One is an exhibitor presentation, and that's with the eLumen representative Karen, and then Bruce Moses and Wendy Weeks. There is also going to be an institutional presentation with Wendy, Bruce, and Vanessa Romero from the college. We are excited to hear their presentations.

I know there will be two representatives from Faculty Senate attending, two from staff council, and some administrators, as well.

Here it's going to be Tal and Joe, right?

I think you'll enjoy it. You'll learn a lot. It's one of my favorite conferences, but I'm a nerd.

Next is immigrant and refugee student resource center. I last time I mentioned there is going to be a reception. It was very

successful, a lot of people, not only internal folks but we had community folks, community agencies, refugee agencies here, and adult ed was here.

So we really made a nice connection and networking with the immigrant resource center, and we have two students working there.

Again, this is a short-term plan. The long-term plan is to have an actual center, not just a little tiny office. But it's a start. We are happy about that.

I'd also like to thank the student services folks and advising during this registration period that we had, the PEAK season. It's lines and lines of students. We tried to get more help through the counselors. I'm very grateful for your contributions. We had ELT members contribute. 4.18 increase in services provided to students. That's significant. We are going to keep trying every semester little by little, but that is very helpful, so I thank you for that.

The enrollment management initiatives, there is a summary there what's been completed and what's in progress. Remember, this has been work that's been neglected for years, for decades. So you won't see an improvement from one day to the next but we are chipping away, little by little, and we have a team dedicated to that, so I'm very happy that that's being accomplished, too. More and more you'll be

seeing improvements in the whole process, the student experience process.

In fact, the ELT is going to be having a retreat in the summer, going to focus on the student experience. Everybody's going to follow the same steps that a student has to do to apply, the assessments, everything. That will be an interesting experience.

Regarding advising and counseling, so we have some highlights. We have five new program advisors. Their names are there. We welcome them to the Pima team.

On February 12 there was a love-your-major event with the U of A transfer group, and that was held at West Campus. The counseling faculty have created some healthy relationship programming in this month, early March, and you can see the schedule there as to when and where they will take place. So we are very pleased with the counseling teams working on something so important as this.

Student Life has had several events. I won't go through all of them, but they have been at various campuses, working with student senate, for example. Here at Downtown, there was a self-care 101 that took place here, and I heard it was very successful.

The emerging leaders, the spring program at the Downtown Campus. Keynote speaker, one of our faculty members, Dr. Dennis Just.

First-year experience program hosted a Career Cafe at Desert Vista, popcorn with the program also at West Campus. We are happy with all those folks that worked on these initiatives.

And getting close to the end. The Speaker Series, we have one coming up on March 5. That's going to include Josie and some fellow colleagues in the English department, right? They will be sharing their own pieces that they have written. That's poetry, short story, fiction, everything? Yeah. Please come and support your colleagues. That will be a lot of fun.

And then the last one for the semester is on April 2, called Information Poverty, why students need more than information literacy skills to succeed in life. These are from our educational support faculty librarians, Chuck Becker and Keith Rocky. They are a dynamic duo. I think you'll learn a lot and be fully engaged.

I have my schedule, connect and reconnect with the provost. As I had mentioned before, you come to a room and then we talk, but I felt it would be more engaging if I went to the various units, walked around the faculty offices, go to the student services centers, and libraries, and ask what questions do you have or concerns or things I can follow up on?

So it's a way for us to connect on a more one-on-one basis.

Please look which one accommodates you, and I will be around at that campus. So the next one is at Downtown on March 8.

The last item is Julian's memo that he sent to everyone about the partial curriculum hiatus. He did meet with the Faculty Senate leadership before sending out the e-mail as well as with ELT, the presidents, and myself, the chancellor, and the college curriculum council, as well.

That's briefly in a nutshell everything that's been going on.

Are there any questions up to this point?

If not, you can see me at the connect or reconnect with the provost. You can always e-mail me or stop by my office. It's always a pleasure to see you guys. I miss the classroom, and I miss you, as faculty. It's nice to see you here together.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you, Provost Duran-Cerda. Drive safely.

Next up we have an elections update with Tal.

>> TAL SUTTON: There is going to be two phases to this. One is to sort of get candidates interested. So I'm putting together a Google form right now that will go out hopefully next week that will sort of call for people interested in running for senate.

If you remember the change we made to the charter, seats will now

be designated by divisions. This is the survey. I didn't share it, because if you edit in Google forms, they are permanent. You can't track changes in there at all.

That's unfortunate. But anyway, I will just walk through it quickly. The beginning is just sort of a description of what we are looking for. I sort of put in a note where we currently have officers, so there is four full-time and one part-time seat allocated to mathematics division, but I'm going to be continuing as an officer, so that position is full, so we are going to be looking for three full-time faculty and one part-time faculty. This sort of lays out what is going to be available.

Then obviously I need to know your name, if you're going to run for the seat. Then I tried to sort of be as general as possible. I hope this reads well. I will ask for anyone that's willing to sort of look through this over the weekend or early next week to give me some feedback. I will ask for volunteers at the end of this.

I will walk through this survey quickly. What division do you want to represent in Faculty Senate? So note, it doesn't need to be your own division. It likely will, but it need not be, based on the language in the charter.

A question, because I'm anticipating that what might happen,

especially with the current composition that senate has, we might get more candidates in one division than there are available seats, and then in another division we will get no candidates for some number of seats.

So I'm just asking if the division you are running for has more senate candidates than seats available, would you consider representing another division that has too few candidates, in which case your name would be included on that division's ballot, which would be the second Google form that goes on after this one.

Then I ask, what is your faculty designation, because I sort of need to know if you're full-time or part-time faculty. Full-time means you're either instructional faculty or full-time staff instructor, and part-time faculty is just the general term for adjunct faculty or part-time staff instructor.

Then the other component related to a peculiarity of the language in the charter is part-time faculty can have a seat either for their particular part-time faculty seat or they can serve in one of the full-time seats, so there is a specific question for part-time faculty about what seat they are specifically interested in running for. Since they can run for either, with the one stipulation that for a particular division you can't have more than half of those

seats that are meant for full-time faculty to be filled with part-time faculty.

And then there is the next section, which is just the information that is going to be included, if you sort of remember, we didn't, in our charter revision, we didn't try to force a constraint to enforce a diverse collection of faculty per division, you know, mandating some amount of representation across some number of campuses, or the specific disciplines within a division. So I'm going to collect that information. Why aren't you going on to section 2? Why aren't you going to section 2?

Oh, it's right here. So now I will just collect, this is me collecting information that will go on to the ballot. So that when people are considering who to vote for, you can sort of see what specific division you belong to, as was mentioned earlier, I might be interested in representing arts, for some reason, because they're really cool. So here I would specifically say, my earlier question I would have said I am in the math, I'm running for arts, but here I would say I am from the math division.

And then another question is what do you identify as your home campus? I switched Community Campus with PimaOnline, since I think that makes more sense right now.

And then what discipline do you consider your primary area of expertise? I'm not super happy with the phrasing of that question, because I know -- math is very easy. That question is -- but I know there are people out there that have complicated situations with what they might be certified to teach, what they are teaching, what they kind of have to teach to make load, and so I just don't quite know how to sort of frame that question.

If you sort of identify yourself as a gender studies instructor but maybe you're listed as a history faculty, what do you identify here as? I don't know.

But this is -- what I'm trying to get at, capture in this question is when your butt is parked in Faculty Senate and you are sort of discussing curriculum-based issues, how do you identify, how are you going to sort of make decisions or make points or make arguments for or against something in senate from based on your, like, based on what you identify as and what you identify as your discipline as.

That's what I'm trying to sort of get at in that particular question. With that being said, what I would now like is two to three people I can give permissions to do this, so they can go through and look at it and see if it makes sense. If somebody does

not feel particularly, like, if you feel like, oh, I don't really know much about this, you would be the perfect guinea pig, perfect sets of eyes to look at it, because I need to make sure that it makes sense.

Are you offering to volunteer?

>> SPEAKER: I'm offering to volunteer

>> TAL SUTTON: Thank you, Lisa. And Rosa?

>> ROSA MORALES: Can I make a comment, too?

It might be a good idea to include a question about what committees would you be interested in participating, given that everybody that is in the Faculty Senate will have to, you know, participate in a subcommittee. And then make a list of the ones that I already, that already exist, but then put a couple of lines that they might come up with something.

>> TAL SUTTON: Then I could add that in -- okay. I will add that in section 2, a question like that in section 2.

>> ROSA MORALES: I think we are trying to create that sense that participating in the Faculty Senate is just one of the options, but it's important that they also extend their engagement by collaborating one of those.

>> TAL SUTTON: When I send out this survey I will include in an

e-mail a brief description of what senate does, what the expectations of senators are, so that's going to be outside of the survey because I want the survey to be a little bit cleaner so it's easier to get through. Then there will be sort of a wordy e-mail to read or not read to learn more about the senate.

>> SPEAKER: A quick question, and I don't know there is anything we can do about this, but I guess being in the communications division and a very, very small minority in that division, I'm a little concerned that disciplines are going to be lost. Because if we get all writing faculty or all Spanish faculty applying, and because they have a majority of members, they are the ones that get voted in and small disciplines will not be represented on Faculty Senate.

>> TAL SUTTON: This was brought up in our discussions about the charter change, and it was one of the issues that we said, if we can encourage people to have, to vote for a diverse representation within their division, we are hoping that our faculty are collaborative enough they are okay with that. If that ends up not being the case, we have stipulations of kicking in certain seats. For instance, if we don't get any representation from West Campus, which, okay, that was a bad example, Northwest Campus, then there would necessarily

-- there would be for that election cycle a position to be created as an at-large member for that campus.

That's one way we can sort of fix that. To make the opposite point of what you're suggesting is we also don't want to put an undue burden on tiny departments to say you must, in addition to all the crazy amount of work you have to do amongst a tiny group of people, we are going to add to that responsibility load by saying you need to select a senator.

It really was an impossible balance, and we are trying for the best fit. If this ends up being an issue after this election, I'm hoping there is ways -- I'm really hoping there are ways to get around that, which is why I have questions like would you be willing to represent a different division? I'm perfectly, based on who I see month in and month out here, I'm perfectly expecting that some of these divisions are going to not have as many nominations as they have seats.

So if somebody wants to have a voice at senate and they are concerned they might not get elected in a field of 12 people, they can check that box and then be put into a different division.

I'm clearly out of time. In my group I have Lisa, Rosa, and I have Joe. Grenier. Rosa. And Joe Brewer.

>> SPEAKER: Thank you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Okay. So I have the next few minutes, and I will be as brief as possible.

So this, I just want to say that I sent this out to all of the people who are members of senate committees. Some of those members are not all senators. We allow membership on our committees for those who are faculty but not necessarily are senators.

So anyway, they were all tasked with the homework of revising goals and making sure that membership information is accurate. So if I appreciate the work that committees have done to meet and shore up this information. If you're on a committee and you haven't yet done that, please be sure to do so.

I have a little document here that you can link to if you'd like that outlines all of the members and all of the goals for the next year are currently being added into that document.

So if you could please do that by the April meeting, that would be wonderful. If you're a senator and you'd like to be on a committee, we have assessment, we have accreditation, we have professional development. Although I understand that one could be dissolving. We have a part-time faculty committee. Please let me know and I will direct you to the chair.

You can also look at this document here for a full list of the committees that we have.

>> ROSA MORALES: Our chair for the committee was Michael Parker, and he's not here now. When you sent us that, I looked at the notes, and I wrote the objective based on the notes that we had there before, but I think it's important to mention that we need more members.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Maybe we can come back to that in April to solicit more members.

I was hoping that today we would have time to actually break into our committee groups and that would allow those who aren't currently on one to pick one at least for the meeting. We just don't have time, as you can see, but maybe -- hopefully in April we will see if the agenda is clear enough, leaves enough time to do something like that. I think that's a very good point.

It's great to be involved with at least one committee.

>> PATTY FIGUEROA: Josie, what's going on with the standing committees? Because at one time they were under the purview of Faculty Senate, the vice presidents...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That is a very good question. I think Tal would be best to answer that or... good question.

>> TAL SUTTON: So that's a very good question. As we just saw in the college curriculum college AP, the membership is changing. The membership had been frozen way back when Michael Parker was Faculty Senate president.

So the old practice was in February a call went out and a survey saying would you be interested in serving on a standing committee, if so, which ones. You could select which ones. That went out to all faculty as well as all staff. And then the results of faculty came to the president and vice president, and then the results for the staff went to their chair and vice-chair.

We would go through and sort of try and do our best fit, give people their first choices as best as possible, maybe their second or their third choices.

I did that the first time I was president, which was -- I don't know the year, but it was -- yeah, it was a while ago. And then Michael Parker became president, and it was frozen that year. So he didn't have to do it or he didn't do it in that year. And I didn't do it last year because it was still frozen. It's already March 1. It's frozen still.

The people that were selected back when I was president and have been stuck or at least been listed on that committee since, it's been

in limbo. We have been told that they have been working to revamp it. That's kind of -- I mean, I think it's worth maybe me adding that to an agenda item for our meeting with Lee and the 3 Ps.

>> PATTY FIGUEROA: So where does that make us stand? Now, I was at the curriculum council for years, but I haven't been in it for two years, but my name still appears on it, about the membership. In fact, at one time many of us were on quite a few of them.

>> TAL SUTTON: Yeah, it's a problem.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: The questions are logical, but -- it's in disarray. I wish we could give you a better answer, but we are not the ones to do so.

But I think Tal's suggestion to put it on our next leadership meeting agenda is a good one. We will make very good use of that hour of time.

Carol?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Could you resend us where to find that list again? I'm looking, and I can't find it in my list.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: List of committees?

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: Yes.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: If you open up the agenda, you can link to it from that item.

>> TAL SUTTON: I'll e-mail it to you.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: It's not opening?

>> SPEAKER: My agenda has no link to it.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: That's strange. This is the one I pulled up.

Here is our agenda in our shared senate folder.

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: We just got the officers meeting
link...

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think what happened is you saved it to your
own Google Drive, so you don't get any revisions, so if you go into
our senate folder and click on the March 2019 agenda --

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: (off microphone.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: For me it's opening. This is the one that's
directly from our folder.

Let me make sure. I will do this now. I will do share. Anyone
at Pima College with the link can view it.

>> SPEAKER: I see it in your update in the drive.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: You just want to make sure you click on the
agenda from the drive or from the e-mail I originally sent on Monday.
No, not from the e-mail? Okay. Go to the drive. Okay. That's good
to know.

So just make sure that you go to our shared senate folder and

click on March, and then you can open the agenda from there and it has this document.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: It updated now in the e-mail too.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Now you click on it from the e-mail and it opens? Could be a refresh thing on your computer, you need to refresh the browser windows, because it's basing it off of cookies.

We can now move on. These we can go through quickly. Minutes from the last meeting have been provided. The ones from our meeting a week and a half ago have not, but I will make them available when they are. We had a good meeting. We discussed a variety of different things, including the topic of technology, and we spent a lengthy amount of time. We discussed faculty allocation and that process is beginning shortly. We are supposed to start meeting soon, but I haven't -- we haven't yet started.

So that -- we will keep you updated. There is no real news to provide at this point except that process is starting up again.

The biggest thing I think we discussed and that's on our radar right now is the CDAC evolution, and I sent drafts of the handbook, and I'm collecting comments. Common ones that I have been sent include the dean vote. There is still conflicting perspectives whether or not the deans have the voting power. Same concerns with

part-time and full-time.

I'm getting other good comments as well, like replace the word under the textbook section "purchase" with "use" to allow for OER to be implemented there. So we are getting good comments collected. Please, if you haven't already, share this with your constituents and collect feedback, because the truth is that this is a very difficult document to be a one-size-fits-all. There are a lot of differences between our different areas.

It's really important that this is seen by as many faculty as possible so that every little nuance can be at least communicated to the work group so that it can be considered.

One other final thing here is that as officers, we did request that because there are a lot of concerns and issues and questions that the handbook simply can't address, that we have suggested that a work group be formed to create a supplement that contains answers to frequently asked questions, explanations for issues, et cetera, and also provides a process for the vision moving forward, which is to combine the leadership handbook with the DFC handbook, that they ultimately be one shared, joined document.

Officers want to add anything to what I have said or... correct anything if I said it wrong?

Okay. Please, if you have comments, what I'm suggesting to everyone is to send them to Jenny Scott, because that's what she has requested. But cc me, and I'm creating a separate document, as well.

Okay. I do have to say that Jenny has been fantastic. She sends responses like, at 10:00 at night. You can tell she's devoted herself heart and soul to this work.

Appreciation for Jenny. She always responds to everyone's questions and concerns. Much appreciated. She's not here, but I think she does deserve some thanks for that.

Any questions -- speaker series. Dolores already reminded everyone. March 5. Please come if you can. They will be on hold after this spring. These two are the last two you'll get a chance to attend for a while.

We go on to reports. We only have two of them. I think, MaryKris -- in the interest of time, my goal is to get us out by our scheduled time for these meetings, which is 3:00, because otherwise we are left with very few people. So if you could please be succinct as possible and we will move to closure.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: I'm not known for my succinctness, but I'll do my best. Okay.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Our schedule is for the Board of Governors

report. We can do PCCEA first.

>> BROOKE ANDERSON: Mine is, like, so fast. Can I go ahead?

Thanks.

So basically, just right now, the board report is being written.

So you have time to send me any comments or items that you'd like to be included, so I have to get the report to the board next Thursday.

So remember, send me accomplishments, faculty accomplishments, especially in relation to things like student success, making sure to highlight all of those. I have Jackie on for this next month. We are doing curiosity symposiums in the English department. Any sorts of things that you have that you want to share to celebrate faculty and the work that we do, publications, conferences, all that good stuff.

And then the board meeting is the 13th, this month. That's it.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Finally we have the PCCEA report.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: So one of the most significant things is our new Meet and Confer process, such as it is, and there have been 63 new policies coughed up by admin for our digestion. Some of the most significant ones concern changes to what faculty workload is as well as the circumstances under which faculty might get RIF'd. And there is an especially deleterious impact anticipated on educational

support faculty, specifically counselors.

I'm hoping Josie Milliken is going to send and make available this PCCEA report via e-mail or via the shared drive so that -- I know it came in an e-mail to me, but that was because I was supposed to read it. I'm just trying to make sure that everybody has access to it.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: It's linked to the agenda.

>> MARYKRIS MCILWAINE: Coolness. Good.

Okay. Another item is the mandatory training. We voted to endorse that well-written letter from the communications faculty. So you behaved as PCCEA wanted you to.

Another item concerns overload contracts. I want y'all to know that PCCEA has been working diligently to address an issue that has arisen with the timely generation of overload contracts. A number of faculty have found themselves working without pay relative to their overload contracts. Those have gotten really delayed in a lot of situations for various faculty members this semester, but PCCEA has been working to get that ironed out.

So we are working for you as best we can.

Faculty and administrators salaries and positions, those are under review right now, and PCCEA representatives are meeting right

now, as we speak, with David Bea, talking about that. There will be more information forthcoming after that meeting.

It makes it difficult to recruit faculty to come and work at the college when salaries keep slipping off of the desired benchmark. We were trying to keep the Masters' level salary as second-highest in the state and it has continued to slip and slip and fall out of alignment with that vision.

There has been a severe and serious issue, I will not name any names, but a certain administrator clearly in violation of policy and refusing to even listen to reason was denying a faculty member the permission to have an employee representative group present with him or her at a meeting, and this administrator was claiming that, no, only if there is a grievance or a disciplinary action should that policy be observed.

This is clearly not what policy says. So PCCEA is working to get that ironed out.

The benefits committee is looking to see if we can replace the whatever big corporate entity deals with prescriptions or something.

Flex schedule request reminder. That's today. If you want to put in for a flex schedule, see appendix B of the faculty personnel and policy statement, if it's even called that anymore. It's

probably called handbook now or something, but that deadline to put in for a flex schedule is today, March 1.

Summer schedule has gone live for viewing, even if not for students to actually register. You should check that and make sure all your courses are listed correctly and that there are no errors or omissions. Matej sent me an e-mail and said particularly highlight the fact that there is an all faculty meeting Friday, March 8.

That's exactly one week from today. It will be in this room, Amethyst Room, noon to 2:00 p.m. That's an all faculty meeting.

So mark your calendars. Friday, March 8. Noon to 2:00 p.m. All faculty meeting where we will have a number of things obviously to discuss.

I am told that Matej Boguszak will be able to answer your questions that I am but your humble messenger. Thank you for putting up with me.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Thank you.

Should we just hang out a little longer? What do you think?

Any motions to...

>> SPEAKER: Lisa Werner. Back to the changes in the Ws and the Is that we want to discuss next time, I know that a lot of people I represent are going to have a lot of different thoughts on this.

Who would I go to in the meantime ask to make sure I am understanding the reasons why it is being done? I mean, should I go to Julian?

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: Start with Julian. You could also, if you wanted just to do more research, contact the administrators in charge of advising at your campus or at all campuses. That's what I would do.

>> SPEAKER: Cool. Thanks.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: I think someone was going to motion to...

>> CAROL CHRISTOFFERSON: So moved.

>> SPEAKER: Second.

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

>> JOSIE MILLIKEN: All opposed? Abstain?

Have a wonderful weekend.

(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.